Journal of

Second and Multiple Language Acquisition

JSMULA

Table of Contents

ARTICLES

Metacognitive Language Learning Strategies
Used by Students Learning Mandarin as a Foreign Language

Teow Ghee Tan[1]
University Teknologi MARA Kedah Branch

Teck Heng Lim[2]
University Teknologi MARA Penang Branch

Foo Terng Hoe[3]
University Teknologi MARA Penang Branch

Abstract

This study focused particularly on metacognitive language learning strategies (McLLS). It aimed to identify the McLLS used by students besides examining the effect of learning level and gender on McLLS. The participants were 582 undergraduates who were learning Mandarin as a foreign language in a public university in Malaysia. The findings indicated that *Centering your Learning* and *Evaluating your Learning were of the highly used range while Arranging and Planning Your Learning was of the moderately used range.* The findings also showed that there were no statistical significant differences by genders in McLLS used. However, there were partial significant differences across learning levels on the McLLS used. There was a significant difference in the usage of *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* for students of Level One and Level Two as compared to the students of Level Three. The students in Level One also significantly used *Centering Your Learning* strategies more frequently than the students of Level Three. In addition, the results showed that there was no interaction effect between gender and course learning level on McLLS. The study also suggests some strategies that teachers can adopt in applying *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* in the teaching of the four language skills.

1. Introduction

Numerous researches on language learning strategies for learning a second or foreign language have been conducted. However, most of these researches mainly focused on general language learning strategies. It is still not a common practice to focus on all types of strategies separately. For example, metacognitive language learning strategies have been treated as a sub-type of language learning strategies, and it was included together with other sub-types of strategies in language learning research. Although there are some researches (Vandergrift, 2005; Wen & Johnson, 1997) have indicated the

---

[1]Teow Ghee, Tan is an associate professor of Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Kedah Branch; research field: Individual Differences in Foreign Language Learning. Corresponding author: tgtan05@yahoo.com.my

[2]Teck Heng, Lim is a senior lecturer of Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Penang Branch; research field: Teaching English as a Second Language

[3]Foo Terng, Hoe is an associate professor of Academy of Language Studies, Universiti Teknologi MARA Penang Branch; research field: Teaching Mandarin as a Foreign Language.

importance of metacognitive strategies in language learning, there is still a scarcity of research that focus particularly on metacognitive language learning strategies (Wu, 2007). Researchers propose that metacognitive strategies are very important in language learning as they assist in learning more effectively and decisively (Camello, 2011; Oxford, 1990)

1.1.   Literature Review

Metacognitive language learning strategies are one of the sub-groups of language learning strategies (LLS). Oxford (1990) defines LLS as "specific actions taken by the learners to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more efficient and more transferable to a new situation" (p. 8). She further adds that LLS are steps employed by learners to facilitate the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information. She too produces an exclusive taxonomy or classification of LLS and it was claimed as "perhaps the most comprehensive classification of learning strategies to date" (Ellis, 1994, p.539). In this classification, Oxford (1990) distinguishes direct and indirect strategies and subdivided them into six groups. Memory strategies, cognitive strategies and compensation strategies are sub-groups of direct strategies, while metacognitive strategies, affective strategies and social strategies are the sub-groups of indirect strategies.
In 2001, Oxford summarizes the six categories of language learning strategies as follows:

(i) memory strategies are techniques used for storing and retrieving new information such as creating mental linkages, applying images and sounds, reviewing, and employing actions;

(ii) cognitive strategies refer to skills that involve manipulation or transformation of the language in some direct ways such as through analyzing and reasoning, practicing, receiving and sending messages, as well as creating structure for input and output.

(iii) compensation strategies are behaviours used to overcome knowledge gaps such as guessing at words based on context, using gestures and coining words to communicate.

 (iv) affective strategies help learners control their feelings and attitudes that are related to language learning, such as self-reinforcement and positive self-talk.

 (v) social strategies are actions involving other people in the language
learning process, such as seeking correction, asking for clarification, working with peers, and developing empathy.

(vi) metacognitive strategies are behaviours used for centering, arranging, planning, and evaluating one's learning.

There are eleven strategies under metacognitive language learning strategies (McLLS). Oxford (1990) divides these eleven McLLS into three sets namely *Centering your Learning, Arranging and Planning Your Learning and Evaluating your Learning.* These three McLLS sets are further classified as follows:

(a) *Centering your Learning* strategies such as paying attention and linking new information to materials already familiar help learners regain their focus from overwhelmed language input.
(b) *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* strategies enable learners to arrange and plan their language learning in an efficient and effective way. These included organizing, setting goals and objectives, planning for a language task, and seeking practice opportunities.
(c) *Evaluating your Learning* strategies are used for monitoring one's language learning errors and evaluating one's language learning progress.

These three sets of McLLS are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1
The Three Set of McLLS

Category	Set	Strategy
McLLS	A. Centering your learning	1. overviewing and linking with already known material 2. paying attention 3. delaying speech production to focus on listening
	B. Arranging and planning your learning	1. Finding out about language learning 2. Organizing 3. Setting goals and objectives 4. Identifying the purpose of a language task (purposeful listening / reading / speaking / writing) 5. Planning for a language task 6. Seeking practice opportunities
	C. Evaluating your learning	1. Self-monitoring 2. Self-evaluating

(adopted from Oxford (1990), p. 18-19)

Although most of the research findings demonstrated the importance of McLLS in language learning, McLLS were not the main focus of these researches on LLS. Some of these researches have shown that successful language learners are high frequent users of McLLS compared to the less successful learners (Bremner, 1999; Cohen, 1998; Chamot & Kupper, 1989). McLLS have also been identified as the category of which learners heavily relied on or the most frequently used by foreign language learners (Bremner, 1999; Gan, 2008; Lee & Zubiadah, 2009; Nisbet, Tindal & Arroyo, 2005; Kaur, 2003; Riazi & Rahimi, 2005; Tan, Hairul & Mohd Kamarul, 2009; Shmais, 2003; Woodrow, 2005; Zahra, 2003). On the other hand, studies that investigated the relationship between language learning strategies and gender also produced mixed results. Some studies discovered distinct differences in the strategies used by different genders (Murni Mahmud, & Sahril Nur, 2018; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Ehrman & Oxford, 1989; Green &

Oxford, 1995). Some failed to discover any evidence of differing language learning strategies between genders (Ehrman & Oxford, 1990; Wharton, 2000; Wu, 2007). Except for Wu's (2007) study, all the other findings are part of the results obtained from studies which focussed on general LLS.

On the other hand, many researches reported that higher learning level learners used more strategies that lower level learners (Bialystok, 1981; Green & Oxford, 1995; Oxford & Nyikos, 1989; Politzer, 1983). However, there is no known study that investigates specifically on the relationship between McLLS and learning level. As there is still a lack of study investigating the relationship between McLLS and learning level, and the comparison of McLLS used between genders, this study which focuses on these aspects will provide some new empirical evidences and will help to fill the gap.

Furthermore, there were not many studies that investigated the LLS used by Malaysian undergraduates especially in the learning of foreign languages. Indeed, there are even relatively fewer studies that focus particularly on the LLS used by Malay undergraduates' in learning foreign languages. To the researchers' knowledge, there are only three studies (Gan, 2008; Lee & Zubaidah, 2009; Tan, et al., 2009) that investigated on the LLS used by Malay undergraduates who were learning Mandarin as a foreign language in three different campuses of the university in which this study was conducted. The findings of those studies indicated that among all the LLS categories, McLLS were the most frequently used by the students. To emphasize the importance of McLLS in language learning, besides to gain more detailed evidence on McLLS used by the Malay undergraduates, this study investigated McLLS as a separate category by itself.

1.2.   Research Questions

Due to the importance of McLLS in language learning and the lack of study conducted particularly on McLLS, this study was conducted to seek answers to the following research questions:

(i) What are the McLLS used by the students learning Mandarin as a foreign language?
(ii) Do males and female students differ in terms of the McLLS used?
(iii) Do the students in different learning level differ in terms of the McLL used?
iv) Is there an interaction effect between gender and learning level on the McLLS used?

2. Methodology

This is a quantitative study which employs stratified samplings method. The study took place at a public university in Malaysia which only caters for indigenous students.

2.1.   The Participants

The participants of the study were 582 university undergraduates who were pursuing their study at a public university in Malaysia which only

caters for indigenous students. The participants comprised students who were learning either Introductory Mandarin Level One, Introductory Mandarin Level Two or Introductory Mandarin Level Three. All these students were bilingual in Malay language and English. Those who have background of Mandarin before they registered for the course were excluded from the study. The particulars of the participants are illustrated in Table 2.

Table 2
Demographic of participants

gender	f	%	age	f	%	level	f	%
Male:	292	(50.2)	20 :	16	(2.7)	I:	193	(33.2)
Female:	290	(49.8)	21:	110	(18.9)	II:	195	(33.5)
			22:	345	(59.3)	III:	194	(33.3)
			23:	103	(17.7)			
			24:	6	(1.0)			
			25:	2	(0.3)			

All the 582 participants returned the questionnaires. Among them, 292 of them were male (50.2%), and 290 were female (49.8%). 16 of them were of the age 20 (2.7%), 110 were of 21 (18.9%), 345 were of 22 (59.3), 103 were of 23 (17.7), 6 were of 24 (1%) and 2 were of 25 (0.3%). Their average age was 21.96. 193 (33.2 %) of them were learning elementary Mandarin Level One, 195 (33.5%) Level Two and 194 (33.3 %) Level Three. The demographic data of the participants is illustrated in Table 2.

2.2.   Instrument

The questionnaire used in this study consists of two parts. The first part contained items on participants' demographic data such as age, gender, and learning level. The second part consisted of the items on McLLS. The nine items on McLLS of Oxford's (1990) Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) version 7.0 which were designed for speakers of other languages learning English were used to measure the use of McLLS for the target group. Although there are 50 items in SILL version 7.0 that measure cognitive, metacognitive, compensation, social and affective strategies, only the part (Part D) which measures the use of McLLS was included in the questionnaire to suit the focus of this study. McLLS are divided into three sets by Oxford (1990), that is, *Centering Your Learning* (one item), *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* (six items), and *Evaluating Your Learning* (two items).

SILL has been employed as a key instrument in numerous studies and has its Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients ranging from .85 to .98 in those studies (Bremner, 1999; Oxford & Burry-Stock, 1995, Wharton, 2000). This makes it a trusted measure for gauging students' reported language learning strategies. The McLLS which were included in the questionnaire can be regarded as an independent scale as it has been reported that the reliability and validity statistics of SILL are independent

of the other parts (Bremner, 1999; Oh, 1992; Wu, 2007). Furthermore, the Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of the items used in this study was 0.87. This value is comparable to those previously reported (Bremner, 1999; Oh, 1992; Wu, 2007). This shows that the questionnaire not only meets the established reliability criterion but also achieves satisfactory high reliability too.

To serve the purpose of this study, the word "English" in the questionnaire was substituted with "Mandarin". To prevent confusion and misunderstanding of the items in the questionnaire, each item was translated into the respondents' mother language by two bilingual language lecturers. The respondents were asked to indicate their responses on how true the items in the questionnaire were to them with respect to the use of the specific McLLS. The items were on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from '1' (Never or almost never true of me) to '5' (Always or almost always true of me).

3. Findings

The data collected was analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics analysis and inferential statistics analysis of Two-way MANOVA were performed to serve the analysis purposes.

3.1 The Results of Descriptive Statistics Analysis on the McLLS Used

The results of descriptive analysis on McLLS used were obtained to answer the first research question – "What are the McLLS used by Malay undergraduates learning Mandarin as a foreign language?" Table 3 illustrates the means and standard deviations of the McLLS used by the respondents.

Table 3
The Means of McLLS Used by the Participants (N = 582)

McLLS	Min	Max	M	S D
Centering Your Learning	1.00	5.00	3.79	.78
Arranging and Planning Your Learning	.83	4.17	2.75	.59
Evaluating Your Learning	1.50	5.00	3.66	.65

According to Oxford (1990), a range of 3.5 – 5.0 on an item is thought to reflect high use of that strategy, 2.5 – 3.4 moderate use, and 1.0 – 2.4 low use. As shown in Table 3, among all McLLS categories, *Centering Your Learning* (M = 3.79, SD = .78) was the most highly used strategies, followed by *Evaluating Your Learning* (M = 3.66, SD = .65) which was at the high use range too..*Arranging and Planning Your Learning* (M = 2.75, SD = .59) was only moderately used. Table 4 illustrates the means and standard deviations of the McLLS by gender.

Table 4
The Comparison of McLLS Used by Gender (N = 582)

McLLS	Male n =292		Female n= 290	
	M	SD	M	SD
Centering Your Learning	3.85	.81	3.73	.76
Arranging and Planning Your Learning	2.80	.60	2.71	.57
Evaluating Your Learning	3.66	.63	3.67	.66

Table 4 shows the comparison result of McLLS used by both genders with male scoring slightly higher than female in all the three McLLS sets. They were high users of *Centering Your Learning* strategies (M = 3.85; M = 3.73 respectively) and *Evaluating Your Learning* strategies (M = 3.66; M = 3.67 respectively). They were moderate users of *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* (M = 2.80; M = 2.71 respectively).

The results of the comparisons of McLLS across learning levels in Table 5 revealed that all the students of these three Levels were high users of *Centering Your Learning* strategies (M = 3.82; M = 3.84; M = 3.70) and *Evaluating Your Learning* strategies (M = 3.74; M = 3.69; M = 3.56). However, they only used *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* strategies moderately (M = 2.88; M = 2.80; M = 2.57).

Table 5
The Comparisons of McLLS across Learning Levels (N = 582)

McLLS	Level I n = 192		Level II n = 194		Level III n = 195	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
Centering your Learning	3.82	.81	3.84	.72	3.70	.82
Arranging and Planning your Learning	2.88	.58	2.80	.52	2.57	.62
Evaluating your Learning	3.74	.65	3.69	.61	3.56	.67

3.2   The Results of Inferential Statistics Analysis

Subsequently, the inferential statistics analysis of multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to examine the differences by genders and across learning levels on using McLLS, Before performing MANOVA, a number of assumptions that underpin the use of MANOVA were examined. These assumptions are cell sizes, univariate and multivariate normality, linearity, homogeneity of variance-covariance and multicollinearity (Hair et. al, 1998; Pallant, 2001, Coakes & Steeds, 2003). As the sample size regarding course level was controlled since the beginning of the study, the equal cell size assumption was fulfilled. A total of 193 Level One, 195 Level Two and 194 Level Three students were involved in this study.

The "Regression: Residual Statistics - Mahalanobis Distances" was used to examine the presence of multivariate outliers. Mahalanobis distance is the distance of a particular case from the centroid of the remaining cases, whereby the centroid is the point created by the means of all the variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Mahalanobis distance value obtained for the data was compared against the critical value of three dependent variables, 16.57, by using a chi-square table (Pallant, 2001). Fortunately, there were no extreme cases detected from the data.

Subsequently, Box's M Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices was used to access the homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices. The Box's M test result is shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Box's M Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Box's M	F	df 1	df 2	*P*
65.84	1.29	50	568648.07	.08

[**] *p* < .001

As shown in Table 6, the Box's M Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices indicated that this assumption has not been violated at an alpha level of 0.001 (F = 1.29, *p* = 0.08). This indicates that the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables are homogenous across course levels. Next, a matrix of scatterdots between each pair of dependent variables was conducted separately for gender and course levels to test the linearity among all pairs of dependent variables. The presence of a straight-line relationship between each pair of the dependent variables proved that the assumption was not violated.

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances was also generated to view the equal variance for each type of McLLS under investigation. The results of Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances are shown in Table 7.

Table 7
Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Variable	F	df1	df2	Sig.
Centering Your Learning	1.87	5	576	.10
Arranging and Planning Your Learning	3.53	5	576	.00[**]
Evaluating Your Learning	.71	5	576	.62

As shown in Table 7, the *p* value is greater than 0.05 for *Centering Your Learning* (F = 1.87, *p* = 0.1) and *Evaluating Your Learning* (F = 0.71, *p* = 0.62). This indicates that the variance is homogenous across *Centering Your Learning* and *Evaluating Your Learning*. On the other hand, the *p* value is lesser than 0.05 for *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* (F = 3.53, *p* = 0.00). As such, equal variance is not assumed across *Arranging*

and Planning Your Learning (Coakes & Steeds, 2003; Pallant, 2001; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

As the assumption of equality of variances across *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* was violated, a more conservative alpha level of 0.025 or 0.01, rather than the conventional 0.05 level as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2007) was applied to determine the significance of these variables in the univariate F-test. The results of the MANOVA test are shown in Table 8.

Table 8
The MANOVA Analysis' Results for McLLS

Effect	Wilks' Lambda	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	ŋ
gender	.98	3.06	4	573	.02*	.02
level	.94	4.29	8	1146	.00**	.03
gender * level	.99	.98	8	1146	.45	.01

As shown in Table 8, the value of Wilks' Lamba obtained in the multivariate test for gender is 0.98, F (4, 573) = 3.06, *p* < 0.05, ŋ = 0.02. As the *p* value is less than 0.05, this indicates that there is a statistical significant difference with a small effect size among McLLS by gender. The Wilks' Lambda is used for testing null hypothesis in MANOVA, and it is also referred to as U statistics (Hair, et al., 1998). On the other hand, the results obtained in the multivariate test for course level are, Wilks' Lamba value = 0.94, F (8, 1146) = 4.29, *p* < 0.01, ŋ = 0.03. As the *p* value is less than 0.05, this indicates that there is a statistical significant difference with a small effect size among McLLS across learning level. However, the results obtained in the multivariate test for the interaction between gender and course level are, Wilks' Lamba value = 0.99, F (8, 1146) = .98, *p* > 0.05. As the *p* value is above 0.05, this indicates that there is no statistical significant interaction effect between gender and course level on McLLS.

As the result obtained for gender and learning level was of significant difference, a follow-up investigation had to be conducted to explore this relationship further (Coakes & Steeds, 2003; Pallant, 2001). The tests of between-subjects effects were carried out to serve the purpose. As the assumption of equality of variances across *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* was violated, a more conservative alpha level of 0.01 was applied to determine the significance of these two variables. The results of the tests of between-subjects effects for gender are shown in Table 9.

Table 9
The Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Gender)

Dependent Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	ŋ
Centering your Learning	1.95	1	1.95	3.20	.07	.01
Arranging and Planning your Learning	1.19	1	1.19	3.63	.06	.01
Evaluating your Learning	.04	1	.04	.08	.77	.00

As shown in Table 9, none of the McLLS sets yield a significant F value as the values are greater than 0.05. The results indicate that there is actually no significant difference in McLLS by genders. Table 10 shows the results of the Tests of between–subjects effects for learning level.

Table 10
The Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Learning Level)

Dependent Variable	SS	df	MS	F	Sig.	ŋ
Centering your Learning	2.22	2	1.11	1.82	.16	.04
Arranging and Planning your Learning	10.11	2	5.05	15.44	.00**	.05
Evaluating your Learning	3.24	2	1.62	3.90	.02*	.01

*P<0.05, **P<0.01

As shown in Table 10, only *Centering Your Learning* did not yield a significant F value (F(2, 538) = 1.82, *p* > 0.05). *Arranging Your Learning* and *Evaluating Your Learning* yield significant F value as the values are lesser than 0.01. The results indicate that there is a significant difference in *Arranging Your Learning* and *Evaluating Your Learning* across learning levels. As there were three learning levels, Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey's Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) test was conducted. The Tukey's HSD post-hoc test is performed to identify which comparisons among groups have significant differences (Hair, et al., 1998). The results of Tukey's HSD post-hoc test for comparisons are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11
Summary Table for Tukey HSD Multiple Comparison Test

Dependent Variable	Course level	Mean Difference	p
Arranging and Planning your Learning	Level I – Level II	.08	.39
	Level I – Level III	.30	.00**
	Level II – Level III	.23	. 00**
Evaluating your Learning	Level I – Level II	.04	.79
	Level I – Level III	.17	.02*
	Level II – Level III	.13	.16

Table 11 shows the Tukey HSD post-hoc test results and the mean difference score of each level for *Arranging and Planning Your Learning.* The mean score of *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* for the Level One is significantly higher than that of the Level Three (MD = 0.30, *p* < 0.01). The mean score of

Level Two group is also significantly higher than that of the Level Three (MD = 0.23, *p* < 0.01). However, there is no significant difference between the mean score of Level One and Level Two in *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* (M = 0.08, SD = 0.39).

On the other hand, only the mean score of *Evaluating Your Learning* for the Level One group is significantly higher than that of the Level Three (MD = 0.17, *p* < 0.05). There are no significant differences between the mean score of Level One and Level Two as well as that of Level Two and Level Three.(M = 0.04, SD = 0.79; M = 0.13, SD = 0.16 respectively).

4. Conclusions

When the students were viewed as one unit or a whole entity, the descriptive analysis results showed that they used *Evaluating Your Learning* and *Centering Your Learning* strategies at a high use range, and used *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* strategies at a moderate range. In addition, the descriptive analysis results also showed the similar result for the students in all the three levels. The result showed that the students often think of their progress in learning Mandarin and frequently evaluate their learning through means such as noticing their mistakes and using that information to help them do better. They always center their learning by paying attention. However, the moderately used range of *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* strategies reflects that they were not active in seeking practice opportunities. The results might postulate that the students were not seriously interested in learning Mandarin. They learned the language as an elective course due to the university's academic requirement. As it was compulsory for them to pass the course and the grade may influence their CGPA, it urges them to use *Evaluating Your Learning* and *Centering Your Learning* strategies at a high use range.

When the McLLS sets were compared between genders, the descriptive analysis results showed that McLLS were at a slightly higher use range by male students as compared to the female students. However, the Test of between-subjects effects indicated that there was no significant difference in McLLS used by genders. The result indicated that male and female students were actually applying McLLS at the same range of use.

On the other hand, although *Arranging and Planning Your Learning strategies* were at moderate range use by all the students across three levels, the analysis results showed that there was a significant difference between students in Level One and Level Three, and also between students in Level Two and Level Three. The findings showed that the students at lower levels were more active in seeking practice opportunities than those at higher levels. This may be due to the fact that the students in lower levels started learning the new language from scratch, and a sense of anxiety may occur. This pushed them to seek practice opportunities. As time goes by, these students, who learn Mandarin language to fulfill the academic requirement, may find that they can cope with the learning. Their anxiety would decrease and subsequently they began to lack in seeking practice opportunities.

There was also a significant difference between students in Level One and Level Three in the used of *Evaluating Your Learning*. The students at

elementary level significantly used *Evaluating Your Learning* at a higher range than the students at advanced level. These indicated that the students learning Mandarin as a foreign language were more frequent users of *Evaluating Your Learning* in the earlier level and this probably is due to the fact that they were aware of the immense efforts they should take in learning a foreign language. They were always alert and careful in the learning process. This urged them to employ *Evaluating Your Learning* during their learning. The regular exercises and ongoing tests also provide them plenty of opportunities to evaluate and monitor their learning from time to time. The high range use of *Evaluating Your Learning* was due to the consciousness of the students that they will succeed in the course and score good grades to fulfill the academic requirement.

5. Discussion

This study was conducted to investigate the McLLS used by Malaysia's indigenous undergraduate students towards learning Mandarin as a foreign language. The findings of the study revealed that the students when were viewed as a group or across learning levels, were at high use range of *Evaluating Your Learning* and *Centering Your Learning* strategies and at moderate use range of *Arranging and Planning Your Learning strategies*. The findings also proved that there were no significant differences by genders in the range of McLLS used. There was also no interaction effect between gender and learning level on McLLS used. This provided sufficient answers to the research questions and could provide additional insights in better identifying McLLS and could help to fill the gap that was mentioned in the literature review of this study.

The present study might have micro implications in the form of in-class teaching. As the results show that *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* was only moderately used by the students and across learning levels, the instructors should teach their students to apply more *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* strategies in their language learning. Since McLLS contribute to successful language learning (Oxford, 1990), instructors can also create interesting lesson plans by applying *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* strategies based teaching.

Encouraging students to use *Arranging and Planning Your Learning* in the process of teaching and learning can help them learn the language better. To serve these purposes, instructors are encouraged to adapt strategies suggested by Oxford (1990) namely:

1. allowing students to talk about their language learning problems, ask questions andshare ideas with each other on the effective strategies they have tried,

2. creating the best possible physical learning environment, and help students to create a well planned schedule, and encourage them to keep a learning notebook,

3. aiding students in determining goals and objectives in the four language skills,

4. helping students to plan language task and identify the purpose of language task,
5. challenging students to look for practice opportunities.

The findings of this study can also help syllabus designers to develop courses and design syllabus and create interesting textbooks which will encourage students to use LLS especially McLLS.

References

Bialystok, E. (1981). The role of conscious strategies in second language proficiency. *Modern Language Journal*, 65, 24-35.

Bremner, S. (1999). Language learning strategies and language proficiency: Investigating the relationship Hong Kong. *Canadian Modern Language Review,* 55, 490 -514.

Camillo, I. C. (2011). Metacognitive Strategies in Language Learning. Retrieved from http://www.scribd.com/doc/49751756.

Chamot, A. U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Language strategies in foreign language instruction. *Foreign language Annuals*, 22, 13-24.

Coakes, S. J., & Steed, L. G. (2003). *SPSS version 11.0 for windows. Analysis without Anguish.* Australia : Wiley.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language.* NY: Addison-Wesley Longman Limited.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition.* NY: Oxford University Press.

Ehrman M. & Oxford, R. L. (1989). Effects of sex differences, career choice, and psychological type on adult language learning strategies. *Modern Language Journal,* 73, 1-13.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. L. (1990). Adult language learning styles and strategies in an intensive training setting. *Modern Language Journal,* 74, 311-327.

Gan, K. C. (2008).*Language learning strategies of Mandarin learners at different course levels in Malacca city Campus, MARA University of Technology.* Unpublished master thesis. Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Green, J. & Oxford R. (1995). A closer look at learning strategies, L2 Proficiency and gender. *TESOL Quarterly,* 29, 261-297.

Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (1998). *Multivariate data analysis* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Kaur, P. S. S. (2003). *Perceptual learning style preferences and language learning strategies of ESL university students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Universiti Malaya.

Lee, A. C., & Zubaidah, I-B. (2009). Strategi pembelajaran bahasa Mandarin: Satu tinjauan terhadap pelajar Melayu di universiti Teknologi MARA. *Proceedings of 2nd ILANNS 2009 Conference.* MARA University of Technology Malaysia.

Murni Mahmud, & Sahril Nur. (2018). Exploring students' learning strategies and gender differences in English language teaching. *International Journal of Language Education*, 2 (1), 51-64

Nisbet, D. L., Tindal, E. R., & Arroyo (2005). Language learning strategies and English proficiency of Chinese university students. *Foreign Language Annals,* 38(1), 100-107.

Oh, J. (1992). Learning strategies used by University EFL students in Korea. *Language Teaching,* 1, 3-53.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know* Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Oxford, R.L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.). *Teaching English as a second language*, p. 359-366. Boston: Heimle and Heinle.

Oxford, R. L., & Burry-Stock, J. (1995). Assessing the use of language learning strategies worldwide with the ESL/EFL version of the strategy inventory for language learning (SILL). *System,* 23, 1–23.

Oxford, R. L., & Nyikos M. (1989). Variables affecting choice of language learning strategies by university students. *Modern language Journal,* 73, 291-299.

Pallant, J. (2001). SPSS *survival manual: A step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS.* NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Politzer, R. (1983). An exploratory study of self-reported language learning behaviors and their relation to achievement, *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 6, 54 –65

Riazi, A., & Rahimi, M. (2005). Iranian EFL learners: Pattern of language learning strategy used. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 2(1), 103-129.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Tan, T. G., Hairul Nizam, I., & Muhammad Kamarul Kabilan, A. (2009). Language learning strategies used by MFL students based on genders and achievement groups. *Journal of US-China Foreign Language. 8* (1), 50-58. USA: David Publishing.

Vandergrift, L. (2005). Relationships among motivation orientation, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied Linguistics*, 26(1), 70-89.
Wen, Q., & Johnson, R. K. (1997). L2 learner variables and English achievement: A study of tertiary English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics*, 18(1), 28-48.

Wharton, G. (2000). Language learning strategy use of bilingual foreign language learners in Singapore. *Language Learning, 50,* 203-243.

Woodrow, L. J. (2005). *The challenge of measuring language learning strategies. Foreign Language Annual,* 38, 90-99.

Wu, M. M. (2007). The relationships between the use of metacognitive language learning strategies and language learning motivation among Chinese-speaking ESL learners at a vocational education institute in Hong Kong. *Asian EFL Journal, 9(3).* Retrieved June 02, 2009 from http://www-writing.berkeley.edu/TESL-EJ/ej26/a3.html

Zahra N. (2003). *Learning strategies preferred by the field dependent and field independent students in an EFL environment.* Unpublished master thesis, University of Malaya.

3rd Person Object Pronoun Use in French Beginning Textbooks

Olivia Amzallag[1]

State University of New York at Fredonia

Abstract

The following article reports and discusses the results of a research investigation that examined textbook practices with regards to 3rd person French object pronouns, by tallying and classifying the individual instances of these forms featured in five beginning French L2 instructional textbooks, selected as a representative sample. This evaluation consisted of noting each appearance of a 3rd person object pronoun in the chapters preceding the instructional chapter on 3rd person object pronouns, observing the pronoun type, featured location, context, and includes a discussion of the various findings. The general results reveal a shocking lack of 3rd person object pronoun use prior to the explicit instruction of these forms, and a clear avoidance of these structures by providing unnatural speech patterns. The language used to avoid pronominal also provide a platform for modeling unnatural structures and are presumed to hinder future competency with regards to these grammatical forms.

1. Introduction

The following research reports the results of a textbook evaluation that tallied and classified the individual instances of 3rd person French object pronouns featured in five beginning French L2 instructional textbooks. *Voilà* by Heilenman, Kaplan & Toussaint Tournier (2010), *Horizons* by Manley, Smith, McMinn & Prévost (2009), *Entre Amis* by Oates & Oukada (2013), *Mais Oui* by Thompson & Phillips (2013), and *Chez Nous* by Valdman, Pons & Scullen (2010), were selected as a representative sample for their recent publication and common use in French language courses across the United States. As the textbook generally drives the classroom activities, and instructors do not all use published instructional supplements, none of the supplemental materials was evaluated.

This evaluation consisted of tallying each individual appearance of a 3rd person object pronoun in the chapters preceding the last instructional chapter on 3rd person object pronouns, observing the type of pronoun featured, its' location, frequency on that page, context in which it is found, and whether it is featured prior to the instruction on indirect object

---

[1] Bio: Olivia Amzallag, PhD, also published under Olivia Barone, specializes in French Studies with a focus on Applied Linguistics and Pedagogy. Her dissertation The Effects of Increasing Object Pronoun Input Frequency on the Oral Comprehension of 3rd Person Object Pronouns among Second Semester Classroom Learners of French was published in 2017. Dr. Amzallag is the Coordinator for Student Teaching in French & Spanish and she teaches advanced French linguistics, literature and education courses at SUNY Fredonia. Continuously publishing and presenting in the academic realm, she is also a board member of the Greystone Nature Preserve, and an avid member of the Chautauqua Institution community where she has operated a successful seasonal business for over a decade.

pronouns. Since most French language textbooks divide the instruction of direct and indirect object pronouns into two or more lessons, object pronouns were not tallied through the instructional sections dealing directly with the instruction of object pronouns, nor measures the input following the last formal instruction of the topic, in an effort to focus solely on implicit input, the target language input that did not draw specific attention to these forms. This data essentially permits a wide observation of the textbook practices, for insight into the type of language beginning learners of French are implicitly being exposed. In addition to these totals, this evaluation sought instances of avoidance, which is defined as language where the use of an object pronoun would have been natural, but was not present. Therefore instances of 3rd person object pronoun avoidance were also observed indicating the location, type of avoidance and input context (Appendix A).

French 3rd person direct object pronouns are *l'* [it/him/her], *le* [it/him], *la* [it/her], *les* [them], and indirect object pronouns are *lui* [to him/her] & *leur* [to them]. These forms are notoriously difficult for Anglophone second-language (L2) learners of French to acquire, and some of the acquisitional issues faced by these learners may be rooted in the structure of the French pronominal system. The forms themselves are complex for several reasons, notably those elements that differ from their English counterparts, namely, French object pronouns a) are largely pre-verbal, b) can be contracted, c) contain some forms that are homophonic with other grammatical morphemes (e.g.: *le, la, les* can be definite articles, *le* means both *the* and *him*), d) are often omitted in speech, e) the 3rd person form must agree with the noun they are replacing while possessing masculine, feminine and plural forms, f) exhibit a complex verbal structure with the use of double object pronouns. Some of the complexities surrounding the usage of French object pronouns share qualities with the English pronominal system, notably they are a) are phonetically short, often containing only one syllable or sound, b) are graphically short, often only containing one or two letters, c) are redundant as the pronoun replaces a concept introduced prior in the communication. This complex French pronominal system leads to several difficulties exhibited by Anglophones with the usage of French object pronouns while learning the language. Notably, a) an overgeneralization of subject pronouns, as, unlike in French, English second person pronouns do not have separate forms when functioning as subject or object, for example "*You* love him. He loves *you*.", therefore Anglophones will use the incorrect subject form of *tu* in lieu of the object form *te,* for example the incorrect phrase "Je *tu* paye." [I pay you.], rather than "Je *te* paye." [I pay you.], b) errors in gender, person, and number, for example "Les chats, je l'aime." [The cats, I like it/him/her.], rather than "Les chats, je les aime." [The cats, I like them.], c) errors in agreement and verbal structure, especially with the use of double object pronouns, such as the incorrect phrase "Je le donne à lui." [I give it to him.], where *lui* is in an incorrect position, rather than "Je le lui donne." [I give it to him.], where *him* is in the correct position, and d) object pronoun misplacement, for example "J'aime le." [I it/him like.], in the incorrect position, rather than "Je l'aime." [I like it/him/her.], featured in the correct position, e) object pronoun omission, such as "-Tu aimes le chat? - Oui, j'aime." [Do you like the cat? Yes, I like.], rather than "- Tu aimes le

chat? - Oui, je l'aime." [Do you like the cat? Yes, I like him.] (Connors, Nuckle & Greene, 1981; Jakubowicz, 1991; Kenemer, 1982; Naiman, 1974; Nash, Rigaut & Gérard, 1998; Selinker, Swain & Dumas, 1975; VanPatten, 1984; Wust, 2010a).

This demonstrates object pronoun difficulty for Anglophones, and the reasons for this are abundant, as the French pronominal system is both complex semantically and grammatically. For instance, object pronouns have two independent functions in French speech, their status as affix, which is purely a morphological characteristic, and their status as an agreement marker (Auger, 1995). Also, French verbs are often strongly biased towards either the direct or indirect object pronoun (Diessel, 2007). Unlike in English, there are two types of French pronouns: unstressed or bound, found pre-verbally, and stressed or tonic pronouns that appear elsewhere. The unstressed pronouns are morphologically tied to the verb and carry number and/or gender information, behaving somewhat like affixes, whereas the English pronouns behave like nouns, as they are situated after the verb or preposition much like a noun. And finally, "unlike English pronouns, which seem to have largely lost their case-marking value, French clitic pronouns have over the centuries gained in the amount of information they carry, serving not only a referential but also an inflectional function" (Heilenman & McDonald, 1993; P541), suggesting that Anglophones learning French will have more difficulty than the inverse as English native speakers are not accustomed either to listening for much of the information carried in the clitic or for the need to attend to information that is placed pre-verbally. This was observed in a study of word order conducted by Heilenman & McDonald (1993), where "L2 learners [of French] contrasted with the French native speakers [...] lack of sensitivity of the former group to a syntactic core preference" (P542), where the researchers suggest that this deficiency may be due to a lack of exposure to these different word orders in the classroom French L2 input (P542). This suggests that although the nature of French object pronoun structure makes this system difficult for Anglophone learners of French to acquire and master, the observable lack of modeling of object pronouns during the early stages of instruction could also be impacting the L2 learner.

The language presented in French L2 textbooks is generally simplified during the early stages of instruction, and in this simplification effort, textbooks lower the instances of naturally occurring 3rd person object pronouns. For example "- Tu n'aimes pas le français? – Si, j'aime le français." ["- You don't like French? – Yes, I like French"] (Valdman, 2010, P57) (see Appendix A), where the object of the sentence *le français* is repeated. This practice thereby models unnatural language usage, and inadvertently provides 3rd person pronominal avoidance techniques to L2 learners. Due to the complexity of object pronouns, the trend in current textbooks is to avoid using these forms during the early stages of instruction. This study has observed two dominant avoidance techniques used to convey the material, the first is the omission of object pronouns, for example "– Tu aimes le chocolat? – Oui j'aime!" [- Do you like chocolate? – Yes I like!], the second avoidance technique is to repeat nouns, for example "- Tu aimes le chocolat? – Oui j'aime le chocolat." [- Do

you like chocolate? Yes I like chocolate.]. However, avoiding object pronouns creates a paucity of these forms in the L2 input, furthermore it decreases the instances of modeling natural language, subsequently modeling unnatural language patterns. In turn, a beginning L2 learner may naturalize these avoidance techniques and internalize them in their own language patterns. Therefore, in addition to the difficulty presented by the forms in themselves, the acquisition of French object pronouns may also be hindered by the avoidance of these forms in the very pedagogical materials used to instruct L2 learners. Thus, by increasing the input frequency of these grammatical forms in the instructional materials, the current study enables a better understanding of the mechanisms involved in acquiring object pronouns aurally in adult L2 learners.

Although all French object pronouns are discussed in the literature as being problematic, 3rd person object pronouns have been demonstrated as specifically difficult for Anglophone L2 learners of French. This is principally due to their being more structurally complex than the other pronominal forms. For example, there are both direct and indirect object pronouns, which differ considerably in usage and form. Additionally, some pronominal forms appear similar to previously learned forms such as *nous* [we], which is learned as a subject pronoun, but also acts as the object pronoun for *us*, staying within a comparable range of conceptual meaning. In French, third person object pronouns use the same lexical forms as definite articles, which are always introduced early in the L2 curriculum, although, the relationship between the two categories is somewhat distant and unrelated as compared to the above example. A 3rd person object pronoun such as *le* [it/him/her] is originally learned as 'the', which is an article, making the transition of assigning these forms the new meaning of object pronoun more difficult. The same situation is true for the indirect object pronoun *leur* [to them], which is usually previously learned as the possessive adjective 'their'.

This textbook evaluation revealed a distinct and purposeful lack of 3rd person object pronouns prior to the explicit instruction of these forms. This engenders a tendency towards avoidance of these structures altogether, the implications of which are discussed in the following paper, organized in three principle sections, *Observations*, *Discussion*, and *Conclusion*. The *Observations* section is subdivided by textbook: *Voilà*, *Chez Nous*, *Horizons*, *Entre Amis*, and *Mais Oui*. Each subdivision is further divided into three categories: *Data*, *Strengths*, and *Weaknesses.*

2. Methodology

This evaluation aimed to gauge the average frequency of object pronouns currently found in typical L2 instructional materials by counting each object pronoun in five current French textbooks commonly used to teach elementary French language in universities across the United States. The assessment consisted of tallying each instance of object pronoun use, noting the location and context in which it was used, and whether it was featured pre- or post- indirect object pronoun instruction. These object pronouns were grouped into categories and analyzed for frequency of occurrence, simultaneously analyzing the text for any observed techniques used to avoid

object pronoun use. Each instance of avoidance is observed along with its' location and context (Appendix A)

3. **Findings**
3.1.   *Voilà*
3.1.1. *Data*

Voilà is a first-year textbook consisting of 20 undivided chapters, called *Leçons* [lessons], each dealing with a separate feature of the French language. In a traditional way, each section is followed by its own vocabulary list, with occasional authentic texts scattered throughout. This textbook includes a grammar and verb appendix, a French to English dictionary section, an English to French dictionary, text and photo credits, and a map of the French speaking world on the inside back cover, for a total of 499 pages. Of these, 14 chapters precede the lesson on indirect object pronouns, comprised of 320 pages evaluated for 3rd person object pronoun frequency. Object pronouns were not tallied through the section presenting the instruction for direct object pronouns, pages 154 - 156 (*Leçon* 7), or direct object pronoun instruction with the compound past tense, pages 220 - 221 (*Leçon* 10). The lesson on direct object pronouns is featured between pages 154 and 156, and the lesson on indirect object pronouns is featured on pages 326 through 331 (*Leçon* 14). Pronouns are therefore introduced in two instructional chapters.

In this textbook, there are a total of 100 object pronouns, and of these, there are 72 instances of 3rd person object pronouns over the course of 14 chapters, two of which are featured in a mini-lesson specifically instructing learners on how to use direct object pronouns with past tenses. The first instance of a double object pronoun is found on page 112, featured in an authentic passage rather than in the authored textbook instruction. Unique to this textbook, as compared to the other four evaluated, is the distance between the lesson on direct object pronouns, which ends on page 156, and the lesson on indirect object pronouns, which comes much later, the two lessons placed 170 pages apart. Results are summarized in *Table 3* below.

Table 3
Data Summary Textbook #1.

OP prior to IOP instruction	100
OP between DOP and IOP lessons	69
3rd person OP prior to IOP instruction	72
OP prior to DOP instruction	31
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction	17
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction in pre-verbal position	16
Instances of avoidance	17

(Henceforward)   Object Pronoun - OP
                Direct Object Pronoun - DOP
                Indirect Object Pronoun – IOP

3.1.2. Strengths

Voilà is a good example of the trends exhibited in the other evaluated texts; for instance, the latter instruction contains significantly more object pronouns than the earlier instruction. The avoidance of these forms at the beginning of the instruction decreases over time with an increase of object pronoun use as the chapters go on. In lesson 14 one observes the large quantity of direct object pronouns used to communicate concepts as compared to earlier lessons. This finding supports the notion that object pronouns are frequent in regular language, and required for natural communication, which highlights the importance of their intentionally being omitted in early instruction.

There are also instances that encourage the natural use of object pronouns, for instance, where the text requires the learner to use repetition in a positive way, enforcing the correct natural use of direct object pronouns while practicing the verb payer [to pay], requiring students to repeat the direct object positioned before the verb payer in expressions such as "je le paie" [I pay for it] (P293). This kind of exercise normalizes the direct object placement for the learner, which comes before the verb in French. This example illustrates how these types of difficult forms can be implicitly incorporated into other instruction.

3.1.3. Weaknesses

Of the entirety of object pronoun input, only 17 instances of 3rd person object pronouns were featured prior to the instruction on direct object pronouns, indicating a paucity of input prior to instruction on the topic. This lack of object pronouns throughout the first few chapters provides students with little exposure to these forms prior to instruction. The first instance of a 3rd person pronoun featured is an l' [it/him/her], on page 81. The l' object pronoun is arguably the least comprehensible 3rd person object pronoun in French as it is but one letter and one syllable long. Also, the l' form serves as a definite article, typically introduced early on in the curriculum, to which learners are exposed early on as meaning the rather than it/him/her.

As was observed in all the evaluated textbooks, several of the pronouns found prior to object pronouns instruction are featured in fixed expressions such as "ça m'est égal" [it's all the same to me] (P162), "je vous en prie" [my pleasure] (P108) and "s'il vous plait" [please] (P53). Additionally, this text does not feature any instances of nous [us] or leur [to them] as object pronouns in the pages evaluated, which indicates that there is no exposure to these forms as object pronouns prior to the lessons teaching them as such. Learners following this curriculum will solely be exposed to leur as a possessive adjective prior to assign a new meaning to this word.

There are several examples of exercises used to practice linguistic elements, yet use repetition, intentionally avoiding object pronouns, inevitably reinforcing repetitive unnatural language, and encouraging avoidance. For example, "– Tu aimes l'opéra? – Non, je déteste l'opéra. Et toi?" [– Do you like opera? – No, I hate opera, you?] (Heilenman et al., 2010; P31), where opéra is repeated in an unnatural way. In this example, a native French speaker would have likely used the object pronoun le [it]. A general lack of object pronoun use was observed in this text, with only 100 total object pronouns

featured. There are 16 instances of third person object pronouns prior to their being taught in 154 pages, however each one of these instances are found between pages 110 and 112, only found in passages taken from authentic texts, such as Le Petit Prince. However, without counting these instances, there are no object pronouns featured in the instructional materials. Whether intentional or not, this clearly demonstrates a lack of modeling of these frequently used French forms.

3.2. *Chez Nous*
3.2.1. *Data*

The second textbook, Chez Nous, is comprised of twelve chapters, each divided into 3 lessons. Each chapter is followed by an overall review, using authentic cultural resources related to the chapter materials to practice language skills such as reading and speaking, followed by a chapter vocabulary list. This textbook also includes seven Appendices: The international phonetic alphabet, the pluperfect, future perfect and past conditional tenses, verb conjugation tables and both French-English and English-French dictionaries, a list of sources, and index, for a total of 493 pages. Of these, 231 pages were evaluated for object pronoun usage. Object pronouns were not counted through the instructional sections on direct object pronouns, between pages 228 – 231, and the lesson on indirect object pronouns immediately follows between pages 235 and 238. In this text, there are 31 object pronouns over the course of 231 pages, however only 6 instances of these are 3rd person object pronouns, and of those, 4 are found in a pre-verbal position (see Appendix A). This is summarized in Table 4 below.

Table 4
Data Summary Textbook #2.

OP prior to IOP instruction	31
OP between DOP and IOP lessons	0
3rd person OP prior to IOP instruction	6
OP prior to DOP instruction	31
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction	6
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction in pre-verbal position	4
Instances of avoidance	10

Chez Nous has the lowest total instances of object pronouns as compared to the other four textbooks. The 1st instance of a 3rd person object pronoun in this textbook is *lui* [to him/her], found on page 200. However, this example is in the imperative tense, placing the object pronoun after the verb. The first instance of a pre-verbal 3rd person pronoun is also *lui* [to him/her] in the phrase "Il lui faut" [He needs] (P209).

3.2.2. *Strengths*

The object pronoun *lui* [to him/her] is generally considered an easier object pronoun form for beginners as it has a similar significance in its previously

leaned capacity as a disjunctive pronoun. This textbook is unique as compared to the others, as the lesson on direct and indirect object pronouns follow each other with only 4 pages separating the two, and no grammatical lessons in between. This is unusual as the other textbooks have separated these two lessons with ample other types of linguistic instruction. This textbook should also be noted for it's cyclical curriculum, where the lessons are frequently repeated, expanding further on the topics, while constantly recycling and reviewing earlier material. For instance, the introduction of indirect object pronouns begins with a review of the lesson on direct object pronouns, despite there being only five pages between the two lessons.

3.2.3. Weaknesses

Similar to the other textbooks, many of the instances of object pronouns are featured in fixed expressions such as *s'il vous plait* [please]. Additionally, as observed in the first textbook, there are no instances of *nous* [us] or *leur* [to them] as object pronouns in the pages evaluated.

3.3.　　　Horizons
3.3.1. Data

The third textbook, *Horizons*, is comprised of ten chapters each divided into four sections called *Compétence* [skill], and one review chapter. Following each chapter, there is a reading and composition section, a section on cultural comparisons, and a grammar and vocabulary review. There are several appendices similar to the other textbooks including the phonetic alphabet, verb conjugation tables, French-English and English-French dictionaries, an index and credits, totaling 445 pages. Of these pages, 355 were evaluated for object pronoun usage, with the lesson on direct object pronouns featured between pages 202 and 205, and indirect object pronoun instruction between pages 360 and 361. This textbook is the only one of those evaluated featuring the *en* [some] pronoun instruction between the lesson on direct and indirect object pronouns, on page 324. Also unique in this sample, this text provides the instructions to learners in the target language. There is a total of 91 instances of object pronouns prior to instruction, 67 of which are 3rd person pronouns. These results are summarized below.

Table 5
Data Summary Textbook #3

OP prior to IOP instruction	91
OP between DOP and IOP lessons	58
3rd person OP prior to IOP instruction	67
OP prior to DOP instruction	33
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction	16
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction in pre-verbal position	12
Instances of avoidance	26

3.3.2. Strengths

There is a high frequency of 3rd person pronouns in this textbook, which could be attributable to the increased target language input, as this text provides significantly more instruction in the target language. This is in contrast to the other four textbooks, where instructions in the target language don't appear until much later in the curriculum sequence. The first instance of a double object pronoun is featured on page 269 in an exercise requiring the learner to decipher who is speaking: "J'étais amoureux de Rosalie mais je n'ai jamais eu le courage de le lui dire" [I was in love with Rosalie but I never had the courage to tell her]. Not all textbooks feature double object pronouns, and they generally do not appear until later in the instruction.

3.3.3. Weaknesses

Although all the instructions are given in the target language, this does not necessarily mean there are more object pronouns per input ratio. In this textbook, the ratio of pages evaluated to instances of 3rd person object pronouns is 18.87%, which is on par with the majority of the other evaluated texts. However, as a possibly by product of this increased use of the target language, this text displays more than 26 examples of avoidance, a little over 30% above the next highest avoidance count in the evaluated texts. Despite this increased exposure to the target language, this textbook is similar to the others in that there are few instances of object pronouns in the early chapters. Similarly, there is a drastic increase in object pronoun usage in the pages prior to the lesson on object pronouns (P201).

The first instance of a 3rd person object pronoun is *les* [them] on page 49, in the imperative tense, hence positioned after the verb. The first instance of a pre-verbal 3rd person object pronoun is on page 68 in a very small print cultural note in the margin, which features an *l'*, which is translated in parentheses into English. Furthermore, this text only features seven instances of object pronouns in the third person prior to the lesson on object pronouns, over 235 pages.

There are 155 pages between the lessons on direct and indirect object pronouns in *Horizons.* While some type of separation appears to be the norm, this gap is larger than the others, allowing a longer period for learners to generalize direct object function in situations requiring an indirect object. However, as with several of the evaluated texts, there are no instances of *nous* [us] or *leur* [to them] as object pronouns prior to the instruction on indirect object pronouns.

It was observed that this textbook occasionally modeled language that appeared unnatural. For example: "Elle […] est allée au guichet et a demandé un ticket. Quand on lui a donné son ticket, elle l'a mis dans l'enveloppe." (P187) [She went to the counter and asked for a ticket. When she was given her ticket, she put it in the envelope.], where there are 2 object pronouns in the sentence, *lui* [to him/her] & *l'* [it/him/her], yet also one instance of avoidance in the repetition of the word *ticket*. Likely a choice on the author's part so as not to use a double object pronoun construction, the more natural sentence would have read "Elle […] est allée au guichet et a

demandé un ticket. Quand on le lui a donné, elle l'a mis dans l'enveloppe." [She went to the counter and asked for a ticket. When it was given to her, she put it in the envelope.]. Interestingly, after page 225, most of the observed instances of avoidance are with direct rather than indirect object pronouns.

This text features numerous exercises that not only avoid pronouns but that also incite the abnormal repetition of object nouns, modeling avoidance techniques for learners while re-enforcing unnatural language patterns. One example reads "Ton meilleur ami est sympa?" [Is your best friend nice?] (P117), where students are supposed to respond "Oui mon meilleur ami est sympa." [Yes my best friend is nice.] (P117), this exercise is designed to practice the verbs *être* [to be] and *avoir* [to have]. The exercise promotes repetition, and incites the student to avoid both subject and object pronouns. In another example, the exercise is designed to practice vocabulary relating to foods, and gives this model "J'achète souvent du café parce que j'aime le café./ Je n'achète jamais de café parce que ne n'aime pas le café." [I buy coffee often because I like coffee./ I never buy coffee because I don't like coffee.] (P321). This exercise incites the repetition of both subject and object nouns, repeating the same phrase structure, while avoiding object pronouns. This exposure may solidify unnatural language patterns in learners.

3.4. Entre Amis
3.4.1. Data

The fourth textbook, *Entre Amis*, is comprised of 15 undivided chapters, each with a vocabulary list. This textbook features a verb conjugation table, and sections on phonetic symbols, professions, grammatical terms, negotiations and French-English and English-French dictionaries for a total of 522 pages. Of these, 399 pages were evaluated, excluding both instructional sections on direct object pronouns, where the pronouns were not counted. Interestingly, this 4th textbook divides the instruction of direct object pronouns into two sections. There are 169 pages between the first lesson on direct object pronouns and the lesson on indirect object pronouns, and 116 from the second lesson on direct object pronouns. The first 399 pages were evaluated; the lesson on direct object pronouns is featured between pages 236 and 239, and yet again in a second lesson between pages 289 and 292. The lesson on indirect object pronouns is featured between pages 408 and 410, summarized below.

Table 6
Data Summary Textbook #4

OP prior to IOP instruction	155
OP between DOP and IOP lessons	118
3rd person OP prior to IOP instruction	96
OP prior to DOP instruction	37
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction	16
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction in pre-verbal position	10
Instances of avoidance	17

There is a surprisingly high amount of object pronoun input in this text, featuring 155 instances in the evaluated pages, and 96 of these are 3rd person pronouns. Of those instances, 12 of the 3rd person object pronouns are featured in an authentic passage.

3.4.2. Strengths

This textbook demonstrates positive examples of object pronoun use and reinforcement. For instance in an exercise practicing the verbs *vouloir* [to want] and *pouvoir* [to be able to], the learner is encouraged to use an *l'* [it/him/her] as an object pronoun in a repetitive manner, enforcing a correct language pattern (P287).   Another example is found in a practice exercise featuring instruction "expressing familiarity and judgment", where several object pronouns are noted in various contexts: "- Tu connais Eric? – Oui, je le connais." [- Do you know Eric? – Yes I know him.] (P288). These two examples are found directly prior to the second lesson on direct object pronouns, possibly serving as a segue, nevertheless are good examples of incorporating object pronouns into other types of instruction without resorting to avoiding the form. This text also choses to combine the instruction of the imperative verb tense with direct object pronoun practice (P295) and feature an exercise practicing the verbs *savoir* [to know] and *connaitre* [to know] while using object pronouns (P344), also providing a good example of how to incorporate object pronouns into other contexts.

3.4.3. Weaknesses

The instruction featured in this text can be somewhat inconsistent, for example, directly following the instruction on direct object pronouns, there is an exercise featuring expressions with *avoir* [to have], which is not tied into the topic of object pronouns at all, and none of the examples contained require the use of a direct object pronoun (P237). Observed uniquely in this textbook, during the instruction of the compound past tense, there is a note stating that some verbs are intransitive and do not take a direct object (P197). Unfortunately, at this point in the instruction, the concept of direct and indirect objects has not been explained, and unless the learner were aware of those concepts as applied to their own language, it may not have any meaning to them.

It was also observed that besides one reading passage immediately following the second section of direct object instruction, there are no instances of object pronouns whatsoever in the instructional materials to reinforce the lesson. Additionally, immediately following the instruction on direct object pronouns, there are no follow-up practice exercises provided at all (P238). One instance of abnormal input was observed following both sections of instruction on direct object pronouns (P294). The object pronoun *la* [it/her] is featured and translated into English in parenthesis directly after the object pronoun. Also, although this text contains many instances of object pronoun input, most of it is found following the lesson on direct object pronouns.

3.5.   Mais Oui
3.5.1. Data
This textbook features a total of 14 chapters, each divided into four sections called *Étapes* [steps], followed by a vocabulary list. Appendices include a verb conjugation table, French-English and English-French dictionaries, and index, totaling 521 pages. The lesson on direct object pronouns is found between pages 219 and 221 and the lesson on indirect object pronouns between pages 266 and 268. Of these, there are 45 pages between the lessons on direct and indirect object pronouns, and 130 instances of object pronouns in 262 evaluated pages (see Appendix A). Of all the object pronoun input, 50 instances are 3rd person object pronouns, accounting for 38% of the object pronouns counted. This is summarized in *Table 7* below.

Table 7
Data Summary Textbook #5

OP prior to IOP instruction	130
OP between DOP and IOP lessons	57
3rd person OP prior to IOP instruction	50
OP prior to DOP instruction	73
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction	23
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction in pre-verbal position	18
Instances of avoidance	8

3.5.2. Strengths
Although this textbook contained few examples of object pronouns, it also demonstrated fewer instances of avoidance techniques. Interestingly, this is in accordance with findings in other texts. Of the 3rd person object pronouns, a majority of 30 instances are featured in authentic passages. The first instance of a 3rd person object pronoun is *les*, on page 113. The first instance of a double object pronoun structure is found on page 232, following the lesson on direct object pronouns, in an authentic passage of a popular French novel series. It is apparent that most of the frequent occurrences of object pronouns, those that make up a more natural frequency, are found in authentic passages. This is be observable in the data (Appendix A), for example where there is a surge in the frequency of use of object pronouns, in this case of the pronoun *lui* [to him/her] (P193).

3.5.3. Weaknesses
The choice of translations in this textbook are inconsistent, for example *le* [it/him] is translated in one case, however this instance is not the first time this form is featured in the input (P194). This is unusual in that there is no logic in the translation of this one word at this point in the instruction, and is inconsistent with the rest of the textbook input. In another passage, there are two instances of the indirect object pronoun *lui* [to him/her], however only one is translated, used in the expression *marchez-lui dessus*, shown in the margin to mean *step on it* (P232). Lastly, similar to the other texts, there are no instances of *nous* [us] as an object pronoun.

4. Discussion and Conclusions

Largely, the results of this evaluation revealed infrequent use of object pronouns prior to their explicit instruction, and little in context thereafter. Textbooks exhibited evident instances of avoidance strategies, lowering the instances of naturally occurring pronouns in the instructional input, and in some cases, modeling unnatural language patterns. The most predominant avoidance strategies observed were categorized as *omission* and *repetition*. There were far fewer observed instances of omission than repetition in the selection of textbooks evaluated for this study, although instances of repetition were abundant. With the widespread understanding of the importance of comprehensible input in SLA, this lack of modeling is consequently reflected in the tendencies of Anglophone learners of French to avoid or replace these forms by another grammatically incorrect form, and general difficulty with the comprehension of 3rd person object pronouns.

Evaluating these five textbooks entailed calculating the instances of object pronouns in the target language input, as well as noting occurrences of object pronoun avoidance, providing a general overview of the frequency and location of object pronouns featured in current French college-level language course textbooks in the United States. Featured in a pre-verbal position, the 3rd person object pronoun exposure ranges from 4 to 18 instances prior to their direct instruction. The summary below displays totals for all five evaluated textbooks.

Table 8
Summary of Textbook Input

	Text 1	Text 2	Text 3	Text 4	Text 5
	Voilà	*Chez Nous*	*Horizons*	*Entre Amis*	*Mais Oui*
Total Pages	499	493	445	490	467
Pages evaluated	320	231	355	399	262
Pages prior to DOP instruction	153	227	201	235	218
OP prior to IOP instruction	100	31	91	155	130
OP between DOP and IOP lessons	69	0	58	118	57
3rd person OP prior to IOP instruction	72	6	67	96	50
OP prior to DOP instruction	31	31	33	37	73
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction	17	6	16	16	23
3rd person OP prior to DOP instruction in pre-verbal position	16	4	12	10	18
Instances of avoidance	17	10	26	17	8

Conclusions were drawn from a close examination of these results, showing a general paucity of object pronouns prior to their explicit instruction, and very little in context thereafter, as compared with natural target language patterns. This evaluation also revealed marked instances of avoidance strategies, decreasing the instances of naturally occurring pronouns in the

instructional input. In all cases, the dominant avoidance strategy is the use of repetition, for example: "Le professeur a écrit une phrase au tableau et ensuite il a effacé la phrase." [The teacher wrote a sentence on the board and then he erased the sentence] (Oates & Oukada, 2013; P391). This same textbook reads "les jeunes Américains aiment beaucoup le lait. Mais, en général, les jeunes Français n'aiment pas le lait" [young Americans like milk a lot. But in general, the young French do not like milk] (P44). The repetition of *le lait* [milk] would be unnatural for a French native speaker. In this example, a native speaker would have most likely used the object pronoun *l'* [it/him/her]. The same textbook features a conversation which reads: " – Tu vas au restaurant? – Non, je ne vais pas au restaurant; je vais à la bibliothèque." [– Are you going to the restaurant? – No, I am not going to the restaurant, I am going to the library.] (P135), where *restaurant* is repeated in an unnatural way. In this last example, a native speaker would have most likely used the object pronoun *y* [there]. This is a typical example clearly demonstrating the unnatural repetition of the object noun. However, the sentence is in the past, using the French compound past tense, which would assume that, at this level of study, a learner would be proficient enough in the language to process a sentence with a 3rd person direct object pronoun. Additionally, this example was used in the textbook following the lesson on 3rd person object pronouns, hence shows a missed opportunity for comprehensible input. Similarly these examples are also found late in the textbook sequence: "- Tu n'aimes pas les frites? – Mais si, j'aime beaucoup les frites." [- You don't like fries? – Yes, I like fries a lot.] (Manley et al., 2009; P340). Other examples include "Enfin, notez les traditions associés à ce plat. Est-ce qu'on mange ce plat pour une fête?" [Finally, take note of the traditions associated with this dish. Does one eat this dish on a holiday?] (Valdman et al., 2010 ; P217), and "Mathieu voudrait aussi acheter des cigarettes mais les autres détestent les cigarettes […]." [Matthew would also like to buy cigarettes but the others hate cigarettes.] (Heilenman et al., 2010; P315), found following the lesson on direct object pronouns. All of these are examples of strategies used to avoid the use of object pronouns, and may become a naturalized part of beginner language with such a high frequency of repetitions. The conscious decision to avoid the use of certain forms until later in the curriculum sequence has both positive and negative repercussions, as it simplifies the language for the learner while also modeling unnatural language patterns to them.

Also observed across all five texts, is a lack of acknowledgement of the existence of object pronouns during the initial stages of language instruction. For example, when introducing definite articles, the no other meanings are assigned to these grammatical forms. Initially, articles are generally taught as vocabulary words, possibly making it harder for learners to adjust their perception later on when required to assign new meanings to these forms. For instance, the concept of *it* is introduced early during instruction (P48), but the concept of *it* as a subject versus an object, and how it functions in a sentence, is not discussed. Therefore, L2 learners initially learn that the vocabulary word for *it* is translated to *il, elle, ils, elles* which are subject pronouns, and can mean *it* exclusively as grammatical subject. However, these forms can also can signify *he, she,* or *them.*

Similarly, during the instruction on definite articles, there is no mention of a second possible meaning for those grammatical forms. Although *le* and *la* both mean *the* when they are used as definite articles, they can also mean *it* when used as object pronouns. It may prove advantageous to bring this to the learner's attention right away, so that when the forms are encountered, learners are familiar with the notion that one form may have several meanings.

Although similar patterns are observed in all of the five evaluated textbooks, they vary in one important aspect of instruction, the placement of the object pronoun lessons in the curriculum, and the relationship between the lesson on direct and indirect object pronouns. For example, the first textbook chooses to introduce the direct object pronouns earlier than the other four texts, and separates the lessons on direct and indirect pronouns by 170 pages, the largest gap of all those evaluated. The second textbook introduces the lesson during the middle of the course of instruction, but does not separate the lessons at all; rather they follow one another directly. The third textbook introduces the topic during the middle of their course curriculum, although separates the two lessons by 155 pages, a truly large gap. The fourth textbook chooses to divide the instruction on direct objects into two sections, although the lessons are spaced rather close together. Though, in this same text, the authors choose to separate the last lesson on direct object pronouns with the lesson on indirect object pronouns by 116 pages, another large gap between the two lessons. Finally, the last textbook only spaces out the two lessons by 45 pages, although introduces the topic towards the middle of instruction, similar to the second textbook, with a slightly larger gap between lessons. This shows a vast difference in the sequencing of object pronouns within the various curriculums and choice of instruction of French direct and indirect object pronouns.

This evaluation also a uncovered a drastic increase in the frequency of object pronouns in the portions of the textbooks containing authentic French reading passages. Although rather expected, as reading passages are examples of natural target language patterns, representations of authentic target language. However, the converse observation of the paucity of this natural occurring frequency of object pronouns in the rest of the text, is alarming. This indicates that the lower instances of object pronouns elsewhere in the instructional target language is lacking a natural rate of object pronoun input, and modeling unnatural language. For instance, in the last textbook, 47 instances of the 130 object pronouns found in the input were featured in an authentic reading passage, making up a little over 36% of all object pronoun use in the textbook in very few pages of instruction.

When comparing the above textbooks, it is important to note that undoubtedly each page of a textbook is not identical, and due to the various illustrations and different types of fonts and formatting, one can't assume that each page contains the same quantity of target language text. However, this evaluation attempts to compare these texts based on their linguistic similarities, where the same topics are being taught throughout across textbooks, with a very similar end goal for all learners. Viewed from this

perspective provides a valid basis for the comparative evaluation of these textbooks. Furthermore, all the evaluated textbooks similarly exhibit the same types of object pronoun avoidance. For example, although there has been two clear avoidance techniques revealed in this evaluation, repetition and omission, repetition is unequivocally more frequently used in across texts. Additionally, most of the instances of omission are noted in slang contexts, or where spoken language patterns are demonstrated in a textual fashion, for example: "- Et c'est bien le Canada? – Ah oui, j'adore!" (Heilenman et al., P159) [-And this is really Canada? – Oh yes, I love!], with the object pronoun *it* implied, as one-syllable words often get dropped in speech.

It should be noted, however, that as the nature of object pronouns require an antecedent object noun to which the form is referring, this type of construction often requires more than one sentence, as concepts are developed across longer strings of language. Therefore, object pronouns are generally found in longer linguistic contexts. Since most target language instruction in the early stages of learning are short for comprehensibility's sake, this does not permit a great deal of natural object pronoun use. The models provided by exercises throughout most of the evaluated textbooks only provide one-sentence examples and are disconnected to larger concepts. Although simplification of the target language during the initial stages of language instruction may be beneficial for learners in some respects, exploring techniques that circumvent avoidance would equally enhance instruction. For instance, a majority of textbooks already use translation, whether parenthetical, in the margin, or italicized, to clarify unfamiliar words or structures throughout the instruction. This technique could arguably be adopted to clarify the object pronoun forms, which in some instances has been observed and noted in the evaluation (see Appendix A), rather than omission. Furthermore, although language courses are not uniquely designed around the textbook, these publications generally serve as a course guideline. More importantly, these texts serve as the principle resource provided to learners, upon which they model their own second language.

References

Bybee, J. (2006). "From Usage to Grammar: The Mind's Response to Repetition." *Language* 82, 711-733.

Heilenman, K., Kaplan, I. & Toussaint Tournier, C. (2010). *Voilà! (6th ed.).* Boston: Heinle.

Manley, J., Smith, S., McMinn, J., & Prévost, M. (2009). *Horizons (4th ed.).* Boston: Heinle.

Oates, M., & Oukada, L. (2013). *Entre Amis (6th ed.).* Boston: Heinle.

Thompson, C. & Phillips, E. (2013). *Mais oui! (5th ed.).* Boston: Heinle.

Valdman, A., Pons, C., Scullen, M. (2010). *Chez nous: Branché sur le monde francophone. 4e édition.* Toronto, Canada: Pearson Canada Inc.

VanPatten, B. (1984). "Learners' comprehension of clitic pronouns: More
     evidence for a word order strategy." *Hispanic Linguistics*, 1, 88-98.
Wust, Valerie. (2010). "L2 French Learners' Processing of Object Clitics: Data
     from the Classroom: L2 Journal." *UC Consortium for Language
     Learning & Teaching.* UC Davis.

Appendices

Appendix A

Object Pronoun Input - Textbook #1.

Table 9 - The textbook *Voilà*

Object Pronoun	Frequency	Pre/Post DOP Instruction
m'	4	Pre
m'	4	Post
me	3	Pre
me	2	Post
t'	1	Pre
te	2	Pre
te	4	Post
l'	2	Pre
l'	6	Post
le	4	Pre
le	15	Post
la	4	Pre
la	10	Post
les	1	Pre
les	1	Post
les	19	Post

vous	6	Pre
vous	4	Post
lui	6	Pre
lui	3	Pre
lui	2	Post
Pre- 31 Post- 69 TOTAL - 100		

Object Pronoun Input - Textbook #2.

Table 10
The textbook Chez Nous

Object Pronoun	Frequency per page	Pre/Post DOP Instruction
me	4	Pre
te	2	Pre
le	2	Pre
la	1	Pre
les	1	Pre
lui	2	Pre
vous	22	Pre
Pre- 31 Post- 0 TOTAL - 31		

Object Pronoun Input - Textbook #3.

Table 11
The textbook *Horizons*

Object Pronoun	Frequency	Pre/Post DOP Instruction
m'	4	Post
me	1	Pre
me	5	Post
t'	6	Post
te	2	Pre
te	2	Post
l'	7	Pre
l'	12	Post
le	9	Pre
la	12	Post
les	3	Pre
les	8	Post
lui	16	Pre
vous	3	Pre
vous	2	Post
Pre- 33 Post- 58 TOTAL -91		

Object Pronoun Input - Textbook #4.

Table 12
The textbook Entre Amis

Object Pronoun	Frequency per page	Pre/Post DOP Instruction
m'	1	Pre
m'	3	Post
me	7	Post
te	1	Pre
te	2	Post
l'	14	Post
le	4	Pre
le	14	Post
la	3	Pre
la	17	Post
les	19	Post
lui	8	Pre
lui	13	Post
nous	1	Post
vous	18	Pre
vous	24	Post
leur	1	Pre
leur	1	Post
Pre- 37 Post- 118 TOTAL -155		

Object Pronoun Input - Textbook #5.

Table 13
The textbook Mais Oui!

Object Pronoun	Frequency per page	Pre/Post DOP Instruction
m'	4	Pre
m'	6	Post
me	6	Pre
me	4	Post
t'	2	Pre
t'	6	Post
te	14	Pre
l'	3	Pre
l'	4	Post
le	10	Pre
le	3	Post
la	3	Pre
la	2	Post
les	3	Pre
les	6	Post
lui	5	Pre
lui	11	Post
vous	24	Pre
vous	10	Post
leur	1	Pre
leur	2	Post
Pre-instruction – 73 Post-instruction – 57 TOTAL – 130		

Legend for the following tables
Post Position   – object pronoun featured after the verb.
Exercise – object pronoun featured in a student exercise/activity
Instruction – object pronoun featured in textbook instruction
Passage   – object pronoun featured in authentic text
Translated – object pronoun translated into English
STP– object pronoun featured in the expression "s'il te plait"

SVP – object pronoun featured in the expression "s'il vous plait"

Object Pronoun Avoidance - Textbook #1.

Table 14

The textbook Voilà

Title	Page	Type	Input	Location	Notes
Voilà!	20	Repetition	"- Ah, j'adore le printemps! – Moi, je déteste le printemps"	Instruction	-
Voilà!	20	Repetition	"- Non, je déteste les fleurs! –Tu n'aimes pas les fleurs?"	Instruction	-
Voilà!	21	Repetition	"– Tu aimes l'hivers? – Non, je déteste l'hivers/ Oui, j'aime l'hiver."	Exercise	Promotes avoidance
Voilà!	31	Repetition	"Tu aimes l'opéra? – Non, je déteste l'opéra. Et toi? […]"	Exercise	Promotes avoidance
Voilà!	34	Repetition	"Becky aime les chats. Elle n'aime pas les chiens. Josh aime les chiens, mais il n'aime pas les chats"	Exercise	-

Voilà!	159	Omission	"- Et c'est bien le Canada? – Ah oui, j'adore!"	Instruction	During DOP lesson
Voilà!	170	Repetition	"Faites-vous les mêmes choses? Aimez-vous les mêmes choses?"	Instruction	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	170	Repetition	"… préparez une question par personne à poser à vos camardes de classe. Faites un questionnaire et circulez pour poser vos questions à vos camarades de classe."	Instruction	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	172	Repetition	"Comparez votre liste avec la liste des Français. Est-ce qu'il y a des activités de votre liste qui ne sont pas sur la liste des Français? Des activités de la liste française qui ne sont pas sur votre liste."	Instruction	After DOP lesson Several repetitions
Voilà!	179	Repetition	"Ensuite décidez si la phrase est vraie ou fausse. Si la phrase est fausse, refaites la phrase pour la rendre vraie."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	180	Repetition	"Combinez cette liste et votre liste pour créer une liste de conseils …"	Exercise	After DOP lesson

Voilà!	181	Repetition	"Lisez son CV et posez des questions d'après le CV."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	193	Omission	"- Oui j'aime beaucoup. / Non, je n'aime pas."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	199	Repetition	"- On mange une pizza ce soir? – Oui, d'accord. – Bon, alors, qui achète la pizza …?"	Instruction	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	211	Omission	"Faites une liste pour les hommes et pour les femmes, puis comparez avec le reste de la classe."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	227	Repetition	"Est-ce qu'il y a une couleur dominante dans le poème? Quels mots évoquent cette couleur et qu'est-ce que cette couleur évoque?"	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Voilà!	315	Repetition	"Mathieu voudrait aussi acheter des cigarettes mais les autres détestent les cigarettes et …"	Instruction	After DOP lesson.
TOTAL: 17					

Object Pronoun Avoidance - Textbook #2

Table 15

The Textbook *Chez Nous*

Title	Page	Type	Input	Location	Notes
Chez Nous	57	Repetition	"- Tu n'aimes pas le français? – Si, j'aime le français."	Instruction	-
Chez Nous	114	Repetition	"- Je rends visite a mes parents. – Et moi, je rends visite à mes amis. –Nous, on rend visite à nos parents et à nos amis."	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Chez Nous	148	Repetition	"- Non, je n'ai pas de rasoir. –Tiens, voilà un rasoir; rase-toi donc!"	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Chez Nous	168	Repetition	"-Tu dois jeter cette robe. – Non, j'adore cette robe!"	Exercise	-
Chez Nous	184	Repetition	"[…] mais ils mangent plus de sandwichs que de hamburgers. Ils achètent leurs sandwichs surtout…"	Instruction	
Chez Nous	190	Repetition	"Une personne est le serveur ou la serveuse. Appelez cette personne et …"	Exercise	-
Chez Nous	194	Repetition	"- Avec quoi est-ce qu'on fait une omelette? – On fait une omelette avec des œufs, du lait et du beurre."	Exercise	-

Chez Nous	200	Repetition	"- Est-ce que tu jettes tes vieux tickets de concerts? – Oui, je jette mes vieux tickets de concerts."	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Chez Nous	217	Repetition	"Comment est-ce que la recette est organisée? Quels sont les mesures et les verbes importants pour expliquer comment préparer la recette?"	Exercise	-
Chez Nous	217	Repetition	"Enfin, notez les traditions associes a ce plat. Est-ce qu'on mange ce plat pour une fête?"	Exercise	-
TOTAL: 10					

Object Pronoun Avoidance - Textbook #3.
Table 16
The Textbook Horizons

Title	Page	Type	Input	Location	Notes
Horizons	45	Repetition	"Relisez la conversation entre Michel et Annette ci-dessus. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour décrire…"	Exercise	-
Horizons	80	Repetition	"-Vous préférez passer la matinée à la maison? – Non, nous préférons passer la matinée au café."	Instruction	-
Horizons	109	Repetition	"- Et l'appartement est agréable? –J'aime beaucoup mon appartement."	Instruction	-

Horizons	109	Repetition	"… relisez à haute voix la conversation entre Robert et Thomas en haut de la page. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour décrire…"	Exercise	-
Horizons	116	Repetition	"- Tu es extraverti(e)? – Oui, je suis extraverti(e)."	Exercise	-
Horizons	127	Repetition	"… relisez à haute voix la conversation entre Robert et son ami à la page précédente. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour écrire…"	Exercise	-
Horizons	145	Repetition	"Avec un(e) partenaire, relisez à haute voix la conversation entre Robert et Thomas en haut de la page. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour décrire…"	Exercise	-
Horizons	147	Repetition	"- As-tu l'intention de faire les devoirs demain? – Non, je n'ai pas l'intention de faire les devoirs demain."	Exercise	-
Horizons	163	Repetition	"… relisez à haute voix la conversation entre Robert et Thomas en bas de la page précédente. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour parler …"	Exercise	-
Horizons	185	Repetition	"A quelle heure est-ce que tu as quitté la maison hier? – J'ai quitté la maison vers 9 heures./ Je n'ai pas quitté la maison hier."	Exercise	-

Horizons	186	Repetition	"Cathy a pris une enveloppe. Elle a ouvert l'enveloppe et elle en a sorti une feuille de papier."	Exercise	-
Horizons	186	Repetition	"Elle est entrée dans un café et a commandé un coca. Elle a bu son coca, elle a payé l'addition et elle est repartie."	Exercise	-
Horizons	187	Repetition	"Elle [...] est allée au guichet et a demandé un ticket. Quand on lui a donné son ticket, elle l'a mis dans l'enveloppe."	Instruction	Prior to DOP/IOP lesson but features both.
Horizons	187	Repetition	"Elle a écrit le prix du vélo sur une feuille de papier et elle a mis la feuille de papier dans l'enveloppe."	Instruction	-
Horizons	193	Repetition	"... relisez la conversation entre Alice et Cathy en bas de la page précédente. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour parler ..."	Exercise	-
Horizons	199	Repetition	" – La vaisselle est sale. – Eh bien, fais la vaisselle!"	Exercise	-
Horizons	225	Repetition	"... relisez à haute voix la conversation entre Michèle et Eric en haut de la page. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour faire des projets pour aller au cinéma."	Exercise	-

Horizons	231	Repetition	"… relisez à haute voix la conversation entre Michèle et Eric en haut de la page. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour parler …"	Exercise	-
Horizons	234	Repetition	"J'ai retrouvé mes amis au café. J'ai quitté mes amis vers deux heures."	Instruction	-
Horizons	243	Repetition	"Quel film est-ce que tu as vu récemment? Est-ce que tu as vu ce film au cinéma ou à la télé? Est-ce que tu as aimé ce film? Est-ce que tu recommandes ce film?"	Exercise	-
Horizons	243	Repetition	"… relisez la conversation entre Cathy et Eric en bas de la page précédente. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour parler d'un film.…"	Exercise	-
Horizons	253	Repetition	"Cendrillon pleurait quand sa marraine est arrivée. La marraine a aide Cendrillon et Cendrillon est allée au bal du prince."	Instruction	-
Horizons	285	Repetition	"… relisez la conversation entre Rose et Isabelle en haut de la page. Ensuite, changez la conversation pour parler d'un(e) ami(e)."	Exercise	-
Horizons	317	Repetition	"Combien de fois par semaine est-ce que tu fais les courses? Où est-ce que tu fais tes courses d'habitude?"	Exercise	-

Horizons	321	Repetition	"Aimes-tu le pâté? – J'aime assez le pâté./ Je n'aime pas le pâté."	Exercise	-
Horizons	321	Repetition	"J'achète souvent du café parce que j'aime le café./ Je n'achète jamais de café parce que ne n'aime pas le café."	Exercise	-
Horizons	332	Repetition	"Si vous trouviez un chien dans la rue, est-ce que vous prendriez le chien et … "	Exercise	-
Horizons	340	Repetition	"- Tu n'aimes pas les frites? – Mais si, j'aime beaucoup les frites."	Instruction	-
TOTAL: 28					

Object Pronoun Avoidance - Textbook #4.
Table 17
The Textbook Entre Amis

Title	**Page**	**Type**	**Input**	**Location**	**Notes**
Entre Amis	24	Repetition	« Vous êtes Madame Perrin ? » « … je ne suis pas Madame Perrin. Je suis …»	Exercise	-
Entre Amis	41	Repetition	« James parle bien français. Mais moi, je ne parle pas bien français. »	Exercise	Promotes repetition in exercises #5/ 2,3,4,6,7
Entre Amis	44	Repetition	« Les jeunes Américains aiment beaucoup le lait. Mais, en général, les jeunes Français n'aiment pas le lait. »	Instruction	-
Entre Amis	47	Repetition	« Je ne parle pas du tout l'allemand mais mon ami Hans parle très bien l'allemand. »	Exercise	Promotes repetition

Entre Amis	49	Repetition	"Vous aimez étudier le français ? Oui, j'aime étudier le français."	Exercise	Promotes repetition in exercises #15/ 6,10
Entre Amis	49	Repetition	"Je voudrais une tasse de café. Est-ce que vous aimez le café. Oui, j'aime le café."	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Entre Amis	52	Repetition	" –Est ce que tu aimes le jogging ? – Non, je n'aime pas le jogging."	Exercise	Promotes repetition in exercises #20/ 1,6,7
Entre Amis	53	Repetition	"-Est-ce que tu détestes les hot-dogs ? – Oui, je déteste les hot-dogs."	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Entre Amis	76	Repetition	"-Vous n'aimez pas le café ? –Si, j'aime le café."	Instruction	-
Entre Amis	100	Repetition	"- Quand est-ce que vous regardez la télévision ? – D'habitude, je regarde la télévision le soir."	Instruction	-
Entre Amis	135	Repetition	« - Tu vas au restaurant ? – Non, je ne vais pas au restaurant ; je vais à la bibliothèque. »	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Entre Amis	167	Repetition	- Avez-vous déjà nettoyé votre chambre cette semaine? - Oui, j'ai déjà nettoyé ma chambre."	Exercise	Promotes repetition
Entre Amis	200	Repetition	"- Est-ce que la plupart des étudiants ont mangé une pizza la semaine dernière ? – Oui, ils ont mangé une pizza."	Exercise	Promotes repetition

Entre Amis	230	Repetition	"- Est-ce que la plupart des étudiants apprennent le français ? –Bien sur, ils apprennent le français." "- Est-ce que la plupart des étudiants ont appris le français à l'âge de 15 ans ? – Non, ils n'ont pas appris le français à l'âge de 15 ans."	Exercise	Promotes repetition Several repetitions
Entre Amis	261	Repetition	"- Pendant combien de temps as-tu regardé la télé hier soir ? –J'ai regardé la télé pendant une heure."	Exercise	After DOP lesson Promotes repetition
Entre Amis	324	Repetition	"- Quel est le plus grand État des Etats-Unis ? –L'Alaska est le plus grand État des États-Unis."	Exercise	After DOP lesson Promotes repetition
Entre Amis	391	Repetition	"Le professeur a écrit une phrase au tableau et ensuite il a effacé la phrase."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
TOTAL: 17					

Object Pronoun Avoidance - Textbook #5.
Table 18
The Textbook Mais Oui

Title	Page	Type	Input	Location	Notes
Mais oui!	43	Repetition	"- Les copains de Nicolas ne sont pas actifs? – Si, si! Il sont très actifs."	Instruction	-
Mais oui!	98	Repetition	"Avec un(e) partenaire, préparez un tableau de 4 pourcentages ou chiffres, puis présentez votre tableau à la classe."	Exercise	-
Mais oui!	186	Repetition	"Et la viande, tu n'as pas oublié la viande?"	Instruction	-
Mais oui!	231	Repetition	"Parcourez le texte une première fois pour vérifier vos prédictions. Parcourez le texte une deuxième fois …."	Instruction	After DOP lesson
Mais oui!	234	Repetition	"… M. Bordenave fait un rapport au directeur de l'école sur cette recréation. Ecrivez ce rapport, selon le point de vue de M. Bordenave, […]."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Mais oui!	240	Repetition	"Vous consultez donc un guide. Avec un partenaire, étudiez ce guide et…."	Exercise	After DOP lesson
Mais oui!	261	Repetition	"[…] N'oubliez pas de composter votre billet dans une machine de couleur jaune à l'entrée du quai. Si vous oubliez de composter votre billet le contrôleur…."	Instruction	After DOP lesson
Mais oui!	265	Repetition	"… attendu longtemps le départ du train (de l'avion) ? Est-ce que vous avez raté le train (l'avion) ? "	Exercise	After DOP lesson
TOTAL: 8					