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<tr>
<td>FonF</td>
<td>Focus on Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoFs</td>
<td>Focus on FormS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>First Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Second Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>Second Language Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>Willingness to Communicate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

A communicative language teaching approach (CLT) gives L2 teachers the opportunity to create a ‘free’ classroom environment, which centers around communication (meaning input only and extensive exposure to the L2; prefabrically without any grammar-based teaching) (Spada 2006; Long 1991). This would supposedly lead to enhanced long-lasting effects on proficiency in the L2. However not enough research has been done to confirm this statement (Richards 2011). According to a dynamic usage based theory (DUB), all dissimilarities between students as well as all various sub-systems within a language, should be considered in each study conducted in the field of second language development (Verpoor, Xu 2011). The present study examined proficiency and grammar and compared three groups of secondary school students; one experimental group who received a CLT (focus on form) approach and two control groups who received an instructional-based approach (focus on form S). The results were analysed from a DUB point of view and it was found that the experimental group of students did show an advanced level of proficiency, but not grammar, than the control groups.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

Consider the following sentences, extracted from Dutch students’ writing samples:

1. In my holiday, I not go on a vacation. I think i’m going stay by some friends

2. We’re going to Dubai this summer, to meet some old friends. Meanwhile my dad will fly on to Saudi- Arabië for his work and to sort out something for our next stay.

Any who has a sense of the English language, can feel and see that sentence 2 is constructed in a more advanced and authentic manner than the first sentence. Differences like these is one reason for the enormous difficulty of measuring general proficiency, especially when realizing that the writers of these sentences have the same age and education.

It has not been until recently in the field of second language acquisition, that more and more scholars see the need for measuring general proficiency and develop a teaching method which stimulates proficiency. In *Theories of Teaching in Language Teaching*, Jack Richards explains that before 1960, grammar-based approaches were favoured by many teachers, as its theory underlying it was “ascertained through the use of reason or rational thought” (Richards 22). However, systematic and principled thinking was used to support the method, rather than empirical investigation. When an opposing group emerged, known as Communicative Language Teaching, they were not taken seriously by their opponents due to lack of “evidence to demonstrate that learning was more successful if ‘communicative’ teaching materials were adopted” (Richards 22). According to Richards every approach needs to be tested and examined in real life teaching situations and measured outcomes should indicate whether an approach has proven successful.

Many approaches have failed in this aspect and to establish if a CLT treatment can indeed increase proficiency, more studies have to be conducted and several approaches should be tested. Not by means of merely testing grammar, but by means of testing the language as one unit. This might support and motivate teachers to adopt a more contemporary communicative teaching method (rather than a grammar-based method), from which students will benefit with long lasting effects.

To get a grip on both a traditional teaching method as well as a communicative teaching method and its effects on both decontextualized grammar and proficiency, the present study examines the second language development of three groups of students. All
Dutch secondary school Havo students receive a treatment of six months, from January to June. Two groups will function as control groups and receive a traditional grammar-based method, also known as focus on forms (FoFs, see section 2.2 for a description). The other group is the experimental group and this group will receive a communicative language teaching approach, known as focus on form (see section 2.2 for a description of FonF).

At the beginning, during and at the end of the treatment period, the students will be asked to participate in two grammar tests and three writing tests. This paper compares a CLT method with an emphasis on input with a traditional form focused method (grammar). Groups will be compared by means of the grammar tests and the writing samples. This might give a clearer picture of both grammar development and general proficiency.

This study will take a dynamic usage based approach (see section 2.1.2 for a description of DUB), as it is important that all aspects of the L2 are taken into consideration. A DUB approach enables scholars to measure proficiency in texts on all language levels. The approach even surpasses earlier approaches (like a usage based one), since it also includes learners’ aptitudes (e.g. age, background, education, motivation and so on).

The paper is organized as follows. Chapter two describes the development of CLT and then explains DUB, which is an approach in line with CLT. Subsequently, focus on form and focus on formS are discussed and a distinction will be presented, since these two methods are used for the experiment. At the end, the research questions and connecting hypotheses are presented. Chapter three will give the specifics of how the study was organized, including its participants, teaching methods and materials, tests plus the measuring of the test and analyses. Chapter four will demonstrate the results of the analyses of the two grammar tests and three writing samples. Chapter five discusses the results by answering the research tests and reflecting on the hypotheses. Results are interpreted from a DUB point of view, but they will also be compared to previous studies. Finally, chapter six concludes by declaring that a CLT method leads to advanced proficiency compared to a traditional instructional method.
Second language development (SLD) is a field in which many theories and approaches have been discussed. As this study will examine how a communicative approach (focus on form) on an experimental group may affect change in their second language (L2), as opposed to two groups who received a traditional teaching method (focus on formS), theories which describe these factors and contribute to change are explained in this section: Communicative Language Teaching, Dynamic Usage Based approach, focus on form and focus on formS.

2.1 Communicative Language Teaching

Although the exact implementation of Communicative language teaching (CLT) in classrooms is still debatable and its practice has been interpreted in different ways, this section will describe developments in theory, research and practice of CLT. Contemporary communicative language teaching in the United States can be traced back to the early 1970s, with the original work of Savignon (1972). Savignon's research emphasized “the functional nature of language and how language teaching can allow room for “free” communication without a subsequent loss in grammatical accuracy and other areas of discrete language knowledge (VanPatten 926). Since then, changes have appeared and currently, most “educators agree that CLT is undergoing a transformation (...) and view CLT as in a state of transition (...)” (Spada 271). While many applied linguists and second language teachers find the term CLT no longer useful because of “different methods which overlap in several ways” (Spada 272) and teachers who use the same method but implement it differently, this paper takes a perspective that is in line with CLT; a Dynamic Usage Based (DUB) one.

Originally, CLT was introduced after a theory known as communicative competence was developed. Some linguists (Savignon 1972, Hymes 1971), rejected ideas given by Chomsky (1957), who only dealt with innate grammar and linguistic competences in L2 learning. The opposition had the notion that for learning a language, a student would need more than a set grammar rules. According to them, L2 learners needed actual communication tasks so they would be able to interact and consequently learn a language by using it. Thus, a communicative methodology was embraced by several applied linguists, including Long (1983, 1996) Krashen (1984) and Littlewood (1981). Within the field of second language acquisition (SLA), Krashen and Long researched two different but connected hypotheses, which were particular important for the development of CLT and our conception of CLT: The Comprehensible Input Hypothesis (Krashen 1982) and the Interaction Hypothesis (Long,
Spada summarizes Krashen’s input hypothesis as follows: “Traditionally, L2 learners have been taught grammar rules and receive correction when they make grammatical mistakes while L1 learners receive neither grammatical instruction nor explicit correction when they make errors” (Spada 274). Therefore, Krashen’s suggestion was that if the L2 learners would receive a similar treatment as in L1 acquisition, the L2 learner would be more successful. In *The Input Hypothesis and its Rivals*, Krashen claims that according to the Input Hypothesis, “we acquire language by understanding messages, that ‘comprehensible input’ is the essential environmental ingredient in language acquisition” (Krashen 46). Krashen also stresses that communicative language teaching is achieved by understanding that we acquire new languages when we attempt to produce a message and “adjust our output and try a new version” (Krashen 47). Krashen argues that exposure to a second language would lead to more proficiency and provides Comprehensible-Based methods such as that focus should be on subject matters instead of language itself. In such classes, the subject is central and taught in the target language. Thus, teachers attempt to make the input comprehensible. Tests should also be on subject matters, but in the target language. According to Krashen’s studies, L2 students in ‘subject matter classes’ acquire “at least as much of the second language as traditional comparison students, and often acquire more. In addition, they learn impressive amounts of subject matter at the same time” (Krashen 55).

Next to Krashen’s hypothesis was another group of linguists who were interested in input hypotheses and together formed the interactionist theory. Evelyn Hatch (1978) made the claim that L2 learners had to participate in conversational interactions and it is “through this process that they learn the grammar” (Spada 275). Michael Long agrees with Hatch and deems interaction a vital aspect in this approach. Long explains: “crucial for language learning is interaction between learners and other speakers (...) particularly important is the negotiation for meaning that can occur more or less predictably in certain interactions” (Doughty, Williams 22). It increases input comprehensibility and gives access to unknown L2 vocabulary and grammatical forms.

All in all, CLT embraces several approaches and theories and many scholars agree that the traditional teaching of grammar rules in L2 learning is not the right way for SLD. Features such as exposure, producing and interacting are recurring themes in all approaches, or as Spada argues: “all have two common features which grant them entry into the CLT family: an emphasis on meaning and learner-centered interaction” (Spada 281).
2.1.2 Dynamic Usage Based

Norris and Ortega, who wrote a paper describing and analyzing 49 individual empirical studies on L2 learning, concluded that not only the effectiveness of particular instructional techniques should be investigated. In fact, to conduct an even more reliable study, “the potential impact of a range of moderator variables (e.g. learner factors such as aptitude, age and learning style; cognitive factors, such as learner developmental readiness and degree of noticing; pedagogical factors, such as timing, duration and intensity of instruction (...))” (Norris and Ortega 204) should be included as well. A recent theoretical approach in line with CLT and which deals with learners’ aptitudes is a dynamic usage based (DUB) approach.

A conventional usage based approach “holds that there is no innate grammar that determines the developmental path and; instead, each learner has to discover the regularities and patterns of an L2 through exposure and experience with the language, resulting in individual trajectories and lots of trials and errors along the way” (Verspoor, Xiaoyan 2). From a DUB perspective, one keeps in mind all possible dissimilarities between individual L2 learners, such as age, intelligence, verbal aptitude, motivation, type of exposure and context.

“The term ‘dynamic’ implies that the present level of development depends critically on the previous level of development and therefore “initial conditions” are important” (Verspoor, Xu 2). A DUB perspective implies that no single factor causes development, but some may be more effective than others, often also depending on time.

When working with a DUB approach it is vital to comprehend that several aspects of language may not grow at the same level. Learning is not linear and when a child is showing an increase in vocabulary, he may show a decrease in using tenses – simply because ‘sub-systems’ tend to compete. Several studies have already showed this interaction or competition of an L2 learner. For example, Verspoor, Lowie and van Dijk (2008), looked at the progress of Dutch learners with English as the L2. They found “an asymmetrical competitive interaction between the development of the average sentence length in words (a sentence complexity measure) and the TTR (a lexical creativity measure).” (Verspoor, Xu 4). Nevertheless, it is believed that even at the early stages, L2 learners who receive extensive L2 input already show more advanced constructions. However they are also more likely to produce errors, since they are trying new constructions.

In general a DUB approach is compatible with a CLT approach, but the added insights are that frequency of input, including reiteration are important. Moreover, a DUB approach claims that learners must make errors and show variability to proceed. Most errors will
disappear on their own if the target language is used often enough and only need explicit instruction if they tend to fossilize.

2.2 Focus on FormS versus Focus on Form

Having explained communicative language teaching and a DUB approach, a distinction between two different approaches will be made: Focus on formS (FoFs) versus focus on form (FoF). Whereas focus on FoFs is considered a traditional ‘instruction-based’ approach, FonF is a communicative approach (Long 180). These two methods are used for this experiment.

Michael Long’s paper Focus on form: a Design Feature in language teaching methodology, was first presented in 1988 and attended to the difference between FoFs and FonF. FoFs (also mentioned as ‘grammar-instruction’, formal-instruction and ‘form-focused instruction’) is described by Long as a traditional, synthetic approach to language teaching, whose basic principle is to organize courses by means of teaching individual elements (tenses, plurality and other ‘isolated’ grammar aspects). In contrast, FonF “entails a prerequisite engagement in meaning before attention to linguistic features can be expected to be effective” (Doughty and Williams 3). Long in his paper Focus on Form: A design feature in language teaching methodology, described the term as following:

Focus on form (...) draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication. (Long, 1991, 45 – 46).

According to Long, the advantage of FonF is thus that it supports ‘cognitive processes’, because of its focus on meaning or communication. The traditional FoFs separates and isolates grammar teaching and it removes linguistic aspects from any context or communicative activities. Furthermore, a FoFs syllabus consist of “inductively or deductively presented information about the L2 and (...) classroom procedures are designed to present and practice a series of linguistic items” (Long, 1998, 16).

Long clings to the most restricted interpretation of the term FonF, which means that he does not see any role for FoFs in language teaching. Some linguists, like Ellis (R) and Hatch, more or less agree with Long but still have investigated and experimented with FoFs approaches. For example, Ellis in Current Issues in the Teaching of Grammar: An SLA Perspective, raises the question ‘should we teach grammar’ and addresses issues such as what
grammar should we teach. Ellis states that “This question was motivated by early research into naturalistic L2 acquisition, which showed that learners appeared to follow a natural order and sequence of acquisition (...)” (Ellis 85) This was in line with Krashen (1981), who “argued that grammar instruction played no role in acquisition, a view based on the conviction that learners (including classroom learners) would automatically proceed along their built-in syllabus as long as they had access to comprehensible input and were sufficiently motivated” (Krashen 78). Therefore, Ellis distinguished between ‘naturalistic’ learners and ‘instructed’ learners. Naturalistic learners are those who acquire an L2 by FonF, whereas instructed learners acquire by means of FoFs. Ellis concludes:

the order of acquisition was the same for instructed and naturalistic learners (although there were some interesting differences), that instructed learners generally achieved higher levels of grammatical competence than naturalistic learners and that instruction was no guarantee that learners would acquire what they had been taught. These results were interpreted as showing that the acquisitional processes of instructed and naturalistic learning were the same but that instructed learners progressed more rapidly and achieved higher levels of proficiency. Thus, some researchers concluded (e.g., Long, 1988) that teaching grammar was beneficial but that to be effective grammar had to be taught in a way that was compatible with the natural processes of acquisition. (Ellis 85).

Ellis mainly looked at research conducted in 2000 by Norris and Ortega, who have also searched for an effective form of grammar teaching in a communicative language classroom. Their conclusion is based on researching 49 studies they selected and have found that instructional explicit effects are long-lasting. Moreover, they found that FonF and FoFs treatments are equally effective. However, they also found that the essential features which distinguish FonF and FoFs, had been “inconsistently operationalized, and the wide range of actual observed sizes within each category suggest that the particular subtypes of instructions need to be further investigated (...)” (Norris and Ortega 203). There are more linguists, such as Doughty and Long, DeKeyser and Lightbown, who have some problems with interpretations of the term FonF as proposed by Long and either see a role for FoFs, or stumble upon other ambiguous matters, such as that L1 learners acquire a language in a different way as an adult L2 learner would and can therefore not be compared.
Andringa, who conducted a study in whether there is an interface between explicit (FoFs, what one acquires through form focused instructions) and implicit (FonF, what one acquires through communicative contexts) knowledge and the effects of explicit instruction to the development of second language proficiency for learners of Dutch as a second language concludes: “this study has come to the conclusion that the value of explicit knowledge is limited” (Andringa). While Andringa expected to find a great value of explicit language learning, he proved the contrary. Moreover, “this study has shown, but also pointed out by the DeKeyser (2003), there are surprisingly few studies that actually compared explicit and implicit types of instruction” (Andringa 158).

Yet, one important remark has yet to be made. Ellis expresses doubts about the nature of the research evidence: “Many studies (including most of those reviewed by Norris and Ortega) measure learning in terms of constrained constructed responses (e.g., fill in the blanks, sentence joining, or sentence transformation), which can be expected to favour grammar teaching” (Ellis 86). Ellis continues that “there is only mixed evidence that instruction results in learning when it is measured by means of free constructed responses (e.g., communicative tasks)” (Ellis 86.). This may also clarify the outcome of Andringa’s study. He built his study based on the idea that explicit (FoFs) instruction is very valuable, as numerous studies proved. However, Andringa did use free writing samples for his study and measuring effects that would probably not favour instructed L2 learners.

Andringa therefore also feels the need for ‘free’ writing samples: “The outcomes clearly suggest that measures assessing grammatical knowledge in isolated contexts cannot readily be taken as representative of the learner’s implicit grammatical knowledge” (Andringa 175). And in Norris and Ortega (2000), only 16 percent of the 49 unique studies measured and used a free constructed response. Although their conclusion based on their empirical findings is that - contrary to Andringa’s study - explicit instruction is more effective than implicit instruction, one caveat is: “effects are likely to be greater in studies that employ selected response or constrained constructed response test formats, whereas instruction is likely to result in smaller observed effects if researchers choose to employ metalinguistic judgment or free response test formats” (Norris and Ortega 203).
All in all, many linguists do see a role for grammar instruction, since it has proved to include positive effects on an L2 learner on the long run. Yet, hardly any study has concentrated on how well form-focused L2 learners perform in terms of proficiency in ‘free’ responses, compared to learners who have received a form of CLT and FonF. This is highly odd, since, for example, real life situations do not ask a learner to fill in blanks. More importantly is the manner in which a learner can use the language. After all, a language is learnt to use them, not to know about them. Especially learners who just start with a new language may benefit more rapid by learning a language through FonF, instead of by FoFs. This study therefore compares effects of two methods used for Dutch secondary school students, who have now entered their second year of learning English as a second language. There are three groups in total; one experimental group who receives a FonF treatment and two control groups who carry on with their standard FoFs method, all three taught by the same teacher. To find out if grammar instruction is indeed as valuable for L2 learning as some linguist say and what effects it has on an L2 learner’s general proficiency compared to a high input method, two research questions and connected hypotheses have been formed.

2.3 Research Questions and Hypotheses

A Dynamic Usage Based theory holds that language learning is not linear and that several sub-systems might compete with each other whilst learning a language. This applies for both FonF methods as for FoFs methods. When a small aspect of grammar, for example plural, starts to develop in an L2 learners systems, this may be at the expense of another subsystem such as the use of the past tense. Another example would be that the lexicon may develop before sentences become more complex (Caspi 2010). Crucial however, is that all these sub-systems, which include a learner’s internal resources such as aptitude and motivation, play a role in the developmental process.

The present study focuses on the second language development of three groups of secondary school students; two control groups who receive a FoFs treatment and one experimental group who receives a FonF treatment. In particular, their grammar knowledge and their general proficiency are examined. Grammar is tested since the focus of FoFs is on grammar and this should be tested comparing the groups in this aspect. Proficiency is tested since FonF is a CLT method, which can best be tested through spontaneously produced writing samples. Again, a comparison can be made between the three groups and their
development in general proficiency. Finally, since this study takes a DUB approach, several learners’ aptitudes are studied as well. Therefore, at the end of the experiment a test will be carried to measure the learners’ motivation towards and willingness to communicate in the L2. The following research questions have been shaped:

Research Questions

1. *Do the experimental students acquire different types of grammar as well as the traditional students?*

   Focus on past and present tense and comparison, since these elements are central in second grade Havo.

2. *Do the experimental students become more “proficient” than the control group?*

   Proficiency is operationalized as a holistic score for an informal writing assignment and a total score on receptive vocabulary.

3. *Are experiment students more motivated and are they more willing to communicate that the control students?*

   Motivation and willingness to communicate are tested by means of a survey.

Based on the stated research questions, two hypotheses have been formed. Keeping in mind that learning is not linear, it is expected that first of all, the experimental group will perform worse on grammar tests in the early stages than the control groups. However, they will eventually draw level at a later stage with the control groups, due to exposure and extensive use of the L2. The experimental group might first focus on, for example, the use of vocabulary and at a later stage at the use of grammar. So diverse variables are expected to show growth, but at different rates.

Secondly, when looking at proficiency, three writing samples are scored at different stages (pre-test and post-tests) and the following is expected: From early phases, the experimental group will not necessarily show more proficiency than the control groups. Because of the CLT method, which includes frequent use of the L2 and high exposure, the experimental group might make more errors in the beginning (which might surface in the second writing samples) because they are testing new patterns. However, it is anticipated that
the experimental group will produce more complex structures in all CAF aspects in the final writing samples than the control groups. This would make them more proficient than the control groups at the end of the treatment period.

Finally, it is expected that the experimental group is more motivated and is more willing to communicate than both control groups. It is therefore likely that the experimental group is more eager to acquire the L2 and this will affect their advanced proficiency.
Chapter 3 – the Study

In order to identify the groups’ development – communicatively and grammatically – and their hypothesized differences, several analyses were carried out in the current study and their specifics are described here. The subjects’ details are given, the materials are described and both the holistic scoring and grammar tests analyses are presented.

3.1 Participants
For this experiment, 87 monolingual Dutch secondary school students from the ‘Nieuwe Veste’ school in Coevorden, were divided into three groups. The students are currently students of the second grade of Havo – the next best level of the secondary school system in Holland and they are between 13 and 14 years old. The experiment took place in the second semester from January to June. The students participated in five tests: two grammar tests and three writing tests (including one pre-test).

3.2 Materials
For the experiment, two types of materials were used. On the one hand, the control group continued with their regular method, which they have been working with since first grade. It means that they received a traditional FoFs treatment in line with the course book and work book of New Interface first edition. This course book has a strong focus on grammar with an isolated grammar section (see appendix A3). Additionally, it has three pages of words and sentences the students have to learn by heart. There are hardly any communicative activities, but rather consists of decontextualized L2 use. The work book mainly consists of grammar exercises in which the students have to fill in the grammar they have learnt from the course book, or exercises in which they translate words they can look up in the book (constrained constructed response).

On the other hand, the experiment group received a CLT treatment. The intention was to present students with a high input environment based on FonF. No text books or workbooks with grammar were used. Instead, these students watched English films and read English books. Additionally, the lessons were in English. In January, the lessons started with the book and film Lord of the Flies, by Sir William Golding. The book and film were alternated in each lesson and PowerPoint Presentations (PPP’s) were made to make sure students understood the context of the film and book. Moreover, by repeating one piece of the film over and over again, students got even more grip on the L2. In the second part of the
experiment, the theme was ‘Cinderella’. The film *A Cinderella Story* (2008) and the original Cinderella tale of the Grimm Brothers were used.

Since more scholars (Norris and Ortega, Verspoor, Andringa) see the usefulness of a learner’s profile, at the end of the experimental time, students took their tests on the computer where they were asked about vocabulary, motivation, willingness to communicate towards English, and willingness to communicate. Vocabulary is included since it may prove the experimental group’s growth in this aspect in comparison to the control groups.

3.3 Procedures

3.3.1 Teaching

As mentioned earlier, the control groups received all FoFs instruction in Dutch. At this secondary school, students are given English 3 times a week and each lesson consists of 45 minutes (135 minutes in total). The treatment consisted of an instruction-based method where grammar was emphasized. No films were watched or discussed in English. Students asked all questions in Dutch and received a Dutch answer. *New Interface* is divided into units. With each unit, three tests are made. The first test is a simple ‘word’ exam (see appendix A4). The second test is the small grammar practice exam, where they can practice if they know their grammar. When a unit has been completed (5 to 6 weeks), students get an exam which covers the entire unit – words and grammar (see appendix A4). This test is mainly concerned with the output of words and grammar.

Like the control group, the experiment group also has 3 hours of English a week and each lesson consists of 45 minutes. Films and books were alternated and PPP’s were used to emphasize certain parts of the film (see appendix A1). For example, the script was literally copied and pasted in the PPP and students had to read it first carefully. Once they read the part, it would be shown again with the film. Then, the same part was shown again on the PPP, but certain words and letters were left out. It was up to the students to say the words that would fit into place. For example, first the part of the film was shown. Then, the text was shown:

- No, I didn't see it splash.
- Ow! - See? It splashed again.
- Ha! It's our turn to have fun.
- Assembly!

- What's going on?

- The reason I'm calling this assembly is, too many people are screwing around and not working. There's a bunch of things.

(http://movie.subtitlr.com/subtitle/show/89714)

Then this same part of the film was shown again and after the students had seen it, they had to fill in:

- No, I didn't s__ it splash.

- Ow! - See? It splashed a____.

- Ha! It's our t___ to have fun.

- Ass________!

- What's going on?

- The r_____ I'm calling this assembly is, too m__ people are screwing around and not working. There's a b____. of things.

Furthermore, most parts were discussed in English in class. Students often had to work in groups and carry out a certain task or answer a question in English (also presented on PPP – see appendix A1). Tasks consisted, for example, of performing a part of the film in front of the class or create an entire new part or alternative ending. With the second film A Cinderella Story, they also did an English web quest. Each questions had to be answered in English, so students actually used the language in class.

3.3.2 Measures

Andringa pointed out: “Unusual to FFI studies, even to those that have used measures of spontaneous language use, was the qualitatively oriented exploration of the free written response data.” (Andringa 158). Because this experiment intends to find out two different aspects of language – grammar and proficiency – the students were asked to do a total of five tests. First of all, two constrained constructed response grammar tests were conducted in February and May (example in appendix). Secondly, since this study uses a CLT treatment, it is logical to collect free written response data. Therefore, the students were asked to write three samples of about 175 words each. These samples were collected in January (pre-test),
April and June (examples in appendix B1 – B3). This study will thus be looking at about three times 66 writing samples and grammar tests.

The writing samples were scored holistically and were checked on general proficiency following a procedure as described by Verspoor and Xu. They elucidate and apply a three-dimensional L2 proficiency model which includes Complexity, Accuracy and Fluency (CAF). This model measures growth in various degrees of language: text length, sentence length, sentence complexity, use of different types of clauses, use of tense, aspect, voice and mood, vocabulary range, use of L1, idiomatic language, errors and accuracy.

The samples were scored on proficiency by teams of three or four raters, including one native speakers of English and one native speaker of Dutch. All members of the team had experience within the field of applied linguistics. The samples were scored individually by each team member. The interrater reliability scores ranged from 0.543 to 0.951 Cronbach’s Alpha for the different batches. Subsequently, the teams discussed each sample and the score given by the majority was the final score given. In some cases, when there was not a clear majority score, the sample was discussed until team members agreed. The final score, which ranged from 1 (lowest) to 5 (highest) can be calibrated to CEF levels. 1 can be compared to an absolute beginner, A1.1 on the CEF scale. 5 can be compared to high intermediate, B1.2 on the scale of CEF.

Finally, a post test (created in Survey Monkey) was completed by the student, which measures their vocabulary, motivation and willingness to communicate, after the treatment period (within a week time). Since this paper uses a DUB approach, which takes many different factors into consideration, several learners’ affective variables were tested.

Vocabulary was tested to see if the experimental group has a higher vocabulary range than the control groups at the end of the treatment period. The students were given a list of 180 words and they had to indicate if they knew the word or not, by clicking yes or no. Some words were pseudo words, to control for learners who overestimate their knowledge.

Motivation and willingness to communicate were tested by means of statements such as to ‘would you like to talk to someone who is a native speaker of English’. The students have to choose between ‘strongly agree’, ‘agree’, ‘neutral’, ‘disagree’ and ‘strongly disagree’.
3.3.4 Statistics

All data have been collected over a period of six months. The tests were done by students in a computer room at their school. The students had access to the assignments in TeleTop, their online learning environment. They also handed in their assignment via this program. All tests were ran in class, under supervision of the teacher, also the researcher.

As mentioned earlier, a total of five tests were carried out. The students were not directly informed of the intention of their assignments. The grammar tests served as practice and the writing samples were disguised as an assessment. The students were told that they could be as creative as required and that the stories did not have to be true.

A number of statistical methods have been used and the data has been analyzed by Xiaoyan Xu, from the department of Applied Linguistics at the Rijksuniversiteit Groningen. (As a student of English I had not had courses in statistics.) The data of both grammar tests were processed in excel, per group and per student. Each correct answer was marked with 1, while wrong answers were labeled with 0. Xu then entered the data in SPSS and analyzed these mainly by using one-way ANOVA’s or one-way MANOVA’s. One for a total score and one for each separate grammar forms (comparison, present perfect tense and past simple tense).

Roughly the same procedure was used for the writing samples. After all samples were scored by the teams, all data was first entered in excel, again per group, per student. Xu first identified the interrater reliability of each writing sample and for each group, to make sure optimal scores emerged. A Cronbach’s Alpha was used to establish this. Then, to compare groups one-way ANOVA’s were conducted to process results. Finally, to compare all three writing samples, two-way measures of ANOVA was used.
Chapter 4 – Results

In this section, the results of the grammar tests will be discussed. Then the writing samples and final questionnaire and vocabulary tests are discussed.

4.1 Grammar Tests

Two grammar tests were taken during the experiment. The first grammar test was taken by the students on the 10th of February, after the experimental group had received CLT for about one month. The grammar test is constructed in three parts, treating three different aspects of grammar: present perfect tense, past tense and comparison. These specific parts are used since these belong to the most basic grammar of the second year Havo. The control groups are instructed on these grammar aspects throughout the year and it is expected they can use these grammar features correctly after the second year.

4.1.1 Grammar test 1

A reliability analysis with all three groups of students included (N=74) showed a Cronbach’s alpha level is .721 which is quite satisfactory, indicating that the grammar tests measures what it intends to measure. Then a one-way ANOVA was used to compare the test scores of the three groups and the results are below. An ANOVA and multiple comparison showed a significant difference between Groups 2 and 3 (p = < 0.05). In other words, one of the control groups scored significantly higher than the experimental group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9,92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8,41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Descriptives grammar test 1

A subsequent analysis shows the differences between the two sub-parts of the test--comparison and tense (present perfect, past simple)-- in more detail. For the use of comparison a one-way ANOVA analysis was carried out. The experimental group performed significantly worse (P = < 0.05) on the comparison part of the test than both of the control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2,74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Descriptives grammar test 1: comparisons
As far as the use of tense was concerned, a one-way MANOVA was used since the test scores are related to each other, except for present and comparison. The results show that there is no difference between the control groups and experimental group on tense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7,09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5,67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Descriptives grammar test 1: tenses

4.1.2 Grammar Test 2

The second grammar test was made the 11th of May, after about 4,5 months into the experiment. The test was constructed the same way as the first test, since the three aspects – present perfect tense, past simple tense and comparison – are still part of the central grammar for the control group at this point. The control group is now expected to know and apply these grammar features within exercises. The experimental group has not received any instruction as to how the present perfect and comparison have to be used. It is anticipated that the experimental group still scores worse than the control groups, but that they have made a slight improvement by this time.

A reliability analysis shows that the Cronbach’s alpha level is .778, which is acceptable. A one-way ANOVA is used to compare the total test scores (18 grammar items) of the three groups and the results are below. The results show that the mean score of the experimental group of students (E3) was significantly lower than both control groups (C1 and C2). There was no statistically significant between the control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13,81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9,64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Descriptives Grammar test 2

A one-way ANOVA to explore the groups’ differences on the present perfect (items 1-5) shows a significant difference (P = < 0.05) between one control group (C2) and the experimental group (E3). A one-way ANOVA to explore the groups’ differences on the
perfect + past test items (items 6-13) shows that there is no significant difference among the three groups. A one-way ANOVA to explore the groups’ differences on the comparison (items 14-18) shows that the both of the control groups perform significantly better ($P = < 0.05$) than the experimental group (E3). The difference between the two control groups is not statistically different.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present perfect</th>
<th>Present versus Past</th>
<th>Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3,11</td>
<td>1,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3,96</td>
<td>1,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2,36</td>
<td>1,85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Descriptives Grammar test 2: Present perfect tense, Present versus past tense and comparison

Because students’ performances on all three tests are significantly related to each other, a MANOVA was performed, which shows the same results as the separate ANOVA’s.

4.1.3 Grammar tests compared

Grammar test 1 and 2 were not exactly the same due to increase of L2 knowledge by the time the second grammar test was taken; therefore, it is not possible to compare the development in each specific aspect and the following analysis will only concern the total grammar scores for each test.

A two-way repeated measures of ANOVA is conducted with the two grammar tests. The following table shows the means of each grammar test of each class and also the total means of all 69 students in each test. Only those students who did both tests are included in this analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grammar test 1</th>
<th>Grammar test 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8,67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: descriptives of grammar test 1 and 2

Figure 4.1 below shows the two tested effects results: time and interaction between time and class. The first effect is significant (there is a time effect on the two grammar tests) and the interaction is not.
A post-hoc test showed C1 and C2 are significantly better than E3. The difference between C1 and C2 is not significant.

![Figure 4.1. Growth in grammar results for all three groups. It does not show a significant interaction.](image)

4.2 Writing samples

The students had to write three writing samples during the treatment period. The first writing test was considered the pre-test, which took place in the same week as the treatment started. The second writing test was taken in April, and the third writing test was taken in June, the same day that they took an additional vocabulary test and answered questions on motivation. All writing samples were holistically evaluated by three trained scorers on “proficiency”, who had general features of complexity, fluency and accuracy in mind. The interrater reliabilities of the three evaluators were generally very high (the scores will be given below for each group separately). The score settled on was the majority score (two out of three) or a discussion that would lead to consensus.
4.2.1 Writing sample 1 – Christmas holidays

The students’ first texts were written in January, immediately after the Christmas holidays. Up to that moment, all groups had received the same instruction of English. Their level should be roughly the same and this needs to be established. Thus, the first writing samples are considered a pre-test.

To compare the groups, a one-way ANOVA is conducted and the results are shown in Figure 4.2. A significant difference is only noticed between C1 and E3. There is no significant difference between group C2 and E3.

![Figure 4.2.1 Writing samples 1.](image)

4.2.2 Writing sample 2 – The worst/best thing my friend ever did to me

The second samples on the worst/best thing my friend ever did to me were written in April. The story did not have to be true. The experimental group had now received a CLT method for about 3,5 months.

The reliability analyses (Cronbach Alpha) for each group are as follows: C1-0,912, C2-0,860 and E3-0,954. A one-way ANOVA is used to compare the differences among the groups and the results are below in figure 4.2.1.
Figure 4.2.2. Writing samples 2.

The groups differed significantly in scores. There is no difference between group C1 and C2 or between group C1 and C3. However, there is a significant difference between C2 and C3. P=<0.05 (0.024).

4.2.3 Writing samples 3 – Plans for summer holiday

The third samples about plans for the summer holidays were written on the 12th of June, in the same week as the treatment period finished. The students wrote these samples on the computer after they had filled in the questionnaire on motivation and willingness to communicate and taken the vocabulary test. Table 7 (writing 3) shows that there is a difference between group C2 and E3, but it does not reach a significant level. A significant difference is only found between group C1 and group E3. A comparison between all three writing samples will be shown in the following section.
4.2.4 Samples compared

Figure 4.2.4. All writing samples compared.

A two-way repeated measures of ANOVA is conducted with the three writing tests as well (66 students did all three writings).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing 1</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 3</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Statistics of all three writing samples

For the writing tests, the time effect is not significant, while the interaction between time and class is significant (see appendix C1), which means that the effect of time on writing is different in classes.

Based on the average scores of the three writing scores, it is found that E3 students have significantly higher scores than C1, but not higher than C2.
The graph shows a very interesting pattern. E3 shows a slow but steadily increase in writing scores, while C1 and C2 do not show a linear but quadratic pattern.

![Graph writing samples compared](image)

Figure 4.2.5. Graph writing samples compared

4.3 Vocabulary, Motivation and Willingness to Communicate Test

At the end of the treatment period (June), all groups were asked to carry out a test in Survey Monkey to look at vocabulary, motivation and willingness to communicate.

4.3.1 Vocabulary

A one-way ANOVA to compare the vocabulary test scores among the 3 groups shows that there is no significant difference in their vocabulary performance.
4.3.2 Motivation

79 students answered the motivation questionnaire. A reliability analysis for the motivation items is conducted. Because the reliability is high (Cronbach Apha is 0.869) the average score for the motivation items is used for further analysis.

A one-way ANOVA to compare the three groups’ motivation shows that the experimental group (E3) has a higher motivation score, but this difference is not significant.
4.3.3 Willingness to Communicate

A reliability analysis on the items measuring willingness to communicate (WTC) is good (Cronbach Alpha is 0.837). An ANOVA does not reveal a significant difference among the 3 classes on WTC.

4.4 Correlations between proficiency and affective measures

To get a clearer picture of how different measures interact at the end of the experiment a correlation analysis was conducted between the last writing score (sample 3), vocabulary, motivation and willingness to communicate.

The following table shows that there is a significant correlation between the writing score, vocabulary, motivation and willingness to communicate. There is also a significant correlation between motivation and the willingness to communicate.
4.5 Summary results

Both the first and second grammar tests showed similar results. The experimental group did not score significantly lower than the control groups on tenses, but did show a significant difference in comparison. For this reason, a post-hoc test analysing both grammar tests, showed that the E3 group scored significantly lower on the grammar tests in general.

The analysis of the first writing sample only showed a significant difference between group C1 and E3, not between C2 and E3. The second writing sample showed the opposite; a significant difference is now detectable between group C2 and E3, but not between C1 and E3 anymore. The third samples showed almost the same as what the first samples showed, there was no significant different anymore between C2 and E3, but C1 shows a lower scoring once more. Comparing the three writing samples thus showed that the control groups process highly irregular data throughout the treatment period and the experimental group shows a slow but linear growth. There is no significant difference noticed between the groups and their vocabulary, which was tested in a survey.

The experimental group showed to have more motivation and willingness to communicate than both control groups. Although this did not reach a significant level, it is likely that it would have reached significant level if the treatment continued.
Chapter 5 – Discussion

The present study investigated whether a FonF approach would make secondary school students more proficient in their English L2, compared to students who received a traditional FoFs approach. Three groups of the same year of Havo were used; two control groups (FoFs) and one experimental group (FonF). To evaluate the students’ proficiency, three writing samples were written by the students. Moreover, grammatical development – in isolated test constructions – was examined in all groups during the treatment period. Three particular forms of grammar - past tense, present perfect tense and comparison - were tested in both tests. In this chapter, analyses presented in the previous chapter will be discussed and evaluated in relation to the two research questions with their connected hypotheses, as well as to the theories as described in the background theory section.

5.1 Research Question 1

Research Question 1: Do the experimental students acquire different types of grammar as well as the traditional students?

The first hypothesis is stated once more:

It is expected that first of all, the experimental group will perform worse on grammar tests in the early stages than the control groups. However, they will eventually draw level at a later stage with the control groups, due to exposure and extensive use of the L2. The experimental group might first focus on, for example, the use of vocabulary and at a later stage at the use of grammar. So diverse variables are expected to show growth, but at different time spans.

First of all, an overall discussion of the three categories – past tense, present perfect tense and comparison – is presented for each test and the variation between the three groups will be examined. Because the grammar tests measured three forms of grammar, these will be discussed separately as well, to find out the groups’ development of each of these grammar forms. The first grammar test will be discussed first, followed by the second. This section will finish with the first and second grammar tests compared to each other.

One important fact about control group (C1) is that at the end of the treatment period and thus their school year, the group is considered a weak group. There are at least eight or nine students who have to repeat the year or go to Mavo (level lower than Havo) and the group has an average grade of 6,3 (group two has an average of 7,2). The group should
achieve the same results as group C2, but they do not due to the many weak students, so some of the significant differences between C1 and E3 may be due to differences in ability. We shall therefore consider C2 as the main control group.

5.1.1. Grammar Test 1

The students made the first grammar test in February, about one month after receiving a CLT treatment. The overall score in Table 1 showed that the experimental group scored significantly lower than the second group, but not significantly lower than the first. When looking separately at past tense, present perfect tense and comparison, the outcome of the test can be specified somewhat more.

Interestingly, the experimental group seems to level with the control groups when looking at the tense exercises. In other words, there are no significant differences, at least not in the present perfect tense as can be seen in table 3. Control group 2 does show advanced knowledge of the past tense in comparison to the first control group and the experimental group.

What actually makes the experiment group score significantly lower than both control groups is their scoring on comparison, which can be seen in table 2. A significant difference can be found between group 1 and 2 on one hand and group 3 on the other hand. Another one-way MANOVA analysis is conducted once more, to see the difference between tense in general and comparison.

As the results show in table 3, only the significant difference in the comparison test between the control groups and the experimental group remains and not in tense anymore. One hypothesized assumption has been thus verified; in the early stages of the treatment, the experimental group does score worse in grammar, but only on comparison.

5.1.2. Grammar Test 2

The second grammar test was made by the students in May, after about 4,5 months of the experiment. Again, past tense, present perfect tense and comparison were tested. The test has been constructed in the same way as the first, but slightly more difficult because of (supposed) increase of grammatical knowledge.

The overall score of grammar test 2 (present perfect tense, past tense and comparison combined) can be found in table 4. It showed that the experimental group scored significantly
lower than both control groups.

Looking at the three aspects of grammar individually again, table 5 shows that in the present perfect tense and past tense, the three groups do not show a significant difference. Control group 2 shows advanced knowledge again of the present perfect, but this time only a significant difference with the experimental group.

The comparison test has proved to be most difficult again for the experimental group. They score significantly worse than both control groups, as can be seen in table 5. The difference between the two control groups is not significant.

Correlation between the three groups has been further analyzed by means of post-hoc tests. Wilk’s Lambda has been looked at (Table 6) and it shows on which test the groups vary in scoring. Table 6 shows that there is significant difference in the comparison test between the three groups, but not in present and past tense test. So although the groups score significantly different in one aspect of grammar, they have reached the same level of tenses at the end of the treatment period. We may conclude that especially comparisons are amenable to teaching explicitly. For the use of the tenses explicit teaching did not make a difference.

5.1.3. Grammar Tests Compared

An overall comparison on all three aspects of the grammar tests can be seen in figure 4.1. Although growth occurred in all three groups on all three aspects, there is a significant difference in scoring between the three groups; control groups 1 and 2 on the one hand and experimental group 3 on the other hand.

Time and interaction between time and class were subsequently tested. Table 6 shows the two tested effects results: time and interaction between time and class. It shows that control group 1 and control group 2 are significantly better than experimental group 3 and the difference between control group 1 and control group 2 is not significant. However, as mentioned earlier, figure 4.1 shows that growth occurs in all three groups, which would mean that the experimental group reveal that grammar can be obtained through a communicative approach only.

Yet, the experimental group did not draw level on all aspects of grammar with the control groups, which was not anticipated. Moreover, the control groups showed more growth in the time span of the experiment than the experimental group (group 1 shows +2.37, group 2
+2.2 and group 3 +1.23). Since the experimental group does reveal growth on all three aspects – even comparison – they may have been able to catch up with the control groups if the treatment had continued. Furthermore, comparison might be an aspect of grammar which does not occur frequently enough in the input and is best acquired in formal instruction, since the experimental group only showed a significant difference in comparison, rather than in all three (present perfect and past simple) forms of grammar which were tested.

5.2 Research Question 2

The second research question was as followed:

*Research Question 2: Do the experimental students become more “proficient” than the control group?*

The hypothesis which is connected to the second research question is stated once more:

From early phases, the experimental group will not necessarily show more proficiency than the control groups. Because of the CLT method which includes frequent use of the L2 and high exposure, the experimental group might make more errors in the beginning (which might surface in the second writing samples) because they are testing new patterns. However, it is anticipated that the experimental group will produce more complex structures on all C A F aspects in the final writing samples than the control groups. This would make them more proficient than the control groups at the end of the treatment period.

5.2.1 Pre-test Writing Sample 1

The first writing sample was written in January. Before January, all groups had received the same treatment for 1.5 years and the test can therefore be considered a pre-test. First of all, the second group shows a low reliability level. The main reason is that the first two raters were not always in agreement. However, we assume that through discussion and consensus the score was reliable.

After having established reliability levels for all three groups, the analysis showed what the pre-test was expected to show. Figure 4.2.1 shows that there is no significant difference between group 2 and 3. Group 1 only shows a significant difference from group 3.
However, group 1 should have achieved the same results, but probably do not due to the number of weak students.

5.2.2 Writing Sample 2

The second samples were written in April, when the experimental group had received a CLT (high input and exposure to L2, no grammar) treatment for about 3.5 months. The experimental group is not necessarily expected to show an increase in their free written response task at this point, due to multiple systems which are likely to compete. In fact, they may even make more errors because they are testing out new patterns.

The interrater reliability level of the second writing samples varied between .860 to .954 Conbrach’s Alpha, a satisfactory reliability level. The analysis of the second samples showed that, this time, there is no significant difference anymore between group 1 and 3 or 1 and 2 (figure 4.2.2). However, the second samples now show a significant difference between group 2 and 3. Group 3 scored exactly the same as on the first sample, whereas group 2 showed a significant decrease. Group 1 on the other hand showed an increase in April.

5.2.3. Writing Sample 3

The final test was conducted in June, one week after the treatment had finished. The hypothesis stated that the experimental group was expected to be more proficient than both control groups at the end of the treatment period. Thus, the experimental group would have become more complex on all CAF structures.

The final writing samples showed that group 1 again differs significantly from group 3. There is no significant difference anymore between group 2 and 3. The second control group did not reach their first score of 3.18, they end with 2.91. Control group scores worst on the final writing sample.

5.2.4 Writing Samples Compared

When all three writing samples are compared to each other, an interesting patterns occurs. Whereas both control groups 1 and 2 show a fluctuating process (figure 4.2.5) and group 1 and 2 show high inconsistency in their writing samples, group 3 shows a slow but steady increase. Therefore, control groups 1 and 2 show quadratic patterns, rather than linear. We
expected the experimental group to fluctuate the most. Instead, the control groups show high irregularities in their writing tasks.

Taking all three writing samples plus an average score in mind, the hypothesis that the experimental group becomes more proficient, is not confirmed. Although the only group showing a slow but steady increase is the experimental group, there is no significantly higher score than the second control group. While it was anticipated that the experimental group would reach higher proficiency levels than both control groups, they only show a significant higher score than the first control group – the group considered a weak group. A significant difference between the second control group and the experimental group is only reached in the second writing sample, but at that point, there is no significant difference anymore between the first control group and the experimental group. What makes the experimental group perform slightly better than both control groups, are of course the several C A F aspects on which they have been holistically scored. For example, because of high input, the experimental group can use more words and expressions to utter thoughts.

5.2.5. Vocabulary

A vocabulary test was carried out in Survey Monkey one week after the treatment period. Expected was that the experimental group would naturally have a higher vocabulary range. However, the test showed no significant difference between the three groups (figure 4.3.1).

5.3 Research Question 3 – Motivation and Willingness to Communicate

This section will deal with the final research question:

Research Question 3: Does motivation and WTC affect the groups’ scoring (in both grammar and proficiency?)

The hypothesis is stated once more:

It is expected that the experimental group is more motivated and has an enhanced WTC than both control groups. It is therefore likely that the experimental group is more eager to acquire the L2 and this will affect their advanced proficiency.
We expected the experimental group to be more motivated and willing to communicate than the control groups, simply because they seemed to enjoy the subject English better due to their FonF treatment (watching films and carrying out tasks). Students were asked to answer questions – by agreeing or disagreeing – such as ‘do you like it when the teacher explains grammar’ and ‘I like to speak English in class’. A one-way ANOVA was used to compare the collected results from Survey monkey and the analyses showed that the experimental group did show a higher motivation score (figure 4.3.2). However it did not reach a significant level yet. A significant effect is expected if the experiment continues since it is already close to a significance level. Also for Willingness to Communicate (WTC) the analysis again showed that the experimental group did reach a higher level, but not significantly.

5.4 Overall Discussion

The theoretical framework in which this study was carried out, included Communicative Language Teaching, Dynamic Usage-Based, Focus on Form and Focus on FormS. The foundation of CLT immediately presented a strong notion that an L2 learner would need more than a set of grammar rules and rejected ideas as presented by Chomsky. Researchers like Savignon claimed that when using free communication in teaching, no loss for grammar accuracy would occur. The results of this study showed that this claim may be true. Although the experimental group does score lower in grammar than the control groups, they do progress and the differences are mainly due to one aspect of grammar, forming comparisons. Additionally, because the proficiency levels are the same, we may assume there is no difference in grammar accuracy, as grammar is included in CAF as well.

However, looking back at other theories presented, some more issues should be dealt with. Ellis, Spada, Norris en Ortega and DeKeyser have been right as well. When looking solely at grammar, in its own decontextualized form, it is best acquired through a traditional FoFs treatment, so it seems. The control groups scored significantly better than the experimental group. On the other hand, there are some vital issues which must be pointed out once more. Initial conditions are important according to a DUB approach. This would mean that it should be taken into account that the control groups had experience with constructed tests and decontextualized grammar output, whereas the experimental group had not. And, as Norris and Ortega said, testing needs to be looked at since if the control groups – who received an FoFs treatment – are used to decontextualized tests, they are likely to score better
in grammar. This also emerged in Ellis’ study, saying that grammar tests might favour instructional students.

Ellis made a distinction between instructed learners and naturalistic learners and found that instructed learners generally achieved higher levels of grammatical competence. However, the instruction was no guarantee that learners would actually acquire what they had been taught. The processes were more or less the same, but the instructed learners progressed more rapidly and achieved higher levels of proficiency. Norris and Ortega also found that FonF and FoFs treatments are equally effective, based on 49 studies in the field. This study also found that the FoFs students generally achieved a higher level of grammatical competence. However, they did not reach a higher level of proficiency than the FonF students. Furthermore, Ellis’ and Norris and Ortega’s studies included mostly constrained constructed tests and were “inconsistently” in which proficiency can hardly be measured.

However, it is not true that without formal instruction, an L2 learner cannot acquire grammar. As has been shown, the experimental group does show growth, albeit less fast. What is more, the experimental group does not significantly differ when it comes to tenses, forms of grammar which are quite crucial. The experimental group only shows a significant difference in the comparison test. Ellis’s question of ‘what grammar should be tested’, has proven to be a crucial one in this matter. Perhaps not all grammar needs to be instructed, but some aspects (comparison) might be useful.

Krashen, who developed the Input Hypothesis, already stressed that exposure to a language would lead to more proficiency and that learning an L2 should be similar to learning our native language. His studies claimed that students from ‘subject matter classes’ acquired at least as much as traditional ‘grammar’ students. Plus, they learn “impressive amounts of subject matter at the same time” (Krashen 55). Although the experimental group did not score as well on the grammar test as the control groups, they did show a consistent and advanced growth in proficiency. Moreover, a DUB approach implies that no single factor causes development, but some may be more effective than others, often also depending on time. If the experiment had continued, it is likely that they acquired the same amount of grammar and were even able to show this in a constructed test.

Proficiency was measured by means of free writing samples, as several previous studies also suggested. Andringa found that the explicit method did not prove valuable for grammar as measured in free writing samples. In fact, the effects an FoFs treatment has on general proficiency as measured in free writing samples has proven to produce high
inconsistency for both control groups. This study also found that students with an FoFs treatment did not show advanced writing skills compared to the students who received a FonF treatment.

Long’s claim that a CLT approach would give access to unknown L2 vocabulary and grammatical forms did not occur in this study. The experimental group did not show an advanced knowledge of vocabulary as analyses of the survey showed. Nevertheless, A dynamic usage based approach believes each learner has to discover certain patterns of a language through exposure and experience. This will not go without errors and trials. As time range is very important in a DUB approach, it may be that at the time of the vocabulary test, the experimental group was dealing with other patterns of the L2. Because of dynamic perspective difference, multiple systems compete and thus develop somewhat separately.

Finally, from a DUB perspective, learners’ aptitudes such as motivation and willingness to communicate were also measured. Although the experimental group showed a higher score in both variables, no significant difference was to be found. They may produce more complex samples because they are more willing to communicate and show their L2 skills, but this cannot be stated with any certainty. Most interesting is when looking from a DUB perspective, but now applying it to the control groups. Both control groups show a high inconsistency in their writing task, which may mean that grammar students are trying out new acquired forms even more than CLT students or that their range of vocabulary and expressions is too limited to write something new. This sounds logical since they do not actually have to apply language all the time. On the rare three occasions that they have done that during the treatment period, they may try out new forms every time, resulting in errors on grammar one time and errors in vocabulary the other. They might not see the language as a whole unit due to their grammar only input and have therefore more difficulties to get all aspects correct. Whereas the experimental group was expected to show this pattern, it is in fact the control groups who realize this pattern.
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This study analyzed grammar, proficiency and affective variables of second language learners of English. The students are Dutch secondary school Havo students. From a DUB perspective, this study should be regarded within this particular environment (e.g. learner’s age, level, previous education and so on). Conducting the same study with students from higher education would likely produce another outcome. The results showed that the experimental group did not acquire one grammatical facet, the comparison, as well as the control groups. Even the second grammar test which was carried out nearly at the end of the treatment period, the experimental group did not draw level with the control groups in all aspects. Yet, when looking at SLD of the groups from a DUB perspective, different sub-systems develop at different time spans and relies on the kind of input a group receives. The control group (especially the second one) was better in grammar, but seemingly at the cost of proficiency.

A DUB approach would predict that the group with CLT treatment would show more advanced constructions, even at early stages and this has proven to be true. Already from the start, the experimental group showed an advanced proficiency level and continued this line throughout the treatment period. Although not reaching a significant level at the end with the second control group, they still show a higher score and if this experiment had continued longer, we could have seen some significance differences. A slightly higher motivation and WTC may have affected the advanced proficiency score of the experimental group, but the experiment should have taken longer to validate this.

Researchers such as Ellis, Doughty and Long were perhaps right; some grammar should be taught and some focus on formS instruction may be needed, but not for each aspect of grammar. Ellis has raised questions as ‘what grammar should we teach’?, but he does not come to a sound conclusion. What has been shown in this study is that the experimental group did acquire the tenses as well as the control groups, they showed no significant difference. However, time is important with a DUB approach and the experimental group might have drawn level with the control groups as comparison is concerned. But, to achieve a quicker effect, a feature like comparison should perhaps be pointed out to L2 learners. Yet, with patience and a FonF approach only, a longer lasting effect is expected. Grammar instruction has not proven to be of long lasting effect, in which case a FonF approach would be in favour.

Doing more research within a DUB perspective and free writing samples, but also
continuing with especially comparing the acquisition of different grammatical forms, it might perhaps lead to an ideal contemporary teaching method – or in any case a better picture of what leads to long-term proficiency. Perhaps some formal instructing (but keeping it very minimal due to the progress of proficiency) the features which are difficult to acquire in a certain time span and for the rest merely using a FonF method. Still, eventually it is more important to be able to use the language (proficiency) instead of knowing about it (formal grammar). Having showed that a FonF treatment increases proficiency and is more likely to have a long lasting effect, teachers, scholars and linguists should experiment and study its effects even more, so a FonF (CLT) method can hopefully someday be integrated in various L2 languages.

Finally, as there are no significant differences in proficiency between these two different methods, it still might still be better to opt for a FonF, high input approach that entertains the students. Even though the motivation scores were not significantly different, as a teacher I saw students in class who were much more motivated to pay attention, who could not wait to see the next section of the movie, and who had great fun acting out the characters of the movie. Also in class, the experimental learners did not object to me speaking English to them and seemed less hesitant to use English themselves. In fact, at one point they (accidentally) started to speak English to each other in classes when working on assignments together. Moreover, treating language as one unit, rather than constantly dividing it into sections of grammar, may possibly result in linear learning. Nevertheless, similar studies within the field of second language development have to be conducted to confirm this.
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Appendices

Appendix A1: Focus on Form materials used in class

Questions film part I

- What do you think happened? Why are the boys in the water?
- Do you know what the green stick is and why it can light up?
- Do the boys believe there are more people on the island?

Quiz

- Somebody help me! I can’t s…! Get the r…! Somebody help me!
- What is that? It’s a g… stick.
- How does it work? From some kind of c…….. Do you think anybody else is here, sir? It’s just an i……. There’s nothing here.
Appendix A2: Focus on Form examinations

S.O. 2

LORD OF THE FLIES: 0 - 20 minutes film
Nobody knows we're here. They know where we were going.
1. But where we are. We never got where we were going.
2. Where were we going? We were going...
I'm sure they're looking.
3, 4. We should set up some kind of signal, like a ..., and keep it going all the time. And we're gonna have to have rules.
Can I have the conch? 
6. Yes, Ralph's right. We've gotta make a fire.
7. Sir, are you the leader? Jack's the dest.
8. But Ralph's the colonel. I think it should be Ralph
9. Sir, is it really? You bet it is. Simon's right. We're gonna be rescued.
10. Get your together, guys. We're going home.
I...
Beat it, you kids.
11. Come on. Why isn't anybody getting food or?
12, 13. Spit! Come on! Spit! Come on! ....!
- Spit! - Go on, spit!
- Spit. I got it. There it is.
14. No, you're not gonna get out until I see it splash in the ocean.
15. - That m... it. - No, I didn't see it splash.
16. - Ow! - See? It sp...... again.
Ha! It's our turn to have fun.
17. A........
What's going on?
18. The r...... I'm calling this assembly is,
19, 20. too m... people are screwing around and not working. There's a ...... ......
Some kids don't know when to use the bathroom.

Exam 2
Lord of the Flies

A) Choose the correct word
examine  -  distance  -  whistle  -  chant  -  warning  -  eager  -  sensible  -  terrified
1. I am ... you! Next time I'll tell your parents.
2. The pig was .... of the hunters who were chasing it.
3. Ralph and Piggy are the most .... persons on the island. They know how to behave.
4. Let the doctor .... you Suzy, you may be ill!
5. Lennart is .... to learn French. His girlfriend is from France.

B) Give the meaning of the words (try in English if you can!)

1. hidden  
2. savage  
3. guess  
4. tribe  
5. determination  
6. putting all your eggs in one basket  
7. prepare  
8. throne  
9. distance  
10. to attract attention

C) Make a correct sentence using the words (use at least 7 words in your sentence!)

1. blushed - gift  
2. intention - unrecognizable  
3. tribe - bushes - scarecrow

D) Finish the story

1. Jack says that we're n...... gonna be rescued.
2. No, you mis........... him. That's not what he meant.
3. That's ..actly what I meant. There's eight million islands out here.
   Why should they find this one?
4. Don't ...... to him. We will be rescued, Peter.
   Honest.
   Are you going hunting for pigs again? I wanna come next time.
   Me too.
   I don't know what I'm gonna do.
5. Hey, ... ... ....

Z.O.Z.

E) Which word goes for which thing?

Sharp  –  round  –  has a hole  –  wood  –  metal  –  shell  –  brown  –  white/pink  –  transparent(see through)
1. Conch  
2. Spear  
3. Glasses
F) Answer the questions from the book (in English)

1. “Kill the beast! Cut his throat! Spill his blood!” (p. 152) Explain what is happening here.

2. “The rock struck Piggy a glancing blow from chin to knee; the conch exploded” (p. 181) Why was Piggy holding the conch and what happened to Piggy here?

3. What name has Jack given to his part of the island? (Also title of chapter 11)

G) Answer the questions from the film

1. What color does the pig (the ‘lord of the flies’) have?

2. What do Jack’s boys use to paint their faces?

3. Why isn’t Ralph killed by Jack’s group at the end of the film?

H) The book and film

1. Who is the ‘beast’ in the book and who is the ‘beast’ in the film?

2. Describe Simon’s death in the book and in the film. What is the difference?

3. What do you think of the title of the book? Explain why you think it’s a good/bad title (40 words)

4. If you would be one of the boys on the island, in which camp would you be? Jack’s or Ralph’s camp? Explain why. (30-40 words)

5. Looking back at the film and book, what are your feelings about it? Do you think the film and book are impressive or boring? What is your favorite part? Explain why. (70 words)

I) Bonus questions

You all successfully danced the penguin dance! Congratulations!
Appendix A3: Journal of treatment period Focus on Form

Week 1

Tuesday 4th of January – lesson one

0 – 15 min: Introduction
  
  - New method of working (lessons fully in English language, new tests, less grammar)
  - An important test to be made 3 times (January, April and June) to be handed in via teletop (e-education platform of De Nieuwe Veste).
  - Hand out planner + dates of tests

15-30 min: Background on Lord of the Flies
  
  - Sir William Golding
  - Hand out copies
  - Divided throughout the 2nd period between a film, book and audio book.
  - Book is divided in 12 chapters and there will be an exam after every one or two chapters.
  - Almost each class will start with a small section of the film, with an explanation afterwards. Then the class will read pages from the book together and discuss them. Sometimes in groups, sometimes in class. There will be other assignments as well.
  - Feedback and questions from students

30-45 min: Getting results back of an exam the students made before Christmas and discuss these.

Wednesday the 5th of January – lesson two

0-45 min: The group will gather at a computer room, where they will write a short story (+- 175 words) about what they did during their Christmas holidays. They will hand this in through teletop.

Thursday the 6th of January – lesson three

0-5 min: Hand out copies chapter one Lord of the Flies

5-13 min: Start film Lord of the Flies (up to 7 minutes) (transcript: http://movie.subtitlr.com/subtitle/show/89714)

13-30 min: Show PPT, divide the class into groups. First the question and discussion, then the quiz.


Week 2

Thursday 13th of January – lesson 4

0 – 20 minutes: Read until page 15 + explanations, words, sentences.

20 – 45 minutes: In groups, describe in your own words (in English) of how you think Ralph and Piggy look. After this, try to draw them.
Week 3

Tuesday 18th of January – lesson 5

0 – 10 minutes: 7-10 minutes of the film (Ralph and Piggy find the shell)

10 – 25 minutes: Show what Piggy and Ralph say on PPT and discuss. Listen to their conversation once more.

25 – 35 min: read pages 16 and 17 from the book.

35 – 45 min: Discuss, what is the main difference between the film and book?

Wednesday 19th of January – lesson 6

0 – 20 minutes: read pages 18 – 24 (end when Piggy isn’t allowed to join Ralph and Jack on their exploration of the island)

20 – 30 minutes: discuss the pages. Have you ever told somebody not to join your group?

30 – 45 minutes: Show 10 – 13 minutes of film. Discuss PPT.

Thursday 20th of January – lesson 7

0 – 5 minutes: Make groups of 5 en give each group a piece of script from the film, which they have to play ‘on stage’. (5 groups of 5)

0 – 20 minutes: Groups will prepare their piece of text/divide roles/practice

20 – 45 minutes: In class, each group will show their piece and the group with the best performance will win the ‘grand prize’.

Week 4

Tuesday 25th of January

0-10 minutes: Some students will read a summary they’ve written in front of the class.

10 – 30 minutes: look at difficult words until page 22 of book

20 – 45 minutes: Take 11 of the difficult words and students have to write their own story in pairs with the 11 difficult words. About 100 words. Each pair has to read in class their own created story. (Mountain, expect, heat, dazzling, etc.)

Wednesday 26th of January

0 – 10 minutes: explain lists and films on teletop (digital learning environment).

10 – 30 minutes: watch part 3 and 3 minutes of part 4 of film. End when boys are playing in the water.

30 – 45 minutes: discuss the film. Students have to make a summary from the beginning of the film until this minute on the computer. Save it (at end they will have a complete summary of the entire film.)
Thursday 27th of January
0 - 45 minutes: no class due to French exam students

Week 5

Tuesday 1st of February
0 - 45 minutes: English text exam (all students)

Wednesday 2nd of February
0-20 minutes: s.o. 1, first 20 minutes of film.
20 - 30 minutes: s.o. irregular verbs
30 - 45 minutes: Reading book page 22 to 25 together. Fill in list of difficult words.

Thursday 3rd of February
0 – 20 minutes: watch film part 3 and part 4
20 - 45 minutes: view PPT 5 together with parts 3 and 4 again.

Week 6

Tuesday 8th of February
0 - 25 minutes: finish the book chapter one
25 - 35 minutes: finish difficult word list
35 - 40 minutes: discuss differences film and book

Wednesday 9th of February
Class P.E. day

Thursday 10th of February
0 - 45 minutes: grammar test 1 on computer

Week 7

Monday 14th of February
0 - 25 minutes: prepare a drama play of first chapter of book in groups. Divide the characters and make your own Lord of the Flies story.
25 - 40 minutes: perform the play in front of class.

Wednesday 16th of February
0 - 45 minutes: first exam Lord of the Flies. Chapter one from book +difficult word list and part 1, 2, 3, 4 of film Lord of the Flies.
Thursday 17th of February

0 - 45 minutes: taking History exam.

Week 8

Spring break

Week 9

Monday 28th of February

0 - 10 minutes: welcome back. Explanation 3rd period --> finish Lord of Flies and start another project.

10 - 45 minutes: Give a detailed summary of chapter 3 - 8 Lord of the Flies. Children will start chapter 9 in book (efficiency needed to stay closely connected to film).

Wednesday 2nd of March

0 - 10 minutes: Provide new dates of s.o's and tests

10 - 25 minutes: start book chapter 9 + difficult word list

25 - 45 minutes: take a look at the film (PPT 6)

Thursday 3rd of March

0 - 45 minutes: Start report on Lord of the Flies. Counts as 1 s.o. grade. Write 2 word documents about 1. who the author is 2. the time in which the book has been written 3. why the book is about boys on an island who become savages. Hand in before Friday the 25th of March.

Week 10

Monday 7th of March

0 - 15 minutes: read the part in which Simon is torn by the other children and 'his dead body floats in the sea'.

15 - 45 minutes: Make a comic about the part in which Ralph and Jack fight over who is chief until the part in which Simon’s dead body drifts off into the sea. It will be assessed by the drawing teacher.

Wednesday the 9th of March

No class

Thursday the 10th of March

No class

Week 11

Monday the 14th of March
0 - 20 minutes: reading page 155 - 158, chapter 10

20 - 45 minutes: work on comic

**Wednesday 16th of March**

0 – 45 minutes: book chapter 11 – Piggy dies. Discuss in groups the death of Piggy.

**Thursday 17th of March**

0 – 20 minutes: s.o. words 2

20 – 45 minutes: film part 9 and 10

**Week 12**

**Monday 21st of March**

0 – 15 minutes: finish chapter 11

15 – 45 minutes: part 10 and 11 of film

**Wednesday 23rd of March**

0 – 15 minutes: book chapter 12

15 – 45 minutes: finish film

**Thursday 24th of March**

Students working on their assignment which is due before 25th of March.

**Week 13**

**Monday 28th of March**

0 – 45 minutes: Computer assignment 2: What is the best/worst thing your best friend ever did to you?

**Wednesday 30th of March**

0 – 45 minutes: Lord of the Flies film part 1; closure of lotf with popcorn, drinks and big screen.

**Thursday 31st of March**

0 – 45 minutes: Lord of the Flies film part 2; closure of lotf with popcorn, drinks and big screen.

**Week 14**

**Monday 4th of April**

0 – 10 minutes: explanation of today’s groupwork. Groups of 4 think of an alternative ending to The Lord of the Flies. Find a quiet place in school and make sure every one of you says something in English.

0 – 35 minutes: Groups gather and create their alternative ending.
35 – 45 minutes: Groups perform their play.

**Wednesday 6th of April**

0 – 15 minutes: PPT 1 ‘Fairytale’. Introduction to next couple of weeks’ them: fairytale. (Grimm brothers, Cinderella)

15 – 30 minutes: Watch a piece of the film ‘Brothers Grimm’.

30 – 45 minutes: In groups, think as much fairytale as you can and write them down in English.

**Thursday 7th of April**

No class – 8th of April Exam 2 Lord of the Flies

**Week 15**

**Monday 11th of April**

Start of ‘A Cinderella Story’ the film.

0 – 45 minutes: PPP 1, part 1A. (See PPP 1)

**Wednesday 13th of April**

0 – 45 minutes: PPP, part 1B/C

**Thursday 14th of April**

0 – 20 minutes: PPP 1, part 1D

0 – 45 minutes: work on own ‘fairytale’ in pairs. Students have to write their own fairytale and hand it in via Teletop. The winners will receive a pie.

**Week 16**

**Monday 18th of April**

0 – 20 minutes: Reading the Cinderella version of the Brothers Grimm.

20 – 30 minutes: Discuss differences between the Cinderella we know and the Cinderella described by the brothers Grimm.

30 – 45 minutes: part 2A of film

**Wednesday 20th of April**

0 – 15 minutes: start part 2B and 2C and PPP

15 – 35 minutes: watch part 2B and C

35 – 45 minutes: Discuss PPP

**Thursday 21st of April**
No class

**Week 17**

**Monday 25th of April**
0 – 15 minutes: start part 3A, 3B
15 – 35 minutes: discuss PPP parts 3A and B
35 – 45 minutes: watch parts again

**Thursday 27th of April**
0 – 10 minutes: Get together in groups. Each group will receive a scene with text from the film. Divide roles among groups and find a quiet place to practice.
10 – 30 minutes: groups practice their part
30 – 45 minutes: groups perform their scene in class.

**Week 18**

**Spring break**

**Week 19**

**Monday the 9th of May**
0 – 45 minutes: watch part 1a, b, c, d; 2a, b, c, d and 3a, b. Occasionally stop and ask what certain words mean. Explain that they have to make a webquest for their Cinderella test.

**Wednesday the 11th of May**
0 – 45 minutes: Grammar test 2 in a computer room.

**Thursday the 12th of May**
0 – 15 minutes: PPP 4a. discuss final part of the film. What do you think will happen?
15 – 40 minutes: show final parts and show PPP 4b.
40 – 45 minutes: ask opinion about end of film. Answers are all in English

**Week 20**

**Monday 16th of May**
0 – 5 minutes: explain the quiz we are about to do about Cinderella story. Students have to answer questions in English about the film to see how much they have memorized. They are going to work in pairs and can therefore discuss answers in English.
5 – 30 minutes: do quiz
30 – 45 minutes: give answers and see who scored most points --> candy
**Wednesday the 18th of May**

0 – 45 minutes: take a French exam during English lesson.

**Thursday 19th of May**

No class

**Week 21**

**Monday the 23rd of May**

Watch first part of Cinderella, together with popcorn and drink on smart board

**Wednesday 25th of May**

Watch second part of Cinderella, together with popcorn and drinks on smart board

**Thursday 26th of May**

English group chat, which the students had to do for their web quest. Each group had 15 minutes of asking questions in English via MSN.

**Week 22**

**Monday 30th of May**

0 – 5 minutes: Choose a scene of 10 minutes from the film and make groups of 4.

0 – 15 minutes: Take lines from the internet and start practicing the scene

15 – 45 minutes: Practice lines and scene

**Wednesday the 1st of June**

All classes had outdoor sports, all day long

**Thursday the 2nd of June**

No classes

**Week 23**

**Monday 6th of June**

Students have to hand in their Cinderella web quest.

**Wednesday 8th of June**

Perform the chosen scene in class, explain first why you chose the scene.

**Thursday 9th of June**

Survey Monkey test + final writing samples in computer room
Week 24

Monday 13th of June
Practice ‘taaldorp’ (oral exam) for exam week

Wednesday 15th of June
Practice ‘taaldorp’ (oral exam) for exam week

Thursday 16th of June
Practice ‘taaldorp’ (oral exam) for exam week

Week 25

Monday 20th of June
0 – 45 minutes: text exam ‘Henry’

Wednesday 22nd of June
Practice ‘taaldorp’ (oral exam) for exam week

Thursday 23rd of June
Last class before exam week and holidays; students can pick a film they like and this will be watched. Of course with popcorn and drinks. Students are thanked for their enthusiasm and motivation during the past 6 months.

Week 26

Final week – exam week no classes.

Student have ‘language village’ for English, which means they have to prepare an oral exam.
Appendix A4: Focus on FormS materials used in class (New Interface)

Coursebook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Esther</th>
<th>Excuse me...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aku</td>
<td>Oh, hello. Do you need anything?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>No, no. I wanted to thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aku</td>
<td>What for?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>Oh, you know. For getting us on this ferry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aku</td>
<td>It was a mix-up with the reservation, that's all. Just a mistake. It could happen to anybody. No problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther</td>
<td>I've travelled a long way to see the Kariba Dam. Africa's really cool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aku</td>
<td>Cool?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Esther | Oh, you know what I mean. It’s the best place I’ve ever seen. I’ve had such a good time so far. |
| Aku    | It’s my home. I’ve never been anywhere else. |
| Esther | How come you speak such good English, then? Where did you learn it? |
| Aku    | Even black African boys get an education these days. |
| Esther | Oh, sorry, I didn’t... you’re teasing me, aren’t you? |
| Aku    | Yes, I am. Sorry. My first language is Swahili, and English is my second language. But working with my father on the farm... well, I speak English...
Lesson 16

Wat zeg je...?

...als je wilt weten of iets mogelijk is:
Can't you drive any faster, Uncle?
Can't you just overtake this great smelly lorry?

...als je op iets verheugt:
I can't wait to get out of this stinking traffic.
I've always wanted to sail up the Zambezi.
I've dreamed of crocodiles swimming in the cool water.
Oh, I'm so excited, isn't this exciting?

...als je iemand advies geeft:
You watch out for those crocodiles, my girl.

Hoe zeg je...?

Ik kan niet ademhalen door al die uitlaatgassen.
Dan zou ik m'n naampje maar dicht doen.
O, ik ben nergens bang voor.
Bedenk wel, ik heb nog nooit eerder Kariba bezocht.
Nu ben ik dus echt de weg kwijt.
Kaziba Ferry... die kant op, kijk maar, daar links.
En welke kant moet ik nu op, denk je?
Net op tijd.

Kunt u niet harder rijden, oom?
Kunt u die grote stinkende vrachtwagen niet gewoon inhalen?

Ik zal blij zijn als we eentmaal uit dit stinkende verkeer zijn!
Ik heb altijd al de Zambezi op willen varen.
Ik heb gedroomd van krokodillen die in het koude water zwemmen.
O, ik ben zo opgewonden, vind je het niet spannend?

Pas jij maar op voor die krokodillen, meisje.

I can't breathe for all the exhaust fumes.
I should shut your window, then.
Oh, I'm not scared of anything.
Mind you, I've never visited Kariba before.
Now I'm well and truly lost.
Kaziba Ferry... down that way, see, left over there.
Now which way do I go here, do you think?
Just in time.

New words

sensible
speed limit
smelly
lorry
breath (to...)
for
exhaust fumes
unpleasant
vehicle
stinking
crocodile
cool...
bite (to...)
visit (to...)
truly
read signs

verstandig
maximum snelheid
vies, stinkend
vrachtwagen
ademen
door, vanwege
uitlaatgassen
onzorgzaam, akelig
voertuig
stinkend
krokodil
koel
bijten
bezoeken
echt, werkelijk
lezen

onregelmatige werkwoorden:
bite (to...)

drive (to...)

fly (to...)

give (to...)

come (to...)

make (to...)

see (to...)

hit (to...)

right (to...)

slow (to...)

text (to...)

send (to...)

check (to...)

smooth (to...)

buy (to...)

rent (to...)

pick up (to...)

room

book (to...)

reserve

lijst

reservation

verhuur

ophalen

plaats

exhaled

exciting

which

signal (to...)

left hand lane

opgewonden

spannend

welk

zwaaien

wegens

linker rijstrook

list

rental

pick up (to...)

room

book (to...)

reserve

lijst

reservation

verhuur

ophalen

plaats
Unit 4 Helpdesk

4.1 present perfect (voltooid tegenwoordige tijd)

de present perfect bestaat uit een vorm van 'have' ('haw' of 'has') gevolgd door een voltooid deelwoord

vorm: Het voltooid deelwoord van een regelmatig werkwoord eindigt op -ed:
> dreamed; booked; picked
Het voltooid deelwoord van een onregelmatig werkwoord heeft een eigen vorm:
> done; made; given

gebrauk: Je gebruikt de present perfect als je wilt aangeven dat iets gebeurd is maar dat het niet belangrijk is wanneer.
Vaak staan er woorden als: always / ever / never / just / (not) yet / already in de zin.

bevestigend: vraagend: ontkennend:
1/You've booked for today's ferry. Have 1/you booked for today's ferry?
He/She's booked for today's ferry. Has he/she booked for today's ferry?
We/You/They've booked for today's ferry. Have we/you/they booked for today's ferry?

4.2 past simple (verleden tijd)

vorm: De past simple (verleden tijd) van regelmatige werkwoorden: -ed achter het hele werkwoord
> look - looked; love - loved
De past simple van onregelmatige werkwoorden: eigen vorm
> come - came; speak - spoke

gebrauk: Je gebruikt de past simple (onvoltooid verleden tijd) als iets in het verleden gebeurd is.
Het gaat er om wanneer het gebeurd is (er staat bijna altijd een tijdsaanwijzing in de zin).

bevestigend: vraagend: ontkennend:
1/You flew into Harare last year. Did you fly into Harare last year?
He/She flew into Harare last year. Did he/she fly into Harare last year?
We/You/They flew into Harare last year. Did we/you/they fly into Harare last year?

4.3 present and past

present simple My relatives speak Afrikaans.
Do your relatives speak Afrikaans?

present continuous Look, that young man is waving at us.
Is that young man waving at us?

present perfect I've travelled a long way.
Have you travelled a long way?
I haven't travelled a long way.

past simple They flooded all this in 1958.
Did they flood all this in 1958?
Your father flooded all this in 1958.

> altijd / nooit / regelmatig
> is nu aan de gang
> is gebeurd
> niet belangrijk wanneer
> in het verleden gebeurd
> (wel belangrijk wanneer)
4.4 tags

A tag is a short question at the end of a sentence: are you / isn't it? / can she? / don't you?
Je bedoelt: Volg je ook niet?
In het Nederlands zeg je vaak: nietwaar? / he? / toch? / is het niet?

Na een bevestigende zin (+) is de tag ontkennend (-).
Na een ontkennende zin (-) is de tag bevestigend (+).

- In de 'tag' herhaal je de vormen van to be en van helpwerkwoorden (have, can, will, must, would, could, should).

- Als die niet in de zin staan, moet je de passende vorm van to do gebruiken, dus:

  + You're testing me, aren't you?
  - You're not testing me, are you?

- You're testing me, aren't you?
  He has got money, hasn't he?
  She likes tea, doesn't she?
  She liked tea, didn't she?
  + You're not testing me, are you?
  He hasn't got any money, has he?
  She doesn't like tea, does she?
  She didn't like tea, did she?

4.5 comparison (vergelijken)

Als je wilt vergelijken zeg je:
bigger than ... = have given you a bigger car than ...

as ... as ...
This car is as big as that one.

not as ... as ...
This car is not as big as that one.

De trappen van vergelijking vorm je als volgt:
1 Korte bijvoeglijke naamwoorden (één lettergroep) krijgen in de vergroante en overtreffende trap - er - est:
fast - faster - (the) fastest
big - bigger - (the) biggest

2 Lange bijvoeglijke naamwoorden (drie lettergroepen of meer) krijgen in de vergroante en overtreffende trap 'more' en 'most':
unpleasant - more unpleasant (than) - (the) most unpleasant
interesting - more interesting (than) - (the) most interesting

3 Bijvoeglijke naamwoorden van twee lettergroepen krijgen meestal more en most:
more boring (than) - (the) most boring

Behalve als ze eindigen op:
- ow > yellow - yellower - yellowest,
- le > simple - simpler - simplest,
- er > clever - cleverer - cleverest,
- ance > handsome - handsomest - handomest,
- y > happy - happier - happiest

Onregelmatige vormen:
(slecht) bad - worse (than) - (the) worst
(good) good - better (than) - (the) best
5 Choose the right form

Read the following pairs of sentences. Decide if you have to use the present perfect or the past simple. Underline the right forms.

STEM

1a We booked a room earlier today. I booked into Harare last year.
1b We can't babysit for Duobie because we booked a seat for tonight's show.
2a Ms famous (left / has left) her boyfriend for an American Football player twice before.
2b Peter left (left / has left) home without a word last night.
3a I didn't do / haven't done my homework yet. I'll do it this afternoon.
3b Julie didn't do / hasn't done her homework yesterday.
4a Helen was / has been very angry with her parents because they said she couldn't go out.
4b Elaine was never / has never been so scared in her whole life.
5a Sharon didn't ask / hasn't asked her Mum about the party yet.
5b Mary asked / has asked Namib about the Fashion Show after class.
6a Were you / Have you been at the match on Sunday?
6b Were you / Have you been to a rugby match before?
7a My Dad broke / has broken the teapot yesterday.
7b His nose hurts so much he is afraid he broke / has broken it.
8a Did you tell / Have you told anyone about your wedding plans yet?
8b Robert told / has told me all about it yesterday.

6 Fill in the right forms + stencil

than the even older oldest - y - y er - est old

more most

1 (artistic) Rasheed is ... than Mary.
2 (sunny) It's going to be ... today than it was yesterday.
3 (naughty) Gizmo is the ... puppy I know.
4 (beautiful) All the boys say that Donna is the ... girl in our class.

more artistic

Sunnier

Naughtiest

Most beautiful

seventy-seven 77
26 Grammar round up

present and past

present simple  ▶ Most of my friends speak English.
(altijd, nooit, regelmatig)

present continuous  ▶ The man is moving at us.
(is nu bezig, aan de gang)

past simple  ▶ They flooded all this when...
(lets is gebeurd; niet belangrijk wanneer)

past continuous  ▶ They were lying in the doorways.
(In het verleden; wel belangrijk wanneer)

Kijk ook in Helpdesk 4.3 op p. 140.

to overtake:

1. That Porsche ... the Ferrari a few seconds ago.
   overtook

2. My Dad ... other cars really fast now that he has a new car.
   overtakes

3. Look at that maniac! He ... that car on the wrong side.
   is overtaking

4. Lara looked behind her while she ... the lorry.
   was overtaking

5. Can you see if the police car ... that lorry yet?
   has overtaken

to swim:

6. Mr Marquez ... at least three times a week.
   swims

7. – Do you know where Steve is? – Yes, he ... in the river with
   the others.
   is swimming

8. We ... in this pool lots of times before.
   have swum

9. The sun was shining and lots of people ... in the river.
   were swimming

10. We went to France for two weeks and we ... in the sea every day.
   swam

to steal:

11. When we walked past the bus stop we saw the pickpocket who
    ... that lady’s money.
    was stealing/stole

12. That kid’s going to end up in prison. He ... things before, you
    know.
    has stolen

13. somebody ... our video recorder and dvd-player last night.
    stole

14. Look, that man ... money from the till!
    is stealing

15. Pickpockets always ... things when nobody’s looking.
    steal
30 Hoe zeg je...?

1. Misschien komt het door de hitte. Maybe it’s the heat.
2. Slapen we allemaal gewoon buiten op het dek?
   Do we all just sleep out here on the decks?
3. Meen je dat nou?
   Are you serious?
4. Ik ben nog nooit van mijn leven zo bang geweest.
   I’ve never been so scared in all my life.
5. Gelooft me nou maar.
   Trust me.

31 Talk with a friend 2HI

You (A) have been on a holiday to ... (choose a country) and you’re telling your friend (B) all about it. First read the sentences below.

A
1. (A) (je vertelt naar welk land je op vakantie was)
2. (A) (je vertelt dat je daar vaak bent geweest met je familie)
3. (A) (je zegt dat je alleen reisde)
4. (A) (je geeft antwoord, en vraagt of B ooit in haar/ijn eentje heeft gereisd)
5. (A) (je vraagt naar B’s vakantie)
6. (A) (je vraagt wat B in de vakantie deed)
7. (A) (je vraagt of het lekker weer was in Nederland)

B
2. (B) (je zegt dat je daar nooit bent geweest)
3. (B) (je zegt wat B ooit in haar/ijn eentje heeft gereisd)
4. (B) (je zegt dat spannend was)
5. (B) (strong, maar je oudere broer/wel)
6. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
7. (B) (je zegt dat je veel naar het zwembad ging)
8. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
9. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
10. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
11. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
12. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
13. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)
14. (B) (je zegt dat je dit jaar thuis bleef)

Finished? Change roles!

Ga eens naar What’s on? op de cd-rom. Daar vind je een leuke multimedia-oefening over het thema van deze unit.

Self-testing Lessons 16, 17, 18

32 Complete the sentences

Compare. Use the words in italics (schuingedrukte woorden).

1. (tall) Lesley is ... than all the others. taller
2. (cool) Nancy is the ... girl in our school. coolest
3. (ugly) That rhino is the ... creature I’ve ever seen. ugliest
4. (bad) Mr Dixon? He’s the ... teacher I know. worst
5. (exciting) Our trip to Zambia was the ... trip I’ve ever made. most exciting
6. (grumpy) Grandad is even ... today than he was yesterday! grumpier
7. (valuable) Gold is ... than silver. more valuable
8. (dangerous) What is the ... animal in the world? most dangerous
Vertaal de onderstreepte woorden naar het Engels (twee per zin!!!!)

1. Een vrachtwagen heeft een maximum snelheid van 80 kilometer per uur.
2. Een familieled van mijn moeder woont helemaal alleen in een verlaten hutje op de hei.
3. Deze juwelen zijn van platina en witgoud en zijn dus erg kostbaar.
4. Wat een fantastische zonsondergang, het landschap ziet er zo heil anders uit.
5. Vanwege de uitslagen is het niet verstandig de ramen open te laten tijdens een file.
6. Pas op voor die luitenant, vorige week haalde hij nog met zijn poot uit naar een oppasser.
7. De dodo, die helaas uitgestorven is, was een lelijk uitzienende vogel, die niet kon vliegen.
8. Sommige wetenschappers zijn er van overtuigd dat je een aap een opleiding kunt geven.
10. De panda is een beschermd soort.

Vertaal de volgende zinnen naar het Engels

1. Nu ben ik dus echt verdwaald!
2. Ik ben er echt misselijk van geworden.
3. O, ik ben nergens bang voor.
4. Ze is Engelsstalig opgevoed.
5. Misschien komt het door de hitte.

Maak het rijtje van de volgende onregelmatige werkwoorden af

1. vliegen
2. zwemmen
3. spreken
4. rijden
5. bijten

Good Luck!!
Je hoeft bij de volgende opdrachten alleen de antwoorden op te schrijven!

A) Gebruik de Present Perfect (have + voltooide deelwoord)

1. My grandfather ---- always ---- (work) as a carpenter, and he still does, sometimes.
2. Those stupid poachers ---- just ---- (shoot) an elephant.
3. Theo ---- (swim) two kilometers a day since he was fifteen.
4. The construction workers ---- never ---- (build) a house before!
5. I ---- never ---- (feel) anything like that before!

B) Gebruik de Past Simple (OW2)

1. They ----- (stop) a few poachers from shooting an impala yesterday.
2. I ----- (not drink) that much last Saturday!
3. Frank and Glen ----- (leave) the party early the other night.
4. ----- you ----- (see) Mandy in her black leather dress last night? What a vamp!
5. Where ----- (be) you when I called you last Monday?

C) Gebruik nu de Present Perfect of de Past Simple

1. When I ----- (meet) my husband I was still at school.
2. John ----- (work) for this company for ten years.
3. ----- you ----- (play) that new computer game yet?
4. ----- she ----- (look) at you at last Friday’s school party?
5. Peter ----- (not ever be) to Africa before.

D) Maak de zin af met behulp van tags:

1. Ajax won’t win the cup this year, -------?
2. Marian’s got three big dogs and seven cats, -------?
3. You can’t really dance, -------?
4. We shouldn’t talk too much, -------?
5. Iris and Kimberley are working in the shop right now, -------?

E) Gebruik de trappen van vergelijking:

1. Peter is ---- (tall) than Marcel, but Charles is the ---- (tall).
2. Christina must be the ---- (beautiful) girl I’ve ever seen.
3. A Ferrari is ---- (expensive) than a Lada.
4. Harry is the ---- (happy) boy in class since he was elected the ---- (popular) one.
5. Don’t go with Alan, he’s the ---- (bad) driver I know!
ATTENTIE!!! Bij opdrachten D, E en F moet je DE HELE ZIN opschrijven, bij de rest alleen de NUMMERS en de INVULLINGEN.

A

**Complete**

Use: tags

Example: He is very kind, ...? He is very kind, isn't he?

1. Your uncle can't speak Swahili, ...?
2. You're not listening to me, ...?
3. You haven't eaten your breakfast yet, ...?
4. Daniel threw up in the car, ...?
5. People don't kill elephants for their tusks anymore, ...?
6. Your story was true, ...?

B

**Fill in**

Fill in the correct form of the verb. Use: past simple or present perfect.

Example: They ... (travel) a long way. They have travelled a long way.
They ... (repair) the car yesterday. They repaired the car yesterday.

1. The wind suddenly ... (increase) yesterday.
2. You ... (not answer) my question yet!
3. Last week your friend ... (promise) us that he would help us.
4. Let's go to London! I ... (always - want) to see Tower Bridge.
5. I must go to a doctor because a dog ... (bite) me.
6. When my brother ... (wake up) this morning he wasn't feeling well.
7. ... the television programme ... (start) yet?
8. Yesterday we ... (hear) the news about that terrible gale in England.

C

**Fill in**

Compare and fill in the right forms.

Example: My brother is ... (tall) than my father
He is the... (tall) person in our family.

My brother is taller than my father.
He is the tallest person in our family.

1. This exercise is ... (easy) than the other one.
2. This is the ... (appalling) story I have ever heard.
3. Amsterdam is a ... (big) city than Utrecht.
4. Your boots are ... (muddy) than mine.
5. Kelly is a ... (attractive) girl than Wendy.
6. 'Lord of the Rings' is the ... (amazing) film I have ever seen.
7. I think that was the ... (bad) day of my life.
8. Vandana is the ... (bright) girl in our class.

D

**Wat zeg je...?**

1. Je ziet een paar beesten in de dierenriem maar je weet niet meer hoe je ze noemt. Wat vraag je?
2. Er zit een eng beest onder je stoel. Je moeder stelt je gerust dat het alleen maar een grote oude pad is. Wat zegt ze?
3. Jullie zijn aan het schaatsten. Je vriend is erg bang om door het ijs te zakken. Je zegt dat het volkomen veilig is. Wat zegt je?
4. Je stelt je vriend voor om te gaan zwemmen voor het middageten. Wat vraag je?
5. Iemand vraagt je hoe je vakantie bevult. Je zegt dat je het tot nu toe zo erg naar je zin hebt gehad. Wat zegt je?

E

**Hoe zeg je...?**

1. Ik ben nergens bang voor.
2. Tenzij je niet kunt zwemmen natuurlijk.
3. Ik ben Engelsstalig opgevoed.
4. Meen je dat nou? Vind je het niet spannend?
5. Het is die kant op, daar links.

Good Luck!!
Appendix B1: Grammar Tests

Grammar test 1

Fill in use: the present perfect

HAVE/HAS + OW 3 of WW+ed

Vb. Peter has worked there since 1998
   They haven't seen their Grandmother for ages.

Hi Carla!
How’s life? I know it has been (be)a while since I e-mailed you. You must think I 1 ... (forget) you. I haven’t. I (2) ... just .... (be) really busy, that’s all. I hear that you (3) ... (sold) your old bike. That’s great! Still, you’ll be interested to hear about this plan which Darren, Mikey and I (4) ... (come) up with to earn some extra money.

Jess (5) ... (join) a wildlife group, did you know that? Well, she has, and the guys and I (6) ... (talk) to her about it and that (7) .... (give) me an idea. I (8) ... just ... (meet) with Darren and Mikey. It’s a bit late now, so I’ll call you tomorrow to tell you all about it, OK?

Bye,

Tom

1. have forgotten
2. have been
3. have sold
4. have come
5. has joined
6. have talked
7. has given
8. have met

Fill in

Use: the present perfect or the past simple

1. Last week I a first date with Laila (have)
2. I about her ever since I first saw her (dream)
3. When I was 16, we on holiday to Japan. (go)
4. She never in Amsterdam before! (be)
5. you that film with Brad Pitt yesterday? (see)

1. had
2. have dreamed
3. went
4. has been
5. did see

Complete the sentences
Use: -er, -est, more ..., most...

1. Clean   My room is much   than yours.
2. Beautiful   Amy is the   girl at our school, if you ask me.
3. Expensive   Are you crazy? That hotdog is   than the one over there!
4. Strict   Mr. Watson is the   teacher I know.
5. Happy   I think that couple is   than them, because they have won the lottery.

1. cleaner
2. most beautiful
3. more expensive
4. strictest
5. happier

Grammar test 2

A) Finish the story: only use the Present Perfect!

Present Perfect: Has/Have + WW-ED or OWW 3

Example: Lily hasn’t received news since 9 o’clock this morning

They have been in that restaurant for ages!

Dear Diary,

My parents ..(1) .. never ..(1). (understand) me. I really want to quit playing the piano, but they won’t let me. They say that I (2) ... (played) the piano since I was only 6 years old. But now I am already 14 and I am bored with it. I want to play the drums now. I (3) ..... (see) this very nice drum kit already! I’m totally in love with it. I (4) ....... (not tell) my mum and dad yet, because they (5) ..... just ....... (buy) a new piano. I’m going to tell them now, wish me luck!

1 –
2 –
3 –
4 –
5 –

B) Finish the story: this time use the Past Simple or the Present Perfect!

I SAW MAY FRIEND THREE WEEKS AGO. (Past Simple)

I HAVE NOT SEEN MY FRIEND FOR A WHILE. (Present Perfect)
Hi Jake!

How are you? Are you enjoying your holidays? I (1) ........ (not hear) from you for ages! I’m feeling really good. Yesterday I (2) .... (go) to the cinema with Barry, to watch the film Scream 4. It was pretty scary. I (3) .....(not see) the first 3 yet, but I’m going to this week. (4) .... you ..... (watch) all parts last year? Tomorrow I’m going to a concert with my brother. We (5) .... (book) tickets a couple of weeks ago and we’re excited. By the way,(6) .... you already ..... (be) to Amsterdam? I (7) ...... (forget) to ask you last time, sorry. But I have to go. Oh, now I (8) ....... (not say) anything about my new girlfriend. Next time, I promise! Anyway, I hope you’re having a good time, see you later.

Pete

1 – 4 - 7 -
2 – 5 - 8 -
3 – 6 -

C) Comparison: complete the sentences

Use: -er, -est, more ..., most...

1 – Delicious I think this is the chocolate cake ever!
2 – Pretty Do you think Samantha is than Brianna? I do.
3 – Good You are the mum in the world!
4 – Intelligent A dog is than a fish.
5 – Sweet That is the thing anyone has ever done for me! Thank you.
Appendix B2: Writing Samples (from 1 to 6)

Level 1 –

In my holidays i go to the bios to a movi. The next day i wake up and have breakfast. Than in the evening we go to frence by spain. That's wil be nice. When we come back we go to sleep because it is in the night.

Level 2 –

This summerholiday am I going to Italy. I am going with my mum, dad, and my two brothers. We go for four weeks. My brother and I go wit the train to Italy, it is the first time that we may on our self. We are I think, five days in the train, that is not going so fast. When we were at home I go to stay with Robin, a girl oud my old city, I was born there. There go I stay for a few days. Then I am going I wit the train and busses back to home. Sophie and I go to 'hank' that is a camping in Noord- Brabant, there will we stay for a few days. I also go with Sophie to a Funpark, mayby Walibi or something, and mayby I go sleep then by Sophie. Then is the holiday finish, we are going back to school. By

Level 3 –

My Holiday I go to Spain in my holiday. In the Hotel is a swimpool with icecream bar. We go one week to Spain. I am going to do lots of things there, as swimming, biking, tan be. I am going to lots of food eat. I am going to watch movies and a will be the next manager of barcelona. By Barcelona I am going to win all prices and all money and then I get the most beautiful women in the world. I am a millionar so I design new cars and new motors. And I build a new stadion for Barcelona with a popcorn machine and cinema. And then come the aliens attacking. I shoot then dead. I will go to my house and sleep well and then come my mother and wake my up. This is my story.

Level 4 –
In the summer holiday me and my dad are going to Califonia for 3 weeks. We are going to see alot of citys by train. We are also going to Canada to catch a moose and take it home to be a pet moose. Then I can ride it to school and I will pay the school to make a moose stable When I get back I'm going to Amsterdam. I will stay with my aunt and her boyfriend but most of the I will stay with friends. Also on 22th of july my other aunt and her guy are having a wedding the whole family is going to be there and the party will be till midnight At the very beginning of the vacation me and my family will go to Germany for a family. My brother is going to learn the moonwalk but his leg is broken so he is going to ask michael jackson to do it for him.

Level 5 –

In the summer holidays im going to Abu Dhabi with my parents and brother, not for long, about a week. After our journey to Abu Dhabi we're moving on to Dubai to meet some old friends, meanwhile my dad will fly on to Saudi- Arabië for his work and to sort out some thing for our next stay. After bringing back memories with our lovely friends, we get to move on to Saudi- Arabië. We're going there because the Queen from Holland, Beatrix, will be there to. Several days later after celebrating our holiday, we're going to flying to Miami, we will stay there for 2 weeks. Going to the beach, meeting new friends, chilling and going out. My dad said that if we like it in Miami we might stay there, to live. My brother and i will go to school and live a totally diferent live, more partying and stuff. We might even get to go to the Emmy's and meet famous singers and acturs. I decided that i wanna get a summer job in Miami, at Sean Kingston's villa as cleaning lady. So it lookes like my holiday is gonna be Fantastic, it will be like a little trip around the world. I hope it wi'll have lots of fun!

Level 6 –

In my holiday I'm gonna tour around the whole entire world with my dog 'Zebra'! Gonna see lots of cultures and meet new people. First I am going to Alaska, between the weird and scary eskimo's. After that I'm gonna go to Wonderland! Meeting my big star Alice. I admire her to death. I hope she's gonna be nice and gonna show me the big white palace! After that we're of to Indonesia, finally meeting some people I know from there. Also I wanna go to Australia!
They seem to have a lot of strange animals over there! When I get back from this tour. I'm gonna chill in my bed and only eat cupcakes, muffin's and Hamburgers I brought in America. I'm gonna sleep, read, dream, play games and get fat! When I am fat enough I think I'm going to lose some weight. For that I'm gonna rent a personal trainer, 'Hulk Hogan'! Maybe my dog will join me, he's fat too. After my whole train thing stuff. I'm gonna go to America again to meet my old friends! In Texas I'm gonna ride Horses with Cowboys. In Las Vegas I'd like to join a big show with monkey's. In Los Angeles I'm gonna go to a award show and meet all these big stars! In the state Washington I'm gonna visit the set from Twilight because I love that movie! Then I'm going to a show from K3, they got very famous in the US. When I'm getting to New York I'm gonna stalk the famous and big stars over there! That is my holiday so far, I will send you a postcard if you want.

Appendix B3: Survey Monkey Screenshots
3. Willingness to communicate at school: please indicate how much you agree with these statements:

- I feel comfortable speaking English in a group discussion.
- I often give answers in English in class.
- I am interested in the culture of English-speaking countries.
- I can understand everything during my English classes.
- I would like to have more English speaking friends.
- I want to be fluent in English.
- I enjoy speaking English.
- English enables me to communicate with people from different language groups.
- It is important to me to learn English.
- I will need English after high school for my studies.
- Studying English is important because it will be useful in getting a job.
- I like to talk to native speakers of English.
- English helps me to find new friends or hobbies.
- English is an important language of communication in the world.
- I like my English class.
- I understand everything during my English classes.
- I would like to have more English speaking friends.
- I want to be fluent in English.
- I am interested in the culture of English-speaking countries.
- I can understand everything during my English classes.
- I would like to have more English speaking friends.
- I want to be fluent in English.
- I am interested in the culture of English-speaking countries.

4. Lies in order and indicate the correct answers:

   - Lies in order and indicate the correct answers:
     - 1. Obey
     - 2. Thirst
     - 3. Narrative
     - 4. Expert
     - 5. Large
     - 6. Accurate
     - 7. Common
     - 8. Show
     - 9. Early
     - 10. Stumble
     - 11. Dear
     - 12. Grow
     - 13. Lantern
     - 14. Red

5. Lies in order and indicate the correct answers:

   - Lies in order and indicate the correct answers:
     - 1. Obey
     - 2. Thirst
     - 3. Narrative
     - 4. Expert
     - 5. Large
     - 6. Accurate
     - 7. Common
     - 8. Show
     - 9. Early
     - 10. Stumble
     - 11. Dear
     - 12. Grow
     - 13. Lantern
     - 14. Red
Appendix C1: Statistics time and interaction of writing tests

Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type II Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
<th>Noncent. Parameter</th>
<th>Observed Power*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>Sphericity-Assumed</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>2.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1.930</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>2.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>.460</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.241</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>2.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.919</td>
<td>1.438</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time * class</td>
<td>Sphericity-Assumed</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>3.761</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>15.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.202</td>
<td>3.761</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>15.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>4.808</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>2.404</td>
<td>3.761</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>7.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(time)</td>
<td>Sphericity-Assumed</td>
<td>40.273</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greenhouse-Geisser</td>
<td>40.273</td>
<td>121.593</td>
<td>.331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huynh-Feldt</td>
<td>40.273</td>
<td>126.000</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower-bound</td>
<td>40.273</td>
<td>63.000</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Computed using alpha = .05