

A quantitative and qualitative analysis of determiner-noun combinations in advanced Dutch

EFL writing: A corpus-based study

Radboud University Nijmegen
Myrthe Vos
s4230884
MA thesis
15 August 2017
myrthe.vos@student.ru.nl

Supervisor: Dr P. de Haan
Second reader: Dr S. van Vuuren

ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LINGUISTICS

Teachers who will receive this document: Dr P. de Haan & Dr S. van Vuuren

Title of document: *A quantitative and qualitative analysis of determiner-noun combinations in advanced Dutch EFL writing: A corpus-based study*

Name of course: MA Thesis Linguistics

Date of submission: 15 August 2017

The work submitted here is the sole responsibility of the undersigned, who has neither committed plagiarism nor colluded in its production.

Signed

Name of student: Myrthe Vos

Student number: 4230884

Abstract

This study looked into the syntactic development of advanced Dutch EFL writers, specifically their use of determiner-noun combinations. It addresses quantitative and qualitative differences in determiner-noun use between native and non-native English academic writing, and is designed in such a way that it highlights the Dutch student writers' individual development. It focuses on the non-native writers' grammatical competency and related features in their writing, such as structural complexity of noun phrases and mean sentence length. Based on previous research, the expected findings were an initial underuse of determiner-noun pairs and an overuse of personal pronouns (De Haan & Van der Haagen, 2014). This was confirmed by the quantitative and qualitative analyses of part-of-speech tagged data from two corpora, LONGDALE-NL and LOCNESS. Although the non-native writers' individual development was non-linear and varied extensively, the results did indicate a general move towards a more nativelike distribution of determiner-noun pairs. However, the study failed to show an unambiguous relation between grammatical competency and the nativelikeness of determiner-noun use, and found no correspondence to mean sentence length and structural complexity of noun phrases.

Keywords: EFL writing, syntactic development, determiner-noun pairs, qualitative analysis, LONGDALE, complex noun phrases, mean sentence length

Table of contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Background	8
2.1 English in the Netherlands	8
2.1.1 English teaching in Dutch education	8
2.2 Previous research into determiner-noun pairs	9
2.3 Learner corpus research	11
2.3.1 Contrastive interlanguage analysis and the comparative fallacy	11
2.4 BA English language and culture at Radboud University Nijmegen	12
3. Method	13
3.1 LONGDALE data	13
3.1.1 Cohort 2012	13
3.2 LOCNESS data	14
3.3 Procedure	15
4. Results	17
4.1 Quantitative analysis	17
4.2 Qualitative analysis	21
4.2.1 RAD1210	21
4.2.2 RAD1220	25
4.2.3 RAD1253	27
4.2.4 RAD1277	30
4.2.5 RAD1280	33
4.2.6 Summary	35
5. Discussion	36
6. Conclusion	52
References	54
Appendix I – LONGDALE yr1t1a (tagged)	57
Appendix II – LONGDALE yr2t3 (tagged)	66
Appendix III – LONGDALE yr3t2 (tagged)	81
Appendix IV – LOCNESS ICLE-BR-SUR16-33 (tagged)	95
Appendix V – Penn Treebank tag set	165

1. Introduction

Learner corpus research has provided many interesting insights into the linguistic behaviour of non-native writers. By compiling corpora and comparing the non-native data to native English writing, researchers have, for example, shown that non-native writing is less sophisticated than native writing, even if the non-native writers are very advanced (De Haan & Van der Haagen, 2013). Another study by De Haan (2015) shows that non-native writing becomes more complex in terms of noun phrase structure once the use of personal pronouns decreases, and in that way it becomes more similar to native academic writing. De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), too, found that the linguistic behaviour of non-native writers is different from native writers initially, although not in terms of ungrammaticality. They observed an initial underuse of determiner-noun and noun-noun pairs in non-native writing, but over time this became more similar to the native distribution.

The aim of this study is to find out if there is a relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs in EFL writing by advanced Dutch students of English. The hypothesis is that as the students' grammatical competency improves, they will use more complex noun phrases and the writing will become more academic in terms of quality. Since complex noun structures consist of smaller units such as nouns and determiner-noun pairs in, for example, prepositional complements, it is assumed that the percentage of determiner-noun pairs should increase over the course of the students' BA course. This is based on previous studies such as De Haan (2015) and De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014). The current study addresses the following research questions:

1. Are there any quantitative differences in determiner-noun combinations between native English and Dutch EFL writing?
2. Are there any qualitative differences in determiner-noun combinations between native English and Dutch EFL writing?
3. Does individual development show a move towards native writers' use of determiner-noun combinations?
4. Is there a relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs in advanced Dutch EFL writing?
5. Is there a relation between the use of complex noun structures and the frequency of determiner-noun pairs?
6. Is there a relation between sentence length and the use of determiner-noun combinations?

Next, it is important to define some of the terminology used in this study, such as determiners and noun phrases. The *Cambridge grammar of the English language* makes a distinction between determiners and determinatives. Determiners are defined as a dependent function of an NP, and can be divided into three categories: basic determiners (determinatives and DPs), subject-determiners (genitive NPs), and minor determiners (plain NPs and PPs) (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). Determinatives, on the other hand, represent “a category of words (and certain larger expressions) whose distinctive syntactic property concerns their association with the determiner function” (p.355), such as *the* in *the book*. Examples of basic determiners are articles (*the, a*), demonstrative determinatives (*this, that*), personal determinatives (*we, you*), universal determinatives (*all, both*), distributive determinatives (*each, every*), existential determinatives (*some, any*), cardinal numerals (*one, two, three*), disjunctive determinatives (*either, neither*), the negative determinative *no*, the alternative-additive determinative *another*, positive paucal determinatives (*a few, a little, several*), degree determinatives (*many, much, few, little*), sufficiency determinatives (*enough, sufficient*), and interrogative and relative determiners (*which, what, whichever, whatever*) (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002, p. 356). The second class of determiners, subject-determiners, is made up of genitive NPs, such as *Mark's* in *Mark's idea*. According to Huddleston & Pullum (2002), the third class of determiners, so-called minor determiners, can be plain NPs (e.g. *what size shoes, tomorrow morning*) and PPs such as *around ten thousand copies* (p. 357). While it is true that *around* premodifies *ten thousand* and *tomorrow* premodifies *morning*, this study will not treat such phrases as determiners.

English noun phrases typically assume the function of argument in clause structure, as subject (*The student was tired*), object (*She needed a break*), predicative complement (*John is a teacher*), or prepositional complement (*Fiona's reliance on public support*) (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). The noun phrase contains a noun as head, except in fused-head constructions, and can be pre- or post-modified by various dependents. Furthermore, English nouns typically can inflect for number (singular or plural, although there are non-count nouns as well) and case (plain or genitive) and can be referential or non-referential (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). The structure of NPs is quite rigid, i.e. the various pre-modifying dependents tend to occur in a fixed order. For example, if a noun phrase contains an article and an adjective, the adjective is always preceded by the article. In addition to that, it is possible to remove an adjective from an NP without interfering with the grammaticality of the constituent (Van de Velde, 2010).

The previous paragraphs have explained this study's aim and research questions, as well as some of the terminology that is used. The rest of the thesis is structured as follows.

Chapter 2 provides background information on English in the Netherlands and in Dutch education, and it discusses some of the previous studies into the use of determiner-noun pairs. It furthermore discusses learner corpora and describes the English department at Radboud University Nijmegen, where the non-native data collection took place. The third chapter describes the native and non-native data and the procedure for the quantitative and qualitative analyses. Chapter four consists of the results from the quantitative and qualitative analyses, in which the differences between the native and non-native writers are highlighted. The fifth chapter is dedicated to the discussion of the methods and results, and contains recommendations for future research. Finally, a conclusion to this study is provided in chapter six.

2. Background

The aim of this thesis is to investigate the possibility of a relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs in EFL writing by advanced Dutch students of English. The following sections will provide a theoretical background to the research questions. This chapter is divided into four sections. First, there is a brief introduction to English in the Netherlands and in Dutch secondary education, followed by a section that discusses a number of studies that have also looked into the syntactic development of EFL writers. The third section describes learner corpus research and contrastive interlanguage analysis (CIA). The final section provides a characterisation of Radboud University Nijmegen's students of English Language and Culture and its BA programme, which gives an indication of how the university expects its students' writing competency to develop.

2.1 English in the Netherlands

English is the most important foreign language in the Netherlands, and it has been growing in popularity since the Second World War (Edwards, 2016). Although the Netherlands is still an Expanding Circle country within the World Englishes paradigm, McArthur (1993) argues that it is very much on the move towards attaining ESL-like status. Ammon & McConnell (2002), too, argue that English has almost become a second national language in the Netherlands. Edwards (2016) describes English in the Netherlands as “widespread throughout society, not restricted to elites, increasingly used internally as a symbol of prestige, an identity marker and an additional creative resource, and acquired not just at school but also in wider society” (p.157). These characteristics mean that English could qualify as the second language in the Netherlands. However, Dutch English (Dunglish) is not recognised as a valid hybrid variety of English, due to social stigma. There remains a clear preference for native models rather than Dutch English as a target model. It is therefore premature to consider English the official second language in the Netherlands.

2.1.1 English teaching in Dutch education

In 2017, the Netherlands is the leading country in the English Proficiency Index, a statistic based on the results of English tests taken by 950,000 adults worldwide (Education First, 2017). The country scored 72.16 (“very high proficiency”), which corresponds to Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) level B2, thereby surpassing Denmark (71.15) and Sweden (70.81). This score must at least in part be due to the position of English in Dutch education (Edwards, 2016). In primary education, English is taught in the final two grades

(ages 11-12), though more and more schools have started to offer English at an earlier stage, sometimes even in the first grade (age 4) (Kwakernaak, 2011). The introduction of English in primary education has been controversial, one of the reasons being that the increased amount of time spent on English education meant less time for Dutch (De Korte, 2006, cited in Edwards, 2016).

In secondary school, English is a compulsory subject for all. Pupils are streamed into one of three types of schooling: VMBO (*voorbereidend middelbaar beroepsonderwijs*, pre-vocational secondary education), HAVO (*hoger algemeen voortgezet onderwijs*, senior general secondary education), or VWO (*voorbereidend wetenschappelijk onderwijs*, pre-university education) (Edwards, 2016). English is taught for the full length of secondary education, which, depending on the stream, is four (VMBO), five (HAVO) or six (VWO) years. VWO-pupils, who are most relevant to this particular study, are subject to at least 513 hours of EFL (*Overzicht aantal uren onderwijstijd*), which is 9 per cent of the total number of hours of compulsory secondary education (Fontein, Prüfer, De Vos, & Vloet, 2016).

Finally, higher education in the Netherlands has been subject to “Englishisation” (Edwards, 2016, p.30), as increasingly more courses and degree programmes are now taught in English. According to Dybalska (2010), “there is hardly any chance to complete a university degree programme without demonstrating a high level of linguistic competence in English” (cited in Edwards, p.33). All in all, this shows the importance of English in Dutch education, now and in the future.

2.2 Previous research into determiner-noun pairs

The design of this study is based on other longitudinal studies such as De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014) and De Haan (2015), who also looked at the syntactic development of advanced Dutch students of English. De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014) found that Dutch students of English initially underuse determiner-noun combinations compared to native writers, but overuse them later. A possible explanation for this observation is that, as the non-native writers mature and learn more about English grammar, they are able to create sentences that are more complex, that is, sentences that consist of more ‘building blocks’. These building blocks are likely to contain determiners and nouns. As De Haan (2015) shows, students’ frequent use of personal pronouns at the beginning of their degree course decreases over time and makes way for an increased use of noun phrases, which can be premodified by a determiner and/or an adjective and postmodified by a preposition phrase. The non-native writing thus becomes more complex in terms of its noun phrase structure. This is a possible

explanation for the observed development in De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), and is reflected in the results of De Haan (1994).

Another study that shows that non-native writers' development is non-linear is De Haan & Van der Haagen (2012). Although they studied the use of adjectives in EFL writing rather than determiner-noun combinations, their findings are in line with this study's hypothesis. De Haan & Van der Haagen (2013a) found that Dutch EFL writing initially contains elements of spoken English, which is for example reflected in their use of intensifiers, but as the students learn more about academic writing, they gradually become more nativelike. It is expected that the present study will have pedagogic implications similar to those of De Haan & Van der Haagen (2013a). By making students aware of how particular constructions or constituents, determiner-noun combinations in this case, are used in native writing, their own writing is expected to become more nativelike.

Another study which is relevant to this research is De Haan (2015), which looked at the use of nouns and noun phrases by advanced Dutch students of English. Even though this study only followed two students over a relatively short period of time (September 2011 – January 2012), it showed that the individual students' development differed substantially. It furthermore provided an interesting analysis by linking the results to the students' grammar exam scores. The study shows an increased use of determiner-adjective-noun combinations in the less advanced student (RAD1102), although their use of determiner-noun pairs remained stable (RAD1102) or decreased (RAD1101) (De Haan, 2015). While this finding is in part contrary to the current study's hypothesis (i.e. it did not find an increased use of determiner-noun combinations), it could be due to the fact that the period of observation is only five months, which may not be long enough to observe more syntactic development (Ortega, 2003). De Haan (2015) concludes that "grammatical control does not automatically imply grammatical and/or discourse competence" (p.139), since the students performed equally well on a grammar exam, but displayed varying degrees of grammatical control in their writing. The same conclusion is reported in De Haan (2016), who investigated the use of verbs and verb phrases rather than determiner-noun pairs, but is nevertheless relevant since it also uses data from Radboud University students and has a comparable set-up to this research. The findings indicate that, as non-native writers start to produce more academic and more mature texts, they switch from a more verbal to a nominal style of writing. Both De Haan (2015) and De Haan (2016) conclude that the increased use of nouns indicates that a text is more structurally complex, as students begin to use more complex noun phrases and prepositional phrases.

De Haan & Van Esch (2005), finally, note that there is a relation between a student's level of advancedness and the mean sentence length in their writing. Based on Grant & Ginther (2000), their study consisted of an analysis of argumentative essays by students of English and students of Spanish. They found that the more advanced students produce longer sentences, and, thanks to their longitudinal set-up, they found that the students' mean sentence length increases every year (De Haan & Van Esch, 2005). Based on these findings, it is expected that the students under observation in the current study will display a similar developmental trajectory, meaning that they will use longer sentences that are structurally more complex and contain more determiner-noun combinations in the third year compared to the first year.

2.3 Learner corpus research

Learner corpus research is probably one of the best ways to study the syntactic development of EFL writers. Having its origins in corpus linguistics, it began to develop in the late 1980s, when it became easier to store and process L2 data electronically (Granger, Gilquin, & Meunier, 2015). From then on, it was possible to analyse L2 data with a variety of software, such as part-of-speech taggers and concordance programs (Granger et al., 2015). Most learner corpus studies focus on (academic) writing, but recently the field has seen an increase in studies into L2 speech. There also exists a preference for cross-sectional research, although longitudinal studies and research into individual variability are on the rise (Granger et al., 2015). One of the aims of learner corpus research is to gain "a better understanding of the mechanisms of foreign or second language acquisition" (Granger et al., p.3), which is why the data are preferably as natural as possible and with a limited degree of monitoring or editing (Granger et al., 2015). Most learner corpora today have English as the target language, such as the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE) and the Louvain International Database of Spoken English Interlanguage (LINDSEI). The same goes for the corpora used in this study, LOCNESS (Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays) and LONGDALE (Longitudinal Database of Learner English), on which more information can be found in the following chapter.

2.3.1 Contrastive interlanguage analysis and the comparative fallacy

Contrastive interlanguage analysis (CIA) is a term coined by Granger in 1996, which represents one of the most popular methods in learner corpus research (Granger, 2015). It was designed in such a way that it allows for a comparison of learner language (or interlanguage)

with native language, as well as a comparison of learners with different L1 backgrounds. One of the reasons behind this design was that it would be beneficial to creators of “more efficient language teaching tools and methods” (Granger, 2015, p.9). Like other learner corpus studies, most CIA studies involve written L2 data, and they are characterised by research into advanced interlanguage (Granger, 2015).

The majority of CIA studies compare native data to learner data, and the present study is no exception. One should, however, at all times be aware of the so-called “comparative fallacy” (Granger, 2015), which implies that “by continuing to equate identity with idealized native speaker production as a definition of success, it is difficult to avoid seeing the learner’s IL as anything but deficient” (Larsen-Freeman (2014), cited in Granger, 2015, p.13). In this case, however, the EFL writing that is analysed is by students of English language and culture, who are training to become EFL professionals, which should justify this comparison to the target language (Verheijen, Los, & De Haan, 2013).

2.4 BA English language and culture at Radboud University Nijmegen

The English department at Radboud University Nijmegen argue that they train their students to become EFL professionals, rather than EFL users (De Haan & Van der Haagen, 2013). According to De Haan & Van der Haagen (2013), EFL professionals are “non-native speakers of English who are employed as language teachers, language trainers, translators, or editors, usually in a non-native English environment...[who] should not merely have a very advanced proficiency of English (CEFR C2), but a native-like command” (p.18). Van Vuuren (2017), too, states that in contrast to other Dutch universities the English department in Nijmegen expect their BA students’ exit level to be at C2, for writing, speaking, reading, and listening. However, as is also noted by Van Vuuren (2017), the C1 and C2 CEFR levels remain underspecified and apparently unable to differentiate on such high levels. In 2013, all first-year students of English at Radboud University took the OOPT, a placement tool that corresponds to the CEFR (Van Vuuren, 2017). The results indicated that approximately 40 per cent of first-year students were already at C2, i.e. the level that third-year students are expected to attain (Van Vuuren, 2017). The C1 and C2 levels are clearly not specific enough to map the development of these future EFL professionals and cannot provide an answer to the question of how close to nativelike the students are at a certain point in their degree course. The CEFR is certainly a valuable framework for the classification of other EFL or ESL users, but for these budding EFL professionals there is a need for a more precise tool or framework. That, however, is beyond the scope of this thesis.

3. Method

While the previous chapter discussed the position of English in the Netherlands and in Dutch education, as well as a number of relevant studies in the area of corpus linguistics, the current chapter is dedicated to the methods used in this study, and explains which native and non-native data were used and what kind of analysis took place.

3.1 LONGDALE data

The Longitudinal Database of Learner English (LONGDALE) was founded in 2008 by the Centre for English Corpus Linguistics at the University of Louvain, Belgium (Granger et al., 2015). It aims to accumulate longitudinal data from students with different L1 backgrounds by following them over a three-year period. So far, data have been collected by teams at Radboud University Nijmegen (the Netherlands), University of Hannover (Germany), University of Louvain (Belgium), University of Padua (Italy), and University of Paris-Diderot (France), and two new teams from Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (Brazil) and University of Valencia (Spain) have recently joined the project (Meunier, 2015). The database also contains comprehensive learner profile information, including “age, gender, educational background, variables pertaining to the task, and when available, information on the proficiency levels of the students as measured by internationally recognized tests” (Meunier, 2015, p.124).

The Dutch part of the corpus, LONGDALE-NL, consists of data collected at Radboud University Nijmegen from 2009 onwards (De Haan & Van der Haagen, 2013a). LONGDALE-NL comprises a variety of text types, including personal statements, research proposals, and literature essays. The present study used material from cohort 2012, that is, students who started their degree course in September 2012 and who handed in written work over the following three years. More information on this particular cohort will follow in the section below.

3.1.1 Cohort 2012

Since one of the aims of this study is to characterise individual development in the use of determiner-noun pairs, the study analysed data from five advanced Dutch students of English that participated in the Dutch part of the LONGDALE project. They started their BA degree course in September 2012, and handed in seven pieces of writing during the first year, three in the second year and two in the final year. During this three-year period, the students took courses such as Writing English, Grammar & Translation, Academic Writing, Syntax I and II,

and various literature courses, which have helped them to become (more) natively like in their writing. Not all students handed in their work at each data collection moment, which is why some of them were not eligible for this study. The five students that have been selected for analysis are referred to as RAD1210, RAD1220, RAD1253, RAD1277, and RAD1280. They are all students of British English. The data collection moments that were chosen for this study are September 2012 (yr1t1a), June 2014 (yr2t3), and December 2014 (yr3t2). Ortega (2003) found that, in order to be able to observe substantial changes in the syntactic development of non-native writers, one needs “an observation period of roughly a year of college-level instruction” (p. 492), which is why this study looks at three assignments, one from each year in the BA-programme. Admittedly, the time lapse between the second and third task is only six months instead of one year. This is due to the fact that assignment yr2t3 was the only academic piece of writing from the students’ second year that was recorded in the LONGDALE-NL database. The question of whether this shorter time lapse affected the results will be addressed in Chapter 5. The first assignment, yr1t1a, was written in class and was timed, the other two assignments were untimed and were a literature take-home exam (yr2t3) and a research proposal (yr3t2). The non-native data consisted of 9,461 words in total.

3.2 LOCNESS data

LOCNESS, the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays, consists of argumentative essays written by both American and British university students (De Haan & Van der Haagen, 2013). Compiled in the 1990s, the essays feature a variety of topics and are both timed and untimed (De Haan & Van der Haagen, 2014). LOCNESS was designed to be used as a native reference corpus for comparison, which is why it is similar to learner corpora, in particular ICLE, on parameters such as task type and task length (Granger et al., 2015). The material selected for this study comes from brsur1, the first part of the corpus, which consists of 33 essays written by British undergraduate students in March 1991. Eighteen of these essays were selected for analysis (ICLE-BR-SUR-0016 to ICLE-BR-SUR-0033), because they were academic in nature and written by British English students, and therefore most comparable to the LONGDALE data. The native data amounts to a total of 18,129 words. The essays in question concerned French society and institutions, with topics ranging from French higher education to unionism in France. These texts are regarded as the norm in this study, because, again, the native writers’ academic background is similar to that of the LONGDALE writers, which makes it perfectly suitable to serve as material for comparison.

3.3 Procedure

Once access to both corpora had been obtained, the first step was to have a part-of-speech tagger tag the data. The Stanford Natural Language Processing (NLP) Group offers a freely available part-of-speech tagger, which analyses a piece of text within a couple of seconds after it has been pasted into the program, and “assigns parts of speech to each word (and other token), such as noun, verb, adjective” (*Stanford log-linear part-of-speech tagger*). The tags correspond to the Penn Treebank tag set, which can be found in Appendix V (Santorini, 1990). Appendices I to IV contain the LONGDALE and LOCNESS data as tagged by the Stanford part-of-speech tagger.

A quick survey of the results revealed that the part-of-speech tagger had not always been consistent in its analysis. For example, the phrase *information-structure differences* had been tagged in two ways:

“the_DT information-structure_NN differences_NNS” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

“the_DT many_JJ information-structure_JJ differences_NNS” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

Typing errors also caused the program to assign wrong tags to determiners, adjectives, and nouns, and cardinal numbers in determiner position were assigned a CD-tag rather than a DT-tag. This meant that the data were checked again, manually, in order to eliminate these inconsistencies and correct any errors. The discrepancies between the data as tagged by the Stanford tagger and the manually post-edited data are discussed in the fifth chapter. Post-editing the data consisted of colour-coding determiners, nouns, and attributive adjectives with markers and calculating how frequently these parts of speech and combinations of parts of speech occurred in each students’ three texts, as well as in the native data. This made for an efficient quantitative analysis of the categories relevant to this research, the results of which can also be found in Chapter 4.

The second part of the analysis was based on the qualitative differences between native and non-native writing, with a focus on the Dutch EFL writers’ individual development. This involved comparisons between L1 and L2 writers, between the Dutch EFL writers, and within-subject comparisons, for example RAD1253’s performance at yr1t1a and at yr3t2, to show how the non-native writers developed over time. Chapter 4 shows the results from these quantitative and qualitative analyses.

The fifth research question required the analysis of complex noun phrase structures in selected texts. This consisted of converting the data to a Word-file, printing the texts and marking each complex noun phrase by hand. After they had all been marked, the complex noun phrases were further divided into four categories, based on the number of determiners

they contained (zero to three). The results of this analysis are presented in Chapter 5, where they best fit into the discussion.

Finally, the data required in order to answer the sixth research question were processed by *Wordsmith Tools*, a program that can be used to analyse texts in a number of ways (Scott, 2017). It can, among other things, create key word lists and concordances, and provides the user with a list of statistics (Scott, 2008). The mean sentence length scores and standard deviations were obtained not by myself, but with the help of an expert. Since these results are not entirely my own, they are discussed in Chapter 5, instead of in Chapter 4.

4. Results

4.1 Quantitative analysis

The results of the quantitative analysis are given below in Tables 1 to 3, with the results from the LOCNESS corpus repeated in each table for comparison. The results are given as percentage scores, which means that, for example, RAD1210 used an average of 12 determiners per 100 words in the first assignment (yr1t1a). It should be noted that sometimes the results from, for example, DT|N and DT|JJ|N do not add up to the percentage of DTs, as is the case for RAD1220 at yr2t3. Such discrepancies are due to two reasons. Firstly, sometimes there was more than one determiner or more than one adjective per noun phrase. For example, in yr1t1a, RAD1220 uses the phrase *one or two lectures*, in which both *one* and *two* are counted as determiners, but count only once as a DT|N pair. The same goes for adjectives. For example in yr2t3, RAD1253 writes about “the_DT beautiful_JJ young_JJ women_NNS”, where *beautiful* and *young* are counted separately as adjectives, but as one DT|JJ|N combination. Secondly, rounding errors can cause discrepancies. For example in yr1t1a, RAD1253 produced 17 attributive adjectives in a text of 481 words (3.53%), 8 of which were part of a DT|JJ|N combination (1.66%) and the other 9 (1.87%) were part of an JJ|N pair. However, the percentage scores are rounded off to one decimal, which leads to a 0.1% difference.

Table 1

Results of the quantitative analysis of LONGDALE yr1t1a, percentage scores

YR1T1A	Native N=18,129	RAD1210 N=535	RAD1220 N=404	RAD1253 N=481	RAD1277 N=330	RAD1280 N=433
DT	13.6	12	9.4	14.6	12.4	12.2
N (total)	24.9	20.2	16.1	19.8	21.5	17.6
Attr. adj.	6.9	7.3	4.7	3.5	5.2	6.2
DT N	9.7	7.1	6.2	12.9	8.5	8.3
DT JJ N	3.7	4.9	3	1.7	3.9	3.9
JJ N	2.4	1.9	1.5	1.9	1.2	1.6
N (compound or unmodified)	8.9	6.4	5.4	3.3	7.9	3.7

Table 2

Results of the quantitative analysis of LONGDALE yr2t3, percentage scores

YR2T3	Native N=18,129	RAD1210 N=827	RAD1220 N=795	RAD1253 N=728	RAD1277 N=684	RAD1280 N=730
DT	13.6	12.5	13.3	9.8	13.6	11.9
N (total)	24.9	17.2	24	13.7	24	16.6
Attr. adj.	6.9	3.7	6.8	2.5	5.7	6
DT N	9.7	10	9.3	8	9.1	7.3
DT JJ N	3.7	2.4	3.8	1.6	4.2	4.7
JJ N	2.4	0.5	1.8	0.7	0.4	0.7
N (compound or unmodified)	8.9	4.2	8.6	3.4	10.2	4

Table 3

Results of the quantitative analysis of LONGDALE yr3t2, percentage scores

YR3T2	Native N=18,129	RAD1210 N=470	RAD1220 N=1,024	RAD1253 N=717	RAD1277 N=422	RAD1280 N=881
DT	13.6	12.8	12.3	10.2	10.4	12.7
N (total)	24.9	26.6	22.5	25.1	24.6	26
Attr. adj.	6.9	10.4	6.1	7.9	8.3	5
DT N	9.7	8.9	8.3	6.7	7.3	9.6
DT JJ N	3.7	3.4	3.7	3.2	3.1	3
JJ N	2.4	4.9	1.8	3.9	4.7	1.9
N (compound or unmodified)	8.9	9.1	8.7	11.4	9.5	11.4

Tables 1 to 3 have been colour-coded. If a cell is green, it means that for that particular part of speech, the student's score was up to 10 per cent above or below the mean score of the native writers from the LOCNESS corpus. Blue cells represent the runners-up in their category, and are awarded when the score is no more than 15% away from the native writers' percentage. For example, RAD1210's percentage score for total number of nouns at yr3t2 is coloured green, because 26.6 is only 6.8 per cent removed from the native score of 24.9 nouns per 100 words.

The results from yr1t1a in Table 1 show that at this early stage in the BA programme, RAD1277 is already able to produce a text that has a nativelike distribution in terms of determiners, nouns, and adjectives. With two green cells and three blue cells, the student appears to be more nativelike than the other four in this respect. RAD1220 appears to have the least nativelike distribution, scoring consistently far below the native percentages. Examples (1a) and (1b) below are fragments taken from RAD1220's first text. An explanation of the tags used in (1b) can be found in Appendix V.

(1a) "Homework at university is not something you should take lightly, but not to worry. Just follow these steps and you will be successful in your first year. The first thing you have to make sure is that you are thoroughly organised. This means you need to get a diary and use it properly. Write down every single course you take. If you are not fond of paper diaries, use your phone to help remind you of your courses. By doing this you will never miss a class." (RAD1220, yr1t1a)

(1b) "Homework_NN at_IN university_NN is_VBZ not_RB something_NN you_PRP should_MD take_VB lightly_RB ,_, but_CC not_RB to_TO worry_VB ._. Just_RB follow_VB these_DT steps_NNS and_CC you_PRP will_MD be_VB successful_JJ in_IN your_PRP\$ first_JJ year_NN ._. The_DT first_JJ thing_NN you_PRP have_VBP to_TO make_VB sure_JJ is_VBZ that_IN you_PRP are_VBP thoroughly_RB organised_VBN ._. This_DT means_VBZ you_PRP need_VBP to_TO get_VB a_DT diary_NN and_CC use_VB it_PRP properly_RB ._. Write_VB down_RP every_DT single_JJ course_NN you_PRP take_VBP ._. If_IN you_PRP are_VBP not_RB fond_JJ of_IN paper_NN diaries_NNS ,_, use_VB your_PRP\$ phone_NN to_TO help_VB remind_VB you_PRP of_IN your_PRP\$ courses_NNS ._. By_IN doing_VBG this_DT you_PRP will_MD never_RB miss_VB a_DT class_NN ._" (RAD1220, yr1t1a)

RAD1220 uses only 12 nouns in this fragment of 87 words, which is just 13.8 per cent. RAD1253's performance is striking as well, due to the large percentage of determiner-noun combinations compared to the relatively low score of nouns in total (19.8 compared to 24.9, see Table 1). The qualitative analysis below will further discuss possible reasons for RAD1220 and RAD1253's low scores compared to the other non-native writers and the native writers. Important to note, too, is RAD1220, RAD1253, and RAD1280's use of compound or unmodified nouns, or rather, a lack thereof. This difference will also be addressed in the qualitative analysis.

Table 2 shows that the percentage of compound and unmodified nouns does not change much for RAD1253 and RAD1280, but improves dramatically for RAD1220. In fact, RAD1220 has gone from being one of the least nativelike writers in yr1t1a to having the most nativelike distribution of determiners, adjectives, and nouns in yr2t3. This improvement is considerable, with the total number of nouns rising from 16.1 per cent to 24 per cent. At the same time, RAD1253 has become least nativelike in nearly all categories, but especially with respect to the total number of nouns. The excerpt in (2a) and the tagged version in (2b) below show that RAD1253 uses few nouns at this stage.

(2a) “The queen and her fellow judges decide that he is to live, but then the old hag asks him to marry her. He finds this idea repulsive as she is old and ugly. She offers him a choice, she can either be young and probably unfaithful, or old and faithful.”

(RAD1253, yr2t3)

(2b) “The_DT queen_NN and_CC her_PRP\$ fellow_JJ judges_NNS decide_VBP that_IN he_PRP is_VBZ to_TO live_VB ,_, but_CC then_RB the_DT old_JJ hag_NN asks_VBZ him_PRP to_TO marry_VB her_PRP ._ . He_PRP finds_VBZ this_DT idea_NN repulsive_JJ as_IN she_PRP is_VBZ old_JJ and_CC ugly_JJ ._ . She_PRP offers_VBZ him_PRP a_DT choice_NN ,_, she_PRP can_MD either_RB be_VB young_JJ and_CC probably_RB unfaithful_JJ ,_, or_CC old_JJ and_CC faithful_JJ ._ .” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

The fragment above contains only 5 nouns, and indicates that RAD1253 has not yet mastered an appropriate academic style. A more extensive discussion of RAD1253’s writing style and the results of the other students follows in section 4.2.

The results from yr3t2 in Table 3 show that, in general, the students have become more nativelike than they were at the time of the first assignment. The percentage scores are not as far apart anymore, and there is not one student who is much more nativelike than the others. However, RAD1277 appears to have become less nativelike at yr3t2 compared to the year before, similar to RAD1280 at yr2t3. RAD1277’s non-nativelike distribution at yr3t2 is due to a return to the use of personal pronouns. It is not immediately visible from the quantitative results, because the percentage score for nouns is comparable to the native score as a result of the use of many compound nouns. This issue will be addressed in more detail in section 4.2.4.

All students clearly follow very different developmental patterns, but RAD1253’s development is most difficult to characterise. What RAD1253 does have in common with the other students, is that the number of unmodified nouns and compound nouns increases. In

RAD1253's case, this percentage has nearly quadrupled by the third year. This increase could be indicative of a more academic writing style, with more compound nouns and unmodified nouns in prepositional complements, which is in correspondence with the findings of De Haan (2015).

In conclusion, the colours allow for a quick (though limited) comparison of the native and non-native data. They suggest that, in terms of quantity, RAD1220 is most native-like out of the five students after three years, with four green cells and two blue cells at yr3t2. This is a remarkable achievement, given how far from nativelike RAD1220's performance is at yr1t1a. When it comes to the development of the use of determiner-noun pairs, it is difficult to establish a general tendency. RAD1210 and RAD1220 behave similarly, as they both produce more DT|N pairs at yr2t3 than at yr1t1a, but then fewer DT|N pairs at yr3t2 than at yr2t3. RAD1280 does the exact opposite, but is in the end most nativelike for this part of speech. RAD1277's distribution at yr1t1a is more nativelike than the others, but least nativelike in the third year. RAD1253, finally, uses increasingly fewer determiner-noun pairs in each of the assignments. The students' very different trajectories of individual development are discussed in more detail in section 4.2.

4.2 Qualitative analysis

The following qualitative analysis takes the quantitative analysis above as a starting point. It contains references to specific examples in the native and non-native texts to highlight some of the differences and similarities found in the L1 and L2 data. Given that the emphasis in this thesis is on the Dutch students' individual development, the five non-native writers are discussed separately below. Finally, a summary of the findings is given in section 4.2.6.

4.2.1 RAD1210

Table 1 shows that RAD1210's text at yr1t1a is not very nativelike in terms of quantity, except for the student's use of attributive adjectives. The total number of nouns in this text is relatively low, at only 20.2 per cent compared to the native score of 24.9 nouns per 100 words. This is due to RAD1210's frequent use of personal pronouns, as exemplified in (3) and (4).

(3) "Although elementary school probably gave you the opportunity to lay back once a while, university really does not have any room for that behaviour anymore. Before you were a member of a group, you were pretty much always told what to do. Perhaps one of the most important things to remember is that in university you are in fact an

individual. That means that you yourself are responsible for the success you have within your study.” (RAD1210, yr1t1a)

(4) “There you are. You have made the transition from elementary school to university. There really is no way around it, you now are a member of the intellectual elite of your country, and that position is a small burden to bear. Not just because you are expected to perform exceptionally well at your specific subject of study, you are also obliged to reach that high level of success on your own.” (RAD1210, yr1t1a)

All sentences in the two excerpts above contain a personal pronoun. This is in line with findings from De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), who also observed an initial overuse of personal pronouns paired with an underuse of nouns. Such use of personal pronouns is inappropriate in academic writing, and it means that the sentences are not very complex in terms of noun phrase structure. After all, for every instance of a personal pronoun, a noun could have been used, which could be premodified by a determiner and/or adjective, or postmodified by a prepositional complement. It should be noted that the prompt for this assignment was to write a personal statement, which is why first person singular *I* and second person singular and plural *you* occur so frequently. The relatively low number of nouns has as a consequence that the percentage of determiner-noun pairs is equally low in comparison to the native distribution.

RAD1210’s first text contains some minor grammatical mistakes, but is otherwise well-written. One error would, however, lead to a slightly different percentage score upon correction, i.e. the use of a determiner in the phrase *other members of the staff*:

(4) “You can contact lecturers or other members of the staff to ensure you always know what is going on, what needs to be handed in and what is expected of you.” (RAD1210, yr1t1a)

Native writers would omit the determiner from such a phrase, as can be seen in the following example from LOCNESS, which bears much resemblance to the example above.

(5) “The constitution of 1958 honoured this, by placing the President first among the members of parliament.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0025.1)

Without the determiner in (4), *staff* would fall into the category of unmodified noun. The percentage score would increase slightly, from 6.4 to 6.5, which means it is still not very close to the native score of 8.9 compound or unmodified nouns per 100 words.

At yr2t3, RAD1210 writes an essay on Middle English literature that contains a few grammatical errors, but is, again, well-written. This is, however, not entirely reflected in the quantitative analysis in section 4.1, as only the scores for determiners and determiner-noun

pairs are close to the native distribution. RAD1210's use of nouns has decreased, falling from 81.1 per cent (20.2, see Table 1) to only 69.1 per cent (17.2, see Table 2) of the native score. Once again, it appears that this is due to the fact that RAD1210 uses far more personal pronouns than the native writers of LOCNESS. Contrary to the first text, which contained mostly first and second person singular pronouns, the second text contains many instances of the third person singular pronouns *he* and *she*, as can be seen in the examples below.

(6) "This particular tale tells the story of a knight of the round table. **He** rapes a young girl in field of grain and that means that **he** is punishable by death." (RAD1210, yr2t3)

(7) "If **he** fails to deliver the answer at the last day, **he** will still be executed. The knight travels through the country but **he** cannot discover the answer since all women tell him something different. On his way back to the castle, **he** runs into an old witch who promises him that **she** will save him in exchange for the knight's promise that **he** will do anything **she** desires from him afterwards. It turns out that the old witch wants to marry with the knight and **he** has got no other choice than to comply." (RAD1210, yr2t3)

Examples (6) and (7) also show that RAD1210's yr2t3 text is not so much an argumentative essay as it is a recollection of the literature that was read in preparation for the assignment. Although this style of writing cannot be considered academic, RAD1210 has two green cells at yr2t3 (see Table 2). This is due to the student's frequent use of noun phrases such as *the knight*, *the queen*, and *the witch*. RAD1210 furthermore uses hardly any compound nouns at this stage, which explains the student's score of only 4.2 per cent in Table 2.

(8) "Upon seeing his sorrow, she presents him with a choice: either she changes herself into a beautiful, young wife but she will be unfaithful to him or she remains old and ugly and she will promise him to be faithful and obedient for eternity." (RAD1210, yr2t3)

The 44 words above contain only 4 nouns, i.e. *sorrow*, *choice*, *wife*, and *eternity*, whereas a sentence of similar length (40 words) from the LOCNESS corpus contains eleven nouns:

(9) "Perhaps due to the ideological extremism of the CGT, perhaps through fear of losing jobs, or of opposing a very authoritative patronat, union membership in France has always been weak, representing at the present time only 15% of the workforce." (ICLE-BR-SUR-0019.1)

Where RAD1210 favours the use of personal pronouns, the native writer prefers to use nouns and a compound noun (*union membership*). If RAD1210 wishes to become more natively like in

academic writing, one of the first things they should do is use as few personal pronouns as possible and increase the total number of nouns and the number of compound nouns.

Finally, the second text contains one sentence that can be interpreted in two different ways due to its ungrammaticality, both of which would alter RAD1210's percentage scores.

(10a) "The king, however, chooses to let his wife, the queen, determine what faith is going to bestow on the knight." (RAD1210, yr2t3)

The Stanford part-of-speech-tagger tags this sentence as follows:

(10b) "The_DT king_NN ,_, however_RB ,_, chooses_VBZ to_TO let_VB his_PRP\$ wife_NN ,_, the_DT queen_NN ,_, determine_VB what_WP faith_NN is_VBZ going_VBG to_TO bestow_VB on_IN the_DT knight_NN ._" (RAD1210, yr2t3)

First of all, RAD1210 probably meant *fate* instead of *faith*. However, as neither *fate* nor *faith* can bestow something upon someone in this scenario, it is impossible for *what* to be an interrogative pronoun. This leaves two interpretations:

(11a) *The king, however, chooses to let his wife, the queen, determine what fate she is going to bestow on the knight.*

(11b) *The king, however, chooses to let his wife, the queen, determine what fate is to be bestowed on the knight.*

In both (11a) and (11b), *what* is a determiner rather than an interrogative pronoun, and *what fate* would be regarded as a DT|N pair.

RAD1210's second text contains no other errors where determiners and nouns are concerned, except for an omitted determiner in the sentence *He rapes a young girl in field of grain*. It is likely that this is simply a typing error, and it should be noted that typing errors also occur in the native texts.

At yr3t2, RAD1210 produces slightly more nouns on average than a native writer, as can be seen in Table 3. This increase could be due to the prompt, i.e. a research proposal, which was more academic in nature than the previous two prompts. RAD1210's performance is very close to the native distribution, scoring within ten per cent of the native writers' percentages on all categories except for attributive adjectives and adjective-noun pairs (Table 3). Despite this nativelike performance in terms of quantity, the text still contains some sentences that sound distinctly non-native, such as:

(12) "There is a clear parallel noticeable between these novels and the developments in American mental health care." (RAD1210, yr3t2)

The third text also shows that RAD1210 has not fully mastered the distinction between count and non-count nouns. The following two examples demonstrate this:

(13) “Next to literary criticism and close reading of novels this research also relies on a detailed literary research on American psychiatry in and around the 1960s.”

(RAD1210, yr3t2)

(14) “Articles containing criticism on controversial treatments appeared as soon as lobotomies and electro-shock therapies were applied to human beings.” (RAD1210, yr3t2)

In examples (13) and (14), *research* and *therapy* should both be viewed as non-count rather than count nouns, which means that the indefinite article in example (13) should have been omitted and *therapies* in (14) should have been singular. These two sentences, however, do not affect the results too much, as only the correction of example (13) would lead to a change in the percentage scores in Table 3.

All in all, RAD1210’s development shows a move towards nativelikeness, especially in terms of noun production. By the third year, the initial overuse of personal pronouns has decreased and RAD1210 has adopted a style of writing that is clearly more academic.

4.2.2 RAD1220

RAD1220, like RAD1210, uses a large amount of personal pronouns in the first assignment, for example in the following excerpt:

(15) “The first thing you have to make sure is that you are thoroughly organised. This means you need to get a diary and use it properly. Write down every single course you take. If you are not fond of paper diaries, use your phone to help remind you of your courses. By doing this you will never miss a class. The workload at university will be a lot more than you were used to in secondary school. In order to not succumb under this, and to not get a nervous breakdown because of it, you need to carefully plan everything.” (RAD1220, yr1t1a)

Again, this relatively high number of pronouns is related to the fact that the percentage of nouns is rather low in comparison to native writers. In all other respects, however, this text is well-written. It has a clear introduction and conclusion, and it contains hardly any grammatical errors. Although a first look at the results in Table 1 suggests that RAD1220 is least nativelike of the five students, this is not immediately reflected in the quality of RAD1220’s writing. The overall low percentage scores are merely caused by the overuse of personal pronouns, which cannot be modified by determiners, adjectives or other nouns.

At yr2t3, RAD1220’s distribution of determiners, nouns, and adjectives is nativelike (see Table 2). Some non-native features, however, persist, such as the frequent use of the

phrase *a lot*. RAD1220 uses *a lot* seven times in this text, sometimes even twice in one sentence (example (21)), and there is also one instance of *lots*:

(15) “These characters incline to make lots of rash promises, which the trickster dutifully takes advantage of.” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(16) “Due to the fabliaux’s earlier existence in France, a lot had already been written about when the English picked up the genre (Canby 205).” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(17) “Consequently, a lot of fabliau literature was not written down and saved, which explains why there are so few surviving English fabliaux (Canby 207).” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(18) “Unlike nowadays, not a lot of people could read in the Middle Ages.” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(19) “Manuscripts took a lot of tedious work, and too expensive to waste. It would take until the late thirteenth century for the English people to start using English as their language of choice in speaking and writing (245).” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(20) “Due to its French origin and big French tradition, there was a lot of material already available and England was quite late to the fabliaux craze.” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(21) “Due to the amount of tedious labour that went into making these manuscripts, and the fact that not a lot of medieval people knew how to read, not a lot of manuscripts were made.” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

The material from the LOCNESS corpus, 18,129 words in total, only contains six cases of *a lot*, and *lots* does not occur at all. Otherwise, the text is well-written and it contains no other mistakes that are relevant to this research.

RAD1220’s third text, yr3t2, does not contain the phrase *a lot*. However, like RAD1210 at yr3t2, RAD1220 mistakenly uses *research* as a count noun, as in the following example.

(22) “I could not find any previous research relating this specific topic, because this is a brand-new research set up by Dr de Vries.” (RAD1220, yr3t2)

RAD1220 furthermore omits an indefinite article (*a*) or cardinal number (*one*) before *more obscure poem* in the next sentence:

(23) “One assignment will be that they have to read two or three short poems, preferably one they have had in class and more obscure poem, and consequently having them analyse the poems in conversational manner.” (RAD1220, yr3t2)

Correction of this phrase would lead to a slight increase of the DT|N percentage score in Table 3, which is currently 14.4 per cent under the native distribution (8.3 compared to 9.7).

Other than this, there are no errors concerning determiners or nouns in this text that would affect the results upon correction. All in all, RAD1220's third text is comparable to native writing. By using the appropriate academic register, RAD1220 produces a text that is natively like both in terms of quantity and quality of determiner-noun use.

4.2.3 RAD1253

Table 1 shows that RAD1253 is not very close to a natively like distribution at the time of the first assignment. In terms of quality of writing, too, RAD1253 performs relatively poorly in comparison to the other four students, and especially in comparison to native writers. RAD1253's yr1t1a text comes across as incoherent due to a lack of punctuation marks and an occasional lack of agreement between (possessive) pronoun and antecedent, as in the following examples.

(24) "To become a successful student you have to take certain steps that will lead them to their goal of graduating college." (RAD1253, yr1t1a)

(25) "The first step a student could take is to come to all of their classes." (RAD1253, yr1t1a)

(26) "The third step a student should take is to simply do their assignments." (RAD1253, yr1t1a)

(27) "Again there are more reasons why a student should make their assignments." (RAD1253, yr1t1a)

Example (24) is different from the others, because one could argue that in (25)-(27) RAD1253 used *their* as a gender-neutral pronoun to address both male and female students. This, however, is impossible to say of (24), where RAD1253, it seems, was unsure whether to use second person singular or third person plural, and ended up using both. If (25)-(27) are examples of the use of plural *their* in agreement with a singular noun (*student*), it would be interesting to see if this also occurs in native writing. In the LOCNESS data, *their* is used a couple of times in combination with a singular noun phrase, but in all cases the noun phrase refers to a group of people and it is therefore in agreement with *their* on the basis of plurality, rather than gender-neutrality. These NPs are *the bourgeoisie* in (28) and *the older generation* in (29):

(28) "It should be said here that earlier attempts at increasing the role of primary and secondary education and making it open to all frightened the bourgeoisie who then sent their children to schools linked to the Lycées so that they still had an advantage." (ICLE-BR-SUR-0016.1)

(29) “This is quite a problem in France as the older generation cost a great deal of money to support, and the fact that their support is seen as a past debt rather than a future investment in the case of children, makes such support be given rather begrudgingly.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0017.1)

Other than (28) and (29), there are no occurrences of singular noun phrases combined with *their* in the native data. In examples (25)-(27), RAD1253 would have been more nativelike by using plural *students* as antecedent of *their*. In addition to creating a more coherent text, it would also help lower the percentage of determiners in this text, which would make the student’s distribution more nativelike.

Table 2 shows that RAD1253 uses relatively few nouns in the second text in comparison to the native writers. Like RAD1210, the student appears to have misunderstood the assignment and has written a text that resembles a short story, rather than an argumentative essay. That is why third person singular pronouns *he* and *she* occur frequently, as in (30) and (31) below.

(30) “She breaks the spell, when he gives her what all women want, namely control over their husbands, she rewards him. The knight first meets the wife of bath, when he is desperate looking for the answer to what women most desire as the answer will save his life. She promises to tell him, if he does whatever she asks him to.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(31) “She offers him a choice, she can either be young and probably unfaithful, or old and faithful. To this he replies that she can choose as she will probably know what is best for them[...].” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

The use of these personal pronouns does not allow for as much structural complexity as the use of nouns, because they are not usually pre- or postmodified. It is therefore likely that the overuse of personal pronouns has led to such a non-nativelike distribution.

There is one particular construction that RAD1253 uses five times in the yr2t3 text, i.e. *the woman she is*, which occurs in a variety of ways:

(32) “He was tested successfully and thus he is worthy to see the beautiful woman she really is.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(33) “She changes his mind set by giving him a lecture on gentillesse, which makes him able to see her for the beautiful young women she is.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(34) “He was tested and now he has proven himself, she breaks the spell, which makes him able to see the woman she already was.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(35) “She puts a spell on him, which makes him unable to see the beautiful woman she is.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(36) “But this is not only because he gives her what she wants, he also has proven himself worthy to see her as the woman she is.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

This structure is mentioned here because of its frequency of use, not because of ungrammaticality. What is, however, ungrammatical, is the use of *women* as singular in (33), which happens twice in this text, the other instance being the example below.

(37) “He told her that he was disgusted by her, because she was not a noble women, she was old and she was ugly.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

All in all, RAD1253 has not reached a nativelike distribution of determiners and nouns by the second year of the BA programme, which is visible from both the quantitative and the qualitative analysis.

Compared to the first and second text, RAD1253’s third text comes across as more academic. It contains only a small number of personal pronouns and far more unmodified nouns and compound nouns than the earlier texts, as the quantitative analysis shows.

RAD1253 makes only one determiner-noun error in this last text, which is the omission of a determiner before *less advanced or basic learner of English* in the following sentence:

(38) “In that way I can compare less advanced or basic learner of English to a more advanced learner and draw my conclusions on whether or not the degree of English education helps the students to do better in translating difficult English constructions.” (RAD1253, yr3t2)

This is similar to RAD1220’s omission in example (23), and it is likely that both cases are merely typing errors. Table 3 also indicates RAD1253’s limited use of determiners, i.e. only 75 per cent of the native percentage score (10.2 compared to 13.6 determiners per 100 words). This is unexpected, because the percentage of nouns is relatively high (see Table 3). There are several explanations for this, the most important of which is that the number of unmodified nouns is fairly high. Nouns such as *Dutch*, *English*, and *German*, here used as nouns referring to the languages rather than as adjectives, are very frequent, as in (39a) and (39b).

(39a) “They conclude that the information-structure differences between *Dutch* and *English* are the final hurdle for Dutch learners of *English* as a foreign language [...]” (RAD1253, yr3t2)

(39b) “They_PRP conclude_VBP that_IN the_DT information-structure_NN differences_NNS between_IN Dutch_NNP and_CC English_NNP are_VBP the_DT

final_JJ hurdle_NN for_IN Dutch_JJ learners_NNS of_IN English_NNP as_IN a_DT
foreign_JJ language_NN [...].” (RAD1253, yr3t2)

The tags in example (39b) have been edited, as the tagger originally classified all instances of *Dutch* and *English* as adjectives. The cursive occurrences of *Dutch* and *English* in example (39a) are, however, unmodified nouns. Due to the high frequency of these forms, there are relatively few determiners in RAD1253’s third text.

To conclude, RAD1253’s development can be characterised as a move toward nativelikeness, but not quite reaching the level of, for example, RAD1220. Compared to the other students, RAD1253’s learning curve is the steepest. By the third year, RAD1253 produces a text that has more features of academic writing and contains fewer personal pronouns, which is at the same time indicative of the student’s maturity as a writer.

4.2.4 RAD1277

The quantitative analysis in Table 1 indicated that RAD1277 was most nativelike out of the five students at yr1t1a. This result is reflected in the quality of writing, as RAD1277 produces a text that is grammatically sound, although the tone is far from academic. Like the other four students, RAD1277 uses many personal pronouns, for example in (40) and (41):

(40) “How do you expect to pass those tests when you have not been to one single lecture? You may have excelled in English at secondary school, but university standards are much higher.” (RAD1277, yr1t1a)

(41) “That way, you will make your mother proud of you, and you won’t have to take the resits, which saves you a lot of time.” (RAD1277, yr1t1a)

Contrary to the other four students, however, RAD1277 manages to attain a relatively high percentage of nouns in the yr1t1a text. In fact, RAD1277’s distribution of determiners and nouns at yr2t3 is quite close to the native distribution. One particular NP structure stands out in this text, because it does not occur in the other non-native texts: determiner – adjective – coordinating conjunction (or other) – determiner – adjective – noun. This type of noun phrase occurs twice in RAD1277’s yr2t3 text, i.e. *the classical and the medieval versions* in (42) and *a British rather than a Greek king* in (43):

(42) “Both in the classical and the medieval versions, Orpheus / Sir Orfeo wins back his beloved one by playing music [...].” (RAD1277, yr2t3)

(43) “By making Sir Orfeo a British rather than a Greek king, and by placing the story in Britain, the author of the medieval text made the story more accessible to his, largely British, audience.” (RAD1277, yr2t3)

This structure is slightly different from a more frequent structure, which is determiner – adjective – coordinating conjunction (or other) – adjective – noun, for example *the finite and non-finite form* in (44) and *many academic and scientific articles* in (45) below.

(44) “A verb qualifies as an optional infinitive if both the finite and non-finite form occur in certain contexts.” (RAD1277, yr3t2)

(45) “In order to complete this, many academic and scientific articles concerning psychology and psychiatry have been accessed.” (RAD1210, yr3t2)

The inclusion of a second determiner in such noun phrases as in (42) and (43) appears to be rare, because it occurs just once in the native corpus:

(46) “His finance minister was a personal as well as a political friend and hence was willing to execute D'Estaings wishes.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0027.1)

RAD1277's yr2t3 and yr3t2 texts contain no other unusual constructions or possible typing errors that would affect the results of the quantitative analysis upon correction. Finally, the relatively high percentage of adjectives in yr3t2 (8.3, see Table 3) can be explained by the fact that the text is a research proposal about the use of optional infinitives. The frequent repetition of this term caused these comparatively high percentage scores.

It is interesting to note that by the second year of their BA course, RAD1277 and RAD1220 appear to have learnt about register in academic writing. Their work contains hardly any personal pronouns, in contrast to the other three students:

(47) “The queen gives him one year and one day to discover what it is that all women most desire. If he fails to deliver the answer at the last day, he will still be executed. The knight travels through the country but he cannot discover the answer since all women tell him something different. On his way back to the castle, he runs into an old witch who promises him that she will safe him in exchange for the knight's promise that he will do anything she desires from him afterwards.” (RAD1210, yr2t3)

(48) “In medieval times, it was not custom to document every single piece of literature that was made. Consequently, a lot of fabliau literature was not written down and saved, which explains why there are so few surviving English fabliaux (Canby 207). Unlike nowadays, not a lot of people could read in the Middle Ages. This sparked the oral tradition of telling stories and rendered it unnecessary to write every single story down. The stories needed to live on through the memories of the people, instead of on the skin of goat.” (RAD1220, yr2t3)

(49) “She puts a spell on him, which makes him unable to see the beautiful woman she is. He was to go on a quest to find out what women really want, and she lets him fulfil

the wish of women. Because when he gives her what all women want, namely dominating and controlling their husbands, he is rewarded and the spell is broken. But this is not only because he gives her what she wants, he also has proven himself worthy to see her as the woman she is.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(50) “The story takes place partly in Winchester, which is called Thrace in the narrative, and partly in the Otherworld. This is a magical place where fairies and a fairy king exist. The fairies are said to be a Celtic element, thus making the lay more appealing to its medieval audience. Sir Orfeo contains some of the popular themes in medieval literature, namely that of exile and return, and a happy ending. This truly shows that the narrative has been altered in such a way that it would suit the tastes of its medieval readership.” (RAD1277, yr2t3)

(51) “This tale speaks of a young knight who is set to find out what women most desire and he learns this answer from a woman better known as the loathly lady. Now, when they are about to get married the Loathly Lady puts the knight in a dilemma. She is either forever young, beautiful and unfaithful or she is an old hag who is loyal, true and humble. Although there are several opinions that the old hag is really an old hag, it is actually quite clear that the Loathly Lady was never an old hag, but always was and always will be a beautiful woman.” (RAD1280, yr2t3)

The examples above show that RAD1220 and RAD1277 have appropriated the right academic register, with as few personal pronouns as possible. RAD1210, RAD1253, and RAD1280 have made this transition, too, by the time of the third assignment. When all is taken into account, RAD1277, like RAD1220, produces writing that is natively like in terms of quality and quantity of determiners and nouns at a relatively early stage. However, RAD1277 seems to experience a relapse to the use of personal pronouns by the third year, as in example (52).

(52) “I intend to test my hypothesis by analysing as many transcripts in CHILDES as my schedule allows, and then comparing that to what I have found in previously written academic articles. My contribution to the field will probably be minimal, since I will not be aggregating child speech data of my own, but rather studying already published material. However, I do hope that by connecting loose ends and regrouping information, I will put together a coherent survey of what has been researched on this topic and thereby create something meaningful.” (RAD1277, yr3t2)

The use of personal pronouns is not directly visible from Table 3, given that the possibility of a low percentage of nouns is balanced out by the relatively large number of compound nouns.

The percentage of determiners in RAD1277's third text does indicate that the distribution is not quite natively like. It remains unclear why RAD1277 started to use personal pronouns again, having carefully avoided them in the second assignment. It is possible that the student underestimated the degree of formality. Overall, RAD1277 produces texts that are consistent in quality. It is likely that RAD1277 would have as many green cells in Table 3 as RAD1210 or RAD1220 had there been no personal pronouns in the student's third text.

4.2.5 RAD1280

At yr1t1a, RAD1280's writing is similar to that of RAD1220 in terms of quality. Although their percentage scores are slightly different, RAD1280 and RAD1220 both overuse personal pronouns and produce only few nouns in comparison to native writers. Table 1 shows that RAD1280's distribution is otherwise quite close to the native writers' distribution of determiner-noun pairs. RAD1280's yr1t1a text is grammatically correct, with the exception of the following two infelicitous sentences.

(53) "However, if you are truly terrified by the idea of your first year in university, there are some few basic steps to make even your (worst imaginable) year to a successful one." (RAD1280, yr1t1a)

(54) "Students can help each other when they are facing problems, this will make your year much easier." (RAD1280, yr1t1a)

The sentence in (53) actually contains two phrases whose grammaticality is questionable. Firstly, *some* does not usually premodify *few*. It is most likely that RAD1280 intended to write either *some basic steps* or *a few basic steps*. Secondly, *to* should be omitted or replaced by *into*, so that it is either *to make even your (worst imaginable) year a successful one* or *to make even your (worst imaginable) year into a successful one*. Example (54) is infelicitous due to a lack of agreement between the possessive pronoun *your* and its antecedent. This sentence can be corrected in a number of ways, an example of a version of (54) that has agreement is given below in (54a).

(54a) *As students, you can help each other when you are facing problems. This will make your year much easier.*

Though this sentence has agreement between the possessive pronoun and the antecedent, it is admittedly still not very natively like due to the use of personal pronouns.

The quantitative analysis in Table 2 indicates that by yr2t3, RAD1280's distribution of determiners and nouns is not as close to natively like as those of RAD1220 and RAD1277. RAD1280 still produces large quantities of personal pronouns at this stage. This, together

with some non-punctuated run-on sentences, makes the text come across as less academic, which is illustrated by example (55).

(55) “With saying this, the knight gives the Loathly Lady maistrie and with doing so, he shows that he has respect for her and that she can make her own decisions and she becomes both fair and good.” (RAD1280, yr2t3)

The overuse of personal pronouns is a likely cause of the comparatively low percentage of nouns in RAD1280’s second text. In spite of this, the score of 4.7 determiner-adjective-noun combinations per 100 words is rather high. This can be explained by the frequent use of one of the characters’ names in the literature that is described, i.e. *the Loathly Lady*, as well as by the highly descriptive language that RAD1280 uses.

(56a) “Although there are several opinions that the old hag is really an old hag, it is actually quite clear that the Loathly Lady was never an old hag, but always was and always will be a beautiful woman.” (RAD1280, yr2t3)

(56b) “Although_IN there_EX are_VBP several_JJ opinions_NNS that_IN the_DT old_JJ hag_NN is_VBZ really_RB an_DT old_JJ hag_NN ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ actually_RB quite_RB clear_JJ that_IN the_DT Loathly_JJ Lady_NN was_VBD never_RB an_DT old_JJ hag_NN ,_, but_CC always_RB was_VBD and_CC always_RB will_MD be_VB a_DT beautiful_JJ woman_NN ._.” (RAD1280, yr2t3)

Example (56a) and (56b) show that the combination DT|JJ|NN occurs frequently.

By the time of the third assignment, however, RAD1280 has learnt not to use personal pronouns in academic writing. The percentage score for nouns increases by 9.4 per cent and the average number of determiner-noun pairs resembles the numbers found in native writing. RAD1280’s yr3t2 text contains only one determiner-related error, i.e. the use of the indefinite article in *a critical research* in (57) below.

(57) “This research paper aims to serve as a starting point for a critical research in which the CEFR is respected for its usefulness, but is thoroughly investigated and tested to become more efficient, reliable, transparent and easier to use not only by language teachers but also by language learners.” (RAD1280, yr3t2)

This is the same error as RAD1210’s *a detailed literary research* in example (13) and RAD1220’s *a brand-new research* in example (22). Apart from this error, RAD1280’s third text shows that, at least in terms of determiner-noun use, the student has become more nativelike.

4.2.6 Summary

The quantitative analysis in 4.1 showed that all students experienced a general move towards a more nativelike distribution of determiner-noun combinations. For the first assignment, the percentage scores for nouns in the non-native texts are still rather low in comparison to the native writers' mean score. This is also true for RAD1210, RAD1253, and RAD1280 in the second year. RAD1220 and RAD1277, however, have developed more quickly towards a nativelike distribution. The qualitative analysis revealed that this is due to the fact that they hardly produce any personal pronouns at this stage, which shows that RAD1220 and RAD1277 have mastered a sophisticated, academic style of writing. The other three students, on the other hand, start to use a similar style of writing only by the time of the third assignment.

In terms of quality, most progress is made by RAD1253. The examples in section 4.2.3 show that RAD1253 occasionally struggled with grammaticality and register in the first two assignments, but it also becomes clear that the student has improved considerably by the third year. RAD1210 and RAD1280, too, have become more nativelike at this stage, whereas RAD1220 and RAD1277 remain stable in their quality of writing. For RAD1277, this consistent quality does not show from Table 3, in which the percentage scores for determiners and determiner-noun pairs for this student appear to be rather low in comparison to the native writers of LOCNESS. The qualitative analysis revealed that this is due to an unexpected return to the use of personal pronouns, and that the text is otherwise well-written.

In conclusion, some findings from the quantitative analysis are confirmed by the qualitative analysis, but the qualitative analysis can also refute or contradict the numbers. The best supporting evidence of this claim is RAD1210's performance at yr1t1a, which appears quite far from nativelike in Table 1. A close inspection of the actual text, however, revealed that it is not inferior to RAD1210 or RAD1280's text. The numbers in Tables 1 to 3 should therefore be seen as a starting point, which is then complemented by in-depth scrutinisation of the written work.

5. Discussion

The previous chapter has outlined the results from the quantitative and qualitative analysis, which indicated that the non-native writers' development is non-linear and that there is a lot of individual variation. This chapter provides answers to the six research questions, discusses the method used in this study, and contains suggestions for future research.

The aim of this study was to find out if there is a relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs in EFL writing by advanced Dutch students of English, compared to native English writing. This comparison is justified and not an example of the comparative fallacy, because the students are training to become EFL professionals and the university requires them to achieve a nativelike command. The hypothesis was that the students would produce more complex noun phrase structures as they gained grammatical competency during their three-year BA programme, and that their use of determiner-noun combinations would thus come to resemble the distribution found in native academic writing.

The non-native writers' determiner-noun distributions have been discussed in the previous chapter. Their grammatical competency is measured in terms of three test scores: the scores from the students' grammar exam in October 2012 and scores from two diagnostic grammar tests that the students took in September 2012 and June 2013. The results are given below in Table 4. Unfortunately, no scores were available for RAD1253 and RAD1280's performance on the second diagnostic grammar test.

Table 4

Students' scores on two diagnostic grammar tests and a grammar exam

	Diagnostic test 1 September 2012	Diagnostic test 2 June 2013	Grammar exam October 2012
RAD1210	32/50	35/50	6.3/10
RAD1220	40/50	42/50	6.8/10
RAD1253	29/50	-	5.3/10
RAD1277	38/50	45/50	8.1/10
RAD1280	27/50	-	3.4/10

The students took the first diagnostic grammar test and the grammar exam around the same time as assignment yr1t1a. Table 4 shows that the students had varying degrees of

grammatical knowledge. RAD1253 and RAD1280 had the lowest scores on the first diagnostic grammar test and on the grammar exam, and RAD1220 and RAD1277 had the highest scores overall. Compared to the quantitative analysis, the relation between grammatical competency and determiner-noun use is not immediately apparent. According to Table 1, for example, RAD1220 has the least nativelike distribution in September 2012, whereas Table 4 shows that the student outperforms RAD1210, RAD1253, and RAD1280 on the first diagnostic grammar test and the grammar exam. However, the qualitative analysis revealed that, except for the relatively large number of personal pronouns it contained, RAD1220's yr1t1a text was well-written and comparable to native writing. The relation between grammatical competency and the nativelikeness of determiner-noun use is most evident from the results of RAD1277 and RAD1253. RAD1277 is most nativelike in terms of quantity and quality at yr1t1a, which is reflected in the grammatical competency scores in Table 4. RAD1253, whose work was deemed least nativelike out of the five students at yr1t1a in terms of quality, also has one of the lowest scores on the first diagnostic test. For RAD1280, however, it is difficult to see the relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs. This student has the lowest grammatical competency scores overall, and a particularly low score on the grammar exam in October 2012, but the quantitative and qualitative analyses do not reflect this. As in De Haan (2015) and De Haan (2016), there does not seem to be a one-to-one correspondence between increased grammatical knowledge and grammatical control that is true for all students.

With the information above, it is now possible to answer the six research questions posed in the first chapter.

1. Are there any quantitative differences in determiner-noun combinations between native English and Dutch EFL writing?

The quantitative analysis showed that, especially in the first year of their BA programme, not all students' distributions of determiner-noun pairs are nativelike. Only RAD1277 and, to some extent, RAD1280 are close to nativelike at yr1t1a in terms of determiner-noun pairs. The percentage scores of RAD1210 and RAD1220 are much lower and RAD1253's is much higher than the native average of 9.7 determiner-noun pairs per 100 words. By the second year, RAD1210 and RAD1220 have reached nativelike levels, like RAD1277. It should be noted, however, that the qualitative analysis later indicated that RAD1210's writing style at yr2t3 was not academic, due to an overuse of personal pronouns. The determiner-noun percentage scores of RAD1253 and RAD1280 are relatively low at this point, i.e. 8 per cent

and 7.3 per cent compared to the native score of 9.7 per cent. Finally, at yr3t2, there are still some quantitative differences between the native and non-native writers' use of determiner-noun pairs, even though the average number of nouns the Dutch students produce has reached nativelike proportions. The increase of the percentage of nouns in non-native writing seems to be related to a decrease in the use of personal pronouns. According to De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), this move towards a more formal style of writing is due to first-year writing classes such as Writing English, where students are taught about academic register.

2. *Are there any qualitative differences in determiner-noun combinations between native English and Dutch EFL writing?*

The qualitative analysis in the previous chapter showed that there were only a few differences in the use of determiner-noun pairs between native and non-native writers. Some students used determiners that were not appropriate for the non-count nouns they premodified, such as *a detailed literary research* in RAD1210's yr3t2 text. Another qualitative difference that was found was RAD1253's use of *a noble women* and *the beautiful young women she is*, when clearly a native writer would have used *woman* in both cases. In general, however, the students' use of determiner-noun pairs was grammatically correct and comparable to native writing. This was to be expected based on De Haan & Van der Haagen (2012) and De Haan & Van der Haagen (2013a), who found that Dutch students of English made no serious grammatical errors. The quality of RAD1210, RAD1253, and RAD1280's texts improved considerably by the time of the third assignment, unlike RAD1220 and RAD1277 who started to produce formal writing free of personal pronouns before yr2t3.

3. *Does individual development show a move towards native writers' use of determiner-noun combinations?*

The answer to this question is affirmative, although individual development varies extensively. RAD1210 and RAD1220 produce more determiner-noun pairs at yr2t3 than at yr1t1a. They then produce fewer determiner-noun pairs at yr3t2 than at yr2t3, but this is still more than at yr1t1a. Almost the same can be said of RAD1277, except that this student's yr3t2 percentage is lower than that of yr1t1a. RAD1280's development is almost the opposite, because the student produces fewer determiner-noun pairs at yr2t3 than at yr1t1a, but then reaches a nativelike distribution by yr3t2 because of a 2.3 per cent increase. RAD1253's development is rather special. This student's percentage of determiner-noun pairs is very high at yr1t1a, but steadily decreases over time, to one of the lowest percentage scores recorded for

this category. For all students but RAD1277 the scores at yr3t2 are closer to the nativelike percentage than at yr1t1a. These, however, are all findings based on numbers. In terms of quality, it appears that RAD1220 and RAD1277 reach an academically appropriate style by the second year of their BA course, whereas the other students seem to require more time to adapt their writing styles. All in all, this shows that the development of cohorts cannot and should not be generalised. It should be noted that the scope of this study did not allow for personal characteristics of the non-native writers to be taken into account, such as language aptitude and motivation, which could have an impact on their learning trajectory (Dörnyei, 2015; De Bot, Lowie & Verspoor, 2007).

4. *Is there a relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs in advanced Dutch EFL writing?*

The results of this study do not point to an unambiguous relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun pairs. Such a relation does seem to exist for RAD1277, who has one of the best scores on the first diagnostic test (September 2012), the best score on the grammar exam (October 2012), and the most nativelike distribution at yr1t1a (September 2012). It also holds for RAD1220, who has the best score on the first diagnostic test and whose first text is comparable to native writing in terms of quality. For a student such as RAD1280, however, the relation between grammatical competency and determiner-noun use is less clear. RAD1280's grammatical knowledge is below average and the student's writing style only becomes more academic by the third year, but RAD1280's written work is not equally poor in terms of quality and grammaticality.

The average number of nouns might be a better indicator of grammatical control than the number of determiner-noun pairs. The determiner-noun scores at yr3t2 do not reflect how much more academic the students' writing styles have become. They also do not show the early decrease in personal pronoun use by RAD1220 and RAD1277 at yr2t3. The percentage scores for nouns, however, do point towards RAD1220 and RAD1277's early adaptation of academically appropriate writing. This is in line with findings from De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), and it also corresponds to the findings of De Haan (2015), who found that a decrease of personal pronoun use co-occurred with an increase in complex noun phrase structures, such as noun phrases that are postmodified by a prepositional phrase. Given that not all complex noun phrase structures contain determiners, but all contain nouns by definition, it is obvious why such development is most clearly visible from the percentage scores of nouns.

5. *Is there a relation between the use of complex noun structures and the frequency of determiner-noun pairs?*

To find out if the hypothesis above (i.e. the use of more complex noun phrase structures means more nouns, but not necessarily more determiner-noun pairs) is true, an additional analysis of the data was executed. This analysis consisted of counting the total number of complex noun phrase structures and the number of such structures containing 0 to 3 determiners, to establish whether or not there is a relation between the use of complex noun phrase structures and the frequency of determiner-noun pairs. Two examples of such complex noun phrase structures are given below in example (58), in which the first complex noun phrase (in italics) contains one determiner and the second contains two determiners.

(58) “It has proved particularly difficult in France to change the education system because of *the successive changes in policies*, and due to *an apparent lack of national consensus over the role of education*.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0021.1)

The sentence below gives an example of a complex noun phrase without a determiner and contains the only complex noun phrase with three determiners in this data set.

(59) “He envisaged an orientation cycle in the last two years of the first cycle, then for those carrying on, there was to be a general course of two years when the first half of the 'baccalauréat' would be taken, then the last year would involve more choice for students.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0021.1)

Due to time constraints it was only possible to analyse one text by a native writer (ICLE-BR-SUR-0021.1) and three texts by a non-native writer (RAD1280). ICLE-BR-SUR-0021.1 was chosen because this writer’s distribution of determiners, nouns, and determiner-noun pairs was closest to the native mean percentage scores, and was therefore deemed most representative. RAD1280 was selected because this student used considerably more nouns by yr3t2 than in the first text at yr1t1a (i.e. 26 nouns per 100 words compared to 17.6 nouns in the first year), which could indicate an increased use of complex noun phrase structures.

The results of the analysis are given below in Table 5. They are presented as percentage scores, so, for example, RAD1280’s score of 2.95 complex NP structures for the third assignment means that the student used 2.95 complex noun phrase structures per 100 words.

Table 5

Results from the additional analysis of complex noun phrase structures, percentage scores

	ICLE-BR-SUR-0021.1 N=1,020	RAD1280 yr1t1a N=433	RAD1280 yr2t3 N=730	RAD1280 yr3t2 N=881
Complex NP structures	4.90	1.85	1.64	2.95
Complex NPs with 0 DT N pairs	1.08	0	0	0.34
Complex NPs with 1 DT N pair	2.16	1.15	1.10	0.79
Complex NPs with 2 DT N pairs	1.57	0.69	0.55	1.82
Complex NPs with 3 DT N pairs	0.10	0	0	0

These results indicate that RAD1280 uses far fewer complex noun phrase structures than the native writer in all three texts, but begins to use more by the third year. The table also shows that RAD1280's first and second text contain no complex noun phrase structures without determiners, whereas this structure occurs a number of times in the native text. This difference might be due to the fact that English requires no determiner, or "the zero article" (Aarts & Wekker, 1993, p.125), in a number of cases, for example before singular count nouns with generic reference that denote institutions (*hospital, university*), when Dutch would in fact use a determiner (Aarts & Wekker, 1993). At the same time, however, there are cases where an indefinite article is used in English while Dutch uses the zero article, for example before numerals such as *hundred* and *thousand* (Aarts & Wekker, 1993). Alternatively, the difference could lie in both writers' use of register, as the qualitative analysis showed that RAD1280 only started to use an academically appropriate style of writing by the third year. Further research of the data is necessary to determine whether this initial difference between the native writer and non-native writer is due to L1 interference, or whether use of complex noun phrase structures without determiners is a typical feature of academic writing.

Another question that can be asked in relation to this research question is whether determiner-noun combinations occur predominantly in larger (and therefore more complex) noun phrases. As Table 5 shows, the number of complex noun phrases in RAD1280's text is

rather low. RAD1280 uses 12.2 determiner-noun combinations per 100 words in the first assignment (8.3 and 3.9, see Table 1), but only 1.85 complex noun phrases. Although the numbers shift slightly, the results from the second and third assignment in Tables 2, 3, and 5 reflect this distribution. In the native text, too, the majority of determiner-noun combinations is found outside of complex noun phrase structures.

To conclude, the answer to the research question is not completely affirmative. There is no direct relation between the use of complex noun phrase structures and the frequency of determiner-noun combinations, because not all of these structures contain determiners. As noted earlier, the percentage of nouns used in a text is most likely a better indicator of structural complexity than the percentage of determiner-noun pairs.

6. Is there a relation between sentence length and the use of determiner-noun combinations?

This final research question was based on findings by De Haan & Van Esch (2005), who studied non-native writing by students of English and students of Spanish. They concluded that, on average, the more advanced students produced longer sentences. It would therefore be interesting to find out if there is a positive relation between sentence length and the use of determiner-noun combinations in non-native writing. That is, does an increased use of longer sentences mean that the writer also uses more determiner-noun combinations on average? Moreover, does the claim by De Haan & Van Esch (2005) hold for this particular group of non-native writers? Do the more advanced students (RAD1220 and RAD1277, according to Table 4) produce longer sentences at an earlier stage than the other students?

Tables 6 to 8 below contain the results from WordSmith Tools, i.e. the mean sentence length and standard deviation per student per assignment, with the scores from the native writers repeated in each table as a reference. A score of 17.87 for RAD1210 at yr1t1a means that the student's text contained sentences that were on average approximately 18 words long. The standard deviations are also given, as an indication of how much variation in sentence length there was in each student's text.

Table 6

Mean sentence length and standard deviations for the native writers of LOCNESS and the non-native writers of LONGDALE at yr1t1a

YR1T1A	Native N=18,129	RAD1210 N=535	RAD1220 N=404	RAD1253 N=481	RAD1277 N=330	RAD1280 N=433
Mean sentence length	21.69	17.87	16.83	20.08	18.83	16.69
Standard deviation	11.22	8.58	7.10	14.04	5.63	5.97

Table 6 shows that, in the first year of their studies, the students use sentences that are slightly shorter than those of native writers. Again, it is important to point out that this difference could be due to text type. It is likely that the texts written by the native writers are longer because they are argumentative essays, rather than personal statements on an informal topic, which the Dutch students were instructed to write. The results from Table 6 furthermore indicate that RAD1253 creates the longest sentences on average, thereby approaching the native score. It should, however, be noted that RAD1253 has a large standard deviation compared to the other students, which is indicative of substantial variation in sentence length in this text. Compare, for example, the following two sentences.

(60) “The first step a student could take is to come to all of their classes.” (RAD1253, yr1t1a)

(61) “So in order for a student to graduate from college the student has to take the following steps; come to the classes so the student is allowed to take the exams and gets more detailed information and better explanation about the course material, understand and know the information in order to pass the exams and make the exercises to know whether or not the information has been understood and to give an example of what could be in an exam.” (RAD1253, yr1t1a)

Example (60) is a relatively short sentence of 15 words, approximately 5 words below the student’s average of 20.08 words per sentence. The sentence in (61) consists of 80 words, and is a rather lengthy summation that contains 13 determiner-noun combinations: *a student, the student, the following steps, the classes, the student, the exams, the course material, the information, the exams, the exercises, the information, an example, and an exam*. Given that the average number of determiner-noun pairs in native writing (see Table 1) is 9.7 (per 100 words) and the average number of determiner-adjective-noun combinations is 3.7 (per 100

words), this use of 13 determiner-noun combinations per 80 words by RAD1253 is not very nativelike. It is in line with the results from Table 1 in Chapter 4, which show that RAD1253 uses more determiner-noun pairs than any of the other writers at this stage. The results do not seem to correspond to the findings of De Haan & Van Esch (2005). RAD1253 is not the most advanced student of this group (see Table 4), but does produce the longest sentences on average in this first assignment. De Haan & Van Esch (2005), however, were also careful to note that occasionally the less advanced students would produce longer sentences due to comma splice errors. Example (61) falls into that category.

Table 7

Mean sentence length and standard deviations for the native writers of LOCNESS and the non-native writers of LONGDALE at yr2t3

YR2T3	Native N=18,129	RAD1210 N=827	RAD1220 N=795	RAD1253 N=728	RAD1277 N=684	RAD1280 N=730
Mean sentence length	21.69	22.30	18.40	24.20	23.14	22.06
Standard deviation	11.22	8.83	6.22	11.86	10.18	11.18

Eighteen months after the first assignment, the results are rather different. All non-native writers now produce longer sentences, with an average increase of approximately four words for all students except RAD1220. After adding up the percentage scores for the categories DT|N and DT|JJ|N in Table 2 (Chapter 4) and comparing those to the results from Table 1, it can be concluded that there is no unambiguous correspondence between the production of longer sentences and an increased use of determiner-noun combinations. RAD1280, for example, uses sentences that are on average 5.37 words longer at yr2t3 than at yr1t1a, but the average number of determiner-noun combinations goes from 12.2 (8.3 and 3.9, see Table 1) to 12 (7.3 and 4.7, see Table 2). This means that there is not necessarily a positive relation between sentence length and the frequency of determiner-noun combinations. Furthermore, although RAD1280's mean sentence length increases, the student uses fewer complex noun phrase structures at yr2t3 than at yr1t1a (see Table 5). This is on the one hand unexpected, because the text type for the second assignment is more academic than for the first, and, according to De Haan (2015), an academic style of writing is characterised by the production of more complex noun phrases. It is less surprising on the other hand, since the

qualitative analysis already showed that RAD1280 had not managed to fully adopt the appropriate academic register by the time of the second assignment. At this point, the results from Table 7 still do not correspond to the findings of De Haan & Van Esch (2005). The student who is most advanced in terms of grammatical competency, RAD1277, does not use the longest sentences on average. Instead, it is RAD1253, who had one of the lowest scores on the first diagnostic grammar test and the grammar exam in late 2012 (see Table 4). RAD1253’s yr2t3 text still contains some comma splice errors, though, as in examples (62), (63), and (64) below.

(62) “She breaks the spell, when he gives her what all women want, namely control over their husbands, she rewards him.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(63) “She offers him a choice, she can either be young and probably unfaithful, or old and faithful.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

(64) “By giving him those two options she manipulates him, both options would lead to an unhappy marriage, either because of the cheating or because of the fact that she is old and ugly.” (RAD1253, yr2t3)

The comma splice errors above, and particularly the one in example (64), cause RAD1253’s mean sentence length in Table 7 to be higher than it actually would be without the errors. Even after factoring in the comma splice errors, it remains impossible to claim that the more advanced students produce longer sentences. RAD1220 was one of the best students according to the quantitative and qualitative analyses, as well as the grammar exam and diagnostic grammar tests, but produced the shortest sentences on average. Again, however, it is possible that the findings in this study are different from those in De Haan & Van Esch (2005) due to text type, or due to the limited amount of data that could be analysed.

Table 8

Mean sentence length and standard deviations for the native writers of LOCNESS and the non-native writers of LONGDALE at yr3t2

YR3T2	Native N=18,129	RAD1210 N=470	RAD1220 N=1,024	RAD1253 N=717	RAD1277 N=422	RAD1280 N=881
Mean sentence length	21.69	21.68	22.09	28.96	24.88	28.00
Standard deviation	11.22	9.11	8.87	14.00	8.32	9.57

The results in Table 8 show that there is considerable individual variation among the students, the difference between RAD1210 and RAD1253 being approximately 7 words per sentence on average. This difference is interesting, because RAD1253 uses 9.9 determiner-noun combinations on average (6.7 and 3.2, Table 3), whereas RAD1210, whose sentences are shorter, uses 12.3 determiner-noun combinations (8.9 and 3.4, Table 3). This, again, shows that the production of longer sentences does not equal the use of more determiner-noun combinations. The results also indicate that the students' development can be non-linear, since RAD1210's production of relatively shorter sentences at yr3t2 than at yr2t3 does not conform to the general trend of increased mean sentence length.

Table 8 also shows that RAD1220 and especially RAD1210 are incredibly close to the native writers' mean sentence length. RAD1253 and RAD1280, however, use considerably longer sentences, with averages of 28.96 and 28.00 words per sentence. For RAD1280, that means an increased sentence length of 5 words on average, nearly 6 (22.06 at yr2t3 and 28.00 at yr3t2). Although RAD1280's mean sentence length and number of complex noun phrase structures have increased between the second and third assignment, it was shown before that the use of longer sentences does not automatically mean more complex noun phrase structures. Shorter sentences can also contain complex NPs, such as examples (65) and (66) below, which both consist of 22 words yet contain two complex noun phrase structures each.

(65) *"The participants for this research proposal will be a group of 80 Dutch students of English in secondary school (age 12 – 18)."* (RAD1280, yr3t2)

(66) *"Next to the students will be a group of 10 English language teachers and a group of 10 native speakers of English."* (RAD1280, yr3t2)

In conclusion, on the basis of the current data it is impossible to say that there is an unambiguous relation between sentence length and the use of determiner-noun combinations. The tables and examples above show that an increased mean sentence length does not automatically imply the use of more determiner-noun combinations, even when taking into consideration the occurrence of comma splice errors. It also proved difficult to establish a connection between mean sentence length and the structural complexity of noun phrases, although it is possible that analysis of a larger amount of data might lead to slightly different results. Finally, there was no direct correspondence between grammatical competency and mean sentence length, as the most advanced students did not produce the longest sentences. The findings by De Haan & Van Esch (2005) could not be replicated with this particular data set, but, again, the analysis of more data could perhaps lead to different results.

There are still a number of problems related to this study. Firstly, the results from the native data differ from the native data in the quantitative analysis by De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), who also used LOCNESS essays as reference material. The native writers' results from both studies are given below in Table 9.

Table 9

Results from the quantitative analysis of LOCNESS data in two comparable studies, percentage scores

	The current study N=18,129	De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014) N=47,850
DT	13.6	11.6
N	24.9	27.5
DT N	9.7	7.2

The results from the quantitative analysis in Chapter 4 would be slightly different if the native norms of De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014) had been used. It would mean that none of the students reach a nativelike distribution of nouns by the time of the third assignment and that they all overuse determiner-noun pairs, except for RAD1253. Due to time constraints, it was impossible for this study to analyse a larger number of native essays. Obviously, a larger data set means that the percentages become more reliable, and the results from De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014) are therefore more representative in general. However, they analysed native American English essays in addition to the British English essays also used for this study. These essays were both literary and non-literary and concerned a variety of topics, which means that they are in fact less representative of the native British English academic norm that is used for reference in this study.

Secondly, the relatively limited scale of this research also did not allow for the analysis of more non-native data. Further research is needed to find out, for example, what caused RAD1220 and RAD1277 to become more nativelike between the first and second assignment, and why the other three students only reached a more nativelike distribution after yr2t3. The analysis of two to three texts per student per year should be enough to track their development even more closely. It is true that the time lapses between the three tasks in this study are uneven, i.e. 18 months between yr1t1a and yr2t3 and 6 months between yr2t3 and yr3t2. According to Ortega (2003), having a smaller time lapse between tasks means that syntactic development is less likely to be visible. The qualitative results and certainly the

quantitative results, nonetheless, show great individual progress towards nativelikeness between the second and third assignment, perhaps even more than between the first and second assignment. The uneven time lapses between the tasks are therefore not considered to have affected the results, but the recommendation for future research remains to analyse more data per student per year.

Another issue that should be taken into account is the influence of text type and prompts on the results. The prompt for the first assignment was to write about the steps first-year students can take to become more successful in college. This led the students to assume an expert's point-of-view and address their readers in the second person singular or plural, which is at least one of the reasons why the non-native writers used such large quantities of personal pronouns at yr1t1a. It is likely that these numbers would be lower if the prompt for the first assignment was to write an academic essay. It should also be noted that the texts produced at yr1t1a were timed, in-class assignments. The other two assignments were untimed take-home exams and research proposals. If the aim is to have a fair comparison of advanced Dutch students of English to native English students, it would be ideal to control for text type and the time allowed for each task in future research.

One limitation of this study is that the data concerning the students' grammatical competency were incomplete. That is, the scores for RAD1253 and RAD1280 on the second diagnostic grammar test were missing from the LONGDALE-NL database, either because the students did not complete this test or because the data simply were not entered into the file. There were also no grammatical competency scores available from the students' third year. For a more thorough investigation of the relation between grammatical competency and the use of determiner-noun combinations, future studies should ideally report grammatical competency scores for all students. It would be best to have these grammar exams take place around the same time as every data collection moment, so that the results are most representative of the student's grammatical competency at that point in time.

Due to time constraints, it was unfortunately not possible to analyse the structural complexity of noun phrases in all the students' texts. The results from the analysis of RAD1280's texts did not confirm the hypothesis that the use of more structurally complex noun phrases corresponds directly with the production of determiner-noun pairs. It is possible that this hypothesis would have been confirmed if a larger data set had been used. Related to this is the category of compound or unmodified nouns, which remains a rather broad category. A recommendation for future research is that this category be split in two, compound nouns on the one hand and unmodified nouns on the other. That way, it becomes possible to

investigate, for example, if there is a relation between the increased use of compound nouns and the use of more complex noun phrase structures. Based on the results in Tables 2, 3, and 5, it is possible that these are related, because RAD1280's percentage of compound or unmodified nouns rises from 4 to 11.4 per 100 words between the second and third assignment, which is also when the student begins to use more noun phrases that have complex structures. More research is necessary to determine whether this is a common development also found in comparable advanced EFL writing.

Future research could also consist of a replication of the current study, but with advanced EFL writers (students of English, ideally) that have a first language that is not Dutch. Denmark and Sweden are in the top three of the 2017 English Proficiency Index, and are therefore ideal candidates (Education First, 2017). By using the same set-up as this study, but perhaps using a larger data set, it then becomes possible to compare the Dutch and Danish or Swedish EFL writers' developmental patterns. That is not to say that the current study's method is the best way to analyse EFL writing. It is mostly for comparative purposes that a replication of this study with another L2 is recommended. Such a study would also be more comprehensive, because it allows for an L2 vs. L2 comparison, in addition to L1 vs. L2, within-subject, and between-subject comparisons.

Finally, there were some issues with the part-of-speech tagger, which necessitated manual post-editing of the complete data set. Grant & Ginther (2000), who also studied learner essays that had been tagged by a computerised tagging program, ran into similar problems and they, too, resorted to re-editing their data by hand. Although the Stanford NLP studio tagger is efficient and user-friendly, the tagged output (see Appendices I-IV) still contained a large number of mistakes. For example, words like *English* and *French* that can be used either as adjectives or nouns were frequently assigned the wrong labels.

(67a) "For a general comparison between the French & English systems we can start with the primary schools." (ICLE-BR-SUR-0016.1)

(67b) "For_IN a_DT general_JJ comparison_NN between_IN the_DT French_NNP &_CC English_NNP systems_NNS we_PRP can_MD start_VB with_IN the_DT primary_JJ schools_NNS ._" (ICLE-BR-SUR-0016.1)

(68a) "There is relatively little selection in French universities, especially when you compare it with the British system of required grades and interviews." (ICLE-BR-SUR-0016.1)

(68b) "There_EX is_VBZ relatively_RB little_JJ selection_NN in_IN French_JJ universities_NNS ,_, especially_RB when_WRB you_PRP compare_VBP it_PRP

with_IN the_DT British_JJ system_NN of_IN required_JJ grades_NNS and_CC interviews_NNS ._.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0016.1)

In example (67a), *French* and *English* are attributive adjectives, but are tagged in (67b) as proper nouns (see Appendix V). This is in contrast with French and British in example (68a) and (68b), where the part-of-speech tagger did assign the right labels. However, *little*, which is a degree determinative in the sentence in (68a), is also tagged as an attributive adjective. A similar error occurred with *little*, which is correctly assigned a JJ-tag in example (69b), but incorrectly in example (70b) where it functions as a determiner.

(69a) “Employers were wary of unions, so the state had to act as an intermediary between the two sides to develop a little dialogue between them.”
(ICLE-BR-SUR-0023.1)

(69b) “Employers_NNS were_VBD wary_JJ of_IN unions_NNS ,_, so_IN the_DT state_NN had_VBD to_TO act_VB as_IN an_DT intermediary_JJ between_IN the_DT two_CD sides_NNS to_TO develop_VB a_DT little_JJ dialogue_NN between_IN them_PRP ._.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0023.1)

(70a) “Most corpuses are based on advanced language learners or translators, but little research is focused on the translations of less advanced translators.” (RAD1253, yr3t2)

(70b) “Most_JJS corpuses_NNS are_VBP based_VBN on_IN advanced_JJ language_NN learners_NNS or_CC translators_NNS ,_, but_CC little_JJ research_NN is_VBZ focused_VBN on_IN the_DT translations_NNS of_IN less_JJR advanced_JJ translators_NNS ._.” (RAD1253, yr3t2)

The tagged output also contained instances of demonstrative pronoun *this* tagged as a determiner, as in example (71) below.

(71a) “I might have to get some help from the students to transcribe this accurately.”
(RAD1220, yr3t2)

(71b) “I_PRP might_MD have_VB to_TO get_VB some_DT help_NN from_IN the_DT students_NNS to_TO transcribe_VB this_DT accurately_RB ._.” (RAD1220, yr3t2)

Manual post-editing of the tagged data was necessary, because the part-of-speech tagger did not identify all determiners (e.g. *little* in (70)), and, conversely, identified words as determiners when they were not (e.g. *this* in (71)). The tagger also did not recognise subject-determiners as determiners, such as *Fouchet’s* in example (72).

(72a) “There was not great reform of secondary education after the events of May 1968 but by the early 70's it was realized that Fouchet's reforms of 1963 were still not good enough.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0033.1)

(72b) “There_EX was_VBD not_RB great_JJ reform_NN of_IN secondary_JJ education_NN after_IN the_DT events_NNS of_IN May_NNP 1968_CD but_CC by_IN the_DT early_JJ 70_CD 's_POS it_PRP was_VBD realized_VBN that_IN Fouchet_NN 's_POS reforms_NNS of_IN 1963_CD were_VBD still_RB not_RB good_JJ enough_RB ._.” (ICLE-BR-SUR-0033.1)

The final recommendation for future research is therefore to use a more sophisticated part-of-speech tagger, which makes it possible to analyse more data and makes the quantitative analysis more efficient.

The findings of this research have pedagogical implications. First-year writing courses should pay more attention to register and the appropriate use of personal pronouns in academic writing. If the advanced Dutch students of English are made aware of this at an early stage, it is likely that their first-year texts will become more nativelike in terms of quantity and quality of determiner-noun use. A replication of this study could then be used to show that the new cohorts are closer to native writing at an earlier stage.

6. Conclusion

This study investigated the relation between the use of determiner-noun pairs and grammatical competency in advanced Dutch EFL writing. Based on previous longitudinal studies into syntactic development in non-native writing, the hypothesis was that the Dutch students would use fewer determiner-noun pairs on average than native English writers in the first year. Then, as the students learnt more about grammar and academic writing, their distribution would gradually become more nativelike in terms of quantity and quality, and their writing would come to contain more complex noun phrase structures. This increase in structural complexity would involve the use of more determiners and nouns, as they are the building blocks of noun phrases. This was based on findings by De Haan & Van der Haagen (2014), De Haan (2015), and De Haan (2016).

The results from the quantitative analysis indicated that this hypothesis was true to some extent, i.e. most students produced fewer determiner-noun pairs than native writers at the time of the first assignment. However, the quantitative analysis failed to show that the students had a nativelike distribution of determiner-noun pairs by the time of the third assignment. In terms of quantity, the average number of nouns was a better indicator of grammatical competency than determiner-noun scores. This is because as students become more advanced, their writing becomes more sophisticated and starts to contain more structurally complex noun phrases, as shown in Table 5 for RAD1280. However, it was not possible on the basis of this study's findings to confirm a relation between mean sentence length and the use of determiner-noun combinations, or between mean sentence length and structural complexity of noun phrases.

The qualitative analysis consisted of comparisons between LONGDALE-NL and LOCNESS data, comparisons between students, and comparisons at the individual level to show a student's development over time. The results revealed a discrepancy between the quantitative and qualitative analysis. RAD1220, who had the least nativelike quantitative distribution at yr1t1a, produced a well-written, almost error-free text. RAD1253's yr1t1a text was more nativelike in terms of quantity than RAD1220's, but the qualitative analysis showed that this text contained more grammatical errors and was less coherent. The qualitative analysis furthermore revealed that RAD1220 and RAD1270 were comparable to native writers by year two in terms of personal pronoun use, whereas the other three students only reached that level by the final year of their BA degree course. The pedagogical implications of this research are therefore that first-year writing classes should pay more attention to the explanation of academic register and the appropriate use of personal pronouns. Once the

students' texts are free of personal pronouns, their distribution of determiners and nouns comes to resemble native academic writing.

In general, the students became more nativelike over the three-year period and started to produce longer sentences, although individual development varied to a large extent. As mentioned earlier, some students proved to develop at a faster rate than others. This means that it is not right and in fact impossible to make generalising statements when reporting data from one or more cohorts, because every student has a unique developmental trajectory.

The results from this study failed to show an unambiguous correspondence between the students' grammatical competency and the nativelikeness of their determiner-noun use. For two students the hypothesis appeared to hold: RAD1220 and RAD1277 were considered most grammatically competent and produced texts that were nativelike in terms of quality and quantity of determiner-noun pairs. For other students, such as RAD1280, there was no such relation between grammatical competency and determiner-noun use. RAD1280 performed poorly on the measures for grammatical competency, but this was not reflected in the student's writing. More detailed research of within-subject development is required in order to explain the differences between the students' different rates of development.

References

- Aarts, F., & Wekker, H. (1993). *A contrastive grammar of English and Dutch: Contrastieve grammatica Engels/Nederlands*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Nijhoff.
- Ammon, U., & McConnell, G. (2002). *English as an academic language in Europe*. Frankfurt, Germany: Peter Lang.
- De Bot, K., Lowie, W., & Verspoor, M. (2007). A Dynamic Systems Theory approach to second language acquisition. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 10(1), 7-21.
- De Haan, P. (1994). Noun phrase structure as an indication of text variety. *Anglistik & Englischunterricht*, 49, 85-106.
- De Haan, P. (2015). Nouns and noun phrases in advanced Dutch EFL writing: From quantitative to qualitative longitudinal data analysis. In Castello, E., Ackerley, K., & Coccetta F. (Eds.), *Studies in learner corpus linguistics: Research and applications for foreign language teaching and assessment* (pp. 127-142). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- De Haan, P. (2016). Verbs and verb phrases in advanced Dutch EFL writing: Case studies in quantitative and qualitative EFL analysis. In López-Couso, M., Méndez-Naya, B., Núñez-Pertejo, P., & Palacios-Martínez, I. (Eds.), *Corpus linguistics on the move: Exploring and Understanding English through corpora* (pp.87-105). Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill-Rodopi.
- De Haan, P., & Van der Haagen, M. (2012). Modification of adjectives in very advanced Dutch EFL writing: A development study. *The European Journal of Applied Linguistics and EFL*, 1(1), 129 – 142.
- De Haan, P., & Van der Haagen, M. (2013a). Assessing the use of sophisticated EFL writing: A longitudinal study. *Dutch Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 2, 16-27.
- De Haan, P., & Van der Haagen, M. (2013b). The search for sophisticated language in advanced EFL writing: A longitudinal study. In Granger, S., Gilquin, G., & Meunier, F. (Eds.), *Twenty years of Learner Corpus Research: Looking back, Moving ahead* (pp. 103-116). Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium: Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- De Haan, P., & Van der Haagen, M. (2014). A longitudinal study of the syntactic development of very advanced Dutch EFL writing. In Vandelanotte, L., Davidse, K., Gentens, C., & Kimps, D. (Eds.), *Recent advances in corpus linguistics: Developing and exploiting corpora* (pp. 335-349). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Rodopi.
- De Haan, P., & Van Esch, K. (2005). The development of writing in English and Spanish as foreign languages. *Assessing Writing*, 10, 100-116.

- Dörnyei, Z., & Ryan, S. (2015). *The psychology of the language learner revisited*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Drew, I., Oostdam, R., & Van Toorenburg, H. (2007). Teachers' experiences and perceptions of primary EFL in Norway and the Netherlands: A comparative study. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(3), 319-341.
- Education First. (2017). *EF English Proficiency Index (6th edition)*. Retrieved June 4, 2017, from <http://www.ef.nl/epi/>
- Edwards, A. (2016). *English in the Netherlands: Functions, forms and attitudes*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Fontein, P., Prüfer, P., De Vos, K., & Vloet, A. (2016). *IPTO: bevoegdheden en vakken in het vo*. Tilburg, The Netherlands: CentERdata.
- Granger, S. (2015). Contrastive interlanguage analysis: A reappraisal. *International Journal of Learner Corpus Research*, 1(1), 7-24.
- Granger, S., Gilquin, G., & Meunier, F. (Eds.). (2015). *The Cambridge handbook of learner corpus research*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.
- Grant, L., & Ginther, A. (2000). Using computer-tagged linguistic features to describe L2 writing differences. *Journal of second language writing*, 9(2), 123-145.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge UP.
- Kwakernaak, E. (2011). Drie vernieuwingsgolven in het vreemdetalenonderwijs. *Levende Talen Magazine*, 7, 18-22. Retrieved June 4, 2017 from <http://www.lt-tijdschriften.nl/ojs/index.php/ltm/article/viewFile/51/51>
- Meunier, F. (2015). *Introduction to the LONGDALE project*. In Castello, E., Ackerley, K., & Coccetta F. (Eds.), *Studies in learner corpus linguistics: Research and applications for foreign language teaching and assessment* (pp. 123-126). Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Ortega, L. (2003). Syntactic complexity measures and their relationship to L2 proficiency: A research synthesis of college-level L2 writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 24(4), 492-518.
- Overzicht aantal uren onderwijstijd*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 25, 2017, from <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/schooltijden-en-onderwijstijd/inhoud/overzicht-aantal-uren-onderwijstijd>
- McArthur, T. (1993). The study of English and the defence of Dutch. *English Today*, 9(3), 31-33.

- Santorini, B. (1990). *Part-of-speech tagging guidelines for the Penn Treebank project (3rd revision)* (University of Pennsylvania Department of Computer and Information Science Technical Report No. MS-CIS-90-47). Philadelphia, PA: ScholarlyCommons.
- Schoonen, R., Van Gelderen, A., Stoel, R., Hulstijn, J., De Glopper, K. (2010). Modeling the development of L1 and EFL writing proficiency of secondary school students. *Language Learning*, 61(1), 31-79.
- Scott, M. (2008). Developing Wordsmith. *International Journal of English Studies*, 8(1), 95-106.
- Scott, M. (2017). WordSmith Tools version 7. Stroud: Lexical Analysis Software.
- Stanford log-linear part-of-speech tagger*. (n.d.) Retrieved May 3, 2017, from <https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/tagger.shtml>
- Van de Velde, F. (2010). The emergence of the determiner in the Dutch NP. *Linguistics*, 48(2), 263-299.
- Van Vuuren, S. (2017). *Traces of Transfer? Pragmatic development in the use of initial adverbials in the interlanguage of advanced Dutch learners of English*. Utrecht, The Netherlands: LOT.

RAD1210

There_EX you_PRP are_VBP ._. You_PRP have_VBP made_VBN the_DT transition_NN from_IN elementary_JJ school_NN to_TO university_NN ._. There_EX really_RB is_VBZ no_DT way_NN around_IN it_PRP ,_, you_PRP now_RB are_VBP a_DT member_NN of_IN the_DT intellectual_JJ elite_NN of_IN your_PRP\$ country_NN ,_, and_CC that_IN position_NN is_VBZ a_DT small_JJ burden_NN to_TO bear_VB ._. Not_RB just_RB because_IN you_PRP are_VBP expected_VBN to_TO perform_VB exceptionally_RB well_RB at_IN your_PRP\$ specific_JJ subject_NN of_IN study_NN ,_, you_PRP are_VBP also_RB obliged_VBN to_TO reach_VB that_DT high_JJ level_NN of_IN success_NN on_IN your_PRP\$ own_JJ ._. It_PRP is_VBZ understandable_JJ that_IN such_PDT a_DT task_NN ahead_RB may_MD cause_VB some_DT stress_NN and_CC perhaps_RB even_RB panic_VB among_IN freshmen_NNS ._. Luckily_RB ,_, there_EX are_VBP a_DT few_JJ basic_JJ steps_NNS every_DT new_JJ student_NN can_MD take_VB in_RP order_NN to_TO enlarge_VB the_DT chance_NN of_IN succeeding_VBG ._. This_DT short_JJ essay_NN argues_VBZ three_CD of_IN these_DT steps_NNS ,_, hoping_VBG to_TO provide_VB some_DT comfort_NN to_TO those_DT in_IN need_NN of_IN guidance_NN ._. Although_IN elementary_JJ school_NN probably_RB gave_VBD you_PRP the_DT opportunity_NN to_TO lay_VB back_RB once_RB a_DT while_NN ,_, university_NN really_RB does_VBZ not_RB have_VB any_DT room_NN for_IN that_DT behaviour_NN anymore_RB ._. Before_IN you_PRP were_VBD a_DT member_NN of_IN a_DT group_NN ,_, you_PRP were_VBD pretty_RB much_JJ always_RB told_VBD what_WP to_TO do_VB ._. Perhaps_RB one_CD of_IN the_DT most_RBS important_JJ things_NNS to_TO remember_VB is_VBZ that_IN in_IN university_NN you_PRP are_VBP in_IN fact_NN an_DT individual_NN ._. That_DT means_VBZ that_IN you_PRP yourself_PRP are_VBP responsible_JJ for_IN the_DT success_NN you_PRP have_VBP within_IN your_PRP\$ study_NN ._. You_PRP can_MD contact_VB lecturers_NNS or_CC other_JJ members_NNS of_IN the_DT staff_NN to_TO ensure_VB you_PRP always_RB know_VBP what_WP is_VBZ going_VBG on_RP ,_, what_WP needs_VBZ to_TO be_VB handed_VBN in_IN and_CC what_WP is_VBZ expected_VBN of_IN you_PRP ._. Do_VB not_RB wait_VB around_IN passively_RB for_IN things_NNS to_TO come_VB your_PRP\$ way_NN ,_, take_VB matters_NNS into_IN your_PRP\$ own_JJ hands_NNS and_CC you_PRP will_MD find_VB things_NNS will_MD go_VB much_JJ smoother_JJR ._. Studying_VBG in_IN your_PRP\$ spare_JJ time_NN is_VBZ of_IN the_DT utmost_NN importance_NN ._.

Do_VB not_RB forget_VB though_RB ,_, relaxation_NN is_VBZ also_RB a_DT big_JJ part_NN of_IN your_PRP\$ everyday_JJ life_NN ._. Try_VB to_TO cooperate_VB some_DT spare_JJ time_NN into_IN your_PRP\$ planning_NN ._. Provide_VB yourself_PRP with_IN stress-free_JJ periods_NNS ._. Plan_NN to_TO have_VB a_DT relaxing_NN warm_JJ bath_NN every_DT Friday_NNP ,_, get_VB yourself_PRP a_DT new_JJ magazine_NN every_DT Thursday_NNP and_CC promise_VBP yourself_PRP Sunday_NNP morning_NN is_VBZ to_TO be_VB spend_VB with_IN friends_NNS ._. This_DT way_NN you_PRP will_MD ensure_VB you_PRP are_VBP not_RB overworking_VBG yourself_PRP ,_, you_PRP will_MD be_VB able_JJ to_TO keep_VB up_RP a_DT steady_JJ pace_NN of_IN studying_VBG for_IN a_DT longer_JJR period_NN of_IN time_NN ._. If_IN you_PRP neglect_NN spare_JJ time_NN ,_, you_PRP may_MD find_VB yourself_PRP used_VBN up_RP before_IN your_PRP\$ freshmen_NNS year_NN has_VBZ even_RB started_VBN ._. In_IN extend_VB to_TO the_DT first_JJ tip_NN about_IN active_JJ participation_NN ;_: there_EX is_VBZ another_DT tip_NN to_TO keep_VB in_IN mind_NN ._. Do_VB never_RB procrastinate_VBP ._. It_PRP is_VBZ as_IN simple_JJ as_IN that_DT ._. If_IN you_PRP have_VBP the_DT time_NN to_TO get_VB some_DT work_NN done_VBN ,_, do_VBP get_VB some_DT work_NN done_VBN ,_, do_VBP not_RB indulge_VB yourself_PRP in_IN useless_JJ activities_NNS with_IN the_DT excuse_NN that_IN you_PRP have_VBP some_DT time_NN to_TO do_VB things_NNS later_RB ._. Procrastination_NN will_MD in_IN the_DT end_NN always_RB bring_VBP forth_RB more_RBR stress_NN and_CC more_JJR negative_JJ energy_NN ._. Again_RB ,_, take_VB matters_NNS into_IN your_PRP\$ own_JJ hands_NNS ,_, and_CC use_VB time_NN wisely_RB ._. The_DT transition_NN from_IN elementary_JJ school_NN to_TO university_NN is_VBZ a_DT huge_JJ one_CD ,_, frightening_JJ maybe_RB ._. Keep_VB in_IN mind_NN that_WDT millions_NNS of_IN students_NNS before_IN you_PRP have_VBP done_VBN ,_, why_WRB could_MD not_RB you_PRP do_VBP it_PRP too_RB ?_. Keep_VB these_DT basic_JJ steps_NNS in_IN the_DT back_NN of_IN your_PRP\$ head_NN ;_: do_VB not_RB procrastinate_VB ,_, plan_VBP yourself_PRP some_DT spare_JJ time_NN and_CC most_JJS of_IN all_DT ,_, take_VB matters_NNS into_IN your_PRP\$ own_JJ hands_NNS ._. Those_DT steps_NNS combined_VBN with_IN a_DT healthy_JJ dose_NN of_IN curiosity_NN ,_, intelligence_NN and_CC motivation_NN will_MD get_VB you_PRP towards_IN a_DT successful_JJ study_NN ._.

RAD1220

University_NNP differs_VBZ a_DT lot_NN from_IN secondary_JJ school_NN and_CC because_IN of_IN that_IN it_PRP needs_VBZ a_DT whole_JJ new_JJ approach_NN on_IN how_WRB to_TO handle_VB with_IN schoolwork_NN ._. Homework_NN at_IN university_NN is_VBZ not_RB something_NN you_PRP should_MD take_VB lightly_RB ,_, but_CC not_RB to_TO worry_VB ._. Just_RB follow_VB these_DT steps_NNS and_CC you_PRP will_MD be_VB successful_JJ in_IN your_PRP\$ first_JJ year_NN ._. The_DT first_JJ thing_NN you_PRP have_VBP to_TO make_VB sure_JJ is_VBZ that_IN you_PRP are_VBP thoroughly_RB organised_VBN ._. This_DT means_VBZ you_PRP need_VBP to_TO get_VB a_DT diary_NN and_CC use_VB it_PRP properly_RB ._. Write_VB down_RP every_DT single_JJ course_NN you_PRP take_VBP ._. If_IN you_PRP are_VBP not_RB fond_JJ of_IN paper_NN diaries_NNS ,_, use_VB your_PRP\$ phone_NN to_TO help_VB remind_VB you_PRP of_IN your_PRP\$ courses_NNS ._. By_IN doing_VBG this_DT you_PRP will_MD never_RB miss_VB a_DT class_NN ._. The_DT workload_NN at_IN university_NN will_MD be_VB a_DT lot_NN more_JJR than_IN you_PRP were_VBD used_VBN to_TO in_IN secondary_JJ school_NN ._. In_IN order_NN to_TO not_RB succumb_VB under_IN this_DT ,_, and_CC to_TO not_RB get_VB a_DT nervous_JJ breakdown_NN because_IN of_IN it_PRP ,_, you_PRP need_VBP to_TO carefully_RB plan_VB everything_NN ._. Do_VB not_RB do_VB everything_NN at_IN once_RB but_CC spread_VB your_PRP\$ workload_NN over_IN the_DT entire_JJ week_NN ,_, and_CC alternate_JJ reading_NN with_IN making_VBG exercises_NNS ._. Your_PRP\$ brain_NN needs_VBZ some_DT time_NN to_TO rest_NN ,_, too_RB ,_, every_DT now_RB and_CC then_RB ._. So_RB make_VB sure_JJ you_PRP schedule_VBP some_DT breaks_NNS during_IN your_PRP\$ homework_NN as_RB well_RB ._. Attendance_NN is_VBZ very_RB important_JJ at_IN university_NN ._. Every_DT lecture_NN is_VBZ crucial_JJ and_CC you_PRP can_MD not_RB afford_VB to_TO miss_VB more_JJR than_IN one_CD or_CC two_CD lectures_VBZ during_IN one_CD period_NN ._. Just_RB being_VBG there_EX is_VBZ not_RB going_VBG to_TO get_VB you_PRP a_DT good_JJ grade_NN either_CC ,_, you_PRP need_VBP to_TO be_VB active_JJ in_IN class_NN and_CC come_VB well_RB prepared_VBN ._. It_PRP is_VBZ no_DT use_NN coming_VBG to_TO class_NN when_WRB you_PRP did_VBD not_RB read_VB the_DT texts_NNS ,_, did_VBD not_RB do_VB your_PRP\$ homework_NN or_CC even_RB did_VBD not_RB bring_VB the_DT right_JJ books_NNS with_IN you_PRP ._. Preparation_NN and_CC active_JJ participation_NN in_IN class_NN is_VBZ key_JJ ._.

Your_PRP\$ fellow_JJ students_NNS go_VBP through_IN the_DT same_JJ things_NNS as_IN you_PRP do_VBP and_CC it_PRP can_MD be_VB very_RB useful_JJ to_TO work_VB together_RB ._. You_PRP can_MD help_VB each_DT other_JJ with_IN exercises_NNS or_CC difficult_JJ texts_NNS ._. If_IN there_EX is_VBZ something_NN that_IN you_PRP could_MD not_RB get_VB your_PRP\$ head_NN around_IN ,_, they_PRP can_MD help_VB you_PRP ._. It_PRP is_VBZ also_RB a_DT lot_NN more_JJR fun_NN to_TO work_VB together_RB on_IN an_DT exercise_NN ,_, but_CC do_VBP make_VB sure_JJ it_PRP is_VBZ not_RB all_DT fun_NN and_CC games_NNS and_CC that_IN you_PRP get_VBP some_DT actual_JJ work_NN done_VBN ._. At_IN first_RB ,_, university_NN is_VBZ very_RB scary_JJ ,_, but_CC it_PRP all_PDT a_DT matter_NN of_IN getting_VBG used_VBN to_TO the_DT new_JJ regime_NN ._. It_PRP is_VBZ all_DT up_IN to_TO yourself_PRP if_IN you_PRP want_VBP to_TO be_VB successful_JJ at_IN university_NN ,_, but_CC if_IN you_PRP enjoy_VBP it_PRP ,_, it_PRP will_MD not_RB be_VB a_DT problem_NN to_TO be_VB successful_JJ ._.

RAD1253

When_WRB going_VBG to_TO college_NN there_EX is_VBZ one_CD thing_NN all_DT students_NNS want_VBP ,_, which_WDT is_VBZ to_TO graduate_VB ._. Though_IN not_RB all_DT students_NNS will_MD be_VB able_JJ to_TO graduate_VB ;_: might_MD be_VB because_IN they_PRP have_VBP a_DT lack_NN of_IN discipline_NN ,_, might_MD be_VB because_IN the_DT level_NN of_IN education_NN is_VBZ simply_RB too_RB high_JJ ._. In_IN most_JJS cases_NNS the_DT student_NN can_MD determine_VB whether_IN or_CC not_RB he_PRP or_CC she_PRP will_MD graduate_VB ._. To_TO become_VB a_DT successful_JJ student_NN you_PRP have_VBP to_TO take_VB certain_JJ steps_NNS that_WDT will_MD lead_VB them_PRP to_TO their_PRP\$ goal_NN of_IN graduating_VBG college_NN ._. The_DT first_JJ step_NN a_DT student_NN could_MD take_VB is_VBZ to_TO come_VB to_TO all_DT of_IN their_PRP\$ classes_NNS ._. Students_NNS have_VBP to_TO come_VB to_TO class_NN for_IN multiple_JJ reasons_NNS ._. The_DT first_JJ of_IN all_DT is_VBZ that_IN you_PRP have_VBP to_TO have_VB an_DT minimum_NN attendance_NN of_IN eighty_CD per_IN cent_NN ._. When_WRB students_NNS are_VBP less_FW attendant_JJ than_IN eight_CD per_IN cent_NN ,_, but_CC more_JJR than_IN fifty_CD per_IN cent_NN ,_, the_DT student_NN is_VBZ not_RB allowed_VBN to_TO have_VB a_DT second_JJ chance_NN of_IN doing_VBG the_DT examination_NN ._. When_WRB attendant_JJ less_JJR than_IN

fifty_CD per_IN cent_NN ,_, the_DT student_NN is_VBZ not_RB allowed_VBN to_TO do_VB the_DT examination_NN ._. Another_DT reason_NN is_VBZ that_IN in_IN class_NN the_DT teachers_NNS explain_VBP and_CC give_VBP more_JJR detailed_JJ information_NN about_IN what_WP is_VBZ in_IN the_DT books_NNS ._. This_DT is_VBZ even_RB more_RBR important_JJ for_IN students_NNS who_WP are_VBP n't_RB that_DT good_JJ in_IN studying_VBG individually_RB and_CC for_IN students_NNS who_WP do_VBP not_RB really_RB understand_VB all_DT aspects_NNS of_IN the_DT subjects_NNS in_IN their_PRP\$ books_NNS ._. Students_NNS that_WDT do_VBP not_RB understand_VB the_DT topics_NNS of_IN their_PRP\$ classes_NNS will_MD not_RB be_VB able_JJ to_TO pass_VB their_PRP\$ exams_NNS ._. The_DT second_JJ step_NN is_VBZ to_TO know_VB and_CC understand_VB the_DT course_NN material_NN ._. It_PRP is_VBZ not_RB possible_JJ to_TO pass_VB an_DT exam_NN without_IN even_RB knowing_VBG anything_NN about_IN the_DT subject_NN ._. Therefor_RB it_PRP is_VBZ really_RB important_JJ to_TO understand_VB the_DT information_NN ._. Read_VB the_DT information_NN multiple_JJ times_NNS and_CC summarize_VB the_DT text_NN ,_, know_VBP what_WP is_VBZ important_JJ and_CC know_VB what_WP is_VBZ not_RB ._. The_DT more_JJR a_DT student_NN tries_VBZ to_TO understand_VB what_WP is_VBZ really_RB meant_VBN in_IN the_DT text_NN the_DT easier_JJR that_IN student_NN gets_VBZ a_DT high_JJ grade_NN ._. The_DT third_JJ step_NN a_DT student_NN should_MD take_VB is_VBZ to_TO simply_RB do_VB their_PRP\$ assignments_NNS ._. Again_RB there_EX are_VBP more_RBR reasons_NNS why_WRB a_DT student_NN should_MD make_VB their_PRP\$ assignments_NNS ._. To_TO start_VB with_IN the_DT reason_NN that_IN an_DT assignment_NN shows_VBZ whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT course_NN material_NN has_VBZ been_VBN understood_VBN ._. And_CC when_WRB it_PRP has_VBZ not_RB been_VBN understood_VBN a_DT student_NN should_MD repeat_VB the_DT information_NN until_IN understood_VBN ._. Another_DT reason_NN is_VBZ that_IN repetition_NN helps_VBZ to_TO take_VB all_PDT the_DT information_NN to_TO you_PRP ._. Assignments_NNS are_VBP important_JJ preparations_NNS for_IN the_DT exams_NNS ,_, they_PRP give_VBP you_PRP an_DT example_NN of_IN what_WP to_TO expect_VB at_IN least_JJS in_IN an_DT exam_NN ._. So_RB in_IN order_NN for_IN a_DT student_NN to_TO graduate_VB from_IN college_NN the_DT student_NN has_VBZ to_TO take_VB the_DT following_VBG steps_NNS ;_: come_VBN to_TO the_DT classes_NNS so_IN the_DT student_NN is_VBZ allowed_VBN to_TO take_VB the_DT exams_NNS and_CC gets_VBZ more_RBR

detailed_JJ information_NN and_CC better_JJR explanation_NN about_IN the_DT course_NN material_NN ,_, understand_VB and_CC know_VB the_DT information_NN in_IN order_NN to_TO pass_VB the_DT exams_NNS and_CC make_VB the_DT exercises_NNS to_TO know_VB whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT information_NN has_VBZ been_VBN understood_VBN and_CC to_TO give_VB an_DT example_NN of_IN what_WP could_MD be_VB in_IN an_DT exam_NN ._.

RAD1277

Being_VBG a_DT first-year_JJ student_NN myself_PRP ,_, I_PRP know_VBP the_DT first_JJ weeks_NNS in_IN college_NN can_MD be_VB difficult_JJ ._. Everything_NN on_IN campus_NN is_VBZ new_JJ to_TO you_PRP :_: the_DT fellow_JJ students_NNS ,_, professors_NNS ,_, grand_JJ lecture-rooms_NNS ,_, and_CC let_VB 's_PRP not_RB forget_VB the_DT vast_JJ amount_NN of_IN assignments_NNS for_IN every_DT class_NN ._. On_IN top_NN of_IN that_DT ,_, you_PRP need_VBP to_TO start_VB doing_VBG your_PRP\$ own_JJ grocery_NN shopping_NN ,_, laundry_NN ,_, dishes_NNS ,_, and_CC unfortunately_RB ,_, your_PRP\$ room_NN is_VBZ not_RB going_VBG to_TO tidy_VB itself_PRP ._. At_IN first_RB ,_, this_DT whole_JJ new_JJ life_NN can_MD be_VB tricky_JJ ._. Do_VB not_RB worry_VB ,_, though_RB ,_, my_PRP\$ dear_RB freshmen_NNS ,_, because_IN first-year_JJ students_NNS can_MD take_VB specific_JJ steps_NNS to_TO make_VB sure_JJ that_IN they_PRP are_VBP successful_JJ in_IN college_NN ._. First_NNP of_IN all_DT ,_, I_PRP would_MD like_VB to_TO emphasise_VB the_DT importance_NN of_IN lecture-attendance_NN ._. How_WRB do_VBP you_PRP expect_VB to_TO pass_VB those_DT tests_NNS when_WRB you_PRP have_VBP not_RB been_VBN to_TO one_CD single_JJ lecture_NN ?_. You_PRP may_MD have_VB excelled_VBN in_IN English_NNP at_IN secondary_JJ school_NN ,_, but_CC university_NN standards_NNS are_VBP much_RB higher_JJR ._. So_RB please_VB ,_, do_VB yourself_PRP a_DT favour_NN and_CC listen_VB attentively_RB to_TO what_WP your_PRP\$ professors_NNS have_VBP to_TO say_VB ._. Secondly_RB ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ not_RB a_DT bad_JJ idea_NN to_TO complete_VB the_DT assignments_NNS you_PRP are_VBP given_VBN ,_, for_IN they_PRP often_RB contain_VBP a_DT hint_NN of_IN test_NN subject-matter_NN ._. By_IN doing_VBG these_DT exercises_NNS ,_, you_PRP will_MD get_VB acquainted_VBN with_IN the_DT peculiarities_NNS of_IN the_DT subject_NN in_IN question_NN ._. This_DT will_MD save_VB you_PRP time_NN when_WRB in_IN the_DT process_NN of_IN cramming_VBG all_PDT the_DT need-to-

know_JJ information_NN inside_IN your_PRP\$ head_NN ,_, a_DT phenomenon_NN also_RB known_VBN as_IN studying_VBG ._. In_IN the_DT third_JJ place_NN ,_, I_PRP would_MD like_VB to_TO warn_VB you_PRP against_IN the_DT consequences_NNS of_IN the_DT adage_NN ` `` Work_NN hard_RB ,_, play_VBP harder_JJR ' " ._. Although_IN partying_VBG is_VBZ a_DT lot_NN of_IN fun_NN ,_, and_CC definitely_RB part_NN of_IN the_DT university_NN life_NN experience_NN ,_, the_DT study_NN load_NN should_MD not_RB be_VB underestimated_VBN ._. To_TO go_VB out_RP the_DT night_NN before_IN an_DT important_JJ exam_NN is_VBZ never_RB a_DT wise_JJ decision_NN ,_, keep_VB that_DT in_IN mind_NN ._. In_IN conclusion_NN ,_, go_VB to_TO class_NN ,_, finish_VB your_PRP\$ assignments_NNS and_CC pass_VB the_DT tests_NNS by_IN studying_VBG diligently_RB ._. That_DT way_NN ,_, you_PRP will_MD make_VB your_PRP\$ mother_NN proud_NN of_IN you_PRP ,_, and_CC you_PRP wo_MD n't_RB have_VB to_TO take_VB the_DT resits_NNS ,_, which_WDT saves_VBZ you_PRP a_DT lot_NN of_IN time_NN ._. Congratulations_NNS ,_, you_PRP have_VBP just_RB killed_VBN two_CD birds_NNS with_IN one_CD stone_NN ._.

RAD1280

The_DT first_JJ year_NN of_IN going_VBG to_TO university_NN is_VBZ a_DT fun_NN and_CC most_JJS of_IN all_DT scary_JJ year_NN ._. All_PDT these_DT new_JJ impressions_NNS ,_, new_JJ friends_NNS ,_, new_JJ courses_NNS and_CC new_JJ teachers_NNS may_MD look_VB scary_JJ but_CC actually_RB they_PRP are_VBP not_RB that_IN bad_JJ ._. In_IN fact_NN ,_, making_VBG a_DT fresh_JJ start_NN is_VBZ an_DT opportunity_NN that_WDT must_MD be_VB taken_VBN seriously_RB ._. In_IN the_DT end_NN ,_, everybody_NN is_VBZ there_RB to_TO help_VB one_CD another_DT ._. However_RB ,_, if_IN you_PRP are_VBP truly_RB terrified_VBN by_IN the_DT idea_NN of_IN your_PRP\$ first_JJ year_NN in_IN university_NN ,_, there_EX are_VBP some_DT few_JJ basic_JJ steps_NNS to_TO make_VB even_RB your_PRP\$ -LRB- -LRB- worst_JJS imaginable_JJ -RRB- -RRB- year_NN to_TO a_DT successful_JJ one_CD ._. Firstly_RB ,_, remember_VBP that_IN this_DT is_VBZ the_DT first_JJ year_NN of_IN all_DT of_IN your_PRP\$ classmates_NNS ._. Everybody_NN is_VBZ nervous_JJ about_IN making_VBG new_JJ friends_NNS and_CC hoping_VBG for_IN acceptance_NN within_IN the_DT class_NN ._. Be_VB aware_JJ of_IN your_PRP\$ classmates_NNS and_CC find_VB topics_NNS which_WDT relates_VBZ to_TO other_JJ classmates_NNS ._. This_DT will_MD help_VB you_PRP to_TO find_VB a_DT way_NN to_TO start_VB a_DT

conversation_NN ._. For_IN example_NN ,_, since_IN this_DT is_VBZ all_DT your_PRP\$ first_JJ year_NN ,_, you_PRP could_MD talk_VB about_IN the_DT expectations_NNS of_IN the_DT courses_NNS you_PRP will_MD be_VB attending_VBG together_RB ._. Having_VBG friends_NNS within_IN your_PRP\$ class_NN is_VBZ one_CD of_IN the_DT keys_NNS in_IN making_VBG your_PRP\$ year_NN successful_JJ ._. Students_NNS can_MD help_VB each_DT other_JJ when_WRB they_PRP are_VBP facing_VBG problems_NNS ,_, this_DT will_MD make_VB your_PRP\$ year_NN much_RB easier_JJR ._. Secondly_RB ,_, the_DT courses_NNS that_IN you_PRP will_MD be_VB attending_VBG ,_, are_VBP all_DT very_RB interesting_JJ ._. Think_VB about_IN those_DT courses_NNS in_IN a_DT positive_JJ way_NN and_CC make_VB sure_JJ that_IN you_PRP come_VBP well-prepared_JJ to_TO the_DT course_NN ._. Finish_VB your_PRP\$ homework_NN in_IN time_NN and_CC be_VB active_JJ when_WRB you_PRP are_VBP discussing_VBG homework_NN ._. You_PRP should_MD have_VB the_DT right_JJ books_NNS and_CC bring_VB them_PRP to_TO class_NN if_IN necessary_JJ ._. You_PRP are_VBP not_RB taking_VBG this_DT course_NN nor_CC the_DT teacher_NN seriously_RB when_WRB you_PRP come_VBP to_TO class_NN unprepared_JJ ._. Studying_VBG the_DT chapters_NNS and_CC making_VBG your_PRP\$ homework_NN makes_VBZ you_PRP understand_VBP the_DT courses_NNS better_JJR and_CC it_PRP will_MD improve_VB your_PRP\$ skills_NNS ._. Even_RB when_WRB you_PRP already_RB know_VBP something_NN ,_, more_JJR practice_NN will_MD only_RB make_VB you_PRP better_RBR ._. Thirdly_RB ,_, you_PRP have_VBP chosen_VBN to_TO attend_VB this_DT course_NN ._. In_IN a_DT way_NN you_PRP are_VBP saying_VBG that_IN this_DT is_VBZ where_WRB your_PRP\$ interest_NN is_VBZ in_IN ._. Normally_RB ,_, you_PRP should_MD be_VB interested_JJ in_IN most_JJS of_IN the_DT subjects_NNS you_PRP will_MD be_VB following_VBG and_CC if_IN this_DT is_VBZ not_RB the_DT case_NN you_PRP should_MD ask_VB yourself_PRP whether_IN you_PRP have_VBP chosen_VBN the_DT right_JJ educational_JJ programme_NN ._. When_WRB you_PRP find_VBP you_PRP are_VBP in_IN the_DT wrong_JJ courses_NNS ,_, please_VB contact_VB your_PRP\$ study_NN advisor_NN and_CC discuss_VB with_IN him_PRP what_WP the_DT possibilities_NNS are_VBP ._. There_EX are_VBP a_DT lot_NN of_IN ways_NNS to_TO come_VB to_TO a_DT solution_NN ,_, when_WRB you_PRP just_RB tell_VBP people_NNS what_WP is_VBZ on_IN your_PRP\$ mind_NN ._. To_TO sum_VB up_RP ,_, there_EX are_VBP three_CD key_JJ elements_NNS in_IN making_VBG your_PRP\$ year_NN successful_JJ ._. Stick_NNP to_TO the_DT points_NNS

above_IN and_CC as_IN one_NN might_MD expect_VB ,_, your_PRP\$ first_JJ year_NN
will_MD be_VB very_RB successful_JJ one_CD ._.

RAD1210

Geoffrey_NNP Chaucer_NNP is_VBZ perhaps_RB the_DT most_RBS famous_JJ Middle_NN English_NNP writer_NN we_PRP know_VBP ._. His_PRP\$ Canterbury_NNP Tales_NNS are_VBP still_RB an_DT academic_JJ source_NN of_IN information_NN about_IN Middle_NNP English_NNP and_CC about_IN Britain_NNP in_IN and_CC around_IN the_DT middle_JJ ages_NNS ._. Some_DT of_IN his_PRP\$ tales_NNS give_VBP the_DT people_NNS reason_NN for_IN discussion_NN ,_, one_CD of_IN those_DT is_VBZ The_DT Wife_NN of_IN Bath_NN ._. This_DT particular_JJ tale_NN tells_VBZ the_DT story_NN of_IN a_DT knight_NN of_IN the_DT round_NN table_NN ._. He_PRP rapes_VBZ a_DT young_JJ girl_NN in_IN field_NN of_IN grain_NN and_CC that_DT means_VBZ that_IN he_PRP is_VBZ punishable_JJ by_IN death_NN ._. The_DT king_NN ,_, however_RB ,_, chooses_VBZ to_TO let_VB his_PRP\$ wife_NN ,_, the_DT queen_NN ,_, determine_VB what_WP faith_NN is_VBZ going_VBG to_TO bestow_VB on_IN the_DT knight_NN ._. The_DT queen_NN gives_VBZ him_PRP one_CD year_NN and_CC one_CD day_NN to_TO discover_VB what_WP it_PRP is_VBZ that_IN all_DT women_NNS most_RBS desire_NN ._. If_IN he_PRP fails_VBZ to_TO deliver_VB the_DT answer_NN at_IN the_DT last_JJ day_NN ,_, he_PRP will_MD still_RB be_VB executed_VBN ._. The_DT knight_NN travels_VBZ through_IN the_DT country_NN but_CC he_PRP can_MD not_RB discover_VB the_DT answer_NN since_IN all_DT women_NNS tell_VBP him_PRP something_NN different_JJ ._. On_IN his_PRP\$ way_NN back_RB to_TO the_DT castle_NN ,_, he_PRP runs_VBZ into_IN an_DT old_JJ witch_NN who_WP promises_VBZ him_PRP that_IN she_PRP will_MD safe_JJ him_PRP in_IN exchange_NN for_IN the_DT knight_NN 's_POS promise_NN that_IN he_PRP will_MD do_VB anything_NN she_PRP desires_NNS from_IN him_PRP afterwards_RB ._. It_PRP turns_VBZ out_RP that_IN the_DT old_JJ witch_NN wants_VBZ to_TO marry_VB with_IN the_DT knight_NN and_CC he_PRP has_VBZ got_VBN no_DT other_JJ choice_NN than_IN to_TO comply_VB ._. Upon_IN seeing_VBG his_PRP\$ sorrow_NN ,_, she_PRP presents_VBZ him_PRP with_IN a_DT choice_NN :_: either_CC she_PRP changes_VBZ herself_PRP into_IN a_DT beautiful_JJ ,_, young_JJ wife_NN but_CC she_PRP will_MD be_VB unfaithful_JJ to_TO him_PRP or_CC she_PRP remains_VBZ old_JJ and_CC ugly_JJ and_CC she_PRP will_MD promise_VB him_PRP to_TO be_VB faithful_JJ and_CC obedient_JJ for_IN eternity_NN ._. The_DT knight_NN then_RB lets_VBZ her_PRP

make_VB the_DT decision_NN and_CC she_PRP is_VBZ so_RB pleased_JJ with_IN
 that_IN she_PRP turns_VBZ into_IN a_DT beautiful_JJ young_JJ wife_NN ._. Or_CC at_IN
 least_JJS ,_, that_DT is_VBZ what_WP the_DT story_NN makes_VBZ its_PRP\$
 audience_NN think_VBP initially_RB ._. The_DT witch_NN in_IN The_DT Wife_NN of_IN
 Bath_NN does_VBZ not_RB actually_RB change_VB her_PRP\$ appearance_NN since_IN
 it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT knight_NN who_WP learns_VBZ how_WRB to_TO look_VB at_IN
 her_PRP\$ differently_RB ._. The_DT knight_NN has_VBZ to_TO go_VB through_IN
 three_CD changes_NNS in_IN order_NN to_TO become_VB the_DT pure_JJ of_IN
 heart_NN that_IN the_DT witch_NN wants_VBZ him_PRP to_TO be_VB ._. He_PRP
 first_RB needs_VBZ to_TO change_VB his_PRP\$ understanding_NN of_IN nobility_NN ._.
 The_DT knight_NN is_VBZ a_DT man_NN born_VBN with_IN a_DT title_NN and_CC
 he_PRP therefore_RB thinks_VBZ he_PRP is_VBZ noble_JJ by_IN birth_NN right_NN ._.
 The_DT witch_NN ,_, however_RB ,_, teaches_VBZ him_PRP that_IN nobility_NN is_VBZ
 earned_VBN through_IN behaviour_NN and_CC not_RB through_IN birth_NN right_NN :_:
 ``_`` Thanne_FW comth_FW oure_NN verray_NN gentillesse_NN of_IN grace_NN ;_:
 It_PRP was_VBD no_DT thyng_NN biquethe_NN us_PRP with_IN oure_NN place_NN " " -LRB_-LRB-
 Treharne_NN 773_CD -RRB_-RRB- ._. The_DT knight_NN has_VBZ
 not_RB been_VBN behaving_VBG noble_JJ at_IN all_DT and_CC this_DT is_VBZ
 what_WP makes_VBZ him_PRP think_VB ._. Nobility_NN can_MD be_VB earned_VBN
 with_IN the_DT choices_NNS he_PRP makes_VBZ and_CC how_WRB he_PRP
 treats_VBZ other_JJ human_JJ beings_NNS and_CC from_IN the_DT moment_NN the_DT
 witch_NN tells_VBZ him_PRP this_DT ,_, he_PRP starts_VBZ to_TO transform_VB
 inside_RB ._. The_DT witch_NN has_VBZ found_VBN a_DT second_JJ fault_NN
 within_IN the_DT knight_NN ._. The_DT knight_NN tells_VBZ her_PRP\$:_: ``_``
 Thou_PRP art_NN so_RB loothly_RB ,_, and_CC so_RB oold_JJ also_RB ,_, and_CC
 therto_JJ comen_NN of_IN so_RB lough_JJ a_DT kynde_NN ,_, that_WDT litel_VBP
 wonder_NN is_VBZ thogh_IN I_PRP walwe_VBP and_CC wynde_VBP " " -LRB_-LRB-
 Treharne_NN 772_CD -RRB_-RRB- ._. He_PRP does_VBZ not_RB concern_NN
 himself_PRP lucky_JJ or_CC rich_JJ with_IN the_DT witch_NN as_IN his_PRP\$ wife_NN
 ._. She_PRP then_RB tells_VBZ him_PRP that_IN wealth_NN and_CC richness_NN
 is_VBZ not_RB found_VBN in_IN earthly_JJ possessions_NNS or_CC money_NN ._.
 It_PRP is_VBZ found_VBN in_IN acceptance_NN of_IN what_WP one_PRP has_VBZ :_:
 ``_`` Whoso_NNP that_IN halt_NN hym_NN payd_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ povertie_NN ,_,
 I_PRP holde_VBP hym_NN riche_NN ,_, al_NNP hadde_NNP he_PRP nat_VBD a_DT

sherte_NN " " -LRB-_-LRB- Treharne_NN 774_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. The_DT knight_NN then_RB accepts_VBZ her_PRP words_NNS as_IN the_DT truth_NN and_CC this_DT is_VBZ the_DT second_JJ step_NN in_IN his_PRP\$ inner_JJ transformation_NN ._. The_DT last_JJ and_CC most_RBS important_JJ part_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ transformation_NN can_MD be_VB found_VBN in_IN the_DT way_NN he_PRP treats_VBZ women_NNS ._. He_PRP started_VBD out_RP as_IN a_DT knight_NN who_WP raped_VBD women_NNS ,_, who_WP took_VBD form_NN women_NNS what_WP he_PRP wanted_VBD without_IN any_DT regard_NN for_IN their_PRP\$ feelings_NNS or_CC wishes_NNS ._. The_DT answer_NN to_TO the_DT question_NN was_VBD :_: `` `` Wommen_JJ desiren_NNS have_VBP sovereynetee_NN as_IN wel_NN over_IN hir_NN housbonde_NN as_IN hir_NN love_NN ,_, and_CC for_IN to_TO been_VBN in_IN maistrie_NN hym_NN above_IN " " -LRB-_-LRB- Treharne_NN 771_CD -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC this_DT is_VBZ the_DT most_RBS important_JJ lesson_NN the_DT knight_NN has_VBZ to_TO learn_VB ._. After_IN the_DT witch_NN proposes_VBZ the_DT deal_NN to_TO him_PRP he_PRP answers_VBZ with_IN the_DT following_NN :_: `` `` My_PRP\$ lady_NN and_CC my_PRP\$ love_NN ,_, and_CC wyf_NN so_RB deere_JJ ,_, I_PRP put_VBP me_PRP in_IN youre_NN wise_JJ governance_NN ;_: Cheseth_NNP yourself_PRP which_WDT may_MD be_VB moost_JJ plesance_NN ,_, and_CC moost_NN honour_NN to_TO yow_VB and_CC me_PRP also_RB " " -LRB-_-LRB- Treharne_NN 775_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. He_PRP has_VBZ understood_VBN the_DT lesson_NN the_DT witch_NN was_VBD trying_VBG to_TO teach_VB him_PRP and_CC his_PRP\$ transformation_NN is_VBZ complete_JJ ._. After_IN the_DT knight_NN 's_POS quest_NN for_IN the_DT answer_NN to_TO the_DT queen_NN 's_POS question_NN ,_, it_PRP turns_VBZ out_RP that_IN he_PRP was_VBD being_VBG tested_VBN all_DT along_RB ._. The_DT witch_NN proposed_VBD him_PRP with_IN a_DT choice_NN :_: either_CC she_PRP would_MD change_VB into_IN a_DT beautiful_JJ and_CC unfaithful_JJ wife_NN or_CC she_PRP would_MD remain_VB old_JJ and_CC ugly_JJ and_CC would_MD stay_VB with_IN him_PRP forever_RB ._. The_DT knight_NN then_RB passes_VBZ his_PRP\$ test_NN by_IN letting_VBG her_PRP\$ make_VB the_DT decision_NN :_: he_PRP is_VBZ the_DT one_NN who_WP changed_VBD ,_, not_RB the_DT witch_NN ._. All_PDT the_DT information_NN the_DT witch_NN has_VBZ given_VBN him_PRP has_VBZ opened_VBN his_PRP\$ eyes_NNS and_CC has_VBZ given_VBN him_PRP spiritual_JJ enlightenment_NN ._. The_DT witch_NN never_RB changed_VBD ,_, the_DT

knight_NN is_VBZ just_RB able_JJ to_TO appreciate_VB her_PRP\$ for_IN the_DT beautiful_JJ human_JJ being_VBG that_IN she_PRP is_VBZ . .

RAD1220

It_PRP is_VBZ a_DT known_JJ fact_NN that_IN there_EX are_VBP very_RB few_JJ fabliaux_NN existing_VBG in_IN the_DT Middle_NNP English_NNP language_NN . . Other_JJ than_IN the_DT fabliau_NN Dame_NNP Sirip_NNP and_CC some_DT stories_NNS written_VBN by_IN Chaucer_NNP , , there_EX are_VBP hardly_RB any_DT fabliaux_NN known_VBN to_TO be_VB written_VBN in_IN Middle_NNP English_NNP . . The_DT fabliaux_NN are_VBP a_DT separate_JJ , , though_IN marginalised_VBN genre_NN in_IN literature_NN with_IN some_DT typical_JJ characteristics_NNS . . Often_RB written_VBN in_IN verse_NN , , they_PRP contain_VBP octosyllabic_JJ couplets_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- Burrow_NN 91_CD -RRB-_-RRB- . . Their_PRP\$ scope_NN is_VBZ around_IN fifty_CD to_TO approximately_RB 1,000_CD lines_NNS . . As_IN a_DT theme_NN , , deceit_NN is_VBZ at_IN the_DT fabliau_NN 's_POS core_NN . . Thus_RB , , the_DT fabliaux_NN genre_NN has_VBZ standard_JJ set_VBN character_NN roles_NNS , , namely_RB : : the_DT trickster_NN , , the_DT dupe_NN , , the_DT desirer_NN and_CC the_DT desired_VBN . . These_DT characters_NNS incline_VBP to_TO make_VB lots_NNS of_IN rash_JJ promises_NNS , , which_WDT the_DT trickster_NN dutifully_RB takes_VBZ advantage_NN of_IN . . The_DT trick_NN played_VBN by_IN the_DT trickster_NN plays_VBZ is_VBZ also_RB named_VBN cointise_NN or_CC engin_NN , , terms_NNS that_WDT stem_VBP from_IN the_DT fabliaux_NN 's_POS French_JJ origins_NNS . . The_DT fabliaux_NN feature_NN ordinary_JJ people_NNS , , such_JJ as_IN monks_NNS , , priests_NNS , , clerks_NNS , , merchants_NNS and_CC peasants_NNS . . It_PRP has_VBZ a_DT concrete_JJ setting_NN , , mostly_RB urban_JJ or_CC rural_JJ . . Even_RB though_IN the_DT fabliaux_NN were_VBD popular_JJ in_IN France_NNP , , they_PRP never_RB fully_RB got_VBD through_IN to_TO the_DT English_NNP literary_JJ tradition_NN because_IN of_IN its_PRP\$ French_JJ origin_NN , , and_CC the_DT manuscript_NN culture_NN and_CC oral_JJ traditions_NNS . . The_DT fabliaux_NN are_VBP part_NN of_IN the_DT French_JJ literary_JJ tradition_NN , , and_CC are_VBP thus_RB not_RB inherently_RB English_JJ . . It_PRP is_VBZ a_DT genre_NN that_WDT came_VBD to_TO life_NN in_IN France_NNP in_IN the_DT twelfth_JJ century_NN , , but_CC became_VBD popular_JJ in_IN the_DT thirteenth_JJ century_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 91_CD -RRB-_-RRB- . . Due_JJ to_TO the_DT

fabliaux_NN 's_POS earlier_JJR existence_NN in_IN France_NNP ,_, a_DT lot_NN
 had_VBD already_RB been_VBN written_VBN about_IN when_WRB the_DT
 English_NNP picked_VBD up_RP the_DT genre_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Canby_NN 205_CD -
 RRB-_-RRB- ._. Another_DT reason_NN why_WRB there_EX are_VBP hardly_RB
 any_DT English_JJ fabliaux_NN is_VBZ because_IN when_WRB the_DT tradition_NN
 came_VBD to_TO England_NNP ,_, the_DT popularity_NN of_IN the_DT fabliaux_NN
 had_VBD already_RB greatly_RB diminished_VBN in_IN France_NNP -LRB-_-LRB-
 Lewis_NNP 243_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. They_PRP were_VBD not_RB interesting_JJ
 anymore_RB to_TO the_DT public_JJ and_CC thus_RB the_DT part_NN that_WDT
 fabliaux_NN played_VBD in_IN literature_NN at_IN the_DT time_NN was_VBD
 marginal_JJ ._. In_IN medieval_JJ times_NNS ,_, it_PRP was_VBD not_RB custom_NN
 to_TO document_VB every_DT single_JJ piece_NN of_IN literature_NN that_WDT
 was_VBD made_VBN ._. Consequently_RB ,_, a_DT lot_NN of_IN fabliau_NN
 literature_NN was_VBD not_RB written_VBN down_RP and_CC saved_VBN ,_,
 which_WDT explains_VBZ why_WRB there_EX are_VBP so_RB few_JJ surviving_VBG
 English_JJ fabliaux_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Canby_NN 207_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Unlike_IN
 nowadays_RB ,_, not_RB a_DT lot_NN of_IN people_NNS could_MD read_VB in_IN
 the_DT Middle_NNP Ages_NNPS ._. This_DT sparked_VBD the_DT oral_JJ tradition_NN
 of_IN telling_VBG stories_NNS and_CC rendered_VBD it_PRP unnecessary_JJ to_TO
 write_VB every_DT single_JJ story_NN down_RB ._. The_DT stories_NNS needed_VBN
 to_TO live_VB on_IN through_IN the_DT memories_NNS of_IN the_DT people_NNS ,_,
 instead_RB of_IN on_IN the_DT skin_NN of_IN goat_NN ._. Even_RB if_IN texts_NNS
 were_VBD written_VBN down_RP ,_, it_PRP was_VBD not_RB in_IN Middle_NNP
 English_NNP ._. The_DT people_NNS who_WP made_VBD the_DT manuscripts_NNS
 were_VBD often_RB monks_NNS ._. After_IN the_DT loss_NN of_IN Normandy_NNP ,_,
 French_NNP continued_VBD to_TO be_VB spoken_VBN ,_, especially_RB amongst_IN
 the_DT higher_JJR regions_NNS of_IN society_NN where_WRB French_NNP had_VBD
 taken_VBN over_RP completely_RB as_IN the_DT language_NN of_IN government_NN
 and_CC the_DT genteel_JJ ._. Consequently_RB ,_, the_DT monks_NNS that_WDT
 made_VBD these_DT manuscripts_NNS ,_, would_MD often_RB write_VB them_PRP
 Anglo-Norman_JJ or_CC French_JJ ,_, and_CC not_RB Middle_NN English_JJ -LRB-_-
 LRB- Lewis_NNP 245_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. It_PRP were_VBD the_DT upper_JJ
 classes_NNS that_WDT could_MD read_VB and_CC used_VBD the_DT manuscripts_NNS
 ,_, not_RB the_DT common_JJ folk_NN ._. It_PRP was_VBD no_DT use_NN writing_VBG

stories_NNS down_RB in_IN Middle_NNP English_NNP when_WRB no_DT soul_NN could_MD read_VB these_DT manuscripts_NNS ._. Manuscripts_NNS took_VBD a_DT lot_NN of_IN tedious_JJ work_NN ,_, and_CC too_RB expensive_JJ to_TO waste_NN ._. It_PRP would_MD take_VB until_IN the_DT late_JJ thirteenth_JJ century_NN for_IN the_DT English_JJ people_NNS to_TO start_VB using_VBG English_NNP as_IN their_PRP\$ language_NN of_IN choice_NN in_IN speaking_NN and_CC writing_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 245_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Eventually_RB ,_, Dame_NNP Sirip_NNP would_MD become_VB one_CD of_IN the_DT first_JJ Middle_NN English_NNP fabliaux_NN to_TO be_VB written_VBN down_RP ._. It_PRP is_VBZ safe_JJ to_TO say_VB ,_, that_IN English_NNP writers_NNS never_RB really_RB made_VBD the_DT fabliaux_NN genre_NN their_PRP\$ own_JJ ._. Chaucer_NNP may_MD be_VB an_DT exception_NN to_TO this_DT ,_, though_IN some_DT French_JJ scholars_NNS argue_VBP that_IN even_RB his_PRP\$ work_NN is_VBZ far_RB from_IN original_JJ -LRB-_-LRB- Canby_JJ 208_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. This_DT lack_NN of_IN originality_NN is_VBZ due_JJ to_TO the_DT medieval_JJ mentality_NN of_IN preferring_VBG sentence_NN and_CC solace_NN over_IN originality_NN ._. It_PRP was_VBD frowned_VBN upon_IN to_TO write_VB an_DT original_JJ story_NN ,_, which_WDT can_MD be_VB a_DT reason_NN as_IN to_TO why_WRB there_EX are_VBP hardly_RB any_DT English_JJ fabliaux_NN ._. In_IN conclusion_NN ,_, there_EX are_VBP a_DT few_JJ reasons_NNS why_WRB there_EX are_VBP so_RB few_JJ fabliaux_NN in_IN Middle_NNP English_NNP ._. Due_JJ to_TO its_PRP\$ French_JJ origin_NN and_CC big_JJ French_JJ tradition_NN ,_, there_EX was_VBD a_DT lot_NN of_IN material_NN already_RB available_JJ and_CC England_NNP was_VBD quite_RB late_JJ to_TO the_DT fabliaux_NN craze_NN ._. The_DT fabliaux_NN 's_POS popularity_NN had_VBD diminished_VBN greatly_RB and_CC because_RB of_IN that_DT ,_, writers_NNS were_VBD not_RB sparked_VBN to_TO write_VB them_PRP ._. It_PRP also_RB did_VBD not_RB help_VB that_IN during_IN that_DT time_NN ,_, Middle_NNP English_NNP was_VBD not_RB the_DT language_NN of_IN choice_NN ._. French_NNP was_VBD still_RB used_VBN as_IN a_DT language_NN and_CC thus_RB also_RB in_IN manuscripts_NNS ._. Due_JJ to_TO the_DT amount_NN of_IN tedious_JJ labour_NN that_WDT went_VBD into_IN making_VBG these_DT manuscripts_NNS ,_, and_CC the_DT fact_NN that_IN not_RB a_DT lot_NN of_IN medieval_JJ people_NNS knew_VBD how_WRB to_TO read_VB ,_, not_RB a_DT lot_NN of_IN manuscripts_NNS were_VBD made_VBN ._. It_PRP would_MD take_VB some_DT time_NN for_IN Middle_NNP English_NNP to_TO sink_VB into_IN all_DT

layers_NNS of_IN society_NN ,_, and_CC to_TO finally_RB replace_VB French_JJ as_IN the_DT main_JJ language_NN ._. When_WRB that_DT finally_RB happened_VBN ,_, the_DT fabliaux_NN were_VBD picked_VBN up_RP by_IN Chaucer_NNP ,_, who_WP gave_VBD us_PRP the_DT Canterbury_NNP Tales_NNS ._.

RAD1253

There_EX are_VBP many_JJ questions_NNS raised_VBD about_IN The_DT Wife_NN of_IN Bath_NNP 's_POS Tale_NNP ,_, such_JJ as_IN if_IN the_DT girl_NN he_PRP raped_VBD was_VBD a_DT peasant_NN ?_. Or_CC whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT knight_NN actually_RB belonged_VBD to_TO the_DT knights_NNS of_IN king_NN Arthur_NNP as_IN he_PRP does_VBZ not_RB show_VB a_DT very_RB courtliness_NN behaviour_NN ._. The_DT one_CD of_IN most_JJS controversy_NN would_MD be_VB whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT wife_NN of_IN bath_NN actually_RB undergoes_VBZ a_DT physical_JJ transformation_NN ._. Some_DT say_VBP that_IN she_PRP transforms_VBZ herself_PRP ,_, others_NNS say_VBP that_IN she_PRP puts_VBZ a_DT spell_NN on_IN her_PRP\$ husband_NN so_IN he_PRP perceives_VBZ her_PRP\$ differently_RB ._. But_CC even_RB though_IN many_JJ people_NNS claim_VBP that_IN she_PRP does_VBZ ,_, the_DT old_JJ hag_NN does_VBZ not_RB transform_VB physically_RB in_IN the_DT transformation_NN scene_NN of_IN The_DT Wife_NN of_IN Bath_NNP 's_POS Tale_NNP ,_, because_IN she_PRP breaks_VBZ the_DT spell_NN as_RB soon_RB as_IN he_PRP gives_VBZ her_PRP\$ what_WP she_PRP wants_VBZ and_CC because_IN she_PRP transforms_VBZ the_DT knight_NN by_IN giving_VBG him_PRP a_DT lecture_NN on_IN gentillesse_NN ._. She_PRP breaks_VBZ the_DT spell_NN ,_, when_WRB he_PRP gives_VBZ her_PRP\$ what_WP all_DT women_NNS want_VBP ,_, namely_RB control_NN over_IN their_PRP\$ husbands_NNS ,_, she_PRP rewards_VBZ him_PRP ._. The_DT knight_NN first_RB meets_VBZ the_DT wife_NN of_IN bath_NN ,_, when_WRB he_PRP is_VBZ desperate_JJ looking_VBG for_IN the_DT answer_NN to_TO what_WP women_NNS most_RBS desire_VBP as_IN the_DT answer_NN will_MD save_VB his_PRP\$ life_NN ._. She_PRP promises_VBZ to_TO tell_VB him_PRP ,_, if_IN he_PRP does_VBZ whatever_WDT she_PRP asks_VBZ him_PRP to_TO ._. The_DT answer_NN to_TO the_DT question_NN is_VBZ that_IN all_DT women_NNS want_VBP to_TO be_VB in_IN control_NN over_IN their_PRP\$ husbands_NNS and_CC loved_VBD ones_NNS ._. The_DT queen_NN and_CC her_PRP\$ fellow_JJ judges_NNS decide_VBP that_IN he_PRP is_VBZ to_TO live_VB ,_, but_CC

then_RB the_DT old_JJ hag_NN asks_VBZ him_PRP to_TO marry_VB her_PRP ._.
 He_PRP finds_VBZ this_DT idea_NN repulsive_JJ as_IN she_PRP is_VBZ old_JJ and_CC
 ugly_JJ ._. She_PRP offers_VBZ him_PRP a_DT choice_NN ,_, she_PRP can_MD
 either_RB be_VB young_JJ and_CC probably_RB unfaithful_JJ ,_, or_CC old_JJ and_CC
 faithful_NN ._. To_TO this_DT he_PRP replies_VBZ that_IN she_PRP can_MD choose_VB
 as_IN she_PRP will_MD probably_RB know_VB what_WP is_VBZ best_JJS for_IN
 them_PRP -LRB-_-LRB- Chaucer_NNP 770-775_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. By_IN giving_VBG
 him_PRP those_DT two_CD options_NNS she_PRP manipulates_VBZ him_PRP ,_,
 both_DT options_NNS would_MD lead_VB to_TO an_DT unhappy_JJ marriage_NN ,_,
 either_CC because_IN of_IN the_DT cheating_NN or_CC because_IN of_IN the_DT
 fact_NN that_IN she_PRP is_VBZ old_JJ and_CC ugly_JJ ._. ```` when_WRB the_DT
 knight_NN asks_VBZ her_PRP\$ to_TO make_VB the_DT choice_NN --_: when_WRB
 he_PRP admits_VBZ himself_PRP from_IN within_IN himself_PRP to_TO the_DT
 sovereignty_NN of_IN women_NNS --_: then_RB and_CC only_RB then_RB he_PRP
 is_VBZ truly_RB blessed_VBN --_: and_CC the_DT lady_NN is_VBZ revealed_VBN in_IN
 all_DT her_PRP\$ charms_NNS " " -LRB-_-LRB- Huppé_NNP 381_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._.
 He_PRP was_VBD tested_VBN successfully_RB and_CC thus_RB he_PRP is_VBZ
 worthy_JJ to_TO see_VB the_DT beautiful_JJ woman_NN she_PRP really_RB is_VBZ ._.
 She_PRP changes_VBZ his_PRP\$ mind_NN set_VBN by_IN giving_VBG him_PRP a_DT
 lecture_NN on_IN gentillesse_NN ,_, which_WDT makes_VBZ him_PRP able_JJ to_TO
 see_VB her_PRP\$ for_IN the_DT beautiful_JJ young_JJ women_NNS she_PRP is_VBZ ._.
 He_PRP told_VBD her_PRP that_IN he_PRP was_VBD disgusted_VBN by_IN her_PRP ,_,
 because_IN she_PRP was_VBD not_RB a_DT noble_JJ women_NNS ,_, she_PRP
 was_VBD old_JJ and_CC she_PRP was_VBD ugly_JJ ._. In_IN her_PRP\$ lecture_NN
 she_PRP explains_VBZ that_IN gentillesse_NN comes_VBZ from_IN Christ_NNP and_CC
 that_IN it_PRP does_VBZ not_RB come_VB from_IN nobility_NN ._. She_PRP
 argues_VBZ that_IN poverty_NN might_MD even_RB give_VB her_PRP\$ better_JJR
 virtues_NNS ._. She_PRP also_RB tells_VBZ him_PRP that_DT her_PRP\$ age_NN and_CC
 the_DT fact_NN that_IN she_PRP is_VBZ ugly_JJ might_MD be_VB because_IN those_DT
 protect_VB her_PRP as_IN she_PRP is_VBZ blessed_VBN -LRB-_-LRB- Chaucer_NNP
 772-774_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. ```` Their_PRP\$ prime_JJ purpose_NN is_VBZ to_TO
 work_VB a_DT sort_NN of_IN magic_NN in_IN the_DT Knight_NNP ,_, to_TO
 transform_VB him_PRP ;_: and_CC the_DT magic_NN is_VBZ potent_JJ " " -LRB-_-LRB-
 Roppolo_NNP 267_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. With_IN her_PRP\$ words_NNS she_PRP

tries_VBZ to_TO transform_VB his_PRP\$ way_NN of_IN thinking_NN ,_, but_CC she_PRP will_MD not_RB let_VB him_PRP see_VB herself_PRP until_IN she_PRP is_VBZ completely_RB assured_VBN that_IN he_PRP has_VBZ changed_VBN completely_RB ._. As_RB soon_RB as_IN he_PRP makes_VBZ her_PRP\$ choose_VB ,_, he_PRP shows_VBZ that_IN he_PRP does_VBZ not_RB matter_VB anymore_RB whether_IN she_PRP is_VBZ beautiful_JJ or_CC not_RB and_CC he_PRP proves_VBZ himself_PRP a_DT man_NN of_IN true_JJ gentillesse_NN ._. He_PRP was_VBD tested_VBN and_CC now_RB he_PRP has_VBZ proven_VBN himself_PRP ,_, she_PRP breaks_VBZ the_DT spell_NN ,_, which_WDT makes_VBZ him_PRP able_JJ to_TO see_VB the_DT woman_NN she_PRP already_RB was_VBD ._. The_DT answer_NN to_TO the_DT question_NN whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT old_JJ hag_NN transforms_VBZ herself_PRP is_VBZ that_IN she_PRP does_VBZ not_RB ,_, in_IN fact_NN she_PRP transforms_VBZ the_DT knight_NN ._. She_PRP puts_VBZ a_DT spell_NN on_IN him_PRP ,_, which_WDT makes_VBZ him_PRP unable_JJ to_TO see_VB the_DT beautiful_JJ woman_NN she_PRP is_VBZ ._. He_PRP was_VBD to_TO go_VB on_IN a_DT quest_NN to_TO find_VB out_RP what_WP women_NNS really_RB want_VBP ,_, and_CC she_PRP lets_VBZ him_PRP fulfil_VB the_DT wish_NN of_IN women_NNS ._. Because_IN when_WRB he_PRP gives_VBZ her_PRP\$ what_WP all_DT women_NNS want_VBP ,_, namely_RB dominating_VBG and_CC controlling_VBG their_PRP\$ husbands_NNS ,_, he_PRP is_VBZ rewarded_VBN and_CC the_DT spell_NN is_VBZ broken_VBN ._. But_CC this_DT is_VBZ not_RB only_RB because_IN he_PRP gives_VBZ her_PRP\$ what_WP she_PRP wants_VBZ ,_, he_PRP also_RB has_VBZ proven_VBN himself_PRP worthy_JJ to_TO see_VB her_PRP as_IN the_DT woman_NN she_PRP is_VBZ ._. At_IN first_RB he_PRP rejects_VBZ her_PRP\$ for_IN the_DT wrong_JJ reasons_NNS ,_, but_CC during_IN her_PRP\$ lecture_NN on_IN gentillesse_NN she_PRP transforms_VBZ his_PRP\$ mind_NN set_VBN into_IN that_DT of_IN a_DT man_NN of_IN true_JJ gentillesse_NN ._.

RAD1277

Based_VBN on_IN Ovid_NNP and_CC Virgil_NNP 's_POS versions_NNS of_IN the_DT story_NN ,_, the_DT lay_JJ of_IN Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP certainly_RB shows_VBZ some_DT similarities_NNS with_IN the_DT classic_JJ myth_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Kittredge_NN 176_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. At_IN the_DT time_NN in_IN which_WDT Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP was_VBD composed_VBN ,_, which_WDT is_VBZ the_DT late_JJ thirteenth_NN or_CC early_JJ fourteenth_JJ century_NN ,_, `` `` imitation_NN ,_, not_RB

originality_NN ,_, was_VBD the_DT rule_NN in_IN English_NNP writing_VBG " " -LRB-
 _-LRB- 176_CD -RRB-_-RRB- __. The_DT text_NN is_VBZ not_RB completely_RB
 the_DT same_JJ ,_, however_RB ,_, as_IN it_PRP has_VBZ been_VBN altered_VBN
 extensively_RB in_IN order_NN to_TO suit_VB the_DT tastes_NNS of_IN its_PRP\$
 medieval_JJ readership_NN __. Thus_RB ,_, Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP is_VBZ a_DT
 retelling_NN of_IN the_DT myth_NN of_IN Orpheus_NNP and_CC Eurydice_NNP ,_,
 only_RB revised_VBN in_IN such_JJ a_DT way_NN that_IN it_PRP would_MD please_VB
 its_PRP\$ medieval_JJ audience_NN __. Both_CC in_IN the_DT classical_JJ and_CC the_DT
 medieval_JJ versions_NNS ,_, Orpheus_NNP /_: Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP wins_VBZ back_RP
 his_PRP\$ beloved_JJ one_NN by_IN playing_VBG music_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Kittredge_NN
 187_CD -RRB-_-RRB- __. In_IN the_DT medieval_JJ adaptation_NN ,_, Sir_NNP
 Orfeo_NNP is_VBZ a_DT `` `` minstrel_NN " " -LRB-_-LRB- Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP
 430_CD ,_, 3rd_CD ed_VBD __. -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, who_WP `` `` charms_NNS the_DT
 court_NN of_IN the_DT fairy_NN king_NN with_IN his_PRP\$ playing_NN ,_, and_CC ,_,
 on_IN being_VBG promised_VBN whatever_WDT boon_NN he_PRP may_MD ask_VB " " -LRB-
 -LRB- Kittredge_NNP 188_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, he_PRP requests_NNS :_:
 However_RB ,_, in_IN the_DT original_JJ myth_NN by_IN Ovid_NNP ,_, Orpheus_NNP
 went_VBD into_IN the_DT Underworld_NN and_CC stated_VBN beforehand_RB to_TO
 Pluto_NNP and_CC Proserpine_NNP what_WP his_PRP\$ mission_NN entailed_VBD ,_,
 i.e._FW retrieving_VBG his_PRP\$ Eurydice_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Kittredge_NNP 187_CD -
 RRB-_-RRB- __. Elements_NNS such_JJ as_IN the_DT harp_NN ,_, which_WDT was_VBD
 an_DT immensely_RB popular_JJ instrument_NN among_IN Celtic_JJ people_NNS -LRB-
 _-LRB- 186_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, and_CC Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP being_VBG a_DT
 minstrel_NN made_VBD the_DT story_NN more_RBR relatable_JJ for_IN its_PRP\$
 early_JJ fourteenth_JJ century_NN audience_NN __. Another_DT difference_NN
 between_IN the_DT older_JJR and_CC newer_JJR versions_NNS of_IN Orpheus_NNP
 ' _POS story_NN is_VBZ the_DT location_NN __. There_EX is_VBZ quite_RB an_DT
 extensive_JJ difference_NN between_IN the_DT stories_NNS ,_, as_IN `` `` Orfeo_NNP
 's_POS journey_NN takes_VBZ him_PRP not_RB to_TO Hades_NNP but_CC to_TO a_DT
 land_NN of_IN fairy_NN " " -LRB-_-LRB- Burrow_NNP 86_CD -RRB-_-RRB- __.
 This_DT Otherworld_NN `` `` exhibits_VBZ certain_JJ Celtic_JJ features_NNS " " -LRB-_-
 LRB- Burrow_NNP 86_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, such_JJ as_IN fairies_NNS __. As_IN
 Treharne_JJ notes_NNS ,_, `` `` Celtic_JJ sources_NNS may_MD have_VB played_VBN
 a_DT formative_JJ role_NN in_IN the_DT narrative_JJ composition_NN ,_, particularly_RB

in_IN the_DT account_NN of_IN the_DT fairies_NNS and_CC the_DT Otherworld_NNP " " -LRB-_-LRB- 551_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Besides_IN the_DT Otherworld_NNP ,_, the_DT story_NN takes_VBZ place_NN in_IN Winchester_NNP ,_, or_CC `` `` Traciens_NNP " " -LRB-_-LRB- Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP 50_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, which_WDT was_VBD where_WRB the_DT court_NN --_: and_CC therefore_RB king_NN Orfeo_NNP --_: resided_VBD at_IN that_DT time_NN ._. The_DT original_JJ Orpheus_NNP ,_, however_RB ,_, was_VBD supposed_VBN to_TO be_VB the_DT son_NN of_IN the_DT Greek_JJ Oeagrus_NN ,_, king_NN of_IN Thrace_NNP ,_, according_VBG to_TO Apollodorus_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Bowra_NNP 113_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. By_IN making_VBG Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP a_DT British_JJ rather_RB than_IN a_DT Greek_JJ king_NN ,_, and_CC by_IN placing_VBG the_DT story_NN in_IN Britain_NNP ,_, the_DT author_NN of_IN the_DT medieval_JJ text_NN made_VBD the_DT story_NN more_RBR accessible_JJ to_TO his_PRP\$,_, largely_RB British_JJ ,_, audience_NN ._. An_DT element_NN frequently_RB seen_VBN in_IN lais_NN is_VBZ exile_NN and_CC return_NN ._. The_DT story_NN of_IN Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP is_VBZ no_DT exception_NN to_TO that_DT `` `` rule_NN ' ' ._. In_IN the_DT classical_JJ version_NN ,_, however_RB ,_, Orpheus_NNP does_VBZ not_RB really_RB go_VB into_IN exile_NN ._. After_IN having_VBG made_VBN the_DT gods_NNS and_CC nymphs_NNS cry_VBP ,_, they_PRP merely_RB advise_VBP him_PRP to_TO make_VB his_PRP\$ way_NN to_TO the_DT Underworld_NN to_TO get_VB back_RB Eurydice_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Bowra_NNP 116_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. In_IN the_DT lay_JJ ,_, Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP goes_VBZ into_IN exile_NN after_IN having_VBG broken_VBN his_PRP\$ vow_NN to_TO keep_VB Heurodys_NNPS safe_JJ ._. He_PRP says_VBZ :_: `` `` Into_NNP wildernes_VBZ Ichil_NNP te_FW /_: And_CC live_JJ þer_NN evermore_RB " " -LRB-_-LRB- Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP 212-13_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, and_CC advises_VBZ his_PRP\$ lords_NNS to_TO appoint_VB a_DT new_JJ king_NN if_IN they_PRP hear_VBP that_IN he_PRP has_VBZ passed_VBN away_RB ._. Later_RB ,_, of_IN course_NN ,_, he_PRP returns_VBZ with_IN his_PRP\$ Heurodys_NNS ,_, a_DT passage_NN which_WDT reminds_VBZ one_CD of_IN the_DT story_NN of_IN Odysseus_NNP and_CC Penelope_NNP ,_, and_CC all_DT is_VBZ well_RB ._. The_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT adaptation_NN features_VBZ the_DT element_NN of_IN exile_NN and_CC return_NN ,_, and_CC also_RB a_DT happy_JJ ending_NN ,_, indicates_VBZ that_IN the_DT story_NN was_VBD moulded_VBN to_TO the_DT likes_NN of_IN medieval_JJ people_NNS ._. In_IN conclusion_NN ,_, Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP is_VBZ an_DT adaptation_NN of_IN

the_DT classical_JJ myth_NN of_IN Orpheus_NNP and_CC Eurydice_NNP ,_, only_RB revised_VBN in_IN such_JJ a_DT way_NN that_IN it_PRP would_MD please_VB its_PRP\$ medieval_JJ audience_NN ._. The_DT author_NN of_IN the_DT story_NN has_VBZ given_VBN Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP some_DT medieval_JJ characteristics_NNS ,_, e.g._FW he_PRP is_VBZ a_DT minstrel_NN who_WP plays_VBZ the_DT harp_NN ._. The_DT story_NN takes_VBZ place_NN partly_RB in_IN Winchester_NNP ,_, which_WDT is_VBZ called_VBN Thrace_NNP in_IN the_DT narrative_NN ,_, and_CC partly_RB in_IN the_DT Otherworld_NNP ._. This_DT is_VBZ a_DT magical_JJ place_NN where_WRB fairies_NNS and_CC a_DT fairy_NN king_NN exist_VBP ._. The_DT fairies_NNS are_VBP said_VBN to_TO be_VB a_DT Celtic_JJ element_NN ,_, thus_RB making_VBG the_DT lay_VBN more_RBR appealing_JJ to_TO its_PRP\$ medieval_JJ audience_NN ._. Sir_NNP Orfeo_NNP contains_VBZ some_DT of_IN the_DT popular_JJ themes_NNS in_IN medieval_JJ literature_NN ,_, namely_RB that_IN of_IN exile_NN and_CC return_NN ,_, and_CC a_DT happy_JJ ending_NN ._. This_DT truly_RB shows_VBZ that_IN the_DT narrative_NN has_VBZ been_VBN altered_VBN in_IN such_JJ a_DT way_NN that_IN it_PRP would_MD suit_VB the_DT tastes_NNS of_IN its_PRP\$ medieval_JJ readership_NN ._.

RAD1280

The_DT Canterbury_NNP Tales_NNS is_VBZ a_DT set_NN of_IN tales_NNS written_VBN and_CC ,_, unfortunately_RB ,_, not_RB completely_RB finished_VBN ,_, by_IN Geoffrey_NNP Chaucer_NNP in_IN the_DT late_JJ 14th_JJ century_NN ._. The_DT tales_NNS are_VBP presented_VBN as_IN a_DT sort_NN of_IN story-telling_JJ contest_NN held_VBD amongst_IN pilgrims_NNS ._. One_CD of_IN these_DT tales_NNS is_VBZ called_VBN `` `` The_DT Wife_NN of_IN Bath_NNP 's_POS Tale_NNP " `` and_CC is_VBZ probably_RB amongst_IN the_DT best_JJS known_VBN tales_NNS of_IN Chaucer_NNP ,_, with_IN a_DT prologue_NN which_WDT is_VBZ almost_RB twice_RB as_RB long_JJ as_IN her_PRP\$ tale_NN ._. This_DT tale_NN speaks_VBZ of_IN a_DT young_JJ knight_NN who_WP is_VBZ set_VBN to_TO find_VB out_RP what_WP women_NNS most_RBS desire_NN and_CC he_PRP learns_VBZ this_DT answer_NN from_IN a_DT woman_NN better_RB known_VBN as_IN the_DT loathly_JJ lady_NN ._. Now_RB ,_, when_WRB they_PRP are_VBP about_IN to_TO get_VB married_VBN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NNP puts_VBZ the_DT knight_NN in_IN a_DT dilemma_NN ._. She_PRP is_VBZ either_RB forever_RB young_JJ ,_, beautiful_JJ and_CC unfaithful_JJ

or_CC she_PRP is_VBZ an_DT old_JJ hag_NN who_WP is_VBZ loyal_JJ ,_, true_JJ
 and_CC humble_JJ ._. Although_IN there_EX are_VBP several_JJ opinions_NNS that_IN
 the_DT old_JJ hag_NN is_VBZ really_RB an_DT old_JJ hag_NN ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ
 actually_RB quite_RB clear_JJ that_IN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN was_VBD
 never_RB an_DT old_JJ hag_NN ,_, but_CC always_RB was_VBD and_CC always_RB
 will_MD be_VB a_DT beautiful_JJ woman_NN ._. When_WRB reading_VBG the_DT
 text_NN it_PRP becomes_VBZ clear_JJ that_IN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN is_VBZ
 actually_RB fair_JJ and_CC good_JJ ._. In_IN lines_NNS 1219_CD up_RP until_IN
 1227_CD the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NNP asks_VBZ the_DT knight_NN to_TO
 choose_VB what_WP he_PRP prefers_VBZ ._. `` `` Now_RB chese_JJ yourselven_NN ,_,
 whether_NN that_WDT yow_VBP liketh_NN "-" -LRB-_-LRB- Chaucer_NNP -RRB-_-
 RRB- ._. The_DT knight_NN responds_VBZ to_TO this_DT by_IN saying_VBG that_IN
 she_PRP must_MD choose_VB herself_PRP what_WP she_PRP wants_VBZ to_TO be_VB
 for_IN him_PRP and_CC as_IN an_DT argument_NN for_IN this_DT he_PRP says_VBZ
 `` `` I_PRP do_VBP no_DT fors_NNS the_DT whether_NN of_IN the_DT two_CD ;:;
 For_IN as_IN yow_NN liketh_NN ,_, it_PRP suffiseth_VBP me_PRP "-" -LRB-_-LRB-
 Chaucer_NNP 1234-1235_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. With_IN saying_VBG this_DT ,_, the_DT
 knight_NN gives_VBZ the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN maistrie_NN and_CC with_IN
 doing_VBG so_RB ,_, he_PRP shows_VBZ that_IN he_PRP has_VBZ respect_NN for_IN
 her_PRP\$ and_CC that_IN she_PRP can_MD make_VB her_PRP\$ own_JJ decisions_NNS
 and_CC she_PRP becomes_VBZ both_DT fair_JJ and_CC good_JJ ._. There_EX are_VBP
 people_NNS such_JJ as_IN Theodore_NNP Silverstein_NNP ,_, who_WP suggest_VBP
 that_IN the_DT old_JJ hag_NN has_VBZ been_VBN put_VBN under_IN a_DT curse_NN
 and_CC that_IN this_DT spell_NN is_VBZ dissolved_VBN after_IN the_DT knight_NN
 has_VBZ given_VBN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NNP the_DT maistrie_NN she_PRP
 needed_VBD ._. And_CC because_IN the_DT spell_NN is_VBZ lifted_VBN ,_, she_PRP
 is_VBZ now_RB fair_JJ and_CC good_JJ -LRB-_-LRB- p._NN 168_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._.
 Although_IN this_DT seems_VBZ an_DT adequate_JJ interpretation_NN of_IN the_DT
 text_NN ,_, there_EX is_VBZ a_DT quite_RB different_JJ and_CC far_RB more_RBR
 likely_JJ interpretation_NN to_TO be_VB found_VBN ._. One_CD without_IN
 miraculous_JJ spells_NNS or_CC curses_NNS but_CC with_IN virtue_NN and_CC the_DT
 true_JJ nature_NN of_IN somebody_NN ._. So_RB rather_RB than_IN a_DT curse_NN
 or_CC spell_NN that_WDT has_VBZ to_TO be_VB lifted_VBN ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ a_DT
 change_NN of_IN heart_NN which_WDT causes_VBZ the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN

to_TO actually_RB be_VB a_DT young_JJ ,_, beautiful_JJ and_CC truthful_JJ woman_NN
 ._. It_PRP all_DT starts_NNS with_IN the_DT knight_NN as_IN the_DT bad_JJ guy_NN
 because_IN he_PRP raped_VBD a_DT girl_NN and_CC is_VBZ therefore_RB a_DT
 sinner_NN ._. Because_IN of_IN viciousness_NN the_DT knight_NN 's_POS vision_NN
 is_VBZ impaired_JJ ._. He_PRP sees_VBZ true_JJ virtue_NN as_IN a_DT foul_JJ thing_NN
 and_CC think_VB that_IN beauty_NN is_VBZ the_DT most_RBS important_JJ thing_NN
 in_IN the_DT world_NN ._. This_DT is_VBZ the_DT case_NN until_IN the_DT
 Loathly_NNP Lady_NN gives_VBZ him_PRP the_DT dilemma_NN ._. The_DT knight_NN
 could_MD have_VB chosen_VBN for_IN young_JJ and_CC beautiful_JJ because_IN
 that_DT is_VBZ what_WP he_PRP used_VBD to_TO desire_NN ._. But_CC instead_RB
 he_PRP gives_VBZ the_DT choice_NN to_TO Loathly_NNP Lady_NNP and_CC says_VBZ
 that_IN whatever_WDT she_PRP chooses_VBZ is_VBZ fine_JJ with_IN him_PRP ._.
 This_DT shows_VBZ that_IN the_DT knight_NN has_VBZ changed_VBN from_IN
 being_VBG vicious_JJ to_TO being_VBG virtuous_JJ ._. This_DT change_NN ,_, and_CC
 the_DT victory_NN over_IN the_DT temptation_NN to_TO sin_NN ,_, has_VBZ led_VBN
 to_TO a_DT purified_VBN vision_NN of_IN the_DT knight_NN ._. The_DT change_NN
 of_IN heart_NN ,_, from_IN viciousness_NN to_TO virtuous_JJ makes_VBZ the_DT
 knight_NN see_VBP that_IN true_JJ virtue_NN is_VBZ actually_RB not_RB foul_JJ
 but_CC a_DT beautiful_JJ thing_NN ._. `` `` The_DT transformation_NN -LSB-_-LRB-
 of_IN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN -RSB-_-RRB- is_VBZ thus_RB the_DT natural_JJ
 consequence_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ own_JJ corrected_VBN vision_NN and_CC insight_NN
 rather_RB than_IN a_DT miraculous_JJ transformation_NN of_IN the_DT Loathly_NNP
 Lady_NNP ,_, for_IN she_PRP has_VBZ been_VBN truly_RB beautiful_JJ and_CC
 truly_RB gentil_NN all_DT along_IN ._. " " -LRB-_-LRB- Levy_NNP p._NN 109_CD -
 RRB-_-RRB- ._. The_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN was_VBD not_RB so_RB loathly_RB
 after_IN all_DT ._. It_PRP was_VBD because_IN of_IN the_DT knight_NN who_WP
 through_IN his_PRP\$ viciousness_NN did_VBD not_RB perceive_VB the_DT world_NN
 correctly_RB and_CC did_VBD not_RB perceive_VB true_JJ beauty_NN ._. Despite_IN
 the_DT fact_NN that_IN some_DT people_NNS say_VBP the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN
 really_RB did_VBD transform_VB because_IN she_PRP was_VBD put_VBN under_IN
 a_DT spell_NN and_CC she_PRP needed_VBD maistrie_NN to_TO dissolve_VB this_DT
 spell_NN and_CC be_VB forever_RB young_JJ ,_, beautiful_JJ and_CC true_JJ ._. It_PRP
 can_MD also_RB be_VB argued_VBN that_IN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN did_VBD
 not_RB transform_VB at_IN all_DT ,_, but_CC that_IN the_DT knight_NN 's_POS

change_NN of_IN heart_NN made_VBD the_DT knight_NN recognise_VBP beauty_NN
and_CC saw_VBD true_JJ beauty_NN in_IN the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN who_WP
he_PRP first_RB believed_VBD to_TO be_VB an_DT old_JJ hag_NN ._. Thus_RB ,_,
it_PRP was_VBD the_DT knight_NN who_WP changed_VBD ,_, rather_RB than_IN
the_DT Loathly_NNP Lady_NN ._.

RAD1210

Next_JJ to_TO literary_JJ criticism_NN and_CC close_JJ reading_NN of_IN novels_NNS this_DT research_NN also_RB relies_VBZ on_IN a_DT detailed_JJ literary_JJ research_NN on_IN American_JJ psychiatry_NN in_IN and_CC around_IN the_DT 1960s_NNS ._. In_IN order_NN to_TO complete_VB this_DT ,_, many_JJ academic_JJ and_CC scientific_JJ articles_NNS concerning_VBG psychology_NN and_CC psychiatry_NN have_VBP been_VBN accessed_VBN ._. How_WRB do_VBP Anthony_NNP Burgess_NNP ' _POS A_DT Clockwork_JJ Orange_NNP and_CC Ken_NNP Kesey_NNP 's_POS One_CD Flew_NN over_IN the_DT Cuckoo_NN 's_POS Nest_NNP criticize_VB American_JJ mental_JJ health_NN care_NN around_IN the_DT 1960s_NNS ?_. Mental_JJ health_NN care_NN in_IN the_DT United_NNP States_NNPS of_IN America_NNP saw_VBD significant_JJ changes_NNS in_IN treatments_NNS ,_, institutionalization_NN ,_, bureaucracy_NN and_CC both_DT professional_JJ and_CC unprofessional_JJ opinions_NNS ._. Controversial_JJ treatments_NNS like_IN electro-shock_JJ therapy_NN and_CC prefrontal_JJ lobotomies_NNS were_VBD applied_VBN to_TO human_JJ patients_NNS on_IN a_DT regular_JJ basis_NN ._. The_DT results_NNS of_IN these_DT varied_JJ drastically_RB per_IN patient_NN and_CC in_IN many_JJ cases_NNS ,_, the_DT patient_NN was_VBD clearly_RB worse_JJR off_IN than_IN before_IN the_DT therapy_NN or_CC operation_NN ._. A_DT Clockwork_NNP Orange_NNP and_CC One_CD Flew_NN over_IN the_DT Cuckoo_NN 's_POS Nest_NNP are_VBP both_DT novels_NNS that_WDT appeared_VBD in_IN the_DT 1960s_NNS and_CC are_VBP both_DT novels_NNS that_WDT carry_VBP psychological_JJ health_NN care_NN at_IN the_DT centre_NN of_IN their_PRP\$ narratives_NNS ._. There_EX is_VBZ a_DT clear_JJ parallel_NN noticeable_JJ between_IN these_DT novels_NNS and_CC the_DT developments_NNS in_IN American_JJ mental_JJ health_NN care_NN ._. The_DT question_NN remains_VBZ ,_, how_WRB much_JJ of_IN a_DT parallel_NN is_VBZ there_EX ?_. Many_JJ literary_JJ reviews_NNS have_VBP been_VBN written_VBN of_IN both_DT One_CD Flew_NN over_IN the_DT Cuckoo_NN 's_POS Nest_NNP and_CC A_NNP Clockwork_NNP Orange_NNP ._. These_DT reviews_NNS do_VBP not_RB deal_VB with_IN the_DT social_JJ criticism_NN that_IN they_PRP could_MD have_VB meant_VBN to_TO deliver_VB during_IN their_PRP\$ time_NN of_IN publication_NN ._. There_EX is_VBZ a_DT widespread_JJ variety_NN of_IN articles_NNS and_CC

books_NNS on_IN the_DT developments_NNS of_IN mental_JJ health_NN care_NN in_IN the_DT United_NNP States_NNPS of_IN America_NNP around_IN the_DT 1960s_NNS ._. Some_DT date_NN as_IN early_JJ as_IN 1942_CD ,_, when_WRB the_DT first_JJ lobotomies_NNS were_VBD performed_VBN on_IN rats_NNS and_CC dogs_NNS and_CC contain_VBP detailed_JJ descriptions_NNS of_IN the_DT method_NN of_IN procedure_NN ._. Articles_NNPS containing_VBG criticism_NN on_IN controversial_JJ treatments_NNS appeared_VBD as_RB soon_RB as_IN lobotomies_NNS and_CC electro-shock_JJ therapies_NNS were_VBD applied_VBN to_TO human_JJ beings_NNS ._. The_DT connection_NN between_IN A_DT Clockwork_JJ Orange_NNP and_CC One_CD Flew_NN over_IN the_DT Cuckoo_NN 's_POS Nest_NNP and_CC anti-psychiatry_JJ in_IN the_DT 1960s_NNS has_VBZ been_VBN made_VBN before_IN ;_: they_PRP even_RB both_DT have_VBP been_VBN labeled_VBN `` `` anti-psychiatry_JJ " _ " novels_NNS in_IN some_DT occasions_NNS ._. Still_RB ,_, detailed_JJ descriptions_NNS of_IN what_WP exactly_RB makes_VBZ these_DT novels_NNS anti-psychiatry_JJ have_VBP not_RB yet_RB been_VBN created_VBN ._. It_PRP is_VBZ expected_VBN that_IN a_DT clear_JJ parallel_NN between_IN the_DT novels_NNS and_CC anti-psychiatry_JJ will_MD show_VB ._. The_DT exact_JJ concrete_JJ establishment_NN of_IN these_DT parallels_NNS will_MD differ_VB ._. One_CD Flew_NN over_IN the_DT Cuckoo_NN 's_POS Nest_NNP focuses_VBZ its_PRP\$ negative_JJ behaviour_NN mainly_RB towards_IN bureaucracy_NN in_IN American_JJ mental_JJ health_NN care_NN and_CC not_RB as_RB much_JJ towards_IN the_DT controversial_JJ treatments_NNS in_IN themselves_PRP ._. A_DT Clockwork_NNP Orange_NNP does_VBZ offer_VB criticism_NN on_IN these_DT treatments_NNS ._. This_DT research_NN will_MD analyse_VB two_CD American_JJ classics_NNS in_IN great_JJ detail_NN for_IN their_PRP\$ -LRB_-LRB- potential_NN -RRB_-RRB- traces_NNS of_IN anti-psychiatry_JJ ._. If_IN it_PRP does_VBZ turn_VB out_RP that_IN these_DT novels_NNS offered_VBD provocative_JJ criticism_NN ,_, one_PRP can_MD even_RB consider_VB conducting_VBG further_JJ research_NN to_TO find_VB out_RP how_WRB much_JJ of_IN an_DT impact_NN these_DT two_CD novels_NNS had_VBD on_IN the_DT social_JJ changes_NNS that_WDT were_VBD made_VBN to_TO American_JJ psychological_JJ health_NN care_NN during_IN and_CC after_IN the_DT late_JJ 1960s_NNS ._.

RAD1220

The DT broader JJR context NN of IN my PRP\$ research NN is VBZ second JJ language NN acquisition NN , , spoken VBN English NNP and CC the DT CEFR NN : : The DT Common JJ European JJ Framework NN of IN Reference NNP for IN Languages NNP . . The DT Common JJ European JJ Framework NN of IN Reference NNP for IN Languages NNP , , or CC CEFR NN for IN short JJ , , was VBD issued VBN by IN the DT council NN of IN Europe NNP in IN 2001 CD . . The DT CEFR NNP has VBZ been VBN very RB influential JJ so RB far RB in IN curriculum NN , , planning NN , , language NN examinations NNS and CC testing NN . . Moreover RB , , the DT CEFR NNP has VBZ had VBN a DT positive JJ effect NN on IN the DT promotion NN of IN plurilingualism NN since IN the DT CEFR NN can MD be VB used VBN for IN many JJ languages NNS -LRB- -LRB- Hulstijn NN 663 CD -RRB- -RRB- . . It PRP is VBZ a DT descriptive JJ framework NN that WDT covers VBZ reading NN , , writing VBG , , listening VBG and CC speaking VBG set VBN out RP over IN six CD different JJ Common JJ Reference NNP Levels NNS , , starting VBG at IN A1 NN and CC ending VBG at IN C2 NN , , which WDT is VBZ the DT highest JJS level NN -LRB- -LRB- North NN 9 CD -RRB- -RRB- . . Each DT level NN and CC scale NN is VBZ defined VBN by IN ` `` can MD do VB ' ' statements NNS involving VBG tasks NNS and CC goals NNS that WDT language NN learners NNS can MD learn VB in IN order NN to TO master VB a DT language NN . . Though IN it PRP needs VBZ to TO be VB said VBN that IN being VBG an DT A2-learner NN or CC a DT B1-learner NN does VBZ not RB mean VB they PRP are VBP at IN that DT level NN across IN the DT whole JJ scale NN . . A DT learner NN may MD be VB B1-level JJ in IN oral JJ communication NN skills NNS , , but CC be VB at IN a DT C1-level NN in IN reading NN . . As IN a DT result NN , , the DT Council NNP of IN Europe NNP has VBZ stated VBN that IN using VBG a DT general JJ term NN as IN B1-level NN may MD be VB too RB restricting VBG when WRB assessing VBG the DT learner NN 's POS abilities NNS -LRB- -LRB- North JJ 12 CD -RRB- -RRB- . . I PRP will MD thus RB choose VB only RB one CD fluency NN scale NN as IN to TO prevent VB this DT research NN of IN becoming VBG too RB elaborate JJ . . Despite IN the DT positives NNS effects NNS that IN the DT CEFR NNP has VBZ had VBN , , many JJ scholars NNS criticise VBP the DT framework NN . . For IN instance NN , , there EX has VBZ not RB been VBN enough JJ research NN concerning VBG the DT descriptive JJ scales NNS and CC L2 NN learners NNS . . For IN instance NN , , Hulstijn NNP argues VBZ that IN

teachers_NNS do_VBP not_RB have_VB enough_JJ support_NN from_IN the_DT
 CEFR_NN when_WRB they_PRP assess_VBP students_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- 666_CD -RRB-_-RRB-
 ._. After_IN all_DT ,_, the_DT CEFR_NN is_VBZ not_RB based_VBN on_IN
 empirical_JJ research_NN with_IN L2_NN learners_NNS data_NNS ._. It_PRP is_VBZ
 not_RB proven_VBN that_IN L2_NN learners_NNS ,_, after_IN attaining_VBG a_DT
 certain_JJ level_NN ,_, can_MD indeed_RB perform_VB every_DT descriptive_JJ ` ``
 can_MD do_VB ' _ " statement_NN given_VBN in_IN that_DT specific_JJ scale_NN ._.
 Hulstijn_NNP argues_VBZ in_IN his_PRP\$ article_NN that_IN research_NN is_VBZ of_IN
 major_JJ importance_NN `` `` it_PRP is_VBZ high_JJ time_NN that_WDT research_NN
 of_IN SLA_NNP ,_, researchers_NNS of_IN language_NN assessment_NN ,_, and_CC
 corpus_NN linguists_NNS paid_VBD attention_NN to_TO each_DT other_JJ 's_POS
 work_NN and_CC engaged_VBN in_IN collaborative_JJ research_NN ,_, testing_VBG
 the_DT linguistic_JJ ,_, psycholinguistic_JJ ,_, and_CC sociolinguistic_JJ assumptions_NNS
 on_IN which_WDT the_DT CEFR_NN rests_VBZ " _ " -LRB-_-LRB- 666_CD -RRB-_-RRB-
 ._. My_PRP\$ research_NN question_NN is_VBZ :_: How_WRB does_VBZ two_CD
 second-year_JJ students_NNS of_IN English_NNP differ_VBP in_IN fluency_NN level_NN
 and_CC how_WRB can_MD they_PRP be_VB placed_VBN in_IN the_DT Common_JJ
 European_JJ Framework_NN of_IN Reference_NNP for_IN Languages_NNPS ?_. It_PRP
 is_VBZ relevant_JJ because_IN it_PRP has_VBZ ties_NNS with_IN the_DT Oral_NNP
 Communication_NNP Skills_NNS classes_NNS at_IN our_PRP\$ own_JJ university_NN
 and_CC second_JJ language_NN acquisition_NN in_IN general_JJ ,_, which_WDT is_VBZ
 important_JJ to_TO us_PRP ,_, the_DT students_NNS ,_, as_IN L2_NN learners_NNS ._.
 As_IN I_PRP have_VBP mentioned_VBN before_RB ,_, there_EX is_VBZ also_RB a_DT
 lack_NN of_IN empirical_JJ research_NN on_IN L2_NN learners_NNS and_CC the_DT
 CEFR_NNP ._. I_PRP could_MD not_RB find_VB any_DT previous_JJ research_NN
 relating_VBG this_DT specific_JJ topic_NN ,_, because_IN this_DT is_VBZ a_DT brand-
 new_JJ research_NN set_VBN up_RP by_IN Dr_NNP de_IN Vries_NNP ._. I_PRP will_MD
 answer_VB my_PRP\$ research_NN question_NN by_IN testing_VBG two_CD second-
 year_JJ students_NNS and_CC their_PRP\$ fluency_NN ._. I_PRP would_MD like_VB
 to_TO have_VB them_PRP do_VB three_CD different_JJ assignments_NNS to_TO see_VB
 how_WRB fluent_JJ they_PRP are_VBP ,_, but_CC before_IN I_PRP have_VBP them_PRP
 do_VB these_DT assignments_NNS ,_, they_PRP need_VBP to_TO do_VB a_DT
 vocabulary_NN test_NN in_IN order_NN to_TO assess_VB their_PRP\$ level_NN ._. I_PRP
 am_VBP going_VBG to_TO record_VB their_PRP\$ speech_NN during_IN the_DT

sessions_NNS so_IN I_PRP can_MD transcribe_VB and_CC analyse_VB the_DT
 session_NN afterwards_RB ._. I_PRP aim_VBP to_TO get_VB 15_CD to_TO 30_CD
 minutes_NNS of_IN speech_NN recorded_VBN of_IN each_DT participating_VBG
 student_NN ._. The_DT topics_NNS of_IN the_DT assignments_NNS are_VBP both_DT
 academic_JJ and_CC non-academic_JJ ._. Before_IN conducting_VBG the_DT
 assignments_NNS I_PRP will_MD meet_VB up_RP with_IN the_DT students_NNS to_TO
 explain_VB the_DT aims_NNS of_IN this_DT research_NN project_NN and_CC what_WP
 is_VBZ expected_VBN of_IN them_PRP ._. They_PRP also_RB need_VBP to_TO sign_VB
 a_DT consent_NN form_NN so_IN I_PRP can_MD use_VB their_PRP\$ material_NN for_IN
 this_DT project_NN ._. One_CD assignment_NN will_MD be_VB that_IN they_PRP
 have_VBP to_TO read_VB two_CD or_CC three_CD short_JJ poems_NNS ,_,
 preferably_RB one_CD they_PRP have_VBP had_VBN in_IN class_NN and_CC more_JJR
 obscure_JJ poem_NN ,_, and_CC consequently_RB having_VBG them_PRP analyse_VB
 the_DT poems_NNS in_IN conversational_JJ manner_NN ._. I_PRP am_VBP curious_JJ
 to_TO see_VB if_IN their_PRP\$ fluency_NN is_VBZ impeded_VBN by_IN
 discussing_VBG an_DT unfamiliar_JJ poem_NN or_CC not_RB ._. The_DT first_JJ
 assignment_NN will_MD be_VB conducted_VBN individually_RB ._. The_DT second_JJ
 assignment_NN will_MD entail_VB some_DT ` `` Keep_VB Britain_NNP Tidy_NNP
 ' _POS advertisements_NNS that_IN they_PRP have_VBP to_TO describe_VB and_CC
 analyse_VB again_RB ._. This_DT assignment_NN will_MD be_VB done_VBN in_IN
 pairs_NNS ,_, which_WDT will_MD hopefully_RB spark_VB some_DT lively_JJ
 discussion_NN between_IN the_DT two_CD students_NNS ._. The_DT third_JJ
 assignment_NN will_MD be_VB a_DT egg-wrapping_JJ assignment_NN and_CC will_MD
 also_RB be_VB done_VBN in_IN pairs_NNS ._. There_EX might_MD be_VB some_DT
 trouble_NN transcribing_VBG this_DT assignment_NN since_IN it_PRP is_VBZ a_DT
 group_NN activity_NN with_IN spontaneous_JJ speech_NN ._. I_PRP might_MD have_VB
 to_TO get_VB some_DT help_NN from_IN the_DT students_NNS to_TO transcribe_VB
 this_DT accurately_RB ._. Once_RB the_DT assignments_NNS are_VBP done_VBN
 and_CC I_PRP have_VBP processed_VBN the_DT materials_NNS ,_, I_PRP will_MD
 meet_VB up_RP with_IN the_DT students_NNS to_TO evaluate_VB the_DT
 assignments_NNS and_CC the_DT overall_JJ process_NN ._. The_DT recorded_JJ
 materials_NNS need_VBP to_TO be_VB transcribed_VBN first_RB ._. I_PRP am_VBP
 not_RB sure_JJ how_WRB to_TO go_VB about_RB this_DT as_IN of_IN yet_RB ,_,
 but_CC I_PRP will_MD figure_VB this_DT out_RB later_RB on_IN ._. I_PRP will_MD

analyse_VB the_DT transcriptions_NNS using_VBG CorpusTool_NNP ,_, which_WDT is_VBZ a_DT programme_NN that_WDT can_MD analyse_VB sentences_NNS and_CC can_MD group_VB them_PRP in_IN specific_JJ categories_NNS like_IN linking_VBG words_NNS ,_, subjects_NNS or_CC objects_NNS etc._FW ._. I_PRP will_MD compare_VB each_DT students_NNS ' _POS statistics_NNS and_CC look_VB for_IN significant_JJ differences_NNS but_CC also_RB similarities_NNS ._. After_IN this_DT ,_, I_PRP will_MD check_VB with_IN the_DT first_JJ vocabulary_NN test_NN whether_IN or_CC not_RB they_PRP are_VBP comparable_JJ with_IN the_DT statistics_NNS found_VBN in_IN Corpustool_NNP ,_, but_CC I_PRP will_MD also_RB assess_VB their_PRP\$ results_NNS with_IN the_DT help_NN of_IN one_CD of_IN the_DT fluency_NN CEFR_NN scales_NNS ._. Ultimately_RB ,_, my_PRP\$ hypothesis_NN will_MD be_VB that_IN both_DT students_NNS will_MD be_VB C2-level_JJ ,_, but_CC that_IN one_CD may_MD be_VB a_DT lower_JJR C2-level_NN or_CC a_DT high_JJ C1-level_NN which_WDT will_MD also_RB show_VB in_IN the_DT statistics_NNS in_IN Corpustool_NNP ._. My_PRP\$ research_NN may_MD contribute_VB to_TO the_DT field_NN in_IN the_DT sense_NN that_IN it_PRP will_MD give_VB some_DT insights_NNS in_IN how_WRB the_DT students_NNS differ_VBP in_IN their_PRP\$ fluency_NN and_CC what_WP distinguishes_VBZ a_DT very_RB fluent_JJ student_NN from_IN a_DT less_JJR fluent_JJ student_NN ._. Once_RB we_PRP know_VBP what_WP distinguishes_VBZ students_NNS in_IN their_PRP\$ fluency_NN ,_, perhaps_RB we_PRP can_MD gear_VB certain_JJ courses_NNS like_IN Oral_NNP Communication_NNP skills_NNS towards_IN improvement_NN and_CC awareness_NN ._. We_PRP might_MD be_VB able_JJ to_TO make_VB students_NNS aware_JJ of_IN what_WP is_VBZ good_JJ spoken_VBN English_NNP and_CC how_WRB they_PRP may_MD improve_VB themselves_PRP ._. Moreover_RB ,_, during_IN this_DT research_NN project_NN I_PRP will_MD test_VB whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT CEFR_NN is_VBZ a_DT valuable_JJ scheme_NN in_IN assessing_VBG the_DT fluency_NN levels_NNS of_IN students_NNS or_CC that_IN the_DT CEFR_NNP needs_VBZ reviewing_VBG ._.

RAD1253

The_DT article_NN `` `` Information_NNP Structure_NN :_: The_DT final_JJ hurdle_NN ?_ . :_: The_DT development_NN of_IN syntactic_JJ structures_NNS in_IN -LRB_-LRB-

very_RB -RRB-_-RRB- advanced_VBD Dutch_JJ EFL_NN writing_VBG "-" explains_VBZ
 that_IN the_DT underuse_NN of_IN constructions_NNS such_JJ as_IN the_DT it-cleft_NN
 makes_VBZ English_JJ text_NN written_VBN by_IN native_JJ speakers_NNS of_IN
 Dutch_JJ perceived_VBN as_IN L2_NN texts_NNS ._. They_PRP conclude_VBP that_IN
 the_DT information-structure_NN differences_NNS between_IN Dutch_JJ and_CC
 English_JJ are_VBP the_DT final_JJ hurdle_NN for_IN Dutch_JJ learners_NNS of_IN
 English_NNP as_IN a_DT foreign_JJ language_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Verheijen_NNP ,_,
 Los_NNP and_CC de_IN Haan_NNP 92-107_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. These_DT
 constructions_NNS are_VBP probably_RB underused_JJ because_IN of_IN the_DT
 differences_NNS in_IN Dutch_JJ and_CC English_JJ grammar_NN ._. This_DT might_MD
 be_VB due_JJ to_TO the_DT fact_NN that_IN ,_, as_IN van_NN der_FW Beek_FW
 states_NNS in_IN her_PRP\$ thesis_NN ``_`` Topics_NNS in_IN Corpus-Based_JJ Dutch_JJ
 Syntax_NN ,_, "-" it-clefts_NNS have_VBP a_DT low_JJ frequency_NN in_IN Dutch_NNP
 ._. In_IN the_DT course_NN Pragmatics_NNS in_IN Translation_NN we_PRP have_VBP
 learned_VBN about_IN the_DT many_JJ information-structure_JJ differences_NNS
 between_IN Dutch_JJ and_CC English_JJ ,_, which_WDT have_VBP to_TO do_VB
 with_IN the_DT SVO-structure_NN in_IN English_NNP and_CC the_DT SOV-
 structure_NN or_CC V2_NN structure_NN in_IN Dutch_NNP ._. In_IN this_DT course_NN
 we_PRP had_VBD to_TO read_VB chapter_NN nine_CD of_IN The_DT Cambridge_NNP
 Grammar_NN of_IN the_DT English_NNP Language_NN ,_, which_WDT describes_VBZ
 all_PDT the_DT properties_NNS of_IN clefts_NNS and_CC the_DT form_NN of_IN
 clefts_NNS ._. By_IN using_VBG his_PRP\$ article_NN to_TO explain_VB how_WRB
 these_DT clefts_NNS work_VBP in_IN English_NNP ,_, we_PRP were_VBD taught_VBN
 how_WRB to_TO translate_VB those_DT into_IN felicitous_JJ Dutch_JJ sentences_NNS ._.
 The_DT element_NN that_WDT is_VBZ foregrounded_VBN in_IN the_DT English_NNP it-
 cleft_NN can_MD in_IN Dutch_NNP either_CC be_VB in_IN first_JJ position_NN or_CC
 be_VB foregrounded_VBN in_IN the_DT middle_JJ field_NN ,_, a_DT solution_NN
 that_WDT is_VBZ only_RB learned_VBN by_IN advanced_JJ language_NN learners_NNS
 ._. Research_NNP has_VBZ been_VBN done_VBN by_IN many_JJ different_JJ
 researchers_NNS such_JJ as_IN Ahlemeyer_NNP and_CC Kohlhof_NNP ,_, Doherty_NNP
 and_CC Fischer_NNP on_IN the_DT translation_NN of_IN clefts_NNS from_IN
 English_NNP to_TO German_NNP ._. Ahlemeyer_NNP and_CC Kohlhof_NNP show_VBP
 in_IN their_PRP\$ article_NN ``_`` Bridging_VBG the_DT Cleft_NNP :_: The_DT
 Analysis_NN of_IN the_DT Translation_NN of_IN English_NNP It-Clefts_NNPS into_IN

German_NNP ._. " " that_IN in_IN German_JJ clefts_NNS are_VBP not_RB only_RB translated_VBN with_IN a_DT Spaltsatz_NNP ,_, a_DT similar_JJ construction_NN in_IN German_JJ ,_, but_CC that_IN they_PRP also_RB use_VBP specific_JJ word_NN orders_NNS ,_, so_RB that_IN the_DT cleft_NN can_MD be_VB dropped_VBN as_IN it_PRP is_VBZ infelicitous_JJ in_IN German_JJ -LRB-_-LRB- 1-25_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. They_PRP based_VBD their_PRP\$ research_NN on_IN a_DT corpus_NN of_IN English-German_NNP translations_NNS ,_, and_CC Doherty_NNP supports_VBZ their_PRP\$ conclusion_NN ;_: she_PRP states_VBZ that_IN clefts_NNS are_VBP only_RB used_VBN in_IN German_JJ if_IN no_DT other_JJ options_NNS are_VBP options_NNS are_VBP not_RB possible_JJ -LRB-_-LRB- 273-293_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Most_JJS corpuses_NNS are_VBP based_VBN on_IN advanced_JJ language_NN learners_NNS or_CC translators_NNS ,_, but_CC little_JJ research_NN is_VBZ focused_VBN on_IN the_DT translations_NNS of_IN less_JJR advanced_JJ translators_NNS ._. My_PRP\$ research_NN will_MD focus_VB on_IN the_DT difference_NN between_IN those_DT more_JJR advanced_JJ learners_NNS and_CC the_DT less_JJR advanced_JJ translators_NNS ,_, and_CC my_PRP\$ research_NN question_NN will_MD be_VB ;_: will_MD the_DT degree_NN of_IN English_NNP education_NN help_NN university_NN students_NNS to_TO become_VB better_RBR in_IN the_DT translation_NN of_IN it-clefts_NNS than_IN students_NNS in_IN their_PRP\$ last_JJ year_NN of_IN secondary_JJ school_NN ?_. In_IN secondary_JJ school_NN Dutch_JJ students_NNS become_VBP more_RBR educated_VBN in_IN grammar_NN ,_, reading_NN ,_, writing_VBG and_CC communication_NN skills_NNS ;_: however_RB translation_NN is_VBZ not_RB the_DT main_JJ focus_NN of_IN English_NNP education_NN ._. The_DT students_NNS become_VBP more_RBR familiar_JJ with_IN the_DT English_NNP language_NN in_IN those_DT five_CD years_NNS of_IN English_NNP education_NN and_CC my_PRP\$ hypothesis_NN is_VBZ that_IN the_DT more_RBR familiar_JJ a_DT student_NN becomes_VBZ with_IN the_DT English_NNP language_NN ,_, the_DT better_JJR he_PRP or_CC she_PRP will_MD be_VB able_JJ to_TO deal_VB with_IN translating_VBG difficult_JJ English_JJ constructions_NNS such_JJ as_IN the_DT it-cleft_NN ._. My_PRP\$ research_NN will_MD be_VB based_VBN on_IN secondary_JJ school_NN pupils_NNS ,_, but_CC it_PRP will_MD also_RB be_VB based_VBN on_IN students_NNS of_IN English_NNP at_IN University_NNP ._. I_PRP will_MD use_VB secondary_JJ school_NN pupils_NNS because_IN they_PRP are_VBP the_DT ones_NNS that_WDT start_VBP to_TO get_VB educated_VBN in_IN English_NNP ._. The_DT ones_NNS that_WDT enter_VBP secondary_JJ school_NN have_VBP just_RB

enough_RB knowledge_NN to_TO be_VB able_JJ to_TO translate_VB basic_JJ sentences_NNS ,_, but_CC are_VBP far_RB from_IN experts_NNS yet_RB ._. They_PRP are_VBP beginners_NNS when_WRB it_PRP comes_VBZ to_TO translation_NN ._. The_DT ones_NNS that_WDT are_VBP about_IN to_TO go_VB to_TO the_DT final_JJ year_NN should_MD have_VB had_VBN enough_JJ education_NN to_TO be_VB able_JJ to_TO translate_VB more_RBR difficult_JJ English_JJ sentences_NNS ._. As_IN the_DT article_NN ``_`` Information_NNP Structure_NN :_: The_DT final_JJ hurdle_NN ?_. :_: The_DT development_NN of_IN syntactic_JJ structures_NNS in_IN -LRB-_-LRB- very_RB -RRB-_-RRB- advanced_VBD Dutch_JJ EFL_NN writing_VBG " " explains_VBZ that_IN the_DT it-cleft_NN is_VBZ one_CD of_IN the_DT final_JJ hurdles_NNS for_IN learners_NNS of_IN English_NNP as_IN a_DT second_JJ language_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 92-107_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, testing_VBG the_DT group_NN that_WDT has_VBZ just_RB entered_VBN secondary_JJ school_NN will_MD be_VB too_RB difficult_JJ for_IN them_PRP as_IN they_PRP will_MD not_RB have_VB had_VBN enough_JJ language_NN education_NN ._. Therefore_RB I_PRP will_MD be_VB testing_VBG the_DT following_VBG two_CD groups_NNS ;_: a_DT fifth_JJ year_NN student_NN of_IN VWO_NN and_CC a_DT second_JJ year_NN student_NN of_IN English_NNP ._. In_IN that_DT way_NN I_PRP can_MD compare_VB less_JJR advanced_JJ or_CC basic_JJ learner_NN of_IN English_NNP to_TO a_DT more_RBR advanced_JJ learner_NN and_CC draw_VB my_PRP\$ conclusions_NNS on_IN whether_IN or_CC not_RB the_DT degree_NN of_IN English_NNP education_NN helps_VBZ the_DT students_NNS to_TO do_VB better_JJR in_IN translating_VBG difficult_JJ English_JJ constructions_NNS ._.

RAD1277

Many_JJ articles_NNS have_VBP been_VBN written_VBN on_IN children_NNS 's_POS use_NN of_IN optional_JJ infinitives_NNS ,_, or_CC root_NN infinitives_NNS as_IN they_PRP are_VBP sometimes_RB called_VBN ._. Optional_JJ infinitives_NNS are_VBP a_DT remarkable_JJ phenomenon_NN of_IN child_NN speech_NN ,_, of_IN which_WDT all_DT children_NNS at_IN an_DT early_JJ stage_NN of_IN language_NN acquisition_NN make_VBP use_NN ._. A_DT verb_VBP qualifies_VBZ as_IN an_DT optional_JJ infinitive_JJ if_IN both_CC the_DT finite_JJ and_CC non-finite_JJ form_NN occur_VBP in_IN certain_JJ contexts_NNS ._. I_PRP find_VBP this_DT flexibility_NN incredibly_RB fascinating_JJ ,_, and_CC I_PRP would_MD love_VB to_TO discover_VB more_JJR about_IN its_PRP\$ origins_NNS and_CC implications_NNS for_IN other_JJ speech_NN

aspects_NNS ,_, such_JJ as_IN the_DT mean_NN length_NN of_IN utterance_NN -LRB-_-LRB- MLU_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. The_DT majority_NN of_IN previously_RB published_VBN articles_NNS on_IN this_DT subject_JJ focus_NN on_IN children_NNS with_IN Specific_JJ Language_NN Impairment_NN -LRB-_-LRB- SLI_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, and_CC how_WRB they_PRP often_RB experience_VBP an_DT extended_JJ stage_NN of_IN optional_JJ infinitive_JJ production_NN ._. I_PRP intend_VBP to_TO focus_VB ,_, however_RB ,_, on_IN children_NNS without_IN any_DT impairments_NNS ,_, although_IN I_PRP might_MD make_VB some_DT comparisons_NNS occasionally_RB ._. The_DT possible_JJ presence_NN of_IN a_DT correlation_NN between_IN the_DT size_NN of_IN a_DT child_NN 's_POS MLU_NNP and_CC the_DT extent_NN to_TO which_WDT they_PRP use_VBP optional_JJ infinitives_NNS will_MD be_VB my_PRP\$ main_JJ point_NN of_IN focus_NN ._. In_IN ``_`` The_DT acquisition_NN of_IN Dutch_JJ syntax_NN " " ,_, Wijnen_NN and_CC Verrips_NNS have_VBP done_VBN extensive_JJ research_NN into_IN the_DT use_NN of_IN optional_JJ infinitives_NNS ,_, and_CC its_PRP\$ potential_JJ relation_NN to_TO the_DT mean_NN length_NN of_IN utterance_NN ._. I_PRP expect_VBP to_TO derive_VB a_DT great_JJ deal_NN of_IN information_NN from_IN their_PRP\$ work_NN ._. Schaerlaekens_NNS ' _POS textbook_NN on_IN children_NNS 's_POS language_NN development_NN includes_VBZ a_DT couple_NN of_IN sections_NNS in_IN which_WDT she_PRP explains_VBZ in_IN basic_JJ terms_NNS how_WRB optional_JJ infinitives_NNS function_NN and_CC what_WP their_PRP\$ purpose_NN is_VBZ ._. I_PRP will_MD study_VB her_PRP\$ work_NN for_IN essential_JJ background_NN information_NN ._. Furthermore_RB ,_, I_PRP intend_VBP to_TO analyse_VB the_DT works_NNS of_IN Haegeman_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 1995_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, Krämer_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 1993_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, Wexler_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- 1994_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, and_CC Freudenthal_NNP et_FW al._FW -LRB-_-LRB- 2006_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. My_PRP\$ hypothesis_NN is_VBZ that_DT children_NNS that_WDT use_VBP finite_JJ verbs_NNS are_VBP capable_JJ of_IN producing_VBG longer_JJR sentences_NNS than_IN when_WRB they_PRP were_VBD still_RB using_VBG non-finite_JJ verbs_NNS in_IN places_NNS where_WRB grammar_NN dictates_VBZ that_IN they_PRP should_MD use_VB finite_JJ verbs_NNS ._. It_PRP seems_VBZ only_RB logical_JJ that_IN a_DT child_NN that_WDT knows_VBZ how_WRB and_CC when_WRB to_TO apply_VB finiteness_NN will_MD also_RB be_VB able_JJ to_TO incorporate_VB objects_NNS and_CC perhaps_RB even_RB adjectives_NNS and_CC adverbs_NNS into_IN the_DT sentence_NN ,_, thus_RB extending_VBG the_DT mean_NN

length_NN of_IN utterance_NN ._. I_PRP intend_VBP to_TO test_VB my_PRP\$ hypothesis_NN by_IN analysing_VBG as_RB many_JJ transcripts_NNS in_IN CHILDES_NNP as_IN my_PRP\$ schedule_NN allows_VBZ ,_, and_CC then_RB comparing_VBG that_IN to_TO what_WP I_PRP have_VBP found_VBN in_IN previously_RB written_VBN academic_JJ articles_NNS ._. My_PRP\$ contribution_NN to_TO the_DT field_NN will_MD probably_RB be_VB minimal_JJ ,_, since_IN I_PRP will_MD not_RB be_VB aggregating_VBG child_NN speech_NN data_NNS of_IN my_PRP\$ own_JJ ,_, but_CC rather_RB studying_VBG already_RB published_VBN material_NN ._. However_RB ,_, I_PRP do_VBP hope_VB that_IN by_IN connecting_VBG loose_JJ ends_NNS and_CC regrouping_VBG information_NN ,_, I_PRP will_MD put_VB together_RB a_DT coherent_JJ survey_NN of_IN what_WP has_VBZ been_VBN researched_VBN on_IN this_DT topic_NN and_CC thereby_RB create_VB something_NN meaningful_JJ ._.

RAD1280

The_DT Common_JJ European_JJ Framework_NN for_IN Reference_NNP for_IN language_NN -LRB-_-LRB- CEFR_NN -RRB-_-RRB- is_VBZ a_DT guideline_NN which_WDT is_VBZ used_VBN to_TO describe_VB students_NNS ' _POS proficiency_NN during_IN the_DT process_NN and_CC eventual_JJ end_NN result_NN -LRB-_-LRB- or_CC fossilization_NN -RRB-_-RRB- when_WRB acquiring_VBG a_DT foreign_JJ language_NN ._. The_DT CEFR_NN levels_NNS range_VBP from_IN A1_NN to_TO C2_NN ,_, with_IN A1_NN being_VBG a_DT beginner_NN and_CC C2_NN being_VBG the_DT highest_JJS level_NN possible_JJ ._. CEFR_NN is_VBZ often_RB used_VBN in_IN educational_JJ contexts_NNS ,_, and_CC learners_NNS ,_, language_NN teachers_NNS ,_, and_CC employers_NNS will_MD find_VB the_DT framework_NN very_RB helpful_JJ in_IN setting_VBG the_DT curricular_JJ system_NN in_IN various_JJ countries_NNS and_CC regions_NNS ._. It_PRP is_VBZ also_RB helps_VBZ people_NNS to_TO be_VB more_RBR specific_JJ about_IN what_WP language_NN students_NNS can_MD and_CC can_MD not_RB do_VB in_IN the_DT language_NN they_PRP are_VBP acquiring_VBG -LRB-_-LRB- Hulstijn_NN 663_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Hulstijn_NNP is_VBZ a_DT professor_NN from_IN the_DT university_NN of_IN Amsterdam_NNP and_CC claims_VBZ that_IN `` `` -LSB-_-LRB- the_DT CEFR_NN -RSB-_-RRB- is_VBZ ,_, of_IN course_NN ,_, not_RB perfect_JJ ,_, but_CC it_PRP is_VBZ good_JJ enough_RB to_TO be_VB improved_VBN upon_IN and_CC developed_VBD further_RB " " -LRB-_-LRB-

Hulstijn_NNP 663_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. In_IN order_NN to_TO find_VB out_RP what_WP exactly_RB can_MD be_VB improved_VBN ,_, the_DT main_JJ research_NN question_NN will_MD try_VB to_TO find_VB an_DT answer_NN to_TO in_IN which_WDT ways_NNS CEFR_NN is_VBZ used_VBN in_IN evaluating_VBG second_JJ language_NN learners_NNS and_CC how_WRB this_DT framework_NN can_MD be_VB improved_VBN ._. Hulstijn_NNP ,_, Anderson_NNP and_CC others_NNS have_VBP suggested_VBN that_IN the_DT CEFR_NN is_VBZ a_DT good_JJ initiative_NN ,_, but_CC is_VBZ not_RB yet_RB perfect_JJ and_CC needs_VBZ improvement_NN ._. This_DT research_NN question_NN will_MD look_VB at_IN how_WRB the_DT CEFR_NN framework_NN is_VBZ used_VBN by_IN language_NN learners_NNS and_CC teachers_NNS and_CC might_MD show_VB what_WP aspects_NNS of_IN the_DT framework_NN work_NN as_IN hoped_VBN and_CC what_WP can_MD be_VB improved_VBN ._. After_IN finding_VBG what_WP can_MD be_VB improved_VBN about_IN the_DT framework_NN ,_, a_DT proposal_NN to_TO certain_JJ changes_NNS can_MD be_VB made_VBN ,_, which_WDT in_IN turn_NN ,_, may_MD lead_VB to_TO a_DT better_JJR functioning_VBG CEFR_NN ._. Previous_JJ research_NN has_VBZ shown_VBN that_IN the_DT CEFR_NN is_VBZ a_DT good_JJ starting_VBG point_NN ._. Some_DT say_VBP it_PRP is_VBZ far_RB from_IN perfect_JJ and_CC needs_VBZ more_RBR improvement_NN whilst_IN others_NNS say_VBP ,_, including_VBG CEFR_NN itself_PRP say_VBP ,_, that_IN this_DT is_VBZ a_DT good_JJ framework_NN in_IN itself_PRP and_CC should_MD be_VB used_VBN as_IN guidelines_NNS rather_RB than_IN as_IN strict_JJ scales_NNS ._. Some_DT critics_NNS of_IN the_DT framework_NN ,_, such_JJ as_IN Little_JJ ,_, find_VB it_PRP problematic_JJ that_IN the_DT CEFR_NN scales_NNS have_VBP no_DT reference_NN to_TO a_DT specific_JJ language_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Alderson_NNP 660_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. However_RB ,_, quite_RB recently_RB ,_, a_DT project_NN has_VBZ been_VBN set_VBN up_RP to_TO develop_VB Reference_NNP Level_NNP Descriptions_NNPS specifically_RB for_IN English_NNP ,_, but_CC Alderson_NNP claims_VBZ that_IN this_DT project_NN was_VBD flawed_VBN from_IN the_DT beginning_NN because_IN of_IN its_PRP\$ narrow_JJ focus_NN on_IN students_NNS who_WP have_VBP taken_VBN a_DT Cambridge_NNP ESOL_NNP exam_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 660_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Another_DT study_NN which_WDT is_VBZ conducted_VBN is_VBZ all_DT about_IN Anchor_NNP Items_NNS for_IN Foreign_JJ Language_NN Skills_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- EBAFLS_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, it_PRP aims_VBZ to_TO be_VB more_RBR transparent_JJ

and_CC reliable_JJ so_RB that_IN diplomas_NNS across_IN borders_NNS really_RB do_VBP have_VB the_DT same_JJ value_NN ._. Bonnet_NN states_NNS that_WDT with_IN the_DT CEFR_NN this_DT is_VBZ still_RB not_RB the_DT case_NN ._. Although_IN there_EX is_VBZ some_DT research_NN done_VBN on_IN trying_VBG to_TO improve_VB the_DT CEFR_NN or_CC come_VB up_RP with_IN a_DT variant_NN on_IN it_PRP ,_, Hulstijn_NNP argues_VBZ that_IN the_DT task_NN to_TO develop_VB and_CC test_VB a_DT theory_NN of_IN language_NN proficiency_NN will_MD remain_VB on_IN the_DT agenda_NN forever_RB -LRB-_-LRB- 664_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. The_DT hypothesis_NN that_WDT will_MD be_VB explored_VBN in_IN this_DT research_NN paper_NN is_VBZ that_IN the_DT CEFR_NN scales_NNS ,_, which_WDT are_VBP often_RB used_VBN in_IN educational_JJ contexts_NNS ,_, are_VBP in_IN need_NN of_IN improvement_NN ._. This_DT hypothesis_NN will_MD be_VB attested_VBN by_IN the_DT means_NNS of_IN two_CD sub-hypotheses_NNS ._. One_CD ,_, Language_NN learners_NNS as_RB well_RB as_IN language_NN teachers_NNS and_CC native_JJ speakers_NNS find_VBP the_DT CEFR_NN scales_NNS vaguely_RB defined_VBN and_CC two_CD ,_, There_EX is_VBZ no_DT consensus_NN amongst_IN teachers_NNS and_CC native_JJ speakers_NNS about_IN the_DT CEFR_NN level_NN of_IN the_DT students_NNS ._. This_DT research_NN paper_NN aims_VBZ to_TO serve_VB as_IN a_DT starting_VBG point_NN for_IN a_DT critical_JJ research_NN in_IN which_WDT the_DT CEFR_NN is_VBZ respected_VBN for_IN its_PRP\$ usefulness_NN ,_, but_CC is_VBZ thoroughly_RB investigated_VBN and_CC tested_VBN to_TO become_VB more_RBR efficient_JJ ,_, reliable_JJ ,_, transparent_JJ and_CC easier_JJ to_TO use_VB not_RB only_RB by_IN language_NN teachers_NNS but_CC also_RB by_IN language_NN learners_NNS ._. These_DT improvements_NNS on_IN the_DT CEFR_NN scales_NNS will_MD allow_VB language_NN teachers_NNS to_TO reach_VB consensus_NN on_IN students_NNS ' _POS levels_NNS and_CC language_NN students_NNS will_MD have_VB a_DT better_JJR understanding_NN of_IN why_WRB they_PRP have_VBP achieved_VBN a_DT certain_JJ level_NN and_CC not_RB the_DT other_JJ ._. The_DT participants_NNS for_IN this_DT research_NN proposal_NN will_MD be_VB a_DT group_NN of_IN 80_CD Dutch_JJ students_NNS of_IN English_NNP in_IN secondary_JJ school_NN -LRB-_-LRB- age_NN 12_CD --_: 18_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Next_JJ to_TO the_DT students_NNS will_MD be_VB a_DT group_NN of_IN 10_CD English_JJ language_NN teachers_NNS and_CC a_DT group_NN of_IN 10_CD native_JJ speakers_NNS of_IN English_NNP ._. The_DT students_NNS will_MD be_VB shown_VBN

a_DT clip_NN and_CC afterwards_RB they_PRP have_VBP to_TO describe_VB what_WP they_PRP saw_VBD in_IN the_DT clip_NN ._. After_IN that_DT ,_, the_DT experimenter_NN will_MD ask_VB a_DT set_NN of_IN five_CD questions_NNS in_IN order_NN to_TO get_VB some_DT spontaneous_JJ speech_NN produced_VBN by_IN the_DT students_NNS ._. To_TO round_VB off_RP the_DT experiment_NN there_EX will_MD be_VB a_DT short_JJ questionnaire_NN in_IN which_WDT there_EX will_MD be_VB questions_NNS about_IN what_WP they_PRP thought_VBD about_IN the_DT experiment_NN ,_, about_IN CEFR_NN and_CC what_WP they_PRP find_VBP difficult_JJ whilst_IN using_VBG CEFR_NN as_IN a_DT framework_NN ._. The_DT oral_JJ experiments_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- short_JJ story_NN and_CC spontaneous_JJ speech_NN -RRB-_-RRB- will_MD be_VB recorded_VBN and_CC the_DT students_NNS ,_, the_DT teachers_NNS ,_, and_CC the_DT native_JJ speakers_NNS of_IN English_NNP will_MD be_VB asked_VBN to_TO assign_VB a_DT CEFR_NN level_NN to_TO each_DT student_NN ._. After_IN all_PDT the_DT data_NNS has_VBZ been_VBN collected_VBN ,_, I_PRP will_MD analyze_VB the_DT data_NNS and_CC see_VB whether_IN there_EX are_VBP any_DT differences_NNS between_IN the_DT assigned_VBN CEFR_NN levels_NNS ._. Through_IN the_DT motivation_NN which_WDT students_NNS ,_, teachers_NNS and_CC native_JJ speakers_NNS gave_VBD ,_, I_PRP will_MD try_VB to_TO find_VB out_RP what_WP the_DT choice_NN was_VBD for_IN that_DT specific_JJ level_NN ._. Ideally_RB for_IN this_DT research_NN ,_, students_NNS ,_, teachers_NNS ,_, and_CC native_JJ speakers_NNS will_MD think_VB that_IN a_DT student_NN could_MD be_VB assigned_VBN two_CD different_JJ levels_NNS ._. Based_VBN on_IN this_DT information_NN ,_, combined_VBN with_IN the_DT teachers_NNS ' _POS and_CC native_JJ speakers_NNS ' _POS motivation_NN for_IN a_DT specific_JJ level_NN ,_, and_CC the_DT questionnaires_NNS about_IN the_DT functionality_NN of_IN CEFR_NN ,_, I_PRP will_MD try_VB to_TO redefine_VB or_CC improve_VB the_DT descriptions_NNS of_IN the_DT CEFR_NN levels_NNS ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0016.1

Before_IN we_PRP can_MD discuss_VB the_DT situation_NN of_IN French_JJ education_NN today_NN and_CC in_IN the_DT recent_JJ past_NN we_PRP should_MD look_VB at_IN its_PRP\$ history_NN as_IN this_DT helps_VBZ to_TO explain_VB the_DT elitisme_NN in_IN the_DT system_NN ._. We_PRP need_VBP to_TO go_VB back_RB to_TO the_DT late_JJ 18th_JJ century_NN when_WRB Napoleon_NNP put_VBD forward_RB his_PRP\$ views_NNS on_IN education_NN ._. He_PRP believed_VBD that_IN people_NNS should_MD be_VB educated_VBN in_IN order_NN for_IN the_DT state_NN to_TO run_VB smoothly_RB ._. ie_FW :_: he_PRP did_VBD not_RB really_RB believe_VB in_IN the_DT right_NN of_IN people_NNS to_TO be_VB educated_VBN just_RB in_IN the_DT need_NN of_IN the_DT state_NN for_IN people_NNS to_TO be_VB educated_VBN ._. As_IN most_JJS of_IN the_DT population_NN were_VBD involved_VBN in_IN agriculture_NN at_IN that_DT time_NN ,_, there_EX was_VBD only_RB need_VB for_IN a_DT very_RB basic_JJ primary_JJ education_NN for_IN the_DT majority_NN of_IN people_NNS ._. This_DT he_PRP left_VBD mainly_RB up_RB to_TO the_DT church_NN as_IN he_PRP believed_VBD the_DT church_NN would_MD promote_VB social_JJ cooperation_NN ._. Secondary_JJ and_CC Higher_JJR education_NN were_VBD more_RBR important_JJ as_IN the_DT would_MD train_VB the_DT professionals_NNS which_WDT the_DT country_NN needed_VBD ,_, and_CC this_DT section_NN of_IN education_NN was_VBD therefore_RB run_VBN by_IN the_DT state_NN ._. At_IN this_DT stage_NN we_PRP can_MD already_RB see_VB the_DT opportunity_NN for_IN a_DT gap_NN between_IN primary_JJ &_CC secondary_JJ education_NN which_WDT remained_VBD in_IN fact_NN until_IN relatively_RB recently_RB ,_, despite_IN attempts_NNS at_IN reforms_NNS which_WDT I_PRP will_MD go_VB into_IN later_RB ._. This_DT system_NN of_IN education_NN did_VBD not_RB lead_VB to_TO much_JJ social_JJ mobility_NN as_IN the_DT children_NNS from_IN poorer_JJR social_JJ backgrounds_NNS left_VBD school_NN after_IN primary_JJ ,_, ``_`` ecole_FW primaire_FW " " ,_, with_IN a_DT very_RB basic_JJ education_NN ,_, whereas_IN the_DT children_NNS from_IN richer_JJR backgrounds_NNS could_MD go_VB on_IN to_TO secondary_JJ and_CC higher_JJR education_NN ._. These_DT ``_`` bourgeois_FW " " children_NNS would_MD then_RB go_VB on_IN to_TO Lycée_NNP and_CC either_RB to_TO University_NNP or_CC ``_`` Les_NNP Grandes_NNP

Ecoles_NNP " " so_IN joining_VBG the_DT class_NN of_IN the_DT élite_NN ._. This_DT elitism_NN has_VBZ survived_VBN to_TO a_DT certain_JJ degree_NN up_IN to_TO today_NN ._. The_DT gap_NN between_IN primary_JJ and_CC secondary_JJ education_NN became_VBD a_DT major_JJ concern_NN for_IN the_DT later_JJ governments_NNS ._. Under_IN the_DT second_JJ and_CC third_JJ republics_NNS not_RB much_RB advance_NN was_VBD made_VBN on_IN the_DT education_NN question_NN as_IN this_DT did_VBD not_RB appear_VB to_TO be_VB a_DT priority_NN ._. Under_IN the_DT forth_RB republic_NN reforms_NNS were_VBD proposed_VBN but_CC because_IN of_IN the_DT multi-party_JJ governments_NNS who_WP had_VBD to_TO face_VB internal_JJ struggles_NNS all_PDT the_DT time_NN ,_, they_PRP failed_VBD in_IN most_JJS cases_NNS to_TO be_VB passed_VBN ._. The_DT main_JJ proposal_NN for_IN reform_NN put_VBD forward_RB by_IN Jean_NNP Zay_NNP &_CC later_RB the_DT Languin-Wallon_NNP plan_NN which_WDT formed_VBD the_DT basis_NN for_IN the_DT eventual_JJ reforms_NNS ,_, concerned_JJ what_WP was_VBD called_VBN `` `` orientation_NN " " ._. This_DT was_VBD an_DT attempt_NN to_TO bring_VB primary_JJ and_CC secondary_JJ education_NN together_RB ._. It_PRP should_MD be_VB said_VBN here_RB that_IN earlier_JJR attempts_NNS at_IN increasing_VBG the_DT role_NN of_IN primary_JJ and_CC secondary_JJ education_NN and_CC making_VBG it_PRP open_JJ to_TO all_DT frightened_VBD the_DT bourgeoisie_NN who_WP then_RB sent_VBD their_PRP\$ children_NNS to_TO schools_NNS linked_VBN to_TO the_DT Lycées_NNPS so_IN that_IN they_PRP still_RB had_VBD an_DT advantage_NN ._. Longuin-Wallon_NNP plan_NN proposed_VBD an_DT orientation_NN period_NN from_IN the_DT age_NN of_IN 11_CD to_TO 15_CD which_WDT would_MD be_VB compulsory_JJ for_IN all_DT children_NNS and_CC would_MD provide_VB a_DT more_RBR coherent_JJ link_NN between_IN primary_JJ and_CC secondary_JJ education_NN ._. Two_CD years_NNS of_IN this_DT orientation_NN would_MD be_VB a_DT set_NN syllabus_NN for_IN all_DT pupils_NNS of_IN all_DT abilities_NNS giving_VBG everyone_NN an_DT equal_JJ chance_NN ._. After_IN these_DT two_CD years_NNS the_DT pupils_NNS would_MD choose_VB options_NNS according_VBG their_PRP\$ interests_NNS and_CC their_PRP\$ abilities_NNS ._. This_DT system_NN was_VBD the_DT basis_NN for_IN the_DT CES_NN -LRB-_-LRB- collège_NN d'enseignement_NN secondaires_NNS -RRB-_-RRB- These_DT proposals_NNS were_VBD thwarted_VBN twice_RB by_IN the_DT two_CD world_NN wars_NNS but_CC are_VBP now_RB in_IN operation_NN ._. I_PRP will_MD now_RB explain_VB how_WRB the_DT

system_NN works_VBZ today_NN ,_, how_WRB it_PRP compares_VBZ to_TO
 England_NNP and_CC why_WRB ,_, despite_IN attempts_NNS by_IN the_DT
 government_NN ,_, the_DT system_NN is_VBZ still_RB prone_JJ to_TO elitism_NN ._.
 We_PRP have_VBP already_RB seen_VBN how_WRB the_DT CES_NN works_VBZ
 so_RB now_RB we_PRP can_MD discuss_VB what_WP happens_VBZ next_JJ ._.
 Pupils_NNS can_MD either_RB stay_VB on_IN in_IN secondary_JJ education_NN ie_FW
 CES_FW until_IN they_PRP are_VBP 16_CD and_CC then_RB leave_VBP school_NN
 or_CC they_PRP can_MD go_VB to_TO a_DT Lycée_NNP where_WRB they_PRP
 will_MD take_VB the_DT bacalauréat_NN in_IN either_CC Science_NN or_CC Arts_NNS
 ._. The_DT third_JJ option_NN ,_, which_WDT was_VBD not_RB always_RB available_JJ
 ,_, is_VBZ the_DT Lycée_NNP technique_NN where_WRB the_DT courses_NNS are_VBP
 more_RBR vocational_JJ ._. You_PRP study_NN for_IN 1_CD ,_, 2_CD or_CC 3_CD
 years_NNS at_IN the_DT Lycée_NNP technique_NN ._. After_IN the_DT first_JJ year_NN
 you_PRP receive_VBP a_DT PEP_NN -_: prévé_NN d'études_NNS professionnelles_NNS ._.
 After_IN two_CD years_NNS you_PRP receive_VBP a_DT CEP_NN -_: certificat_NN
 d'enseignements_NNS professionnelles_NNS and_CC after_IN 3_CD years_NNS a_DT
 CAP_NN -_: certificat_NN d'aptitude_NN professionnelles_NNS ._. Most_JJS of_IN the_DT
 pupils_NNS leaving_VBG the_DT Lycée_NNP technique_NN will_MD go_VB to_TO
 work_VB ,_, although_IN they_PRP can_MD take_VB other_JJ exams_NNS if_IN
 they_PRP wish_VBP to_TO go_VB on_IN to_TO higher_JJR education_NN ._. It_PRP
 is_VBZ rather_RB like_IN a_DT technical_JJ college_NN in_IN England_NNP ._.
 Lycée_NNP is_VBZ more_RBR like_IN a_DT sixth_JJ form_NN college_NN although_IN
 the_DT bacalauréat_NN is_VBZ not_RB the_DT same_JJ as_IN A_DT levels_NNS ,_,
 as_IN you_PRP study_VB more_RBR subjects_NNS for_IN one_CD exam_NN ._. After_IN
 attaining_VBG the_DT bacalauréat_NN you_PRP can_MD go_VB to_TO university_NN ._.
 There_EX is_VBZ relatively_RB little_JJ selection_NN in_IN French_JJ universities_NNS
 ,_, especially_RB when_WRB you_PRP compare_VBP it_PRP with_IN the_DT British_JJ
 system_NN of_IN required_JJ grades_NNS and_CC interviews_NNS ._. This_DT may_MD
 appear_VB to_TO evade_VB elitism_NN but_CC unfortunately_RB it_PRP does_VBZ
 not_RB as_IN children_NNS from_IN lower_JJR classes_NNS will_MD be_VB
 guided_VBN towards_IN more_JJR practical_JJ subjects_NNS in_IN the_DT
 orientation_NN period_NN and_CC so_IN the_DT Lycée_NNP technique_NN because_IN
 their_PRP\$ parents_NNS would_MD be_VB able_JJ to_TO afford_VB to_TO put_VB
 them_PRP through_IN university_NN ._. A_DT system_NN of_IN grants_NNS for_IN

the_DT first_JJ two_CD years_NNS was_VBD proposed_VBN to_TO try_VB and_CC
 avoid_VB this_DT ._. So_RB by_IN the_DT time_NN the_DT student_NN reaches_VBZ
 university_NN ,_, there_EX is_VBZ already_RB a_DT marked_JJ case_NN of_IN
 elitism_NN ._. There_EX is_VBZ one_CD more_JJR extreme_JJ case_NN of_IN elitism_NN
 however_RB and_CC that_DT is_VBZ the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP ._. To_TO
 get_VB into_IN one_CD of_IN these_DT highly_RB prestigious_JJ colleges_NNS you_PRP
 have_VBP to_TO take_VB another_DT exam_NN as_RB well_RB as_IN having_VBG
 the_DT bac_NN ,_, rather_RB like_IN oxford_NN and_CC Cambridge_NNP ._. They_PRP
 are_VBP highly_RB selective_JJ and_CC elitist_JJ ._. The_DT three_CD main_JJ
 schools_NNS are_VBP Ecole_NNP Polytechnique_NNP ,_, Ecole_NNP Normale_NNP
 superieure_NN and_CC Ecole_NNP National_NNP d'Administration_NNP ._. From_IN
 these_DT schools_NNS people_NNS go_VBP on_IN to_TO occupy_VB the_DT highest_JJS
 paid_VBN jobs_NNS in_IN the_DT private_JJ and_CC public_JJ sector_NN ._. As_IN
 an_DT example_NN of_IN their_PRP\$ power_NN and_CC prestige_NN we_PRP can_MD
 look_VB at_IN Giscard_NNP D'Estain_NNP first_RB cabinet_NN ._. Out_IN 16_CD
 members_NNS 7_CD were_VBD from_IN the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP ._. For_IN
 a_DT general_JJ comparison_NN between_IN the_DT French_NNP &_CC English_NNP
 systems_NNS we_PRP can_MD start_VB with_IN the_DT primary_JJ schools_NNS ._.
 In_IN short_JJ the_DT French_NNP is_VBZ moving_VBG towards_IN the_DT old_JJ
 English_JJ system_NN of_IN teaching_VBG a_DT wider_JJR range_NN of_IN
 subjects_NNS and_CC giving_VBG teachers_NNS more_RBR autonomy_NN to_TO
 decide_VB on_IN what_WP and_CC how_WRB to_TO teach_VB whereas_IN
 England_NNP is_VBZ reverting_VBG to_TO the_DT French_JJ method_NN of_IN a_DT
 cour-curricula_JJ set_VBN out_RP by_IN a_DT centralized_JJ body_NN ._. There_EX
 is_VBZ always_RB going_VBG to_TO be_VB a_DT problem_NN with_IN university_NN
 being_VBG associated_VBN with_IN elitism_NN because_IN of_IN the_DT fact_NN
 that_IN poorer_JJR families_NNS would_MD rather_RB see_VB their_PRP\$ children_NNS
 going_VBG out_RP to_TO work_VB than_IN being_VBG a_DT drain_NN on_IN
 their_PRP\$ resorces_NNS ,_, even_RB though_IN the_DT selection_NN process_NN in_IN
 itself_PRP is_VBZ not_RB classist_JJ ._. The_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP are_VBP
 exceptional_JJ cases_NNS ,_, and_CC as_IN with_IN Oxford_NNP and_CC
 Cambridge_NNP ,_, you_PRP will_MD find_VB that_IN most_JJS of_IN its_PRP\$
 entrants_NNS are_VBP upper_JJ class_NN ,_, public_JJ school_NN boys_NNS who_WP
 will_MD come_VB out_RP and_CC work_NN in_IN the_DT highest_JJS jobs_NNS -_:

wages_NNS wise_JJ and_CC prestige_NN wise_JJ -: and_CC perpetuate_VB the_DT cycle_NN by_IN sending_VBG their_PRP\$ children_NNS to_TO the_DT best_JJS schools_NNS money_NN can_MD buy_VB ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0017.1

Studies_NNS in_IN demography_NN have_VBP shown_VBN that_IN the_DT growth_NN of_IN a_DT nation_NN is_VBZ closely_RB linked_VBN to_TO its_PRP\$ economic_JJ development_NN ,_, social_JJ structure_NN ,_, and_CC also_RB cultural_JJ trends_NNS ._. On_IN studying_VBG France_NNP throughout_IN the_DT twentieth_JJ century_NN we_PRP can_MD see_VB that_IN this_DT is_VBZ indeed_RB true_JJ ._. If_IN we_PRP start_VBP at_IN the_DT beginning_NN of_IN the_DT century_NN we_PRP see_VBP that_IN the_DT growth_NN of_IN the_DT population_NN was_VBD inhibited_VBN greatly_RB by_IN the_DT first_JJ world_NN war_NN ,_, where_WRB France_NNP suffered_VBD many_JJ losses_NNS ._. The_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT men_NNS in_IN the_DT society_NN left_VBD to_TO fight_VB meant_VBN that_IN the_DT number_NN of_IN births_NNS was_VBD reduced_VBN greatly_RB ._. This_DT was_VBD also_RB the_DT case_NN on_IN the_DT return_NN of_IN the_DT men_NNS ,_, when_WRB many_JJ did_VBD not_RB come_VB back_RB having_VBG been_VBN killed_VBN ._. Therefore_RB after_IN the_DT first_JJ world_NN war_NN the_DT population_NN of_IN France_NNP decreased_VBD greatly_RB ._. Immigration_NNP was_VBD already_RB present_JJ at_IN this_DT time_NN ,_, and_CC helped_VBD to_TO make_VB up_RP for_IN the_DT large_JJ number_NN of_IN losses_NNS in_IN the_DT war_NN ._. Slowly_RB the_DT population_NN began_VBD to_TO build_VB itself_PRP up_RP again_RB until_IN the_DT beginning_NN of_IN the_DT Second_JJ World_NNP War_NNP ._. In_IN this_DT war_NN France_NNP did_VBD not_RB suffer_VB as_RB many_JJ casualties_NNS and_CC deaths_NNS as_IN in_IN the_DT first_JJ world_NN war_NN ,_, but_CC the_DT fact_NN that_IN there_EX had_VBD already_RB been_VBN losses_NNS made_VBD the_DT situation_NN grave_NN for_IN France_NNP ._. The_DT economy_NN needed_VBD rebuilding_NN ,_, as_IN did_VBD the_DT whole_JJ country_NN ,_, and_CC the_DT work_NN force_NN was_VBD very_RB depleted_JJ ._. There_EX was_VBD an_DT urgent_JJ call_NN for_IN immigrant_JJ workers_NNS to_TO come_VB to_TO France_NNP ,_, and_CC indeed_RB they_PRP did_VBD come_VB -LRB-_-LRB- about_IN 4_CD million_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. When_WRB the_DT troops_NNS came_VBD home_NN ,_, and_CC families_NNS were_VBD reunited_VBN there_EX was_VBD a_DT great_JJ

increase_NN in_IN births_NNS ._. The_DT previous_JJ Malthusian_JJ attitude_NN
 that_WDT less_JJR children_NNS meant_VBD a_DT better_JJR life_NN and_CC
 greater_JJR security_NN was_VBD replaced_VBN by_IN a_DT new_JJ attitude_NN
 that_WDT in_IN order_NN to_TO create_VB and_CC rebuild_VB France_NNP a_DT
 strong_JJ workforce_NN was_VBD needed_VBN ._. Having_VBG a_DT child_NN
 was_VBD regarded_VBN as_IN an_DT `` investment_NN in_IN the_DT future_NN ' ' ._.
 The_DT french_JJ realised_VBN that_IN a_DT defeat_NN was_VBD due_JJ to_TO the_DT
 fact_NN that_IN they_PRP were_VBD not_RB a_DT strong_JJ nation_NN ,_, and_CC
 they_PRP wanted_VBD to_TO build_VB such_PDT a_DT nation_NN ._. The_DT
 gouvernement_NN also_RB adopted_VBD various_JJ policies_NNS to_TO try_VB and_CC
 increase_VB births_NNS in_IN the_DT society_NN ._. It_PRP was_VBD suggested_VBN
 in_IN the_DT 1920s_NNS that_WDT contraception_NN should_MD be_VB made_VBN
 illegal_JJ ,_, but_CC in_IN the_DT end_NN this_DT was_VBD restricted_JJ ._.
 Family_NNP allowances_NNS were_VBD increased_VBN ,_, and_CC medical_JJ
 costs_NNS were_VBD paid_VBN for_IN in_IN order_NN to_TO try_VB and_CC
 encourage_VB births_NNS ._. Also_RB leave_VB from_IN work_NN was_VBD
 increased_VBN ._. The_DT main_JJ incentive_NN was_VBD however_RB that_IN the_DT
 economy_NN was_VBD improving_VBG all_PDT the_DT time_NN ,_, there_EX was_VBD
 full_JJ employment_NN which_WDT generated_VBD security_NN and_CC therefore_RB
 created_VBD the_DT right_JJ sort_NN of_IN environment_NN to_TO favour_VB birth_NN
 ._. There_EX was_VBD therefore_RB a_DT baby_NN boom_NN in_IN the_DT after_IN
 war_NN period_NN ,_, during_IN `` `` les_FW trente_FW glorieuses_NNS " " ._. This_DT
 lasted_VBD until_IN the_DT 1970s_NNS when_WRB a_DT slight_JJ decrease_NN in_IN
 births_NNS was_VBD recorded_VBN ._. It_PRP was_VBD decided_VBN that_IN this_DT
 decrease_NN was_VBD due_JJ to_TO changes_NNS in_IN attitudes_NNS in_IN
 society_NN ._. Firstly_RB ,_, education_NN possibilities_NNS had_VBD been_VBN
 improved_VBN ,_, and_CC therefore_RB more_JJR people_NNS stayed_VBD in_IN
 further_JJ education_NN which_WDT delayed_VBD marriages_NNS which_WDT
 had_VBD become_VBN rarer_RBR ._. Women_NNS also_RB tended_VBD more_JJR
 to_TO want_VB to_TO be_VB educated_VBN ,_, and_CC to_TO continue_VB in_IN
 further_JJ education_NN ,_, as_IN more_JJR opportunities_NNS became_VBD available_JJ
 for_IN them_PRP on_IN the_DT job_NN market_NN as_IN industries_NNS boomed_VBD
 and_CC office_NN jobs_NNS were_VBD in_IN their_PRP\$ plenty_NN ._. As_IN more_JJR
 women_NNS began_VBD to_TO work_VB births_NNS dropped_VBD as_IN work_NN

was_VBD not_RB compatible_JJ with_IN a_DT family_NN ,_, although_IN more_JJR facilities_NNS for_IN looking_VBG after_IN children_NNS were_VBD created_VBN such_JJ as_IN crèches_NNS ._. Women_NNS even_RB if_IN they_PRP did_VBD not_RB particularly_RB want_VB a_DT career_NN still_RB tended_VBD to_TO stay_VB in_IN education_NN as_IN it_PRP was_VBD regarded_VBN as_IN giving_VBG them_PRP a_DT cultural_JJ background_NN considered_VBN necessary_JJ in_IN french_JJ society_NN ._. As_IN the_DT economy_NN developed_VBD society_NN became_VBD a_DT consumer_NN society_NN ,_, and_CC couples_NNS began_VBD to_TO favour_VB having_VBG material_NN things_NNS rather_RB than_IN say_VB a_DT second_JJ child_NN ._. Couples_NNS preferred_VBN having_VBG a_DT car_NN ,_, or_CC annual_JJ holidays_NNS to_TO a_DT child_NN ,_, and_CC thus_RB the_DT birth_NN rate_NN decreased_VBD ._. Also_RB attitudes_NNS of_IN young_JJ people_NNS helped_VBD to_TO decrease_VB the_DT birth_NN rate_NN ,_, as_IN more_JJR co-habitation_NN was_VBD seen_VBN ,_, and_CC fewer_JJR marriages_NNS ._. With_IN the_DT reintroduction_NN of_IN contraception_NN readily_RB available_JJ and_CC also_RB the_DT IVG_NNP programme_NN in_IN 1974_CD this_DT helped_VBD to_TO decrease_VB the_DT number_NN in_IN births_NNS ._. At_IN the_DT moment_NN the_DT french_JJ population_NN is_VBZ not_RB even_RB actually_RB renewing_VBG itself_PRP ,_, as_IN each_DT family_NN needs_VBZ to_TO have_VB 2_CD children_NNS which_WDT it_PRP is_VBZ not_RB having_VBG ._. If_IN it_PRP had_VBD not_RB been_VBN for_IN immigration_NN ,_, the_DT population_NN would_MD have_VB been_VBN around_IN 36_CD million_CD instead_RB of_IN the_DT 56_CD million_CD it_PRP is_VBZ today_NN ._. With_IN the_DT decrease_NN in_IN births_NNS ,_, there_EX is_VBZ therefore_RB an_DT increase_NN in_IN the_DT number_NN of_IN old_JJ people_NNS in_IN french_JJ society_NN as_IN medicine_NN and_CC healthy_JJ eating_NN provides_VBZ a_DT longer_RBR life_NN expectancy_NN ._. This_DT is_VBZ quite_RB a_DT problem_NN in_IN France_NNP as_IN the_DT older_JJR generation_NN cost_VBD a_DT great_JJ deal_NN of_IN money_NN to_TO support_VB ,_, and_CC the_DT fact_NN that_IN their_PRP\$ support_NN is_VBZ seen_VBN as_IN a_DT past_JJ debt_NN rather_RB than_IN a_DT future_JJ investment_NN in_IN the_DT case_NN of_IN children_NNS ,_, makes_VBZ such_JJ support_NN be_VB given_VBN rather_RB begrudgingly_RB ._. There_EX have_VBP been_VBN further_JJ recent_JJ attempts_NNS to_TO try_VB and_CC encourage_VB the_DT birth_NN of_IN children_NNS ,_, such_JJ as_IN leave_NN being_VBG increased_VBN to_TO six_CD months_NNS ,_, and_CC

cash_NN payments_NNS being_VBG made_VBN for_IN third_JJ children_NNS ,,, other_JJ payments_NNS being_VBG greatly_RB increased_VBN also_RB ._. This_DT however_RB does_VBZ not_RB seem_VB to_TO have_VB won_VBN over_IN the_DT current_JJ materialism_NN of_IN the_DT society_NN of_IN today_NN ._. If_IN the_DT graph_NN below_IN is_VBZ studied_VBN than_IN we_PRP can_MD see_VB that_IN demography_NN is_VBZ definitely_RB related_JJ to_TO the_DT economic_JJ ,,, cultural_JJ and_CC social_JJ trends_NNS of_IN a_DT country_NN ._. <graph>_JJ The_DT current_JJ situation_NN of_IN the_DT population_NN today_NN is_VBZ that_IN there_EX are_VBP more_RBR old_JJ people_NNS in_IN society_NN than_IN young_JJ ,,, and_CC that_IN when_WRB the_DT children_NNS born_VBN during_IN the_DT baby_NN boom_NN reach_VBP old_JJ age_NN ,,, there_EX will_MD be_VB more_RBR old_JJ people_NNS than_IN young_JJ ,,, which_WDT may_MD lead_VB to_TO an_DT `` `` immobilisme_NN " " of_IN society_NN where_WRB there_EX are_VBP no_DT new_JJ ideas_NNS and_CC fresh_JJ blood_NN ._. Recent_JJ studies_NNS show_VBP however_RB that_IN marriage_NN is_VBZ now_RB being_VBG favoured_VBN again_RB ,,, and_CC not_RB being_VBG delayed_VBN as_IN it_PRP was_VBD earlier_RBR ,,, although_IN there_EX are_VBP no_DT signs_NNS that_IN materialism_NN is_VBZ decreasing_VBG ,,, and_CC with_IN the_DT current_JJ economic_JJ situation_NN ,,, where_WRB there_EX is_VBZ great_JJ job_NN instability_NN and_CC high_JJ unemployment_NN there_EX is_VBZ not_RB ,,, today_NN ,,, a_DT very_RB favourable_JJ environment_NN to_TO encourage_VB birth_NN ,,, even_RB though_IN all_DT possible_JJ is_VBZ being_VBG done_VBN to_TO encourage_VB it_PRP as_IN regards_VBZ allowances_NNS ,,, lodging_NN ,,, job_NN security_NN ,,, and_CC child-minding_NN ._. France_NNP is_VBZ again_RB in_IN difficulty_NN ,,, and_CC it_PRP remains_VBZ to_TO be_VB seen_VBN when_WRB it_PRP will_MD be_VB able_JJ to_TO remedy_VB the_DT situation_NN ,,, as_IN mainly_RB the_DT economic_JJ situation_NN is_VBZ the_DT problem_NN - : a_DT secure_JJ environment_NN is_VBZ needed_VBN in_IN order_NN for_IN births_NNS to_TO be_VB favoured_VBN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0018.1

The_DT roots_NNS of_IN the_DT problems_NNS in_IN higher_JJR education_NN lie_NN with_IN Napoleon_NNP 's_POS policy_NN on_IN education_NN which_WDT was_VBD to_TO educate_VB a_DT well-trained_JJ small_JJ elite_NN to_TO run_VB the_DT country_NN ,,, while_IN guaranteeing_VBG that_IN the_DT country_NN remained_VBD

stable_JJ by_IN ensuring_VBG that_IN the_DT majority_NN of_IN the_DT population_NN
 was_VBD not_RB over-educated_JJ ._. Although_IN any_DT French_JJ citizen_NN
 with_IN the_DT baccalauréat_NN is_VBZ entitled_VBN through_IN the_DT
 constitution_NN to_TO a_DT university_NN education_NN ,_, the_DT system_NN is_VBZ
 still_RB characterised_VBN by_IN major_JJ inequalities_NNS ._. The_DT system_NN
 of_IN non-selection_JJ for_IN all_DT university_JJ courses_NNS -LRB--LRB- with_IN
 a_DT few_JJ exceptions_NNS such_JJ as_IN dentistry_NN and_CC medicine_NN
 had_VBD led_VBN to_TO the_DT impoverishment_NN of_IN the_DT quality_NN of_IN
 instruction_NN and_CC the_DT status_NN of_IN the_DT universities_NNS ._. Trying_VBG
 to_TO appear_VB to_TO be_VB democratic_JJ ,_, the_DT system_NN allows_VBZ any_DT
 bachelier_NN to_TO enter_VB the_DT first_JJ year_NN of_IN a_DT university_NN
 course_NN ._. However_RB ,_, the_DT drop_NN out_RP rate_NN is_VBZ incredibly_RB
 high_JJ ,_, about_IN 57_CD %_NN ,_, so_RB many_JJ waste_NN a_DT year_NN and_CC
 undergo_VBP a_DT great_JJ deal_NN of_IN stress_NN ,_, both_CC emotional_JJ and_CC
 financial_JJ in_IN this_DT manner_NN ._. Before_IN the_DT Evènements_NNS of_IN
 1968_CD ,_, many_JJ argued_VBD that_IN the_DT universities_NNS were_VBD
 overcrowded_JJ ,_, dirty_JJ ,_, and_CC ruled_VBD to_TO closely_RB from_IN Paris_NNP
 ._. After_IN 1968_CD ,_, Edgar_NNP Faure_NNP tried_VBD to_TO allow_VB for_IN
 more_JJR autonomy_NN and_CC less_JJR direct_JJ rule_NN from_IN Paris_NNP ._.
 Although_IN the_DT Ministry_NNP was_VBD still_RB to_TO be_VB responsible_JJ
 for_IN Building_NN costs_NNS ,_, the_DT universities_NNS were_VBD to_TO be_VB
 allowed_VBN to_TO divide_VB into_IN Unités_NNP d'Enseignement_NNP et_NNP de_FW
 Recherche_NNP -LRB--LRB- UER_NNP -RRB--RRB- and_CC given_VBN more_RBR
 freedom_NN in_IN choosing_VBG academic_JJ staff_NN ._. However_RB ,_,
 universities_NNS were_VBD often_RB divided_VBN into_IN new_JJ universities_NNS
 according_VBG to_TO the_DT political_JJ leanings_NNS of_IN its_PRP\$ professors_NNS
 ,_, and_CC have_VBP been_VBN held_VBN back_RP by_IN political_JJ squabbles_NNS
 ._. The_DT university_NN graduate_NN does_VBZ not_RB enjoy_VB the_DT same_JJ
 prestige_NN as_IN his_PRP\$ European_JJ counterparts_NNS ._. The_DT
 Universities_NNS have_VBP little_JJ contact_NN with_IN the_DT outside_JJ business_NN
 world_NN and_CC the_DT divided_VBN nature_NN of_IN the_DT UERs_NNS
 allows_VBZ little_JJ scope_NN for_IN cross_JJ fertilization_NN of_IN disciplines_NNS ._.
 A_DT licence_NN ,_, does_VBZ not_RB automatically_RB guarantee_VB a_DT good_JJ
 job_NN ,_, and_CC a_DT `` `` jeune_NN diplômé_NN " " could_MD quite_RB easily_RB

find_VB himself_PRP working_VBG in_IN a_DT supermarket_NN check-out_NN ._.
Many_JJ students_NNS ,_, therefore_RB wonder_VB if_IN it_PRP is_VBZ worth_IN
the_DT strain_NN of_IN the_DT French_JJ university_NN which_WDT does_VBZ not_RB
guarantee_VB any_DT future_NN ._. When_WRB it_PRP comes_VBZ to_TO the_DT
top_JJ jobs_NNS ,_, the_DT ex-students_NNS of_IN the_DT `` `` Grandes_NNP
Ecoles_NNP " " will_MD always_RB be_VB top_JJ priority_NN ._. Described_VBN by_IN
`` `` The_DT Guardian_NNP " " as_IN `` `` The_DT Cram_NNP de_FW la_FW Cream_NN
" " ,_, these_DT schools_NNS train_VBP an_DT elite_NN for_IN future_JJ top_JJ
careers_NNS in_IN administration_NN ,_, industry_NN and_CC government_NN ._. Two-
thirds_NNS of_IN the_DT top_JJ hundred_CD french_JJ firms_NNS have_VBP
directors_NNS who_WP are_VBP ex_FW graduates_NNS of_IN these_DT schools_NNS ._.
The_DT privileged_JJ graduates_NNS of_IN these_DT schools_NNS can_MD
guarantee_VB a_DT high-ranking_JJ career_NN and_CC and_CC accelerated_VBD
promotion_NN ._. Entry_NN to_TO these_DT schools_NNS is_VBZ via_IN highly_RB
competitive_JJ exams_NNS ,_, requiring_VBG two_CD of_IN three_CD years_NNS of_IN
intensive_JJ studying_VBG in_IN `` `` classe_JJ préparatoires_NNS " " after_IN the_DT
baccalauréat_NN in_IN lycées_NNS ,_, far_RB superior_JJ to_TO anything_NN
studied_VBN in_IN the_DT first_JJ two_CD years_NNS at_IN university_NN ._. Only_RB
one_CD in_IN twenty_CD candidates_NNS is_VBZ successful_JJ and_CC once_RB
enrolled_VBD in_IN a_DT Grande_NNP Ecole_NNP ,_, the_DT work_NN will_MD be_VB
nowhere_RB near_IN so_RB intense_JJ as_IN it_PRP was_VBD in_IN these_DT
preparatory_JJ classes_NNS ._. The_DT status_NN of_IN these_DT schools_NNS is_VBZ
not_RB necessarily_RB due_JJ to_TO the_DT quality_NN of_IN the_DT teaching_NN
they_PRP offer_VBP ,_, but_CC is_VBZ based_VBN on_IN the_DT calibre_NN of_IN
its_PRP\$ students_NNS ,_, and_CC the_DT quality_NN of_IN the_DT various_JJ
figures_NNS associated_VBN with_IN it_PRP ._. These_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP ,_,
with_IN their_PRP\$ selective_JJ entry_NN processes_NNS are_VBP the_DT inverse_NN
of_IN the_DT universities_NNS ._. Where_WRB the_DT universities_NNS are_VBP
poorly_RB equipped_VBN ,_, the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP have_VBP more_RBR
generous_JJ allowances_NNS ._. The_DT select_JJ and_CC small_JJ number_NN of_IN
the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP contrasts_VBZ with_IN the_DT overcrowding_NN
in_IN the_DT university_NN lecture_NN theatres_NNS ._. Whereas_IN the_DT
university_NN courses_NNS tend_VBP to_TO be_VB narrow_JJ in_IN perspective_NN
and_CC the_DT universities_NNS are_VBP cut_VBN off_RP from_IN the_DT external_JJ

world_NN ,_, courses_NNS in_IN the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP are_VBP far_RB
 more_RBR general_JJ in_IN nature_NN and_CC they_PRP have_VBP en_IN established_JJ
 network_NN of_IN links_NNS in_IN industry_NN and_CC with_IN the_DT business_NN
 world_NN ._. A_DT graduate_NN of_IN a_DT Grande_NNP Ecole_NNP will_MD be_VB
 set_VBN up_RP for_IN life_NN ,_, not_RB only_RB by_IN the_DT guarantee_NN of_IN
 a_DT good_JJ job_NN but_CC also_RB through_IN the_DT ``_`` old-boys_JJ "_"
 network_NN ,_, through_IN which_WDT graduates_VBZ from_IN the_DT same_JJ
 school_NN will_MD always_RB do_VB each_DT other_JJ favours_NNS ._. Higher_JJR
 education_NN is_VBZ still_RB the_DT privilege_NN of_IN the_DT middle_JJ and_CC
 upperclasses_NNS ,_, with_IN only_RB about_RB 6_CD %_NN of_IN the_DT
 university_NN population_NN coming_VBG from_IN working_VBG class_NN
 backgrounds_NNS ,_, compared_VBN to_TO 30_CD %_NN in_IN British_JJ
 Universities_NNS ._. This_DT is_VBZ even_RB more_RBR accentuated_VBN in_IN
 the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP ,_, which_WDT are_VBP largely_RB the_DT
 domaine_NN of_IN the_DT children_NNS of_IN ``_`` cadres_NNS supérieurs_NNS "_"
 and_CC have_VBP proportionally_RB more_RBR men_NNS than_RB female_JJ ._. In_IN
 1945_CD ,_, Debré_NNP established_VBD the_DT Grande_NNP Ecole_NNP for_IN
 Administration_NNP ,_, with_IN the_DT aim_NN of_IN democratising_VBG or_CC
 deparicising_VBG the_DT Civil_NNP Service_NNP via_IN this_DT school_NN ._.
 However_RB ,_, it_PRP remains_VBZ that_IN the_DT majority_NN of_IN these_DT
 pupils_NNS are_VBP children_NNS of_IN ``_`` cadres_NNS Supérieures_NNS "_", ,_,
 male_NN ,_, and_CC from_IN the_DT Parisian_JJ region_NN ._. Attempts_NNS have_VBP
 been_VBN made_VBN to_TO make_VB higher_JJR education_NN more_RBR
 accessible_JJ ,_, for_IN example_NN the_DT establishment_NN of_IN the_DT
 University_NNP of_IN Vincennes_NNP for_IN non-bacheliers_NNS and_CC through_IN
 the_DT introduction_NN of_IN ``_`` Instituts_NNP Universitaires_NNP de_IN
 Technologie_NNP "_"-LRB-_-LRB- IUTS_NN -RRB-_-RRB- which_WDT lead_VBP
 to_TO diplomas_NNS with_IN a_DT technical_JJ and_CC vocational_JJ bias_NN ._.
 However_RB ,_, the_DT snobbery_NN within_IN the_DT French_JJ system_NN
 meant_VBD that_IN these_DT qualifications_NNS were_VBD accredited_VBN with_IN
 low_JJ prestige_NN ._. However_RB ,_, employers_NNS are_VBP now_RB
 beginning_VBG to_TO accept_VB them_PRP ._. It_PRP has_VBZ been_VBN argued_VBN
 that_IN the_DT Universities_NNP are_VBP the_DT ``_`` car-parks_JJ "_", ,_, for_IN the_DT
 student_NN proletariat_NN ,_, while_IN ``_`` Les_NNP Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP "_"

provide_VB the_DT nurseries_NNS for_IN the_DT nations_NNS future_JJ leaders_NNS and_CC that_IN the_DT IUTs_NNS are_VBP factories_NNS to_TO churn_VB out_RP the_DT workforce_NN to_TO keep_VB industry_NN and_CC the_DT economy_NN running_VBG smoothly_RB and_CC that_IN the_DT Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP are_VBP to_TO train_VB the_DT nations_NNS future_JJ leaders_NNS to_TO run_VB the_DT country_NN ._. The_DT French_NNP higher_JJR education_NN system_NN remains_VBZ embued_JJ with_IN snobbery_NN ._. It_PRP is_VBZ entrenched_VBN with_IN out-dated_JJ conceptions_NNS and_CC prejudices_NNS which_WDT prevent_VBP it_PRP from_IN advancing_VBG into_IN a_DT universally_RB equal_JJ system_NN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0019.1

In_IN discussing_VBG the_DT factors_NNS which_WDT have_VBP marked_VBN the_DT development_NN of_IN industrial_JJ relations_NNS in_IN France_NNP under_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ first_JJ worth_JJ mentioning_VBG that_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP established_VBD the_DT ` _ `` comités_FW d'entreprise_FW ' _ " in_IN 1946_CD ,_, a_DT forum_NN where_WRB the_DT management_NN -LRB-_-LRB- patronat_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, staff_NN and_CC trade_NN unions_NNS could_MD meet_VB to_TO discuss_VB the_DT business_NN objectives_NNS and_CC solve_VB any_DT disputes_NNS between_IN different_JJ interest_NN groups_NNS ._. It_PRP must_MD also_RB be_VB noted_VBN before_IN beginning_VBG the_DT discussion_NN of_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP ,_, that_IN from_IN 1884-1968_CD French_JJ Unions_NNS did_VBD not_RB have_VB the_DT right_NN to_TO organise_VB collectively_RB at_IN the_DT workplace_NN ,_, they_PRP only_RB had_VBD the_DT right_NN to_TO ` _ `` social_JJ status_NN ' _ " -_: as_IN a_DT national_JJ body_NN ._. Furthermore_RB ,_, the_DT French_JJ union_NN movement_NN is_VBZ not_RB organized_VBN according_VBG to_TO professions_NNS as_IN in_IN Great_NNP Britain_NNP ,_, but_CC along_IN lines_NNS of_IN ideological_JJ stance_NN ,_, which_WDT gives_VBZ it_PRP a_DT different_JJ role_NN altogether_RB ._. The_DT French_JJ unions_NNS were_VBD not_RB ,_, for_IN a_DT long_JJ time_NN ,_, concerned_VBN with_IN representing_VBG the_DT immediate_JJ material_NN interests_NNS of_IN their_PRP\$ members_NNS ,_, but_CC in_IN fighting_VBG long-term_JJ battles_NNS which_WDT they_PRP hoped_VBD would_MD bring_VB about_IN a_DT better_JJR and_CC more_RBR just_RB society_NN ._. The_DT CGT_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Confédération_NNP Générale_NNP du_NNP Travail_NNP -RRB-_-RRB- the_DT

largest_JJS union_NN with_IN ca_MD 1.2_CD million_CD members_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- it_PRP claims_VBZ more_RBR -RRB-_-RRB- has_VBZ always_RB had_VBN strong_JJ communist_NN affiliations_NNS ,_, and_CC has_VBZ constantly_RB been_VBN hostile_JJ to_TO cooperation_NN with_IN the_DT patronat_NN ,_, seeing_VBG its_PRP\$ role_NN as_IN the_DT destruction_NN of_IN capitalism_NN ._. The_DT CFDT_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Confédération_NNP française_NN démocratique_NN du_NNP travail_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, has_VBZ a_DT more_RBR reformist_JJ stance_NN ,_, and_CC the_DT FO_NN -LRB-_-LRB- Force_NN Ouvrière_NN -RRB-_-RRB- has_VBZ a_DT more_RBR co-operation_NN nature_NN ._. Perhaps_RB due_JJ to_TO the_DT ideological_JJ extremism_NN of_IN the_DT CGT_NNP ,_, perhaps_RB through_IN fear_NN of_IN losing_VBG jobs_NNS ,_, or_CC of_IN opposing_VBG a_DT very_RB authoritative_JJ patronat_NN ,_, union_NN membership_NN in_IN France_NNP has_VBZ always_RB been_VBN weak_JJ ,_, representing_VBG at_IN the_DT present_JJ time_NN only_RB 15_CD %_NN of_IN the_DT workforce_NN ._. Thus_RB we_PRP begin_VB our_PRP\$ discussion_NN of_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP ._. From_IN 1958_CD to_TO 1973_CD ,_, economic_JJ growth_NN ,_, full_JJ employment_NN and_CC prosperity_NN meant_VBD that_IN industrial_JJ disputes_NNS were_VBD fairly_RB few_JJ and_CC far_RB between_IN ._. Negotiation_NN at_IN any_DT level_NN was_VBD pretty_RB rare_JJ as_RB well_RB ._. The_DT French_JJ patronat_NN fall_NN into_IN three_CD categories_NNS :_: the_DT mandarin_NN -_: who_WP is_VBZ a_DT product_NN of_IN the_DT French_JJ elite_NN and_CC a_DT bureaucrat_NN ;_: the_DT American-style_JJ boss_NN who_WP has_VBZ worked_VBN his_PRP\$ way_NN up_IN through_IN the_DT hierarchy_NN ;_: and_CC the_DT remnants_NNS of_IN the_DT old_JJ bourgeois_NN dynasties_NNS ._. Although_IN today_NN ,_, we_PRP can_MD divide_VB basic_JJ attitudes_NNS to_TO industrial_JJ relations_NNS into_IN two_CD groups_NNS :_: the_DT ` `` patron_NN patrimonial_NN -_: who_WP regards_VBZ his_PRP\$ firm_NN as_IN part_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ own_JJ personal_JJ heritage_NN which_WDT he_PRP governs_VBZ by_IN divine_JJ right_NN ;_: and_CC the_DT ` `` patron-Saint-Simonien_NN ' _' -_: who_WP has_VBZ a_DT more_RBR co-operative_JJ stance_NN ,_, realising_VBG the_DT creative_JJ potential_NN of_IN a_DT motivated_JJ and_CC happy_JJ workforce_NN ._. Although_IN the_DT proportion_NN of_IN the_DT latter_JJ is_VBZ growing_VBG ,_, French_JJ industrial_JJ relations_NNS have_VBP been_VBN marred_VBN by_IN a_DT majority_NN of_IN the_DT former_JJ ,_, probably_RB due_JJ to_TO the_DT organisation_NN of_IN French_JJ industry_NN in_IN small_JJ and_CC medium-sized_JJ businesses_NNS ._. So_RB from_IN 1958-73_CD ,_,

we_PRP witness_NN a_DT lot_NN of_IN patronat_NN control_NN ,_, an_DT excess_NN of_IN `` contractalisation_NN ' " :_: patronat_NN agreements_NNS with_IN individual_JJ workers_NNS ,_, a_DT lack_NN of_IN collective_JJ negotiations_NNS ,_, despite_IN the_DT comité_NN d'entreprise_NN ._. The_DT unions_NNS ,_, in_IN particular_JJ the_DT CGT_NNP ,_, spent_VBD its_PRP\$ time_NN showing_VBG its_PRP\$ allegiance_NN to_TO the_DT international_JJ proletariat_NN and_CC the_DT Soviet_JJ Communists_NNPS by_IN organising_VBG sporadic_JJ ,_, ineffective_JJ one-day_JJ strikes_NNS which_WDT were_VBD ineffective_JJ ._. Then_RB in_IN 1968_CD ,_, as_IN a_DT result_NN of_IN the_DT massive_JJ demonstrations_NNS and_CC frustration_NN ,_, the_DT unions_NNS won_VBD the_DT right_NN to_TO organize_VB at_IN the_DT workplace_NN ._. Union_NNP members_NNS were_VBD ceded_VBN noticeboards_NNS and_CC a_DT greater_JJR part_NN in_IN negotiations_NNS ._. In_IN 1973_CD at_IN the_DT time_NN of_IN the_DT first_JJ oil_NN shock_NN ,_, the_DT CGT_NNP saw_VBD this_DT as_IN a_DT chance_NN to_TO finally_RB bring_VB down_RP capitalism_NN and_CC used_VBN strikes_NNS to_TO exacerbate_VB the_DT government_NN 's_POS attempts_NNS to_TO bring_VB down_RP inflation_NN ._. The_DT unions_NNS demanded_VBD higher_JJR salaries_NNS but_CC in_IN the_DT face_NN of_IN high_JJ inflation_NN and_CC unemployment_NN ,_, these_DT demands_NNS were_VBD totally_RB unrealistic_JJ ._. The_DT patronat_NN began_VBD to_TO get_VB annoyed_JJ and_CC between_IN 1975_CD and_CC 1977_CD refused_VBD categorically_RB to_TO discuss_VB salaries_NNS ,_, a_DT reduction_NN in_IN the_DT working_VBG week_NN and_CC holidays_NNS with_IN the_DT unions_NNS ._. Union_NNP membership_NN fell_VBD drastically_RB as_IN employees_NNS tried_VBD desperately_RB to_TO cling_VB on_IN to_TO their_PRP\$ jobs_NNS by_IN agreeing_VBG to_TO any_DT type_NN of_IN contract_NN with_IN the_DT patronat_NN ._. When_WRB Mitterrand_NNP came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1981_CD ,_, despite_IN the_DT lack_NN of_IN links_NNS between_IN French_JJ unions_NNS and_CC the_DT Socialist_NNP party_NN ,_, the_DT unions_NNS were_VBD hopeful_JJ that_IN workers_NNS ' _POS rights_NNS would_MD improve_VB ._. The_DT French_JJ government_NN has_VBZ always_RB been_VBN interventionist_JJ and_CC in_IN truth_NN ,_, workers_NNS have_VBP done_VBN better_RB from_IN state_NN legislation_NN -LRB_-LRB- 1884-social_JJ statute_NN ,_, 1968-right_JJ to_TO organize_VB at_IN the_DT workplace_NN -RRB_-RRB- than_IN from_IN the_DT political_JJ games_NNS of_IN the_DT unions_NNS ._. In_IN 1982_CD ,_, we_PRP see_VBP a_DT turning-point_NN in_IN French_JJ industrial_JJ

relations_NNS with_IN the_DT passing_NN of_IN the_DT lois_NN Auroux_NNP ._. Firstly_RB ,_, the_DT workers_NNS were_VBD granted_VBN the_DT long-awaited_JJ reduction_NN in_IN working_VBG hours_NNS to_TO 39_CD a_DT week_NN ._. There_EX was_VBD to_TO be_VB a_DT ` `` Réglement_NNP Intérieur_NNP ' _POS stating_VBG all_DT rules_NNS of_IN firm_NN practice_NN ,_, so_RB that_IN employees_NNS would_MD know_VB when_WRB they_PRP were_VBD infringing_VBG on_IN their_PRP\$ employers_NNS ' _POS terms_NNS ._. Any_DT discipline_NN case_NN could_MD be_VB referred_VBN to_TO the_DT ` `` Conseil_NNP de_NNP Prud_NNP ` `` hommes_NNS ' _" ,_, to_TO assure_VB that_IN there_EX had_VBD not_RB been_VBN arbitrary_JJ disciplining_VBG and_CC that_IN the_DT penalty_NN fitted_VBD the_DT infringement_NN -_: Workers_NNS had_VBD the_DT right_NN to_TO elect_VB their_PRP\$ own_JJ members_NNS to_TO this_DT body_NN ._. The_DT right_NN of_IN negotiation_NN and_CC wage_NN -_: bargaining_NN by_IN the_DT unions_NNS was_VBD extended_VBN to_TO firms_NNS of_IN less_JJR than_IN 50_CD employees_NNS ,_, and_CC the_DT comité_NN d'entreprise_NN had_VBD now_RB to_TO discuss_VB salaries_NNS and_CC working_VBG hours_NNS on_IN an_DT annual_JJ basis_NN ._. Union_NNP representatives_NNS were_VBD protected_VBN from_IN discrimination_NN by_IN hostile_JJ bosses_NNS ,_, and_CC granted_VBD the_DT right_NN to_TO do_VB union_NN work_NN on_IN firm_JJ time_NN -_: in_IN some_DT cases_NNS they_PRP even_RB got_VBD offices_NNS ._. With_IN the_DT new_JJ change_NN in_IN negotiations_NNS and_CC as_IN a_DT result_NN of_IN the_DT oil_NN shocks_NNS ,_, there_EX was_VBD also_RB a_DT change_NN in_IN the_DT bosses_NNS ' _POS attitudes_NNS ._. There_EX has_VBZ been_VBN an_DT increase_NN in_IN the_DT number_NN of_IN ` `` patron_NN Saint-Simoniens_NNS ' _POS who_WP have_VBP begun_VBN to_TO realise_VB the_DT potential_NN of_IN a_DT cooperative_JJ and_CC happy_JJ workforce_NN ._. Workers_NNS also_RB have_VBP the_DT right_NN to_TO express_VB their_PRP\$ opinions_NNS directly_RB to_TO management_NN as_IN a_DT result_NN of_IN the_DT lois_NN Auroux_NNP ,_, instead_RB of_IN having_VBG to_TO go_VB via_IN the_DT comité_NN d'entreprise_NN or_CC their_PRP\$ 'd_MD élué_VB syndical_NN ' _" ._. There_EX were_VBD management-inspired_JJ improvements_NNS to_TO working_VBG conditions_NNS and_CC Labour_NN relations_NNS ._. Surprisingly_RB ,_, the_DT unions_NNS were_VBD hostile_JJ to_TO these_DT -_: fearing_VBG that_IN management_NN was_VBD trying_VBG to_TO push_VB them_PRP to_TO the_DT sidelines_NNS and_CC undermining_VBG their_PRP\$ power_NN to_TO

represent_VB workers_NNS ' _POS interests_NNS ._. Two_CD examples_NNS of_IN
 such_JJ ` `` enlightened_VBN ' _" bosses_NNS were_VBD Carayon_NNP and_CC
 Bougeneaux_NNP -_: Carayon_NNP tried_VBD to_TO reduce_VB monotony_NN by_IN
 forming_VBG production_NN teams_NNS in_IN semi-autonomous_JJ groups_NNS ,_,
 so_RB that_IN the_DT could_MD fulfil_VB projects_NNS completing_VBG -_:
 learning_VBG from_IN each_DT other_JJ ,_, giving_VBG each_DT worker_NN a_DT
 sense_NN of_IN achievement_NN importance_NN and_CC worth_NN ,_, and_CC team_NN
 spirit_NN ._. This_DT move_NN was_VBD successful_JJ in_IN increasing_VBG
 productivity_NN and_CC is_VBZ widely_RB adopted_VBN in_IN France_NNP ,_,
 although_IN the_DT CGT_NNP were_VBD suspicious_JJ and_CC had_VBD him_PRP
 removed_VBN from_IN power_NN ._. Bougeneaux_NNP used_VBD staff-participation_JJ
 schemes_NNS to_TO encourage_VB staff_NN to_TO participate_VB in_IN the_DT
 running_NN of_IN their_PRP\$ firm_NN ,_, to_TO increase_VB innovation_NN ,_, and_CC
 a_DT sense_NN of_IN belonging_VBG ._. This_DT worked_VBD well_RB too_RB ._.
 The_DT Eighties_NNP also_RB marked_VBD the_DT era_NN of_IN individualism_NN ,_,
 when_WRB workers_NNS preferred_VBN to_TO form_VB individual_JJ links_NNS
 with_IN bosses_NNS rather_RB than_IN collective_JJ negotiation_NN ._. This_DT
 may_MD be_VB because_RB ,_, as_IN Union_NNP membership_NN fell_VBD ,_, the_DT
 Unions_NNS appeared_VBD even_RB more_RBR extreme_JJ than_IN before_RB
 because_IN those_DT who_WP remained_VBD were_VBD committed_VBN political_JJ
 activists_NNS ._. Thus_RB individual_JJ agreements_NNS have_VBP risen_VBN ,_,
 and_CC the_DT unions_NNS have_VBP lost_VBN power_NN ._. They_PRP
 organised_VBD strikes_NNS as_IN a_DT measure_NN of_IN protest_NN against_IN
 the_DT ` `` politique_NN d'austérité_NN ' _" in_IN 1983_CD ,_, but_CC apart_RB from_IN
 the_DT disruptions_NNS of_IN 1986_CD over_IN salaries_NNS ,_, have_VBP been_VBN
 fairly_RB inactive_JJ ._. French_JJ industrial_JJ relations_NNS have_VBP been_VBN
 characterized_VBN by_IN a_DT strong_JJ authoritative_JJ patronat_NN but_CC one_CD
 which_WDT has_VBZ evolved_VBN in_IN the_DT face_NN of_IN economic_JJ
 pressure_NN ;_: a_DT state_NN which_WDT protects_VBZ workers_NNS by_IN
 intervening_VBG in_IN otherwise_RB largely_RB hostile_JJ relationships_NNS ,_, a_DT
 weak_JJ unionized_VBD group_NN ;_: and_CC a_DT series_NN of_IN individual_JJ
 agreements_NNS between_IN management_NN and_CC workers_NNS which_WDT
 looks_VBZ as_IN if_IN it_PRP will_MD continue_VB throughout_IN the_DT 90_CD
 's_POS ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0020.1

All_DT industrial_JJ relations_NNS are_VBP based_VBN on_IN socialist_JJ groupings_NNS ._. In_IN France_NNP unionisation_NN has_VBZ proved_VBN to_TO be_VB very_RB weak_JJ and_CC generally_RB unsuccessful_JJ and_CC this_DT seems_VBZ to_TO reflect_VB the_DT Socialist_NNP political_JJ parties_NNS ,_, whose_WP\$ underlying_JJ prejudices_NNS and_CC differences_NNS make_VBP them_PRP divided_VBN and_CC unstable_JJ too_RB ._. When_WRB the_DT socialists_NNS came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1981_CD ,_, the_DT Trade_NNP Unions_NNS hoped_VBD to_TO gain_VB a_DT lot_NN ._. In_IN the_DT Auroux_NNP laws_NNS of_IN 1982/3_CD the_DT socialists_NNS looked_VBD to_TO sorting_VBG out_RP the_DT ``_`` code_NN du_NNP travail_NN "_ " whose_WP\$ laws_NNS had_VBD barely_RB been_VBN implemented_VBN especially_RB due_JJ to_TO the_DT large_JJ number_NN of_IN Petite_JJ et_FW Moyenne_FW Entreprise_FW which_WDT existed_VBD ._. They_PRP changed_VBD about_IN 1/3_CD of_IN this_DT ``_`` Code_NNP du_NNP Travail_NNP "_ " giving_VBG greater_JJR protection_NN in_IN the_DT workplace_NN for_IN the_DT worker_NN ,_, rules_NNS on_IN disciplinary_JJ matters_NNS publicised_VBN and_CC checked_VBN by_IN the_DT Ministry_NNP of_IN Labour_NNP ,_, and_CC increased_VBD freedom_NN of_IN expression_NN ._. Completely_RB against_IN the_DT TU_NNP 's_POS wishes_NNS ,_, and_CC before_IN the_DT 1986_CD elections_NNS ,_, the_DT Socialists_NNPS made_VBD redundancy_NN easier_JJR to_TO give_VB and_CC were_VBD trying_VBG to_TO make_VB the_DT working_VBG week_NN more_RBR flexible_JJ ._. Trade_NNP Unions_NNS were_VBD legalised_VBN in_IN 1884_CD ,_, although_IN they_PRP were_VBD not_RB allowed_VBN to_TO form_VB meetings_NNS or_CC have_VB a_DT place_NN on_IN the_DT factory_NN floors_NNS and_CC public_JJ services_NNS ,_, including_VBG railways_NNS were_VBD at_IN first_JJ forbidden_VBN to_TO unionize_VB ._. However_RB they_PRP had_VBD to_TO wait_VB until_IN Nov_NNP 1968_CD for_IN trade_NN unions_NNS to_TO be_VB given_VBN a_DT legal_JJ status_NN in_IN factories_NNS and_CC work_NN places_NNS ._. This_DT came_VBD after_IN violent_JJ and_CC extensive_JJ strikes_NNS during_IN May_NNP 1968_CD when_WRB it_PRP is_VBZ said_VBD that_IN approximately_RB 100,000_CD workers_NNS striked_VBD ,_, frightening_JJ employers_NNS into_IN changing_VBG attitudes_NNS ._. The_DT main_JJ Trade_NNP Union_NNP group_NN is_VBZ the_DT CGT_NNP founded_VBN in_IN

1895_CD and_CC very_RB closely_RB attached_VBN to_TO the_DT Communist_JJ party_NN -LRB-_-LRB- PCF_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. It_PRP advocates_VBZ industrial_JJ action_NN and_CC membership_NN of_IN the_DT PCF_NN is_VBZ a_DT large_JJ aid_NN in_IN being_VBG a_DT member_NN ._. Then_RB there_EX is_VBZ the_DT CGT-FO_NN -LRB-_-LRB- confédération_NN générale_NN du_NNP travail-force_NN ouvrière_NN -RRB-_-RRB- which_WDT was_VBD a_DT break-away_NN from_IN the_DT Communist_JJ CGT_NN in_IN 1947_CD ._. The_DT 3rd_JJ biggest_JJS party_NN is_VBZ the_DT CFDT_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Confédération_NNP française_NN démocratique_NN du_NNP travail_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. This_DT is_VBZ a_DT group_NN form_NN in_IN 1963_CD when_WRB the_DT CFTC_NNP broke_VBD up_RP as_IN it_PRP had_VBD become_VBN too_RB radical_JJ for_IN many_JJ of_IN its_PRP\$ Catholic_JJ members_NNS ._. The_DT CFDT_NNP is_VBZ connected_VBN with_IN the_DT PS_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- Partie_NNP Socialiste_NNP -RRB-_-RRB- although_IN it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT least_JJS eager_JJ to_TO appear_VB as_IN acting_VBG as_IN a_DT back-up_JJ for_IN politics_NNS ._. Besides_IN these_DT 3_CD groups_NNS there_EX are_VBP many_JJ other_JJ Trade_NNP Union_NNP formations_NNS in_IN France_NNP -: their_PRP\$ large_JJ number_NN meaning_NN weakness_NN and_CC low_JJ membership_NN ._. The_DT economic_JJ crisis_NN of_IN the_DT 70s_CD meant_VBD that_IN union_NN membership_NN fell_VBD dramatically_RB ._. The_DT Unions_NNS can_MD pressure_VB employers_NNS on_IN matters_NNS of_IN wages_NNS and_CC working_VBG conditions_NNS when_WRB there_EX is_VBZ a_DT recession_NN on_IN ,_, but_CC they_PRP are_VBP powerless_JJ in_IN economic_JJ crisis.As_NNS unemployment_NN rose_VBD ,_, wages_NNS were_VBD held_VBN down_RP in_IN the_DT name_NN of_IN competition_NN ._. Chaos_NN reigned_VBD ._. Due_JJ to_TO the_DT expulsion_NN of_IN the_DT Communists_NNPS from_IN government_NN in_IN 1947_CD and_CC the_DT following_VBG split_NN of_IN the_DT CGT_NNP to_TO create_VB the_DT CGT-FO_NN ,_, there_EX has_VBZ been_VBN much_JJ hostility_NN between_IN Communists_NNPS and_CC non-Communists_NNPS ._. The_DT Communists_NNPS adopted_VBD and_CC kept_VBD the_DT aim_NN for_IN industrial_JJ revolution_NN in_IN the_DT footsteps_NNS of_IN the_DT proles_NNS in_IN the_DT Soviet_NNP Union_NNP ._. Employers_NNS are_VBP also_RB afraid_JJ of_IN them_PRP as_IN they_PRP donot_VBP really_RB know_VB how_WRB far_RB they_PRP want_VBP to_TO go_VB ._. Of_IN course_NN ,_, hostilities_NNS increased_VBN during_IN the_DT Cold_NNP War_NNP ,_, but_CC surely_RB relations_NNS should_MD be_VB cooler_JJR

with_IN present_JJ West-East_JJ relations_NNS improving_VBG ._. TU_NNP
 membership_NN in_IN France_NNP is_VBZ approximation_NN 3-4_CD million_CD ._.
 French_JJ unionization_NN was_VBD approximately_RB 23_CD %_NN in_IN the_DT
 70s_CD and_CC has_VBZ fallen_VBN to_TO around_IN 11_CD %_NN now_RB ._.
 Collective-bargaining_JJ has_VBZ been_VBN introduced_VBN but_CC is_VBZ very_RB
 difficult_JJ due_JJ to_TO all_PDT the_DT representatives_NNS needed_VBN from_IN
 each_DT TU_NNP ._. The_DT government_NN began_VBD very_RB interventionist_JJ
 in_IN its_PRP\$ efforts_NNS to_TO rebuild_VB the_DT economy_NN ._. It_PRP also_RB
 had_VBD to_TO act_VB as_IN a_DT go-between_NN between_IN the_DT employers_NNS
 and_CC employees_NNS who_WP refused_VBD to_TO get_VB on_IN :_: the_DT
 employers_NNS refused_VBD to_TO recognise_VB the_DT trade_NN unions_NNS as_IN
 a_DT legitimate_JJ and_CC safe_JJ partner_NN ._. Relations_NNS between_IN them_PRP
 remained_VBD hostile_JJ and_CC unco-operative_JJ until_IN the_DT events_NNS of_IN
 May_NNP 1968_CD frightened_VBD the_DT employers_NNS into_IN believing_VBG
 there_RB would_MD be_VB a_DT revolution_NN ._. They_PRP therefore_RB began_VBD
 to_TO listen_VB more_RBR closely_RB to_TO employees_NNS ,_, speaking_VBG to_TO
 them_PRP directly_RB and_CC so_RB making_VBG the_DT Trade_NNP Unions_NNS
 redundant_JJ ._. The_DT TUs_NNS were_VBD at_IN the_DT time_NN not_RB being_VBG
 looked_VBD on_IN favourably_RB anyway_RB ,_, after_IN accepting_VBG the_DT
 Grenelle_NNP agreemts_NNS proposed_VBD immediatly_RB after_IN the_DT events_NNS
 of_IN May_NNP 1968_CD ._. The_DT workers_NNS felt_VBD that_IN they_PRP
 had_VBD been_VBN compromised_VBN ._. The_DT elections_NNS of_IN 1986_CD
 were_VBD a_DT first_RB ,_, as_IN the_DT trade_NN unions_NNS gave_VBD no_DT
 specific_JJ indications_NNS or_CC directions_NNS to_TO their_PRP\$ members_NNS ,_,
 as_IN previously_RB done_VBN ,_, on_IN how_WRB to_TO vote_VB ._. The_DT
 CGT_NNP were_VBD doubtful_JJ of_IN the_DT Communists_NNPS success_NN ,_,
 which_WDT was_VBD well_RB anticipated_VBN as_IN they_PRP did_VBD not_RB
 do_VB too_RB healthily_RB ._. It_PRP seems_VBZ very_RB doubtful_JJ that_IN any_DT
 trade_NN union_NN will_MD ever_RB gain_VB concessions_NNS from_IN a_DT
 government_NN ,_, be_VB it_PRP left_VBD or_CC right_NN ._. Employers_NNS do_VBP
 regret_VB the_DT lack_NN of_IN unionism_NN in_IN their_PRP\$ firms_NNS though_RB
 ,_, because_IN when_WRB trouble_NN does_VBZ arise_VB ,_, the_DT workers_NNS
 are_VBP not_RB organised_VBN and_CC have_VBP no_DT leadership_NN ;_:
 concession_NN groups_NNS led_VBN by_IN political_JJ activists_NNS usually_RB

emerge_VBP ,_, which_WDT are_VBP obviously_RB not_RB good_JJ for_IN the_DT employers_NNS ._. More_RBR and_CC more_RBR employers_NNS are_VBP setting_VBG up_RP discussion_NN groups_NNS to_TO ease_VB talks_NNS between_IN themselves_PRP and_CC their_PRP\$ employees_NNS ._. These_DT extend_VBP the_DT `` `` comités_JJ d'enterprise_NN " _" which_WDT were_VBD strengthened_VBN after_IN 1968_CD but_CC make_VB no_DT decisions_NNS and_CC are_VBP simply_RB forums_NNS for_IN discussion_NN :_: they_PRP are_VBP consultative_JJ bodies_NNS ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0021.1

Although_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP has_VBZ been_VBN considerably_RB more_RBR stable_JJ than_IN previous_JJ Republics_NNS ,_, there_EX have_VBP ,_, however_RB ,_, been_VBN various_JJ changes_NNS in_IN government_NN which_WDT have_VBP prevented_VBN continuity_NN in_IN policy_NN matters_NNS ,_, especially_RB in_IN terms_NNS of_IN education_NN ._. I_PRP will_MD briefly_RB mention_VB previous_JJ reforms_NNS from_IN the_DT beginning_NN of_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP and_CC show_VBP that_IN the_DT present_JJ situation_NN is_VBZ still_RB beridden_VBN by_IN inequality_NN and_CC various_JJ forms_NNS of_IN social_JJ selection_NN at_IN secondary_JJ and_CC at_IN higher_JJR education_NN level_NN ._. I_PRP will_MD briefly_RB compare_VB it_PRP to_TO points_NNS in_IN the_DT English_JJ system_NN ._. The_DT Fouchet_NN reforms_NNS made_VBD the_DT first_JJ cycle_NN of_IN secondary_JJ school_NN -LRB-_-LRB- the_DT first_JJ four_CD years_NNS -RRB-_-RRB- more_RBR combined_JJ ,_, yet_RB they_PRP also_RB introduced_VBD tracks_NNS or_CC `` `` filières_NNS ' _" at_IN this_DT early_JJ stage_NN where_WRB people_NNS had_VBD to_TO make_VB options_NNS concerning_VBG their_PRP\$ future_NN ._. It_PRP proved_VBD that_IN those_DT from_IN the_DT lower_JJR social_JJ classes_NNS were_VBD encouraged_VBN ,_, and_CC still_RB are_VBP to_TO a_DT certain_JJ extent_NN to_TO take_VB the_DT shorter_JJR educational_JJ option_NN which_WDT leads_VBZ to_TO employment_NN at_IN an_DT earlier_JJR stage_NN ._. Haby_NNP sought_VBD to_TO resolve_VB these_DT problems_NNS of_IN social_JJ selection_NN and_CC aimed_VBN to_TO postpone_VB the_DT need_NN to_TO make_VB choices_NNS until_IN a_DT later_JJ time_NN ._. He_PRP envisaged_VBD an_DT orientation_NN cycle_NN in_IN the_DT last_JJ two_CD years_NNS of_IN the_DT first_JJ cycle_NN ,_, then_RB for_IN those_DT carrying_VBG on_IN ,_, there_EX was_VBD to_TO be_VB a_DT general_JJ course_NN of_IN two_CD

years_NNS when_WRB the_DT first_JJ half_NN of_IN the_DT `` baccaur at_NN ' ' would_MD be_VB taken_VBN , , then_RB the_DT last_JJ year_NN would_MD involve_VB more_RBR choice_NN for_IN students_NNS . . The_DT second_JJ half_NN of_IN the_DT `` bac_NN ' ' would_MD be_VB taken_VBN at_IN this_DT stage_NN . . The_DT problem_NN was_VBD that_IN the_DT orientation_NN cycle_NN brought_VBD back_RP some_DT of_IN the_DT `` tracking_NN ' ' of_IN the_DT previous_JJ system_NN so_IN a_DT form_NN of_IN social_JJ selection_NN still_RB continued_VBD . . Savary_NNP aimed_VBD to_TO reduce_VB these_DT inequalities_NNS but_CC a_DT change_NN of_IN government_NN shortened_VBD his_PRP\$ tenure_NN in_IN office_NN . . Chev nement_NNP aimed_VBD more_RBR at_IN reconstructing_VBG than_IN reforming_VBG , , with_IN the_DT encouragement_NN of_IN an_DT ' '  cole_JJ d mocratique_NN ' ' as_IN opposed_VBN to_TO the_DT idea_NN of_IN ' '  cole_JJ unique_JJ ' ' by_IN Haby_NNP . . The_DT results_NNS of_IN this_DT are_VBP seen_VBN today_NN . . At_IN secondary_JJ level_NN , , those_DT leaving_VBG school_NN after_IN the_DT first_JJ cycle_NN to_TO continue_VB training_NN in_IN a_DT Coll ge_NNP d'enseignement_NN secondaire_NN for_IN example_NN are_VBP still_RB primarily_RB those_DT from_IN poor_JJ backgrounds_NNS who_WP are_VBP dissuaded_VBN by_IN their_PRP\$ parents_NNS from_IN going_VBG to_TO the_DT Lyc e_NNP but_CC instead_RB encouraged_VBD to_TO find_VB a_DT job_NN at_IN an_DT earlier_JJR stage_NN . . Having_VBG said_VBD this_DT though_RB , , there_EX are_VBP still_RB however_RB several_JJ working_VBG class_NN children_NNS who_WP go_VBP on_IN to_TO the_DT lyc e_NN where_WRB they_PRP will_MD take_VB their_PRP\$ `` bac_FW ' ' . . This_DT route_NN has_VBZ always_RB had_VBD a_DT great_JJ deal_NN of_IN importance_NN attached_VBN to_TO it_PRP because_IN acquiring_VBG a_DT `` bacaur at_NN ' ' is_VBZ the_DT requirement_NN to_TO continue_VB into_IN further_JJ education_NN . . Lionel_NNP Jospin_NNP in_IN 1989_CD aimed_VBN to_TO increase_VB the_DT numbers_NNS of_IN those_DT taking_VBG the_DT `` bac_NN ' ' to_TO 80_CD %_NN in_IN fifteen_CD years_NNS as_IN an_DT attempt_NN to_TO increase_VB equality_NN of_IN opportunity_NN , , however_RB he_PRP aimed_VBD for_IN 80_CD %_NN of_IN people_NNS to_TO take_VB the_DT `` bac_NN ' ' , , which_WDT does_VBZ not_RB necessarily_RB mean_VB they_PRP will_MD pass_VB it_PRP . . At_IN this_DT secondary_JJ level_NN , , therefore_RB , , children_NNS may_MD either_RB continue_VB to_TO take_VB the_DT `` bac_NN ' ' , , or_CC they_PRP may_MD take_VB a_DT shorter_JJR course_NN for_IN example_NN

the_DT ` `` Brevet_NNP d'enseignement_NNP professionnel_NN ' _" -LRB-_-LRB-
 BEP_NNP -RRB-_-RRB- _ . Another_DT course_NN ,_, which_WDT leads_VBZ to_TO
 the_DT ` `` Certificat_NNP d'aptitude_NNP professionnel_NN ' _" is_VBZ supposed_VBN
 to_TO be_VB more_RBR practical_JJ ,_, and_CC more_RBR linked_VBN to_TO future_JJ
 employment_NN _ . The_DT result_NN is_VBZ that_IN a_DT pupil_NN who_WP
 has_VBZ obtained_VBN the_DT ` `` bac_NN ' _" may_MD continue_VB into_IN
 higher_JJR education_NN _ . The_DT likelihood_NN of_IN a_DT pupil_NN
 continuing_VBG with_IN education_NN will_MD depend_VB ,_, as_IN in_IN
 England_NNP on_IN family_NN background_NN ,_, in_IN terms_NNS of_IN what_WP
 parents_NNS did_VBD ,_, but_CC also_RB in_IN terms_NNS of_IN family_NN
 financial_JJ support_NN since_IN grants_NNS are_VBP so_RB low_JJ in_IN France_NNP
 ,_, and_CC now_RB non-existent_JJ in_IN Great-Britain_NNP _ . At_IN the_DT higher_JJR
 education_NN level_NN ,_, there_EX are_VBP universities_NNS and_CC grands-
 écoles_NNS in_IN France_NNP _ . It_PRP is_VBZ the_DT grands-écoles_NNS
 which_WDT are_VBP seen_VBN as_IN élitist_NN and_CC since_IN two_CD years_NNS
 studying_VBG needs_NNS to_TO be_VB done_VBN before_IN you_PRP even_RB
 take_VBP the_DT entrance_NN exam_NN ,_, once_RB again_RB ,_, those_DT with_IN
 less_JJR financial_JJ resources_NNS will_MD be_VB discouraged_VBN from_IN
 taking_VBG this_DT route_NN _ . The_DT grands-écoles_NNS come_VBP in_IN
 different_JJ forms_NNS ,_, the_DT best_JJS reputed_VBN of_IN which_WDT is_VBZ
 the_DT ` `` Ecole_NNP Polytechnique_NNP ' _POS _ . The_DT ` `` Ecole_NNP
 Normale_NNP Supérieur_NNP ' _POS is_VBZ also_RB very_RB élitist_JJ and_CC
 trains_NNS teachers_NNS _ . The_DT ` `` Ecole_NNP National_NNP
 d'Administration_NNP ' _POS is_VBZ particularly_RB important_JJ though_IN because_IN
 it_PRP trains_VBZ the_DT top_JJ civil_JJ servants_NNS of_IN the_DT country_NN _ .
 The_DT result_NN is_VBZ that_IN those_DT who_WP have_VBP the_DT means_NNS
 to_TO continue_VB into_IN a_DT ` `` grand-école_NN ' _" can_MD assure_VB
 themselves_PRP of_IN a_DT well-paid_JJ ,_, high-positioned_JJ job_NN when_WRB
 they_PRP leave_VBP _ . In_IN England_NNP ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT universities_NNS
 at_IN this_DT stage_NN which_WDT are_VBP seen_VBN as_IN more_JJR prestigious_JJ
 ,_, as_IN compared_VBN to_TO the_DT polytechnics_NNS _ . However_RB ,_, social_JJ
 selection_NN in_IN England_NNP actually_RB begins_VBZ at_IN an_DT earlier_JJR
 stage_NN and_CC it_PRP is_VBZ accentuated_VBN by_IN the_DT presence_NN of_IN
 private_JJ schools_NNS _ . The_DT English_NNP seem_VBP to_TO be_VB more_RBR

prepared_JJ than_IN the_DT French_JJ to_TO pay_VB directly_RB for_IN their_PRP\$ children_NNS 's_POS education_NN ,_, which_WDT explains_VBZ the_DT greater_JJR importance_NN of_IN private_JJ schools_NNS in_IN Great-britain_NN ._. The_DT fees_NNS for_IN private_JJ schools_NNS are_VBP very_RB high_JJ ,_, particularly_RB for_IN the_DT more_RBR prestigious_JJ ones_NNS like_IN Harrow_NNP ,_, and_CC Eton_NNP ._. These_DT high_JJ fees_NNS immediately_RB form_VBP as_IN a_DT barrier_NN to_TO families_NNS of_IN a_DT lower_JJR income_NN :_: -: even_RB if_IN they_PRP may_MD wish_VB for_IN their_PRP\$ children_NNS to_TO go_VB there_RB ._. The_DT form_NN of_IN social_JJ selection_NN at_IN secondary_JJ level_NN in_IN Great-Britain_NNP ,_, is_VBZ therefore_RB to_TO do_VB with_IN financial_JJ means_NNS ._. The_DT system_NN is_VBZ seen_VBN as_IN cyclical_JJ to_TO a_DT certain_JJ extent_NN though_IN because_IN those_DT children_NNS who_WP went_VBD to_TO a_DT private_JJ school_NN often_RB become_VBP those_DT who_WP are_VBP best_RBS paid_VBN in_IN later_JJ life_NN ._. In_IN the_DT French_JJ system_NN at_IN this_DT level_NN ,_, the_DT question_NN is_VBZ more_RBR about_IN merit_NN than_IN financial_JJ means_NNS ._. Those_DT who_WP enter_VBP the_DT lycée_NN may_MD be_VB seen_VBN as_IN the_DT meritocratic_JJ élite_NN therefore_RB ._. At_IN the_DT higher_JJR education_NN level_NN in_IN France_NNP ,_, the_DT grands-écoles_NNS are_VBP seen_VBN to_TO be_VB highly_RB selective_JJ not_RB only_RB in_IN terms_NNS of_IN merit_NN but_CC to_TO a_DT certain_JJ extent_NN in_IN terms_NNS of_IN dissuading_VBG those_DT of_IN a_DT lower_JJR social_JJ standing_NN ._. At_IN the_DT higher_JJR education_NN level_NN in_IN Great-Britain_NNP however_RB ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT universities_NNS which_WDT are_VBP seen_VBN as_IN more_JJR prestigious_JJ ._. However_RB ,_, the_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT highly_RB élite_JJ universities_NNS of_IN Oxford_NNP and_CC Cambridge_NNP do_VBP take_VB on_RP students_NNS that_WDT are_VBP not_RB from_IN a_DT particularly_RB wealthy_JJ background_NN serves_VBZ as_IN a_DT landmark_NN that_IN if_IN you_PRP are_VBP good_JJ enough_RB then_RB you_PRP will_MD succeed_VB whatever_WDT your_PRP\$ background_NN ._. It_PRP has_VBZ proved_VBN particularly_RB difficult_JJ in_IN France_NNP to_TO change_VB the_DT education_NN system_NN because_IN of_IN the_DT successive_JJ changes_NNS in_IN policies_NNS ,_, and_CC due_JJ to_TO an_DT apparent_JJ lack_NN of_IN national_JJ consensus_NN over_IN the_DT rôle_NN of_IN education_NN ._. The_DT present_JJ situation_NN may_MD be_VB liked_VBN by_IN Chevènement_NNP though_IN ,_, who_WP said_VBD that_IN in_IN some_DT cases_NNS

inequality_NN was_VBD the_DT only_JJ answer_NN if_IN it_PRP meant_VBD that_IN highly_RB trained_JJ people_NNS were_VBD the_DT result_NN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0022.1

The_DT Algeiran_NNP crisis_NN led_VBD the_DT French_NNP Parliament_NNP in_IN 1958_CD to_TO allow_VB de_FW Gaulle_NNP and_CC his_PRP\$ government_NN recast_IN the_DT political_JJ groundrules_NNS in_IN a_DT new_JJ constitution_NN ._. This_DT ,_, he_PRP confirmed_VBD ,_, would_MD be_VB typical_JJ of_IN any_DT constitution_NN in_IN a_DT traditionally_RB democratic_JJ Western_JJ society_NN ._. Despite_IN this_DT limitation_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP and_CC his_PRP\$ followers_NNS were_VBD able_JJ to_TO shape_VB the_DT new_JJ Constitution_NNP largely_RB according_VBG to_TO their_PRP\$ own_JJ views_NNS as_IN to_TO what_WP would_MD constitute_VB a_DT strong_JJ and_CC durable_JJ republican_JJ regime_NN ._. Debré_NNP ,_, for_IN example_NN ,_, was_VBD impressed_VBN by_IN the_DT British_JJ model_NN ;_: parlementarisme_NN rationnel_NN meant_VBD that_IN the_DT Government_NN is_VBZ not_RB at_IN the_DT mercy_NN of_IN Parliament_NNP ,_, yet_RB is_VBZ ultimately_RB answerable_JJ to_TO it_PRP and_CC thereby_RB be_VB forced_VBN to_TO resign_VB ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP ,_, however_RB ,_, was_VBD the_DT main_JJ inspiration_NN of_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP ._. His_PRP\$ experience_NN of_IN 1940_CD made_VBD him_PRP realise_VB the_DT need_NN for_IN strong_JJ ,_, determined_VBD leadership_NN from_IN the_DT top_NN ._. Before_IN the_DT war_NN this_DT was_VBD greatly_RB lacking_VBG ._. The_DT majority_NN of_IN articles_NNS relevant_JJ to_TO the_DT President_NNP in_IN the_DT 1958_CD Constitution_NNP were_VBD largely_RB similar_JJ to_TO those_DT under_IN the_DT Third_NNP and_CC Fourth_JJ Republics_NNS ._. Despite_IN this_DT ,_, there_EX were_VBD several_JJ new_JJ powers_NNS introduced_VBN and_CC listed_VBN in_IN Article_NNP 19_CD including_VBG ,_, for_IN example_NN ,_, Article_NNP 11_CD -_: referendum_NN ,_, Article_NNP 12_CD -_: right_NN of_IN dissolution_NN and_CC Article_NNP 16_CD -_: emergency_NN powers_NNS ._. There_EX were_VBD ,_, however_RB ambiguities_NNS and_CC certainties_NNS in_IN the_DT text_NN which_WDT have_VBP proved_VBN very_RB significant_JJ in_IN determining_VBG the_DT President_NNP 's_POS role_NN in_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN ._. The_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP was_VBD such_JJ that_IN he_PRP had_VBD powers_NNS and_CC responsibilities_NNS in_IN respect_NN of_IN government_NN policy_NN that_WDT

could_MD be_VB seen_VBN to_TO overlap_VB with_IN the_DT President_NNP 's_POS function_NN to_TO mediate_VB -LRB-_-LRB- arbitrage_NN -RRB-_-RRB- between_IN contending_VBG groups_NNS to_TO ensure_VB the_DT smooth_JJ running_NN of_IN the_DT country_NN ,_, assigned_VBN to_TO him_PRP by_IN Article_NNP 5_CD ._. This_DT was_VBD open_JJ to_TO varying_VBG interpretation_NN ._. The_DT maximalist_JJ interpretation_NN was_VBD generally_RB accepted_VBN ._. This_DT meant_VBD that_IN the_DT President_NNP ,_, instead_RB of_IN being_VBG limited_VBN to_TO the_DT `` domaine_FW réservé_FW ' ' ie_FW the_DT powers_NNS attributed_VBN to_TO him_PRP under_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP ,_, he_PRP was_VBD justified_VBN by_IN virtue_NN of_IN this_DT article_NN in_IN intervening_VBG in_IN policy-making_NN and_CC its_PRP\$ implementation_NN ._. The_DT President_NNP was_VBD also_RB independent_JJ in_IN carrying_VBG out_RP this_DT function_NN :_: he_PRP was_VBD not_RB accountable_JJ to_TO Parliament_NNP by_IN virtue_NN of_IN Article_NN 68_CD and_CC not_RB even_RB directly_RB accountable_JJ to_TO it_PRP via_IN ministers_NNS or_CC the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP for_IN their_PRP\$ `` contreseing_VBG ' ' -LRB-_-LRB- countersignature_NN -RRB-_-RRB- was_VBD not_RB required_VBN by_IN him_PRP ._. Whereas_IN it_PRP had_VBD previously_RB been_VBN the_DT normal_JJ French_JJ practice_NN and_CC was_VBD that_DT of_IN other_JJ european_JJ democracies_NNS to_TO confer_VB the_DT most_RBS significant_JJ powers_NNS to_TO those_DT most_RBS accountable_JJ this_DT was_VBD not_RB the_DT case_NN under_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN at_IN least_JJS while_IN the_DT PRESIDENT_NNP IS_VBZ SUPPORTED_VBN BY_IN A_DT PRALIAMENTARY_NN MAJORITY_NN ._. Under_IN these_DT circumstances_NNS the_DT President_NNP has_VBZ been_VBN largely_RB free_JJ to_TO fulfil_VB this_DT maximalist_JJ interpretation_NN and_CC thus_RB be_VB assumed_VBN to_TO be_VB the_DT head_NN of_IN the_DT Executive_NNP ._. This_DT `` gouvernement_NN présidentiel_NN ' ' can_MD be_VB explained_VBN for_IN various_JJ factors_NNS ._. Because_IN of_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP 's_POS enigma_NN ,_, the_DT wish_NN of_IN the_DT French_JJ people_NNS and_CC a_DT friendly_JJ and_CC somewhat_RB submissive_JJ relationship_NN between_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP and_CC his_PRP\$ Prime_NNP Minister_NNP it_PRP was_VBD soon_RB realized_VBN that_IN the_DT President_NNP 's_POS role_NN would_MD surpass_VB that_IN as_IN outlined_VBN in_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP realized_VBD that_IN the_DT President_NNP could_MD lose_VB this_DT position_NN in_IN two_CD situations_NNS :_: if_IN a_DT

less_JJR prestigious_JJ Prime_NNP Minister_NNP should_MD succeed_VB him_PRP or_CC the_DT parliamentary_JJ majority_NN forced_VBD a_DT newly_RB elected_VBN president_NN to_TO conform_VB more_JJR rigidly_RB to_TO a_DT constitution_NN ._. In_IN his_PRP\$ desire_NN to_TO maintain_VB the_DT concept_NN of_IN presidential_JJ dominance_NN in_IN the_DT Executive_NNP -_: in_IN the_DT future_NN he_PRP solved_VBD this_DT by_IN modifying_VBG ,_, by_IN referendum_NN ,_, the_DT way_NN in_IN which_WDT a_DT President_NN was_VBD elected_VBN ._. In_IN October_NNP 1962_CD this_DT modification_NN ,_, which_WDT involved_VBD the_DT direct_JJ election_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP by_IN universal_JJ suffrage_NN ,_, was_VBD accepted_VBN by_IN the_DT French_JJ people_NNS ._. This_DT effectively_RB meant_VBN that_IN any_DT government_NN policies_NNS had_VBD to_TO be_VB in_IN line_NN with_IN those_DT for_IN which_WDT the_DT President_NNP had_VBD been_VBN elected_VBN ,_, thereby_RB affirming_VBG his_PRP\$ role_NN as_IN head_NN of_IN the_DT Executive_NNP ._. The_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP 's_POS role_NN was_VBD leadership_NN in_IN the_DT field_NN of_IN political_JJ debate_NN and_CC the_DT everyday_JJ matters_NNS involving_VBG economic_JJ and_CC administrative_JJ functions_NNS that_WDT went_VBD with_IN it_PRP ._. The_DT President_NNP defined_VBN in_IN collaboration_NN with_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP and_CC the_DT Government_NN government_NN policy_NN ,_, the_DT latter_JJ being_VBG accountable_JJ to_TO Parliament_NNP ._. The_DT following_VBG survey_NN considers_VBZ the_DT interpretations_NNS of_IN their_PRP\$ roles_NNS by_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP 's_POS successors_NNS ._. Georges_NNP Pompidou_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- 1969-1979_CD -RRB-_-RRB- Being_VBG elected_VBN President_NNP ,_, affirmed_VBD the_DT people_NNS 's_POS desire_NN that_IN `` gouvernement_NN présidentiel_NN '`` should_MD be_VB maintained_VBN :_: because_IN he_PRP won_VBD on_IN the_DT basis_NN that_IN he_PRP would_MD continue_VB the_DT regime_NN in_IN all_DT its_PRP\$ aspects_NNS ._. Valéry_NNP Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NNP This_DT was_VBD described_VBN as_IN a_DT tentacular_JJ presidency_NN ._. He_PRP was_VBD far_RB more_RBR interventionist_JJ in_IN the_DT field_NN of_IN domestic_JJ policy_NN ._. Despite_IN this_DT he_PRP was_VBD not_RB as_IN deformative_NN of_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP as_IN his_PRP\$ predecessors_NNS ,_, conforming_VBG closely_RB to_TO articles_NNS 11_CD ,_, 12_CD ,_, and_CC 16_CD ._. François_NNP Mitterand_NNP Although_IN ,_, as_IN suggested_VBN by_IN his_PRP\$ `` cent-dix_JJ propositions_NNS pour_VBP la_NNP France_NNP '``_POS ,_,

Mitterrand_NNP seemed_VBD to_TO accept_VB the_DT maximalist_JJ interpretation_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP 's_POS role_NN ,_, he_PRP stood_VBD further_RB back_RB from_IN intervention_NN in_IN government_NN policy_NN than_IN his_PRP\$ predecessors_NNS ,_, preferring_VBG to_TO concentrate_VB on_IN ` `` les_FW grandes_FW directions_NNS ,_, les_FW grandes_FW orientations_NNS ' _POS ._. The_DT period_NN of_IN 1986-1988_CD ,_, that_DT of_IN cohabitation_NN has_VBZ been_VBN particularly_RB significant_JJ in_IN the_DT evolution_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP 's_POS role_NN ._. Chirac_NNP became_VBD Prime_NNP Minister_NNP after_IN the_DT Right_NNP 's_POS majority_NN in_IN the_DT legislative_JJ elections_NNS ._. In_IN effect_NN ,_, Mitterrand_NNP remained_VBD in_IN power_NN and_CC lost_VBD many_JJ of_IN his_PRP\$ theoretical_JJ prerogatives_NNS to_TO the_DT Government_NN ._. Since_IN cohabitation_NN Rocard_NN -LRB-_-LRB- P.M._NN -RRB-_-RRB- has_VBZ been_VBN at_IN the_DT forefront_NN of_IN domestic_JJ politics_NNS ._. As_IN has_VBZ been_VBN shown_VBN ,_, the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP in_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN has_VBZ been_VBN ,_, and_CC is_VBZ likely_JJ to_TO continue_VB to_TO be_VB ,_, dictated_VBN by_IN circumstances_NNS ._. As_IN it_PRP is_VBZ ,_, Mitterrand_NNP remains_VBZ the_DT ` `` Head_NNP of_IN the_DT Executive_NNP and_CC maintains_VBZ ,_, in_IN theory_NN ,_, the_DT practical_JJ powers_NNS which_WDT developed_VBD under_IN his_PRP\$ predecessors_NNS although_IN in_IN reality_NN these_DT seem_VBP ,_, at_IN least_JJS under_IN him_PRP ,_, to_TO have_VB somewhat_RB waned_VBN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0023.1

The_DT trade_NN union_NN movement_NN in_IN France_NNP originated_VBD after_IN the_DT French_JJ revolution_NN and_CC has_VBZ always_RB tended_VBN to_TO be_VB revolutionary_JJ or_CC ideological_JJ in_IN character_NN ._. The_DT number_NN of_IN French_JJ employees_NNS unionized_VBD is_VBZ relatively_RB small_JJ -LRB-_-LRB- about_IN 11_CD %_NN -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC thus_RB there_EX is_VBZ great_JJ competition_NN between_IN individual_JJ trade_NN unions_NNS for_IN membership_NN ,_, and_CC a_DT great_JJ distinction_NN between_IN the_DT individual_JJ characteristics_NNS ._. During_IN an_DT economic_JJ expansion_NN ,_, as_IN was_VBD experienced_VBN by_IN France_NNP in_IN the_DT period_NN 1945-75_CD ,_, unions_NNS can_MD make_VB demands_NNS for_IN their_PRP\$ workers_NNS for_IN better_JJR pay_NN and_CC working_NN conditions_NNS ._. But_CC during_IN a_DT

recession_NN ,_, as_IN followed_VBN the_DT oil_NN crisis_NN in_IN 1975_CD ,_,
 their_PRP\$ demands_NNS would_MD be_VB ineffective_JJ and_CC membership_NN
 would_MD drop_VB ._. This_DT is_VBZ what_WP happened_VBD in_IN France_NNP ._.
 Membership_NN fell_VBD as_IN the_DT unions_NNS were_VBD deemed_VBN
 ineffective_JJ in_IN securing_VBG worker_NN demands_NNS ._. The_DT unions_NNS
 has_VBZ always_RB been_VBN political_JJ in_IN nature_NN which_WDT limited_VBD
 their_PRP\$ membership_NN ,_, and_CC once_RB membership_NN dropped_VBD ,_,
 those_DT members_NNS who_WP were_VBD left_VBN tended_VBD to_TO be_VB
 those_DT who_WP identified_VBD with_IN the_DT unions_NNS ' _POS political_JJ
 views_NNS ,_, which_WDT restricted_JJ union_NN aims_NNS still_RB further_RB ._.
 Before_IN 1968_CD ,_, unions_NNS were_VBD not_RB legally_RB allowed_VBN in_IN
 the_DT workplace_NN in_IN France_NNP and_CC there_EX were_VBD few_JJ
 negotiations_NNS ._. The_DT little_JJ there_EX was_VBD was_VBD at_IN a_DT
 general_JJ and_CC regional_JJ level_NN ,_, far_RB removed_VBN from_IN the_DT
 average_JJ worker_NN 's_POS demands_NNS ,_, and_CC this_DT did_VBD not_RB
 help_VB the_DT falling_VBG membership_NN numbers_NNS ._. Employers_NNS
 tended_VBD to_TO be_VB suspicious_JJ of_IN unions_NNS and_CC did_VBD not_RB
 see_VB them_PRP as_IN a_DT valuable_JJ means_NNS of_IN worker_NN
 representation_NN ._. This_DT was_VBD because_IN the_DT great_JJ majority_NN of_IN
 firms_NNS in_IN France_NNP were_VBD small_JJ family_NN concerns_NNS which_WDT
 had_VBD sprung_VBN up_RP in_IN the_DT 19th_JJ century_NN -_: the_DT PME_NN -
 LRB-_-LRB- petites_NNS et_FW moyennes_FW entreprises_NNS -RRB-_-RRB- ._.
 The_DT boss_NN was_VBD seen_VBN as_IN a_DT patriarch_NN who_WP should_MD
 not_RB be_VB challenged_VBN ._. The_DT period_NN of_IN industrial_JJ relations_NNS
 in_IN France_NNP under_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN can_MD be_VB divided_VBN
 into_IN three_CD periods_NNS ._. The_DT first_JJ is_VBZ 1958_CD to_TO 1968_CD ._.
 During_IN this_DT time_NN the_DT State_NN was_VBD highly_RB interventionist_JJ
 in_IN its_PRP\$ approach_NN to_TO the_DT economy_NN ,_, regulating_VBG pay_NN
 and_CC price_NN levels_NNS and_CC investing_VBG in_IN and_CC developping_VBG
 the_DT economy_NN ._. Employers_NNS were_VBD wary_JJ of_IN unions_NNS ,_, so_IN
 the_DT state_NN had_VBD to_TO act_VB as_IN an_DT intermediary_JJ between_IN
 the_DT two_CD sides_NNS to_TO develop_VB a_DT little_JJ dialogue_NN between_IN
 them_PRP ._. However_RB in_IN May_NNP 1968_CD there_EX were_VBD worker_NN
 strikes_NNS and_CC riots_NNS ,_, and_CC employers_NNS saw_VBD their_PRP\$

authority_NN in_IN question_NN ,_, and_CC were_VBD forced_VBN to_TO stand_VB
 down_RP ._. Trade_NNP unions_NNS were_VBD legalised_VBN in_IN the_DT work_NN
 place_NN ._. As_RB well_RB as_IN being_VBG legitimized_VBN in_IN the_DT
 workplace_NN ,_, unions_NNS could_MD also_RB put_VB up_RP candidates_NNS for_IN
 the_DT `` `` comités_FW d'entreprise_FW " " -LRB-_-LRB- a_DT sort_NN of_IN joint_JJ
 employee/employer_NN council_NN for_IN discussion_NN and_CC debate_NN -RRB-_-
 RRB- and_CC for_IN the_DT industrial_JJ tribunals_NNS ._. Their_PRP\$ powers_NNS
 were_VBD dramatically_RB increased_VBN therefore_RB ,_, paradoxically_RB at_IN a_DT
 time_NN when_WRB membership_NN was_VBD beginning_VBG to_TO fall_VB ._.
 The_DT `` `` Genelle_NNP Agreements_NNP " " also_RB raised_VBN minimum_JJ
 pay_NN and_CC raised_VBD pay_NN in_IN certain_JJ industries_NNS -LRB-_-LRB-
 e.g._FW the_DT railway_NN industry_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. From_IN this_DT time_NN
 on_IN employers_NNS became_VBD more_RBR modernist_JJ in_IN their_PRP\$
 thinking_NN and_CC trade_NN unions_NNS could_MD get_VB the_DT changes_NNS
 they_PRP wanted_VBD by_IN negotiating_VBG collective_JJ contracts_NNS ._. The_DT
 prominent_JJ positions_NNS in_IN the_DT CNPF_NN were_VBD taken_VBN by_IN
 this_DT new_JJ generation_NN of_IN entrepreneurs_NNS ._. It_PRP should_MD be_VB
 mentioned_VBN here_RB that_IN the_DT CNPF_NN is_VBZ an_DT organisation_NN
 set_VBD up_RP in_IN 1946_CD to_TO protect_VB employers_NNS ._. With_IN the_DT
 oil_NN shock_NN and_CC ensuing_VBG recession_NN of_IN 1973_CD ,_, the_DT third_JJ
 period_NN in_IN french_JJ industrial_JJ relations_NNS began_VBD ._. The_DT
 recession_NN ,_, and_CC the_DT increased_VBN competition_NN from_IN the_DT
 Common_NNP Market_NNP meant_VBD that_IN firms_NNS had_VBD to_TO
 increase_VB their_PRP\$ productivity_NN and_CC competitiveness_NN ,_, and_CC this_DT
 meant_VBN laying_VBG off_RP workers_NNS ._. The_DT trade_NN unions_NNS
 were_VBD powerless_JJ to_TO stop_VB the_DT rising_VBG unemployment_NN ,_,
 and_CC were_VBD often_RB wrongfooted_VBN as_IN they_PRP could_MD not_RB
 gain_VB better_JJR pay_NN for_IN their_PRP\$ members_NNS during_IN the_DT
 recession_NN ._. This_DT meant_VBD membership_NN would_MD fall_VB ._.
 When_WRB the_DT socialists_NNS came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1981_CD with_IN
 the_DT election_NN of_IN Mitterrand_NNP ,_, no_DT one_NN was_VBD quite_RB sure_JJ
 how_WRB they_PRP would_MD act_VB in_IN the_DT field_NN of_IN industrial_JJ
 relations_NNS ._. As_IN it_PRP turned_VBD out_RP ,_, the_DT Auroux_NNP Laws_NNPS
 of_IN 1982_CD and_CC 1983_CD completely_RB modernised_VBN industrial_JJ

relations_NNS and_CC changed_VBD a_DT third_JJ of_IN the_DT `` `` code_NN du_NNP
 travail_NN " " ._. The_DT Auroux_NNP Laws_NNP had_VBD four_CD main_JJ
 aspects_NNS ._. The_DT first_JJ was_VBD that_IN employees_NNS would_MD now_RB
 be_VB able_JJ to_TO voice_VB their_PRP\$ opinions_NNS directly_RB -LRB-_-LRB-
 not_RB just_RB via_IN trade_NN union_NN channels_NNS -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC
 collectively_RB ,_, and_CC employers_NNS would_MD be_VB forced_VBN to_TO
 listen_VB to_TO their_PRP\$ points_NNS of_IN view_NN ._. Secondly_RB ,_,
 discrimination_NN against_IN a_DT worker_NN would_MD not_RB be_VB allowed_VBN
 ._. The_DT company_NN would_MD have_VB to_TO draw_VB up_RP rules_NNS for_IN
 a_DT code_NN of_IN practice_NN ,_, which_WDT would_MD be_VB made_VBN
 known_VBN to_TO all_DT employees_NNS and_CC to_TO the_DT Ministry_NNP of_IN
 Employment_NNP ._. Thirdly_RB ,_, if_IN an_DT employee_NN did_VBD something_NN
 wrong_JJ ,_, he_PRP could_MD not_RB be_VB punished_VBN arbitrarily_RB ._. He_PRP
 was_VBD to_TO be_VB invited_VBN to_TO attend_VB a_DT preliminary_JJ
 interview_NN with_IN his_PRP\$ employer_NN to_TO see_VB what_WP he_PRP had_VBD
 done_VBN wrong_JJ ,_, and_CC could_MD have_VB a_DT union_NN representative_NN
 present_JJ if_IN he_PRP so_RB wished_VBD ._. Presivously_RB only_RB industrial_JJ
 tribunals_NNS could_MD help_VB employees_NNS ._. Finally_RB there_EX was_VBD
 great_JJ encouragement_NN to_TO collective_JJ bargaining_NN ._. It_PRP was_VBD
 hoped_VBN that_IN negotiation_NN would_MD become_VB a_DT regular_JJ part_NN
 of_IN industrial_JJ relations_NNS ,_, not_RB just_RB something_NN used_VBN in_IN
 crisis_NN situations_NNS ._. Any_DT firm_NN with_IN over_IN 100_CD employees_NNS
 could_MD have_VB a_DT comité_NN d'entreprise_NN and_CC should_MD negotiate_VB
 regularly_RB on_IN a_DT firm_JJ level_NN ._. There_EX would_MD also_RB be_VB
 industry_NN negotiations_NNS every_DT so_RB often_RB to_TO decide_VB pay_NN
 levels_NNS in_IN the_DT sector_NN ._. However_RB the_DT Auroux_NNP laws_NNS
 on_IN collective_JJ bargaining_NN were_VBD not_RB compulsory_JJ and_CC could_MD
 only_RB act_VB as_IN an_DT encouragement_NN ._. But_CC it_PRP is_VBZ
 encouraging_VBG to_TO see_VB negotiation_NN becoming_VBG a_DT more_RBR
 normal_JJ and_CC everyday_JJ part_NN of_IN industrial_JJ relations_NNS ._. The_DT
 collective_JJ bargaining_NN which_WDT was_VBD used_VBN at_IN the_DT `` ``
 height_NN " " of_IN the_DT unions_NNS sucess_VBP -LRB-_-LRB- 1968-1973_CD -
 RRB-_-RRB- was_VBD not_RB without_IN weaknesses_NNS ._. The_DT
 negotiations_NNS were_VBD often_RB carried_VBN out_RP at_IN a_DT general_JJ ,_,

regional_JJ level_NN which_WDT was_VBD far_RB removed_VBN from_IN individual_JJ worker_NN aims_NNS ._. Often_RB the_DT industry_NN was_VBD taken_VBN as_IN a_DT whole_NN in_IN subjects_NNS like_IN pay_NN and_CC only_RB the_DT minimum_JJ pay_NN of_IN the_DT weakest_JJS firms_NNS in_IN the_DT industry_NN was_VBD altered_VBN ._. The_DT unions_NNS tended_VBD to_TO view_VB the_DT SMIC_NNP as_IN the_DT bottom_JJ rung_VBN in_IN the_DT pay_NN ladder_NN and_CC put_VBD pressure_NN on_IN the_DT Government_NN to_TO increase_VB it_PRP ,_, thus_RB increasing_VBG all_DT pay_NN levels_NNS ._. The_DT unions_NNS also_RB tended_VBD to_TO view_VB each_DT negotiation_NN as_IN an_DT opportunity_NN to_TO gain_VB as_RB much_JJ as_IN they_PRP could_MD on_IN that_DT one_CD occasion_NN ._. Meanwhile_RB the_DT employers_NNS saw_VBD this_DT ,_, and_CC thus_RB only_RB offered_VBD very_RB few_JJ changes_NNS as_IN they_PRP were_VBD fearful_JJ of_IN what_WP the_DT unions_NNS would_MD try_VB to_TO take_VB ._. Once_RB negotiations_NNS were_VBD completed_VBN ,_, and_CC collective_JJ agreements_NNS decided_VBN upon_IN ,_, neither_DT party_NN stuck_VBD to_TO the_DT agreement_NN and_CC observed_VBD its_PRP\$ rules_NNS and_CC conditions_NNS ._. Finally_RB the_DT pluralism_NN of_IN trade_NN unions_NNS exacerbated_VBD the_DT problems_NNS ._. Many_JJ different_JJ union_NN representatives_NNS had_VBD to_TO be_VB involved_VBN in_IN any_DT negotiation_NN and_CC this_DT complicated_VBN the_DT process_NN ._. There_EX were_VBD other_JJ methods_NNS of_IN employee_NN representation_NN ,_, of_IN course_NN ,_, such_JJ as_IN the_DT `` `` comité_JJ d'entreprise_NN " " but_CC this_DT was_VBD not_RB compulsory_JJ in_IN firms_NNS with_IN over_IN 100_CD employees_NNS ,_, and_CC of_IN course_NN the_DT abundance_NN of_IN PME_NNP 's_POS meant_VBN that_IN many_JJ firms_NNS were_VBD not_RB eligible_JJ for_IN it_PRP anyway_RB ._. Then_RB ,_, as_IN we_PRP can_MD see_VB ,_, the_DT level_NN of_IN unionization_NN in_IN France_NNP is_VBZ very_RB low_JJ ._. It_PRP has_VBZ reached_VBN the_DT stage_NN where_WRB even_RB employers_NNS wish_VBP it_PRP were_VBD higher_JJR ,_, since_IN when_WRB there_EX is_VBZ worker_NN discontent_NN ,_, the_DT problems_NNS are_VBP aggravated_VBN by_IN the_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT workers_NNS have_VBP no_DT coherent_JJ leadership_NN and_CC are_VBP so_RB disorganized_JJ ._. However_RB it_PRP should_MD be_VB remembered_VBN that_IN workers_NNS in_IN France_NNP quite_RB often_RB show_VBP their_PRP\$ support_NN for_IN a_DT trade_NN union_NN by_IN voting_VBG

for_IN it_PRP ,_, not_RB by_IN joining_VBG it_PRP and_CC becoming_VBG a_DT member_NN ._. We_PRP can_MD therefore_RB see_VB that_DT relations_NNS between_IN employers_NNS and_CC employees_NNS have_VBP often_RB been_VBN strained_VBN ._. The_DT best_JJS time_NN for_IN the_DT unions_NNS was_VBD between_IN 1968_CD and_CC 1973_CD when_WRB they_PRP could_MD negotiate_VB collective_JJ contracts_NNS for_IN their_PRP\$ members_NNS ,_, but_CC this_DT was_VBD stopped_VBN by_IN the_DT recession_NN of_IN the_DT 1970_CD 's_POS ._. Their_PRP\$ powers_NNS had_VBD increased_VBN ,_, but_CC paradoxically_RB ,_, union_NN membership_NN did_VBD not_RB ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0024.1

Under_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN the_DT most_RBS salient_JJ feature_NN to_TO emerge_VB is_VBZ the_DT form_NN of_IN presidentialism_NN started_VBN by_IN General_NNP de_NNP Gaulle_NNP and_CC carried_VBD on_RP successful_JJ by_IN his_PRP\$ successors_NNS ._. From_IN 1791_CD to_TO 1958_CD France_NNP has_VBZ known_VBN 16_CD constitutions_NNS and_CC since_IN 1875_CD 3_CD Republics_NNS ._. The_DT 4th_JJ Republic_NN was_VBD characterised_VBN by_IN a_DT weak_JJ government_NN and_CC a_DT weak_JJ presidency_NN ,_, with_IN power_NN being_VBG concentrated_VBN in_IN the_DT hands_NNS of_IN a_DT divided_VBN National_NNP Assembly_NNP ._. The_DT collapse_NN of_IN the_DT 4th_JJ Republic_NN and_CC the_DT mounting_VBG problem_NN of_IN the_DT Algerian_NNP situation_NN brought_VBD back_RB to_TO power_NN the_DT charismatic_JJ figure_NN of_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP who_WP was_VBD seen_VBN as_IN the_DT only_JJ person_NN capable_JJ of_IN dealing_VBG and_CC solving_VBG the_DT Algerian_NNP problem_NN ._. In_IN his_PRP\$ years_NNS in_IN exile_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP saw_VBD France_NNP humiliated_VBN by_IN her_PRP\$ defeat_NN and_CC subsequent_JJ occupation_NN by_IN the_DT Germans_NNPS ,_, ruled_VBN by_IN the_DT notorious_JJ Vichy_NNP regime_NN and_CC ,_, after_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN the_DT war_NN ,_, still_RB not_RB in_IN control_NN of_IN her_PRP\$ fate_NN ,_, having_VBG to_TO align_VB herself_PRP with_IN the_DT United_NNP States_NNPS ._. France_NNP was_VBD `` `` the_DT sick_JJ man_NN of_IN Europe_NNP " " ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP saw_VBD this_DT sickness_NN as_IN a_DT result_NN of_IN the_DT role_NN and_CC authority_NN of_IN the_DT state_NN being_VBG undermined_VBN and_CC on_IN coming_VBG to_TO power_NN in_IN 1958_CD de_IN Gaulle_NNP was_VBD determined_VBN to_TO strengthen_VB

the_DT state_NN and_CC create_VB a_DT strong_JJ Executive_NNP ,_, which_WDT
 he_PRP hoped_VBD he_PRP would_MD lead_VB ._. His_PRP\$ importance_NN in_IN
 shaping_VBG the_DT 1958_CD constitution_NN can_MD not_RB be_VB
 overestimated_VBN and_CC ,_, though_IN it_PRP can_MD be_VB said_VBD that_IN
 it_PRP was_VBD tailor-made_JJ for_IN him_PRP ,_, it_PRP would_MD be_VB truer_JJR
 to_TO say_VB that_IN the_DT constitution_NN became_VBD more_RBR and_CC
 more_RBR tailor-made_JJ for_IN him_PRP as_IN a_DT result_NN of_IN constitutional_JJ
 amendment_NN and_CC changes_NNS in_IN political_JJ life_NN ._. On_IN drafting_VBG
 the_DT text_NN two_CD conflicting_VBG notions_NNS had_VBD to_TO be_VB
 reconciled_VBN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP favoured_VBD a_DT return_NN to_TO the_DT
 old_JJ Bonapartist_NNP tradition_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP having_VBG full_JJ ,_,
 almost_RB ,_, omnipotent_JJ powers_NNS but_CC others_NNS fearing_VBG this_DT
 style_NN of_IN power_NN concentrated_VBD in_IN the_DT hands_NNS of_IN just_RB
 one_CD source_NN wanted_VBD the_DT government_NN to_TO have_VB more_JJR
 power_NN ._. A_DT compromise_NN was_VBD reached_VBN in_IN which_WDT
 power_NN would_MD be_VB shared_VBN by_IN a_DT strong_JJ Executive_NNP
 comprising_VBG of_IN a_DT president_NN and_CC a_DT cabinet_NN headed_VBN by_IN
 a_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP responsible_JJ to_TO Parliament_NNP ._. De_NNP
 Gaulle_NNP ended_VBN by_IN strengthening_VBG the_DT Executive_NNP in_IN
 favour_NN of_IN the_DT presidency_NN and_CC his_PRP\$ interpretation_NN of_IN
 the_DT most_RBS ambiguous_JJ word_NN in_IN the_DT text_NN ,_, `` `` arbitration_NN
 " " has_VBZ been_VBN untouched_VBN for_IN more_JJR than_IN 30_CD years_NNS ._.
 In_IN Article_NNP 5_CD the_DT word_NN `` `` arbitration_NN " " can_MD be_VB
 interpreted_VBN differently_RB ; : on_IN one_CD hand_NN it_PRP can_MD mean_VB
 that_IN the_DT president_NN is_VBZ an_DT impartial_JJ observer_NN and_CC
 referee_NN and_CC does_VBZ not_RB deal_VB with_IN problems_NNS but_CC on_IN
 the_DT other_JJ hand_NN it_PRP can_MD mean_VB that_IN he_PRP is_VBZ in_IN
 charge_NN of_IN the_DT daily_JJ run_NN of_IN the_DT country_NN ,_, obviously_RB
 having_VBG a_DT more_RBR dynamic_JJ and_CC interventionist_JJ role_NN ._. De_NNP
 Gaulle_NNP chose_VBD the_DT second_JJ interpretation_NN and_CC quickly_RB
 established_JJ presidential_JJ preeminence_NN and_CC authority_NN ._. This_DT
 interpretation_NN has_VBZ been_VBN upheld_VBN by_IN his_PRP\$ successors_NNS
 and_CC the_DT Gaullist_NNP legacy_NN has_VBZ continued_VBN ._. What_WDT
 then_RB ,_, were_VBD his_PRP\$ powers_NNS and_CC how_WRB have_VBP they_PRP

expanded_VBN under_IN successive_JJ presidents_NNS ?_. In_IN his_PRP\$ 10_CD
 years_NNS in_IN office_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP implemented_VBD many_JJ changes_NNS
 in_IN the_DT french_JJ political_JJ system_NN ._. The_DT traditional_JJ powers_NNS
 bestowed_VBN on_IN him_PRP were_VBD ruthlessly_RB exploited_VBN ,_, used_VBN
 and_CC abused_VBN ._. These_DT included_VBD Head_NNP of_IN State_NNP ,_,
 Commander-in-Chief_NNP of_IN Armed_NNP Forces_NNP and_CC the_DT power_NN
 to_TO appoint_VB or_CC dismiss_VB the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP of_IN his_PRP\$
 choice_NN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP was_VBD also_RB given_VBN carte_NN blanche_NN
 to_TO define_VB European_JJ ,_, domestic_JJ ,_, defence_NN and_CC foreign_JJ
 policy_NN and_CC he_PRP did_VBD so_RB ,_, creating_VBG the_DT office_NN of_IN
 the_DT presidency_NN and_CC turning_VBG the_DT presidency_NN into_IN the_DT
 centre_NN of_IN decision-making_NN ._. He_PRP became_VBD the_DT chief_JJ
 policy_NN maker_NN and_CC in_IN the_DT fields_NNS of_IN foreign_JJ and_CC
 defence_NN policy_NN he_PRP left_VBD his_PRP\$ hallmark_NN firmly_RB
 implanted_VBN ._. His_PRP\$ achievements_NNS were_VBD to_TO veto_VB twice_RB
 Britain_NNP 's_POS entry_NN into_IN the_DT common_JJ Market_NN ,_, solve_VB
 the_DT Algerian_NNP problem_NN single-handedly_RB ,_, make_VBP a_DT
 rapprochement_NN with_IN countries_NNS in_IN Eastern_NNP Europe_NNP ,_, give_VBP
 full_JJ recognition_NN to_TO the_DT Communist_JJ party_NN of_IN China_NNP and_CC
 in_IN his_PRP\$ attempt_NN to_TO break_VB away_RP from_IN American_JJ tutelage_NN
 withdrew_VBD France_NNP from_IN NATO_NNP ,_, and_CC drew_VBD up_RP
 plans_NNS for_IN France_NNP 's_POS own_JJ nuclear_JJ deterrent_NN ._. De_NNP
 Gaulle_NNP made_VBD use_NN of_IN all_PDT his_PRP\$ principal_JJ powers_NNS in_IN
 his_PRP\$ first_JJ four_CD years_NNS in_IN office_NN and_CC he_PRP wielded_VBD
 his_PRP\$ power-tool_NN ,_, the_DT power_NN to_TO call_VB a_DT referendum_NN ,_,
 ruthlessly_RB ._. This_DT was_VBD used_VBN twice_RB on_IN the_DT Algerian_NNP
 problem_NN ,_, in_IN October_NNP 1962_CD to_TO reform_VB the_DT constitution_NN
 in_IN order_NN for_IN the_DT president_NN to_TO be_VB elected_VBN by_IN
 universal_JJ suffrage_NN ,_, and_CC once_RB more_RBR in_IN 1969_CD ._. The_DT
 referendum_NN ,_, under_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP ,_, became_VBD synonymous_JJ
 with_IN a_DT plebiscite_NN as_IN each_DT time_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP put_VBD
 forward_RB the_DT proposal_NN it_PRP was_VBD clear_JJ that_IN the_DT elector_NN
 was_VBD voting_VBG for_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP 's_POS proposals_NNS ,_, giving_VBG
 him_PRP ,_, in_IN effect_NN ,_, a_DT vote_NN of_IN confidence_NN ._. The_DT

1962_CD reform_NN tipped_VBD the_DT balance_NN in_IN the_DT favour_NN of_IN the_DT presidency_NN after_IN a_DT record_NN turnout_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 85_CD %_NN -RRB-_-RRB- voted_VBD for_IN his_PRP\$ proposal_NN to_TO elect_VB a_DT President_NN by_IN the_DT people_NNS ._. Now_RB ,_, de_FW Gaulle_NNP proclaimed_VBD ,_, the_DT president_NN is_VBZ the_DT elected_VBN of_IN the_DT nation_NN ,_, by_IN the_DT nation_NN ,_, and_CC as_IN such_JJ is_VBZ the_DT holder_NN and_CC source_NN of_IN legitimate_JJ power_NN ,_, having_VBG the_DT mandate_NN from_IN the_DT people_NNS ._. Also_RB within_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP 's_POS power_NN was_VBD the_DT power_NN to_TO dissolve_VB the_DT National_NNP Assembly_NNP ,_, which_WDT he_PRP did_VBD twice_RB ,_, in_IN 1962_CD and_CC 1968_CD ._. After_IN the_DT student_NN revolts_NNS of_IN May_NNP 1968_CD he_PRP reformed_VBD the_DT french_JJ higher_JJR education_NN system_NN and_CC under_IN Article_NNP 16_CD exercised_VBN his_PRP\$ emergency_NN powers_NNS in_IN Algeria_NNP between_IN April_NNP 23rd_JJ and_CC September_NNP 29th_JJ ._. Though_IN the_DT office_NN of_IN president_NN was_VBD far_RB from_IN being_VBG `` `` omnipotent_JJ ,_, omniscient_JJ and_CC omnipresent_JJ " " his_PRP\$ power_NN and_CC influence_NN was_VBD quite_RB considerable_JJ ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP 's_POS contribution_NN to_TO the_DT presidential_JJ power_NN was_VBD great_JJ and_CC far-reaching_JJ and_CC he_PRP unhesitatingly_RB used_VBD and_CC exploited_VBD the_DT text_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN to_TO change_VB matters_NNS in_IN his_PRP\$ favour_NN ._. This_DT interpretation_NN of_IN Article_NNP 5_CD has_VBZ been_VBN left_VBN untouched_JJ and_CC the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP has_VBZ expanded_VBN and_CC extended_VBN into_IN other_JJ domains_NNS ._. Under_IN his_PRP\$ successor_NN George_NNP Pompidou_NNP ,_, the_DT presidency_NN has_VBZ embraced_VBN the_DT economic_JJ ,_, financial_JJ and_CC institutional_JJ spheres_NNS ._. Pompidou_NNP declared_VBD that_IN the_DT presidency_NN would_MD continue_VB to_TO be_VB the_DT seat_NN of_IN decision-making_NN ._. His_PRP\$ slogan_NN was_VBD `` `` continuité_NN et_FW ouverture_FW " " ._. The_DT only_JJ difference_NN between_IN Pompidou_NNP and_CC de_IN Gaulle_NNP was_VBD style_NN ;_: Pompidou_NNP was_VBD more_RBR cautious_JJ and_CC realised_VBD that_IN France_NNP had_VBD her_PRP\$ limits_NNS on_IN the_DT international_JJ scene_NN ._. At_IN home_NN Pompidou_NN intervened_VBD in_IN financial_JJ and_CC economic_JJ areas_NNS ,_, creating_VBG and_CC restructuring_VBG French_JJ industry_NN ._. The_DT functions_NNS of_IN

the_DT presidency_NN have_VBP thus_RB expanded_VBN ._. The_DT reasons_NNS
 behind_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP 's_POS and_CC Pompidou_NNP 's_POS success_NN to_TO
 keep_VB presidential_JJ authority_NN strong_JJ lies_NNS in_IN the_DT large_JJ
 majority_NN enjoyed_VBN by_IN the_DT Gaullists_NNPS ._. This_DT was_VBD the_DT
 key_JJ and_CC cornerstone_NN to_TO presidential_JJ preeminence_NN ._. In_IN 1974_CD
 Valéry_NNP Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NN ,_, Pompidou_NNP 's_POS former_JJ
 Finance_NNP Minister_NNP ,_, narrowly_RB beat_VB the_DT socialist_JJ candidate_NN
 ,_, François_NNP Mitterrand_NNP ,_, to_TO become_VB the_DT 3rd_JJ president_NN
 of_IN the_DT Vth_NNP Republic_NNP ._. D'Estaing_VBG further_RB enhanced_VBD
 the_DT presidency_NN by_IN embracing_VBG social_JJ and_CC environmental_JJ
 fields_NNS ._. He_PRP promoted_VBD an_DT advanced_JJ liberal_JJ society_NN and_CC
 succeeded_VBD in_IN the_DT social_JJ domain_NN to_TO reduce_VB the_DT voting_NN
 age_NN to_TO 18_CD ,_, legalise_VB female_JJ contraception_NN and_CC abortion_NN
 and_CC he_PRP retained_VBD his_PRP\$ tight_JJ hold_NN over_IN the_DT financial_JJ
 area_NN ._. In_IN the_DT environmental_JJ field_NN he_PRP promoted_VBD
 protection_NN of_IN the_DT environment_NN ,_, by_IN obstructing_VBG plans_NNS
 to_TO build_VB concrete_JJ motorways_NNS and_CC ugly_JJ edifices_NNS and_CC
 maintained_VBD the_DT natural_JJ beauty_NN of_IN the_DT French_JJ countryside_NN
 ._. François_NNP Mitterrand_NNP has_VBZ seen_VBN his_PRP\$ party_NN ,_, the_DT
 socialists_NNS ,_, occupying_VBG seats_NNS in_IN the_DT opposition_NN and_CC
 has_VBZ thus_RB been_VBN forced_VBN to_TO `` `` cohabit_VB " " with_IN his_PRP\$
 non-socialist_JJ Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ,_, M._NNP Rocard_NNP ,_, and_CC
 divide_VBP some_DT of_IN the_DT powers_NNS between_IN him_PRP ._.
 Mitterrand_NNP has_VBZ also_RB been_VBN obliged_VBN to_TO fall_VB back_RB
 on_IN the_DT text_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN where_WRB in_IN articles_NNS
 20_CD and_CC 21_CD it_PRP states_VBZ the_DT prime_JJ Minister_NNP deals_NNS
 with_IN the_DT nation_NN 's_POS affairs_NNS ._. The_DT ambiguity_NN of_IN the_DT
 text_NN has_VBZ favoured_VBN the_DT presidency_NN according_VBG to_TO the_DT
 political_JJ climate_NN at_IN the_DT time_NN ._. Presidential_JJ authority_NN has_VBZ
 been_VBN the_DT most_RBS salient_JJ factor_NN of_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN
 and_CC since_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP the_DT office_NN has_VBZ grown_VBN in_IN
 strength_NN ,_, prestige_NN and_CC has_VBZ enhanced_VBN powers_NNS ranging_VBG
 from_IN Chief_NNP policy_NN maker_NN in_IN defence_NN and_CC foreign_JJ
 affairs_NNS ,_, modernising_VBG the_DT French_JJ economy_NN and_CC

advocating_VBG an_DT advanced_JJ liberal_JJ society_NN ._. Under_IN Mitterrand_NNP we_PRP have_VBP seen_VBN the_DT nationalisation_NN of_IN firms_NNS and_CC new_JJ balance_NN of_IN power_NN in_IN Parliament_NNP ._. The_DT text_NN is_VBZ more_RBR adhered_JJ to_TO now_RB as_IN Mitterrand_NNP has_VBZ not_RB got_VBN a_DT majority_NN to_TO back_VB up_RP his_PRP\$ policies_NNS in_IN Parliament_NNP but_CC he_PRP still_RB enjoys_VBZ the_DT privileges_NNS and_CC wields_VBZ power_NN in_IN the_DT same_JJ manner_NN as_IN his_PRP\$ predecessors_NNS ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0025.1

When_WRB General_NNP de_NNP Gaulle_NNP came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1958_CD ,_, it_PRP was_VBD generally_RB expected_VBN that_IN the_DT role_NN of_IN president_NN would_MD be_VB given_VBN a_DT new_JJ status_NN in_IN the_DT policy_NN of_IN decision_NN making_NN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP 's_POS Bayeux_NNP speech_NN and_CC subsequent_JJ centrings_NNS made_VBD it_PRP clear_JJ that_IN a_DT clearly_RB visible_JJ president_NN was_VBD required_VBN ,_, who_WP would_MD be_VB the_DT `` keystone_NN ' ' to_TO the_DT parliamentary_JJ régime_NN ._. The_DT constitution_NN of_IN 1958_CD honoured_VBD this_DT ,_, by_IN placing_VBG the_DT President_NNP first_RB among_IN the_DT members_NNS of_IN parliament_NN ._. There_EX is_VBZ however_RB a_DT fundamental_JJ difference_NN between_IN the_DT powers_NNS that_IN the_DT constitution_NN and_CC those_DT who_WP drafted_VBD it_PRP gave_VBD the_DT President_NNP and_CC the_DT powers_NNS that_IN he_PRP subsequently_RB acquired_VBD ._. The_DT result_NN is_VBZ a_DT very_RB interesting_JJ example_NN of_IN how_WRB circumstances_NNS and_CC personality_NN can_MD change_VB the_DT constitution_NN ._. The_DT constitution_NN had_VBD originally_RB left_VBN policy_NN and_CC decision_NN making_VBG to_TO the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN and_CC his_PRP\$ government_NN -LRB-_-LRB- articles_NNS 20-23_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. The_DT power_NN granted_VBN under_IN article_NN twelve_CD to_TO dissolve_VB parliament_NN would_MD ,_, according_VBG to_TO Michel_NNP Debré_NNP ,_, only_RB allow_VBP a_DT short_JJ exchange_NN with_IN the_DT public_NN ._. According_VBG to_TO the_DT constitution_NN ,_, the_DT President_NNP was_VBD only_RB to_TO assume_VB the_DT role_NN of_IN constitutional_JJ dictator_NN in_IN times_NNS of_IN grave_JJ trouble_NN -LRB-_-LRB- art._NN 16_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._. In_IN a_DT brilliant_JJ exegesis_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN he_PRP had_VBD authored_VBN in_IN large_JJ part_NN ,_,

Michel_NNP Debré_NNP said_VBD that_IN the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP was_VBD to_TO be_VB that_DT of_IN an_DT arbiter_NN ,_, to_TO oversee_VB the_DT constitution_NN ,_, and_CC be_VB `` beyond_IN politics_NNS and_CC the_DT political_JJ parties_NNS ._. This_DT seems_VBZ to_TO have_VB been_VBN somewhat_RB unrealistic_JJ ._. Neither_CC the_DT war_NN in_IN Algeria_NNP ,_, nor_CC ,_, despite_IN appearances_NNS the_DT personality_NN of_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP would_MD let_VB him_PRP be_VB the_DT arbiter_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN ._. The_DT referendum_NN in_IN 1962_CD gave_VBD the_DT President_NNP the_DT legitimacy_NN of_IN the_DT public_JJ vote_NN ._. Now_RB he_PRP was_VBD directly_RB answerable_JJ to_TO the_DT people_NNS ._. In_IN 1964_CD Charles_NNP de_IN Gaulle_NNP realistically_RB defined_VBD his_PRP\$ role_NN as_IN President_NNP ._. He_PRP was_VBD still_RB prepared_VBN to_TO play_VB the_DT role_NN of_IN arbiter_NN when_WRB absolutely_RB necessary_JJ ._. According_VBG to_TO him_PRP he_PRP was_VBD the_DT head_NN of_IN Parliament_NNP and_CC no_DT other_JJ institution_NN either_CC social_JJ or_CC judiciary_NN was_VBD higher_JJR than_IN him_PRP ._. He_PRP saw_VBD parliament_NN as_IN `` sitting_VBG around_IN him_PRP ' ' " ._. According_VBG to_TO him_PRP ,_, article_NN 16_CD was_VBD the_DT absolute_JJ defence_NN of_IN `` La_NNP Patrie_NNP ' ' _POS ._. Because_IN of_IN Article_NNP twelve_CD ,_, the_DT President_NNP can_MD dissolve_VB Parliament_NNP at_IN any_DT time_NN that_IN he_PRP thinks_VBZ is_VBZ opportune_JJ to_TO him_PRP and_CC so_RB he_PRP can_MD directly_RB interfere_VB with_IN the_DT organisation_NN of_IN Parliament_NNP ._. When_WRB he_PRP thinks_VBZ that_IN the_DT constitution_NN is_VBZ being_VBG abused_VBN ,_, he_PRP can_MD enroll_VB the_DT conseil_NN constitutionnel_NN ,_, and_CC ,_, according_VBG to_TO de_FW Gaulle_NNP ,_, when_WRB the_DT conseil_NN Constitutionnel_NNP can_MD not_RB be_VB used_VBN ,_, as_IN arbiter_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN ,_, the_DT President_NNP can_MD interfere_VB with_IN the_DT unconstitutional_JJ question_NN himself_PRP ._. General_NNP de_NNP Gaulle_NNP himself_PRP only_RB ever_RB used_VBN article_NN 16_CD once_RB when_WRB their_PRP\$ was_VBD trouble_NN in_IN Algiers_NNP ,_, and_CC order_NN was_VBD quickly_RB restored_VBN ._. The_DT President_NNP can_MD be_VB tried_VBN for_IN high_JJ treason_NNS ._. It_PRP has_VBZ been_VBN shown_VBN however_RB that_IN in_IN times_NNS of_IN trouble_NN ,_, those_DT in_IN power_NN of_IN communications_NNS often_RB regain_VBP control_NN ._. This_DT

is_VBZ the_DT only_JJ control_NN there_EX is_VBZ on_IN the_DT President_NNP ._. Critics_NNS of_IN the_DT constitution_NN ,_, said_VBD it_PRP left_VBD too_RB much_JJ power_NN to_TO the_DT President_NNP ,_, which_WDT could_MD be_VB dangerous_JJ in_IN the_DT hands_NNS of_IN his_PRP\$ successors_NNS ._. Defenders_NNS of_IN the_DT constitution_NN said_VBD however_RB that_IN the_DT fact_NN that_IN he_PRP was_VBD elected_VBN by_IN the_DT people_NNS was_VBD a_DT control_NN ._. When_WRB his_PRP\$ successors_NNS ,_, first_RB Pompidou_NNP ,_, who_WP had_VBD been_VBN de_IN Gaulle_NNP 's_POS prime_JJ minister_NN for_IN six_CD years_NNS and_CC then_RB Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NN had_VBD come_VBN to_TO power_NN ,_, they_PRP both_DT made_VBD it_PRP clear_JJ that_IN they_PRP intended_VBD to_TO keep_VB the_DT presidency_NN as_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP had_VBD left_VBN it_PRP ._. Pompidou_NNP himself_PRP praised_VBD the_DT ` `` bastard_NN ' _ " qualities_NNS of_IN the_DT system_NN If_IN in_IN the_DT last_JJ years_NNS of_IN his_PRP\$ presidency_NN ,_, d'Estaing_NN took_VBD on_RP a_DT more_RBR prominent_JJ role_NN then_RB ,_, it_PRP was_VBD only_RB partly_RB because_IN of_IN his_PRP\$ personality_NN ._. The_DT main_JJ reason_NN was_VBD the_DT division_NN between_IN his_PRP\$ prime_JJ minister_NN and_CC his_PRP\$ party_NN ,_, which_WDT he_PRP wanted_VBD to_TO hide_VB by_IN his_PRP\$ prominence_NN ._. When_WRB the_DT constitution_NN was_VBD drafted_VBN it_PRP was_VBD expected_VBN that_IN there_EX would_MD be_VB controversy_NN between_IN the_DT prime_JJ ministers_NNS and_CC presidents_NNS ,_, but_CC after_IN three_CD different_JJ Presidents_NNS each_DT with_IN very_RB individual_JJ personalities_NNS ,_, these_DT were_VBD not_RB apparent_JJ ._. Each_DT of_IN the_DT Presidents_NNP added_VBD their_PRP\$ own_JJ personalities_NNS to_TO the_DT role_NN ,_, for_IN example_NN Pompidou_NNP was_VBD interested_JJ in_IN defence_NN and_CC economics_NNS and_CC so_RB added_VBD these_DT areas_NNS to_TO his_PRP\$ role_NN as_IN President_NNP ._. With_IN hindsight_NN however_RB it_PRP is_VBZ true_JJ to_TO say_VB that_IN d'Estaing_NN and_CC Pompidou_NNP left_VBD the_DT presidency_NN very_RB much_RB as_IN they_PRP had_VBD found_VBN it_PRP ._. Mitterand_NNP had_VBD always_RB criticized_VBN the_DT ambiguous_JJ constitution_NN ._. In_IN a_DT parliamentary_JJ debate_NN with_IN d'Estaing_NN ,_, he_PRP thundered_VBD that_IN France_NNP should_MD adopt_VB an_DT ` `` honest_JJ ' _ " system_NN ._. In_IN his_PRP\$ election_NN campaign_NN in_IN 1981_CD however_RB the_DT socialist_JJ candidate_NN made_VBD no_DT criticism_NN of_IN the_DT

constitution_NN ,_, most_JJS probably_RB because_IN he_PRP recognized_VBD ,_, that_IN the_DT electorat_NN was_VBD perfectly_RB happily_RB with_IN the_DT system_NN ._. In_IN his_PRP\$ first_JJ speech_NN after_IN his_PRP\$ election_NN ,_, he_PRP said_VBD that_IN he_PRP intended_VBD to_TO carry_VB out_RP the_DT role_NN of_IN president_NN to_TO the_DT full_JJ extent_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ powers_NNS and_CC that_IN he_PRP considered_VBD himself_PRP as_IN `` guardian_NN ' ' of_IN the_DT constitution_NN ._. During_IN the_DT years_NNS of_IN cohabitation_NN however_RB ,_, Mitterand_NNP had_VBD to_TO use_VB only_RB his_PRP\$ `` de_FW facto_FW ' ' powers_NNS as_IN strictly_RB defined_VBN by_IN the_DT constitution_NN and_CC he_PRP was_VBD less_RBR in_IN prominence_NN than_IN his_PRP\$ predecessors.It_NN is_VBZ possible_JJ that_IN he_PRP benefited_VBD from_IN this_DT More_RBR recently_RB ,_, Mitterand_NNP has_VBZ been_VBN heard_VBN to_TO criticize_VB his_PRP\$ prime_JJ minister_NN Rocard_NNP in_IN public_NN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0026.1

The_DT Constitution_NNP of_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN was_VBD drawn_VBN up_RP as_IN a_DT compromise_NN between_IN the_DT `` `` Republicans_NNPS " " of_IN the_DT political_JJ parties_NNS of_IN the_DT 4th_JJ Republic_NN and_CC de_IN Gaulle_NNP and_CC his_PRP\$ followers_NNS who_WP wanted_VBD to_TO enhance_VB the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN ._. The_DT constitution_NN which_WDT was_VBD drawn_VBN up_RP between_IN Michel_NNP Debré_NNP ,_, de_FW Gaulle_NNP and_CC a_DT small_JJ group_NN of_IN ministers_NNS ,_, was_VBD however_RB unclear_JJ ._. It_PRP tried_VBD to_TO fuse_NN two_CD incompatible_JJ notions_NNS :_: that_IN of_IN separation_NN of_IN powers_NNS with_IN a_DT powerful_JJ head_NN of_IN state_NN -LRB-_-LRB- presidentialism_NN -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC the_DT principle_NN of_IN parliamentary_JJ responsibility_NN to_TO a_DT government_NN -LRB-_-LRB- parliamentarism_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. This_DT is_VBZ shown_VBN below_IN :_: <chart>_NN ._. Some_DT articles_NNS clear_JJ state_NN that_IN it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN who_WP rules_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- for_IN example_NN article_NN 21_CD -RRB-_-RRB- whereas_IN successive_JJ presidents_NNS and_CC prime_JJ ministers_NNS have_VBP said_VBN it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT president_NN who_WP is_VBZ the_DT supreme_JJ power_NN -LRB-_-LRB- by_IN their_PRP\$ interpretation_NN of_IN article_NN 5_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ._.

Whatever_WDT the_DT case_NN it_PRP became_VBD clear_JJ that_IN the_DT
 constitution_NN strengthened_VBD presidential_JJ power_NN and_CC made_VBD the_DT
 executive_NN responsible_JJ to_TO parliament_NN ._. Before_IN discussing_VBG the_DT
 ambiguity_NN and_CC the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN I_PRP will_MD
 briefly_RB mention_VB the_DT functions_NNS of_IN the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN ._.
 Much_JJ of_IN his_PRP\$ original_JJ power_NN as_IN defined_VBN by_IN the_DT
 constitution_NN <quote>_NN has_VBZ been_VBN usurped_VBN by_IN successive_JJ
 presidents_NNS and_CC their_PRP\$ interpretation_NN of_IN their_PRP\$ function_NN
 such_JJ that_IN now_RB his_PRP\$ main_JJ role_NN is_VBZ to_TO take_VB interest_NN
 in_IN areas_NNS which_WDT do_VBP not_RB interest_VB the_DT president_NN ,_,
 coordinate_JJ government_NN policy_NN ,_, liaise_VBP with_IN parliament_NN to_TO
 enable_VB the_DT smooth_JJ passing_NN of_IN a_DT law_NN ,_, maintain_VBP
 friendly_JJ contact_NN with_IN the_DT largest_JJS coalition_NN party_NN and_CC
 arbitrate_VB in_IN conflicts_NNS between_IN coalition_NN parties_NNS ._. The_DT
 original_JJ role_NN given_VBN to_TO the_DT president_NN of_IN the_DT 5th_JJ
 Republic_NN was_VBD a_DT continuation_NN of_IN that_DT of_IN the_DT 4th_JJ
 Republic_NN in_IN that_IN he_PRP could_MD nominate_VB and_CC dismiss_VB the_DT
 prime_JJ minister_NN and_CC other_JJ ministers_NNS ,_, he_PRP is_VBZ chairman_NN
 of_IN the_DT Constitutional_NNP Council_NNP ,_, he_PRP can_MD negotiate_VB
 and_CC ratify_VB international_JJ treaties_NNS ,_, sign_NN decrees_NNS ,_,
 promulgate_NN laws_NNS and_CC grant_NN pardons_NNS ._. However_RB ,_, the_DT
 constitution_NN did_VBD allow_VB for_IN an_DT extension_NN of_IN the_DT role_NN
 of_IN the_DT president_NN granting_VBG him_PRP new_JJ powers_NNS ;_: for_IN
 example_NN the_DT ability_NN to_TO dissolve_VB the_DT national_JJ assembly_NN
 and_CC ask_VB the_DT Constitutional_NNP Council_NNP to_TO judge_VB on_IN the_DT
 constitutionality_NN of_IN a_DT law_NN -LRB-_-LRB- previously_RB the_DT prime_JJ
 minister_NN 's_POS role_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. It_PRP is_VBZ because_IN of_IN
 article_NN 5_CD that_IN the_DT definition_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN 's_POS
 functions_NNS is_VBZ ambiguous_JJ because_IN this_DT article_NN contains_VBZ
 the_DT concept_NN of_IN arbitrage_NN -LRB-_-LRB- the_DT president_NN can_MD
 either_RB be_VB directly_RB involved_VBN in_IN or_CC kept_VBD apart_RB from_IN
 decision_NN making_NN -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC is_VBZ sufficiently_RB vague_JJ to_TO
 have_VB allowed_VBN successive_JJ presidents_NNS to_TO interpret_VB it_PRP as_IN
 they_PRP wished_VBD ._. Whatever_WDT the_DT aim_NN of_IN the_DT initiators_NNS

of the constitution the power of the presidency has been strengthened throughout the 5th Republic and the nature of his office has changed such that he is now the head of state and of the executive, guardian of national heritage and patrimony and the ultimate political decision maker. The priority given to each of the above rules has depended on the temperament of the president in power but it seems that the president's role has been much more forceful, interventionist and political than a reading of the constitution would imply. De Gaulle was the first President of the 5th Republic and it was he who established the role. He introduced two provisions to enable him to govern the country as he wished. The first of these was the introduction of article 16 which gave him the right to claim special powers in emergency situations. This was not very popular because of the possibility for abuse. The second provision was the introduction of the referendum as an alternative means of election. This gave de Gaulle the opportunity to have a link with the people and it brought about the only amendment of the constitution in 1962: that of election by universal suffrage. Despite these provisions de Gaulle was not prevented from acting unconstitutionally; for example in 1960 he refused to invoke a session of parliament despite the majority of parliament wanting it and in 1961 he abused article 16. Like his three successors, de Gaulle used the political circumstances to strengthen his position. It was in Algeria that he really used his political position to win the Algerian war. For the first four years of the Republic it was Algeria

which_WDT kept_VBD the_DT other_JJ political_JJ parties_NNS from_IN acting_VBG against_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP and_CC he_PRP was_VBD allowed_VBN to_TO abuse_VB the_DT constitution_NN ,_, consolidate_VB his_PRP\$ personal_JJ position_NN and_CC strengthen_VB his_PRP\$ office_NN ._. Despite_IN using_VBG his_PRP\$ own_JJ personality_NN to_TO expand_VB his_PRP\$ role_NN he_PRP did_VBD leave_VB some_DT decision_NN making_VBG to_TO his_PRP\$ ministers_NNS ._. He_PRP was_VBD mainly_RB responsible_JJ for_IN foreign_JJ and_CC defence_NN policies_NNS ,_, colonial_NN and_CC French_JJ community_NN questions_NNS and_CC economic_JJ questions_NNS ._. Having_VBG failed_VBN in_IN his_PRP\$ aims_NNS with_IN the_DT referendum_NN of_IN 1969_CD de_IN Gaulle_NNP resigned_VBD but_CC the_DT practice_NN was_VBD firmly_RB established_VBN for_IN his_PRP\$ successor_NN ,_, Pompidou_NNP to_TO use_VB it_PRP to_TO gain_VB power_NN over_IN and_CC alongside_IN parliament_NN ._. He_PRP continued_VBD to_TO rule_VB in_IN the_DT same_JJ way_NN as_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP which_WDT surprised_VBD a_DT lot_NN of_IN people_NNS showing_VBG how_WRB ``_`` Gaullist_NNP " " tradition_NN has_VBZ become_VBN embedded_JJ in_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN ._. He_PRP used_VBD the_DT referendum_NN in_IN '72_CD with_IN reference_NN to_TO UK_NNP entry_NN into_IN the_DT EC_NNP and_CC to_TO dismiss_VB Chaban-Dalmas_NNP ._. Pompidou_NNP expanded_VBD the_DT role_NN of_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP to_TO include_VB economic_JJ and_CC industrial_JJ policies_NNS ._. He_PRP was_VBD obsessed_VBN with_IN the_DT economical_JJ development_NN of_IN France_NNP and_CC transforming_VBG the_DT nation_NN into_IN a_DT great_JJ industrial_JJ power_NN ._. He_PRP was_VBD responsible_JJ for_IN the_DT devaluation_NN of_IN the_DT franc_NN in_IN '69_CD but_CC did_VBD give_VB a_DT lot_NN of_IN control_NN to_TO his_PRP\$ ministers_NNS ._. Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NNPS came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1974_CD and_CC increased_VBD the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN once_RB more_RBR ,_, showing_VBG how_WRB it_PRP has_VBZ evolved_VBN over_IN time_NN ._. He_PRP was_VBD unwilling_JJ to_TO relinquish_VB any_DT of_IN the_DT previous_JJ presidential_JJ powers_NNS and_CC added_VBD to_TO this_DT his_PRP\$ own_JJ special_JJ fields_NNS of_IN finance_NN ,_, social_JJ and_CC environmental_JJ questions_NNS ._. He_PRP was_VBD more_RBR centrist_JJ and_CC interventionist_JJ ._. He_PRP nominated_VBD Chirac_NNP as_IN his_PRP\$ prime_JJ minister_NN but_CC Chirac_NNP did_VBD not_RB like_VB the_DT way_NN the_DT president_NN intervened_VBD so_RB much_JJ so_IN he_PRP resigned_VBD ._. He_PRP

then_RB nominated_VBD Barre_NNP to_TO keep_VB the_DT support_NN of_IN the_DT largest_JJS party_NN but_CC Barre_NNP was_VBD unpopular_JJ and_CC was_VBD one_CD of_IN the_DT many_JJ reasons_NNS for_IN d'Estaing_NN 's_POS defeat_NN ._. Mitterrand_NNP came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1981_CD and_CC immediately_RB dissolved_VBD the_DT national_JJ assembly_NN ._. His_PRP\$ main_JJ concerns_NNS involved_VBN increasing_VBG the_DT economical_JJ strength_NN of_IN the_DT country_NN and_CC making_VBG France_NNP a_DT more_RBR pluralistic_JJ society_NN ._. In_IN ' _ " 86_CD -_: '88_CD there_EX was_VBD a_DT period_NN of_IN cohabitation_NN with_IN Chirac_NNP as_IN head_NN of_IN government_NN ._. The_DT president_NN was_VBD no_RB longer_RB head_NN of_IN parliament_NN but_CC he_PRP kept_VBD his_PRP\$ role_NN in_IN foreign_JJ and_CC domestic_JJ policies_NNS and_CC as_IN `` _ `` chef_NN des_FW armées_FW " _ " ._. He_PRP had_VBD to_TO go_VB back_RB to_TO the_DT role_NN defined_VBN by_IN the_DT constitution_NN which_WDT allowed_VBD him_PRP to_TO move_VB into_IN the_DT background_NN slightly_RB in_IN political_JJ life_NN ._. ' _ " 88_CD -_: '91_CD has_VBZ seen_VBN a_DT socialist_JJ majority_NN again_RB but_CC Mitterrand_NNP has_VBZ continued_VBN to_TO hold_VB himself_PRP in_IN the_DT background_NN and_CC has_VBZ help_NN open_VB conflict_NN with_IN Rocard_NNP ,_, giving_VBG Rocard_NNP more_JJR room_NN for_IN manoeuvre_NN ._. Therefore_RB as_IN can_MD be_VB seen_VBN the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN has_VBZ evolved_VBN over_IN time_NN and_CC has_VBZ been_VBN strengthened_VBN ._. He_PRP has_VBZ often_RB usurped_VBD the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN and_CC used_VBD his_PRP\$ own_JJ personality_NN to_TO leave_VB his_PRP\$ mark_NN on_IN the_DT country_NN ;_: for_IN example_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP is_VBZ responsible_JJ for_IN many_JJ of_IN the_DT Institutions_NNS ,_, Pompidou_NNP the_DT industry_NN ,_, d'Estaing_VBG Nuclear_JJ Power_NN and_CC the_DT telecommunications_NNS network_NN ._. The_DT president_NN is_VBZ now_RB the_DT head_NN of_IN state_NN ,_, de_FW facto_FW head_NN of_IN government_NN and_CC ultimate_JJ political_JJ decision_NN maker_NN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0027.1

The_DT constitution_NN of_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN was_VBD adopted_VBN by_IN the_DT nation_NN on_IN the_DT 28th_JJ of_IN September_NNP 1958_CD ._. It_PRP was_VBD a_DT compromise_NN between_IN the_DT Gaullists_NNPS and_CC

other_JJ political_JJ forces_NNS ._. Although_IN a_DT rather_RB controversial_JJ
 constitution_NN two_CD facts_NNS did_VBD emerge_VB ._. First_RB that_IN the_DT
 presidency_NN had_VBD been_VBN strengthened_VBN and_CC secondly_RB that_IN
 the_DT executive_NN had_VBD been_VBN strengthened_VBN vis-à-vis_JJ the_DT
 parliament_NN ._. I_PRP will_MD briefly_RB discuss_VB the_DT Prime_NNP
 Ministers_NNPS role_NN and_CC then_RB elaborate_VB on_IN the_DT Presidents_NNS
 functions_NNS ._. Then_RB I_PRP will_MD analyse_VB each_DT presidency_NN
 showing_VBG how_WRB the_DT presidents_NNS role_NN has_VBZ evolved_VBN ._.
 In_IN the_DT constitution_NN it_PRP is_VBZ not_RB very_RB clear_JJ who_WP
 exactly_RB is_VBZ in_IN charge_NN ._. Some_DT articles_NNS clearly_RB suggest_VBP
 it_PRP is_VBZ the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN who_WP is_VBZ in_IN charge_NN while_IN
 past_JJ Presidents_NNS and_CC prime_JJ ministers_NNS have_VBP claimed_VBN it_PRP
 is_VBZ the_DT president_NN ._. Some_DT argued_VBD that_IN there_EX should_MD
 be_VB a_DT twin-headed_JJ executive_NN but_CC in_IN the_DT past_JJ prime_JJ
 ministers_NNS have_VBP always_RB accepted_VBN Presidential_JJ supremacy_NN ._.
 The_DT constitution_NN says_VBZ that_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP is_VBZ
 in_IN general_JJ charge_NN of_IN the_DT government_NN ._. Certain_JJ function_NN
 have_VBP been_VBN clearly_RB listed_VBN eg_FW ._. The_DT appointing_NN of_IN
 ministers_NNS ._. However_RB this_DT function_NN has_VBZ been_VBN usurped_VBN
 by_IN the_DT president_NN ,_, along_IN with_IN certain_JJ other_JJ functions_NNS ._.
 Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NN when_WRB asked_VBD what_WP the_DT prime_JJ
 minister_NN role_NN was_VBD ,_, replied_VBD that_IN the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN
 was_VBD in_IN charge_NN of_IN contingency_NN problems_NNS whereas_IN the_DT
 president_NN was_VBD in_IN charge_NN of_IN what_WP was_VBD permanent_JJ
 and_CC essential_JJ ._. He_PRP was_VBD clearly_RB violating_VBG the_DT spirit_NN
 of_IN the_DT constitution_NN but_CC was_VBD merely_RB reiterating_VBG what_WP
 was_VBD practiced_VBN and_CC preached_VBN by_IN his_PRP\$ predecessors_NNS ._.
 So_IN the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN remains_VBZ a_DT
 controversial_JJ issue_NN ._. The_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN is_VBZ
 defined_VBN in_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP but_CC is_VBZ rather_RB ambiguous_JJ
 and_CC controversial_JJ too_RB ._. Article_NNP 5_CD claims_NNS that_IN the_DT
 president_NN is_VBZ an_DT `` `` arbiter_NN " " ._. This_DT is_VBZ rather_RB
 ambiguous_JJ ._. Does_VBZ this_DT mean_NN he_PRP plays_VBZ a_DT neutral_JJ
 function_NN ,_, as_IN he_PRP is_VBZ an_DT impartial_JJ referee_NN and_CC stays_VBZ

away_RB from_IN the_DT making_NN of_IN policies_NNS or_CC does_VBZ it_PRP mean_VB he_PRP must_MD intervene_VB and_CC play_VB an_DT active_JJ role_NN ?_. The_DT term_NN '`` arbiter_NN '`` is_VBZ sufficiently_RB vague_JJ enough_JJ to_TO allow_VB presidents_NNS to_TO interpret_VB it_PRP as_IN they_PRP wish_VBP ,_, and_CC this_DT they_PRP did_VBD ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP claimed_VBD it_PRP empowered_VBD him_PRP to_TO rule_VB the_DT nations_NNS and_CC his_PRP\$ successors_NNS all_DT acted_VBD as_IN if_IN it_PRP meant_VBD playing_VBG an_DT interventionist_JJ role_NN ._. According_VBG to_TO the_DT constitution_NN the_DT president_NN has_VBZ five_CD basic_JJ functions_NNS ._. He_PRP is_VBZ the_DT ceremonial_JJ head_NN of_IN state_NN ,_, the_DT head_NN of_IN the_DT executive_NN ,_, guardian_NN of_IN the_DT national_JJ interest_NN ,_, the_DT spokesman_NN of_IN the_DT government_NN and_CC lastly_RB the_DT appointer_NN of_IN the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN and_CC other_JJ people_NNS in_IN key_JJ positions_NNS ._. The_DT presidential_JJ interpretation_NN of_IN the_DT last_JJ point_NN has_VBZ been_VBN rather_RB elastic_JJ ._. Not_RB only_RB have_VBP prime_JJ ministers_NNS been_VBN appointed_VBN ,_, they_PRP have_VBP been_VBN dismissed_VBN ._. Accordiing_VBG to_TO this_DT article_NN ,_, the_DT president_NN appoints_VBZ ministers_NNS with_IN the_DT aid_NN of_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP but_CC over_IN time_NN the_DT president_NN needs_VBZ merely_RB the_DT formal_JJ consent_NN of_IN the_DT prime_JJ minister_NN ._. So_IN the_DT priority_NN given_VBN to_TO these_DT functions_NNS ,_, and_CC their_PRP\$ interpretation_NN has_VBZ very_RB much_JJ depended_VBD on_IN the_DT personality_NN and_CC tempement_NN of_IN the_DT presidents_NNS ._. General_NNP Charles_NNP De_NNP Gaulle_NNP was_VBD the_DT first_JJ president_NN of_IN the_DT fifth_JJ Republic_NN ._. He_PRP was_VBD elected_VBN in_IN 1958_CD and_CC stayed_VBD in_IN power_NN for_IN ten_CD years_NNS ._. He_PRP argued_VBD that_IN the_DT reason_NN for_IN the_DT collapse_NN of_IN the_DT Fourth_JJ Republic_NN was_VBD the_DT lack_NN of_IN a_DT strong_JJ executive_NN authority_NN ._. Too_RB much_JJ power_NN was_VBD given_VBN to_TO the_DT parliament_NN and_CC not_RB enough_JJ to_TO the_DT president_NN ._. The_DT president_NN could_MD only_RB exercise_VB his_PRP\$ power_NN depending_VBG on_IN the_DT mood_NN of_IN the_DT parliament_NN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP had_VBD seen_VBN his_PRP\$ beloved_JJ country_NN collapse_NN -LRB_-LRB- the_DT squabbling_NN politicians_NNS of_IN the_DT 30_CD 's_POS ,_, the_DT cowardice_NN of_IN the_DT political_JJ elite_NN in_IN the_DT 40s_CD and_CC

under_IN occupation_NN -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC so_RB he_PRP did_VBD not_RB wish_VB to_TO see_VB this_DT happen_VB again_RB ._. He_PRP therefore_RB interefered_VBD directly_RB and_CC indirectly_RB in_IN the_DT making_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN ._. He_PRP had_VBD no_DT parliamentary_JJ experience_NN and_CC disliked_VBD being_VBG vetoed_VBN or_CC overruled_VBN and_CC so_RB was_VBD determined_VBN to_TO strengthen_VB the_DT presidency_NN ._. Although_IN he_PRP was_VBD unable_JJ to_TO change_VB the_DT constitution_NN into_IN a_DT fully_RB presidential_JJ one_NN he_PRP did_VBD manage_VB too_RB include_VBP two_CD clauses_NNS which_WDT gave_VBD the_DT president_NN a_DT lot_NN of_IN power_NN ._. The_DT first_JJ was_VBD the_DT right_NN for_IN the_DT president_NN to_TO claim_NN special_JJ powers_NNS in_IN times_NNS of_IN emergency_NN and_CC secondly_RB was_VBD the_DT use_NN of_IN referenda_NN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP like_IN referenda_NN ._. It_PRP enabled_VBD him_PRP to_TO bypass_VB parliament_NN and_CC talk_NN to_TO the_DT nation_NN directly_RB ._. In_IN fact_NN it_PRP was_VBD thanks_NNS to_TO a_DT referendum_NN in_IN October_NNP 1962_CD he_PRP managed_VBD to_TO make_VB a_DT major_JJ constitutional_JJ change_NN -_: the_DT election_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN by_IN universal_JJ suffrage_NN ._. The_DT significance_NN of_IN this_DT can_MD not_RB be_VB overestimated_VBN because_IN it_PRP pushed_VBD in_IN favour_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN the_DT ambiguous_JJ balance_NN between_IN power_NN between_IN the_DT President_NNP and_CC the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ._. In_IN 1959_CD the_DT president_NN of_IN the_DT National_NNP Assembly_NNP defined_VBD the_DT so-called_JJ presidential_JJ domain_NN ._. The_DT president_NN could_MD deal_VB with_IN only_RB Foreign_NNP Affairs_NNP ,_, Defence_NNP Policy_NNP ,_, the_DT French_NNP Community_NNP and_CC Algeria_NNP ._. This_DT interpretation_NN was_VBD rejected_VBN by_IN De_NNP Gaulle_NNP by_IN his_PRP\$ speeches_NNS and_CC his_PRP\$ actions_NNS ._. He_PRP dealt_VBD with_IN the_DT above_JJ issues_NNS but_CC also_RB added_VBD colonies_NNS and_CC Europe_NNP to_TO his_PRP\$ domain_NN ._. He_PRP claimed_VBD that_IN it_PRP was_VBD up_RB to_TO the_DT President_NNP to_TO decide_VB which_WDT domaines_VBZ he_PRP would_MD intervene_VB in_IN ._. So_RB although_IN De_NNP Gaulle_NNP defined_VBD his_PRP\$ own_JJ domain_NN he_PRP did_VBD not_RB hesitate_VB to_TO intervene_VB in_IN other_JJ matters_NNS which_WDT he_PRP believed_VBD important_JJ or_CC interesting_JJ ._. Regarding_VBG algeria_NNS ,_, presidential_JJ supremacy_NN was_VBD quickly_RB established_VBN ._.

De_NNP Gaulle_NNP made_VBD important_JJ decisions_NNS without_IN consulting_VBG his_PRP\$ minister_NN or_CC Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ._. Time_NNP and_CC time_NN again_RB he_PRP stressed_VBD the_DT personal_JJ nature_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ policies_NNS ._. He_PRP was_VBD autocratic_JJ in_IN his_PRP\$ behaviour_NN ._. Regarding_VBG Europe_NNP too_RB he_PRP was_VBD autocratic_JJ ._. Apprehensive_JJ ministers_NNS would_MD learn_VB at_IN the_DT same_JJ time_NN as_IN the_DT rest_NN of_IN the_DT world_NN at_IN De_NNP Gaulles_NNP press_NN conferences_NNS any_DT change_NN of_IN French_JJ policies_NNS ._. In_IN fact_NN the_DT veto_NN of_IN Britains_NNS entry_NN into_IN the_DT EEC_NN in_IN 1962_CD was_VBD a_DT purely_RB personal_JJ decision_NN -LRB-_-LRB- it_PRP did_VBD not_RB enjoy_VB the_DT unanimous_JJ support_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ ministers_NNS -RRB-_-RRB- ._. So_IN we_PRP can_MD see_VB that_IN it_PRP was_VBD De_NNP Gaulle_NNP imperious_JJ and_CC imposing_VBG nature_NN which_WDT expanded_VBD the_DT role_NN of_IN the_DT president_NN ._. His_PRP\$ Prime_JJ Ministers_NNPS just_RB executed_VBD his_PRP\$ policies_NNS ._. After_IN De_NNP Gaulle_NNP came_VBD George_NNP Pompidou_NNP in_IN 1969_CD ._. He_PRP had_VBD claimed_VBN to_TO limit_VB the_DT functions_NNS during_IN his_PRP\$ election_NN campaign_NN however_RB once_RB in_IN power_NN ,_, the_DT Gaullist_NNP legacy_NN was_VBD kept_VBN alive_JJ and_CC was_VBD infact_NN strengthened_VBD ._. He_PRP not_RB only_RB appointed_VBN his_PRP\$ prime_JJ minister_NN ,_, but_CC dismissed_VBD him_PRP too_RB ._. He_PRP had_VBD vetoed_VBN his_PRP\$ prime_JJ ministers_NNS plans_NNS for_IN regionalisation_NN ._. To_TO the_DT presidential_JJ domain_NN he_PRP added_VBD financial_JJ industrial_JJ and_CC economic_JJ matters_NNS since_IN being_VBG an_DT ex-banker_NN he_PRP was_VBD interested_JJ in_IN these_DT issues_NNS ._. In_IN 1973_CD Valéry_NNP Giscard_NNP D'Estaing_NNPS came_VBD to_TO power_NN ._. Having_VBG been_VBN finance_NN minister_NN under_IN Pompidou_NNP he_PRP continued_VBD his_PRP\$ interest_NN in_IN the_DT financial_JJ field_NN ._. His_PRP\$ finance_NN minister_NN was_VBD a_DT personal_JJ as_RB well_RB as_IN a_DT political_JJ friend_NN and_CC hence_RB was_VBD willing_JJ to_TO execute_VB D'Estaings_NNS wishes_NNS ._. However_RB in_IN 1976_CD Raymond_NNP Barre_NNP was_VBD appointed_VBN Finance_NNP Minister_NNP and_CC he_PRP was_VBD not_RB as_IN accomodating_VBG ._. However_RB D'Estaing_VBG putting_VBG pressure_NN on_IN him_PRP ,_, showed_VBD him_PRP that_IN presidential_JJ approval_NN would_MD be_VB necessary_JJ on_IN

financial_NN matters_NNS ._. D'Estaing_VBG added_VBN social_JJ and_CC
 environmental_JJ issues_NNS to_TO the_DT presidential_JJ domain_NN as_RB well_RB
 as_IN including_VBG all_PDT the_DT previous_JJ ones_NNS ._. He_PRP took_VBD a_DT
 courageous_JJ and_CC keen_JJ interest_NN in_IN social_JJ matters_NNS eg_FW ._.
 He_PRP amended_VBD the_DT 1st_JJ divorce_NN bill_NN sent_VBN to_TO him_PRP
 by_IN the_DT Judiciary_NNP ._. Mitterrand_NNP was_VBD elected_VBN president_NN
 in_IN 1981_CD ._. He_PRP did_VBD not_RB relinquish_VB the_DT presidential_JJ
 powers_NNS that_WDT had_VBD been_VBN established_VBN over_IN the_DT
 years_NNS ._. However_RB in_IN 1986_CD the_DT Socialist_NNP Party_NNP did_VBD
 not_RB enjoy_VB a_DT majority_NN in_IN parliament_NN and_CC so_RB
 Mitterrand_NNP had_VBD to_TO chose_VBD as_IN his_PRP\$ Prime_NNP minister_NN
 the_DT leader_NN of_IN the_DT party_NN holding_VBG the_DT most_RBS seats_NNS ._.
 This_DT was_VBD Chirac_NNP of_IN the_DT RPR_NN and_CC the_DT period_NN
 1986_CD to_TO 1988_CD saw_VBD the_DT period_NN of_IN `` `` Cohabitation_NNP " " .
 ._. Mitterrand_NNP was_VBD obliged_VBN to_TO fall_VB back_RB to_TO the_DT
 powers_NNS of_IN the_DT president_NN as_IN defined_VBN in_IN the_DT
 constitution_NN ._. This_DT shows_VBZ that_IN the_DT president_NN can_MD only_RB
 enjoy_VB supremacy_NN when_WRB his_PRP\$ party_NN is_VBZ in_IN the_DT
 majority_NN in_IN the_DT parliament_NN ._. The_DT occasional_JJ infringement_NN
 and_CC violation_NN of_IN the_DT constitution_NN causes_VBZ little_JJ reaction_NN
 from_IN the_DT French_NNP ._. The_DT French_NNP have_VBP never_RB had_VBN
 much_JJ respect_NN for_IN the_DT prevailing_VBG constitution_NN ._. In_IN the_DT
 USA_NN it_PRP is_VBZ a_DT quasi-sacred_JJ text_NN but_CC in_IN France_NNP it_PRP
 is_VBZ not_RB the_DT foundation_NN of_IN a_DT social_JJ system_NN but_CC
 merely_RB the_DT mechanism_NN to_TO make_VB the_DT system_NN work_NN ._. If_IN
 it_PRP does_VBZ not_RB work_VB it_PRP can_MD be_VB discarded_VBN ._. The_DT
 past_JJ presidents_NNS have_VBP been_VBN able_JJ to_TO exploit_VB the_DT public_JJ
 indifference_NN to_TO the_DT constitution_NN and_CC with_IN their_PRP\$ strong_JJ
 imposing_VBG personality_NN been_VBN able_JJ to_TO assert_VB presidential_JJ pre-
 eminence_NN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0028.1

After_IN the_DT debacle_NN of_IN the_DT Fourth_JJ Republic_NN when_WRB
 government_NN and_CC ministerial_JJ instability_NN had_VBD led_VBN to_TO a_DT

series_NN of_IN coalition_NN governments_NNS whose_WP\$ power_NN had_VBD been_VBN very_RB limited_VBN due_JJ to_TO the_DT endless_JJ compromises_NNS of_IN its_PRP\$ constituent_JJ elements_NNS ,_, there_EX was_VBD a_DT real_JJ need_NN in_IN France_NNP for_IN a_DT strong_JJ government_NN base_NN ._. Matters_NNS had_VBD come_VBN to_TO a_DT head_NN in_IN 1958_CD with_IN the_DT uprising_NN and_CC unrest_NN in_IN Algeria_NNP ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP had_VBD outlined_VBN his_PRP\$ plans_NNS for_IN the_DT constitution_NN in_IN 1946_CD with_IN his_PRP\$ famous_JJ speech_NN at_IN Bayeux_NNP ,_, but_CC he_PRP had_VBD slipped_VBN back_RB into_IN the_DT shadows_NNS of_IN the_DT Fourth_JJ Republic_NNP ,_, annoyed_VBD at_IN the_DT lack_NN of_IN attention_NN being_VBG payed_VBN to_TO him_PRP by_IN the_DT French_JJ and_CC the_DT victorious_JJ allies_NNS who_WP did_VBD not_RB like_VB his_PRP\$ authoritarian_JJ style_NN of_IN leadership_NN and_CC negotiation_NN ._. By_IN 1958_CD ,_, the_DT country_NN needed_VBD De_NNP Gaulle_NNP and_CC the_DT referendum_NN passing_VBG the_DT new_JJ constitution_NN received_VBD an_DT 85_CD %_NN ` `` yes_UH ' _ " vote_NN ._. This_DT was_VBD in_IN sharp_JJ contrast_NN to_TO the_DT apathetic_JJ 53_CD %_NN vote_NN on_IN a_DT 35_CD %_NN second_JJ turn_NN out_RP which_WDT had_VBD marked_VBN the_DT start_NN of_IN the_DT Fourth_JJ Republic_NN ._. The_DT new_JJ constitution_NN of_IN the_DT Fifth_JJ Republic_NNP aimed_VBN to_TO separate_VB the_DT legislative_JJ ,_, executive_JJ and_CC judiciary_NN ,_, with_IN the_DT powers_NNS of_IN the_DT executive_NN not_RB stemming_VBG from_IN the_DT executive_NN ._. If_IN there_EX had_VBD been_VBN any_DT doubt_NN ,_, which_WDT of_IN course_NN there_EX had_VBD about_IN exactly_RB where_WRB the_DT power_NN lay_VBD ,_, then_RB De_NNP Gaulle_NNP by_IN his_PRP\$ very_JJ actions_NNS soon_RB began_VBD to_TO show_VB who_WP was_VBD in_IN charge_NN ._. There_EX are_VBP several_JJ bones_NNS of_IN contention_NN about_IN the_DT definition_NN of_IN the_DT Presidents_NNS fonctions_NNS ._. Firstly_RB article_NN 16_CD grants_NNS the_DT President_NNP special_JJ powers_NNS in_IN times_NNS of_IN national_JJ emergency_NN ._. However_RB there_EX is_VBZ no_DT distinguishing_JJ criteria_NNS for_IN what_WP constitutes_VBZ a_DT national_JJ emergency_NN ._. In_IN 1961_CD ,_, De_NNP Gaulle_NNP used_VBD these_DT special_JJ powers_NNS ._. The_DT cause_NN of_IN the_DT time_NN of_IN emergency_NN according_VBG to_TO De_NNP Gaulle_NNP was_VBD in_IN Algeria_NNP but_CC this_DT was_VBD strigently_RB debated_VBN at_IN the_DT

time_NN ._. It_PRP had_VBD been_VBN thought_VBN that_IN De_NNP Gaulle_NNP was_VBD rather_RB abusing_VBG these_DT special_JJ powers_NNS ._. Secondly_RB ,_, at_IN the_DT start_NN of_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP there_RB had_VBD been_VBN doubt_NN about_IN how_WRB far_RB the_DT powers_NNS of_IN the_DT President_NNP were_VBD superior_JJ to_TO parliament_NN ._. In_IN article_NN 12_CD ,_, the_DT President_NNP has_VBZ the_DT right_NN to_TO dissolve_VB the_DT `` `` assemblée_NN nationale_NN " " but_CC again_RB it_PRP is_VBZ not_RB blatantly_RB clear_JJ under_IN what_WP circumstances_NNS ._. In_IN the_DT Fourth_JJ Republic_NN ,_, the_DT President_NNP could_MD not_RB dissolve_VB the_DT `` `` assemblée_NN nationale_NN " " until_IN the_DT parliamentary_JJ session_NN was_VBD two_CD years_NNS old_JJ ._. When_WRB the_DT `` `` assemblée_NN nationale_NN " " brought_VBD down_RP the_DT government_NN in_IN 1962_CD after_IN the_DT appointment_NN of_IN Pompidou_NNP as_IN Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ,_, De_NNP Gaulle_NNP dissolved_VBD the_DT parliament_NN ._. In_IN a_DT dispute_NN between_IN parliament_NN and_CC President_NNP ,_, the_DT President_NNP had_VBD shown_VBN who_WP held_VBD the_DT `` `` trump_JJ card_NN " " ._. Equally_RB on_IN 22nd_JJ May_NNP 1981_CD ,_, Mitterrand_NNP on_IN becoming_VBG President_NNP dissolved_VBD the_DT `` `` assemblée_NN nationale_NN " " so_RB as_IN to_TO get_VB a_DT majority_NN of_IN `` `` députés_NNS " " in_IN it_PRP to_TO aid_VB him_PRP with_IN his_PRP\$ new_JJ socialist_JJ policies_NNS ._. This_DT was_VBD surprising_JJ and_CC yet_RB a_DT tactic_NN which_WDT worked_VBD well_RB for_IN Mitterrand_NNP ._. Beforehand_RB ,_, Mitterrand_NNP had_VBD been_VBN an_DT ardent_JJ critic_NN of_IN the_DT institutions_NNS of_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN ,_, yet_RB this_DT act_NN was_VBD seen_VBN as_IN being_VBG more_RBR `` `` Gaullian_NNP " " than_IN De_NNP Gaulle_NNP ._. Thirdly_RB comes_VBZ the_DT most_RBS contentious_JJ of_IN all_PDT the_DT Presidents_NNS powers_NNS ._. The_DT ability_NN to_TO appoint_VB and_CC sack_NN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ._. With_IN the_DT drawing_VBG up_RB of_IN the_DT constitution_NN of_IN 1958_CD ,_, such_PDT a_DT measure_NN had_VBD been_VBN discussed_VBN ,_, but_CC rejected_VBD ._. When_WRB De_NNP Gaulle_NNP was_VBD asked_VBN on_IN the_DT matter_NN in_IN 1958_CD ,_, he_PRP indicated_VBD that_IN the_DT President_NNP could_MD not_RB sack_NN his_PRP\$ Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ._. Yet_RB in_IN 1962_CD ,_, Michel_NNP De_NNP Brey_NNP was_VBD sacked_VBN and_CC replaced_VBN by_IN Pompidou_NNP ,_, a_DT financier_NN who_WP was_VBD not_RB

even_RB a_DT politician_NN ._. Article_NNP 8_CD of_IN the_DT constitution_NN discusses_VBZ the_DT matter_NN and_CC although_IN the_DT word_NN `` `` nomme_FW " " is_VBZ there_RB ,_, there_EX is_VBZ no_DT mention_NN of_IN the_DT word_NN meaning_NN to_TO sack_NN `` `` renvoyer_NN " " ._. In_IN the_DT Mitterrand_NNP presidency_NN ,_, he_PRP has_VBZ changed_VBN his_PRP\$ Prime_NNP Minister_NNP to_TO signify_VB a_DT change_NN of_IN policy_NN ._. In_IN 1984_CD ,_, Mauroi_NNP was_VBD dropped_VBN in_IN favour_NN of_IN Fabius_NNP ._. The_DT constitution_NN implies_VBZ that_IN Prime_NNP Ministers_NNPS can_MD only_RB be_VB changed_VBN with_IN the_DT fall_NN of_IN a_DT government_NN ._. In_IN 1986_CD a_DT very_RB interesting_JJ situation_NN arose_VBD with_IN the_DT loss_NN of_IN the_DT Socialist_NNP majority_NN in_IN the_DT assemblée_NN nationale_NN to_TO the_DT right_NN who_WP had_VBD a_DT majority_NN of_IN 4_CD votes_NNS ._. Mitterrand_NNP appointed_VBN Chirac_NNP ,_, the_DT leader_NN of_IN the_DT right_JJ wing_NN coalition_NN to_TO the_DT post_NN of_IN Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ._. This_DT raised_VBD several_JJ questions_NNS on_IN the_DT spheres_NNS in_IN which_WDT the_DT President_NNP could_MD operate_VB ._. Beforehand_RB ,_, the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP had_VBD to_TO bow_VB to_TO the_DT authority_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP ._. It_PRP was_VBD his_PRP\$ job_NN to_TO `` `` get_VB his_PRP\$ hands_NNS dirty_JJ " " in_IN the_DT words_NNS of_IN Sartre_NNP and_CC actually_RB implement_VBP the_DT policies_NNS evolving_VBG from_IN the_DT President_NNP ._. There_EX had_VBD been_VBN disputes_NNS in_IN this_DT area_NN before_IN ._. In_IN 1976_CD ,_, Chirac_NNP when_WRB Prime_NNP Minister_NNP to_TO Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NNP had_VBD resigned_VBN as_IN he_PRP believed_VBD the_DT President_NNP was_VBD interfering_VBG too_RB much_RB into_IN his_PRP\$ job_NN ._. Giscard_NNP had_VBD been_VBN a_DT finance_NN minister_NN and_CC was_VBD very_RB interested_JJ in_IN this_DT sphere_NN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP had_VBD very_RB much_JJ concerned_JJ himself_PRP with_IN foreign_JJ affairs_NNS ._. Pompidou_NNP when_WRB President_NNP in_IN domestic_JJ matters_NNS ._. However_RB with_IN Chirac_NNP alongside_IN him_PRP ,_, Mitterrand_NNP saw_VBD his_PRP\$ supreme_JJ authority_NN infringed_VBN upon_IN ._. Chirac_NNP accompanied_VBD him_PRP to_TO important_JJ meetings_NNS and_CC by_IN raising_VBG the_DT old_JJ `` `` conseil_FW inter-ministeriel_FW " " ,_, even_RB managed_VBD to_TO barr_VB Mitterrand_NNP from_IN some_DT important_JJ ministerial_JJ meetings_NNS which_WDT took_VBD place_NN at_IN the_DT Prime_NNP

Ministers_NNPS residence_NN ._. However_RB Mitterrand_NNP did_VBD what_WP previous_JJ 5th_JJ Republic_NN presidents_NNS had_VBD done_VBN ._. When_WRB criticism_NN rained_VBD in_IN on_IN governmental_JJ policy_NN ,_, on_IN the_DT planned_VBN introduction_NN of_IN selection_NN for_IN higher_JJR education_NN for_IN instance_NN ,_, Mitterrand_NNP stepped_VBD back_RB and_CC used_VBD the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP as_IN a_DT shield_NN ._. By_IN disassociating_VBG from_IN and_CC criticising_VBG the_DT government_NN ,_, Mitterrand_NNP took_VBD on_IN the_DT form_NN of_IN the_DT ``_`` gardien_FW de_FW l'interêt_FW national_JJ "_". ._. Fifthly_RB there_EX had_VBD been_VBN doubt_NN about_IN De_NNP Gaule_NNP 's_POS use_NN of_IN article_NN 11_CD in_IN which_WDT the_DT President_NNP can_MD by-pass_VB parliament_NN and_CC hold_VB a_DT referendum_NN on_IN a_DT planned_JJ policy_NN ._. De_NNP Gaule_NNP did_VBD this_DT in_IN 1962_CD over_IN the_DT plans_NNS to_TO have_VB the_DT President_NNP elected_VBN by_IN universal_JJ suffrage_NN ._. Under_IN the_DT 4th_JJ Republic_NN ,_, the_DT 2_CD houses_NNS of_IN parliament_NN had_VBD voted_VBN for_IN there_EX President_NNP ,_, under_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN ,_, an_DT electoral_JJ college_NN of_IN about_IN 80_CD 000_CD high_JJ official_JJ civil_JJ councillors_NNS had_VBD voted_VBN ._. The_DT proposal_NN was_VBD passed_VBN decisively_RB by_IN the_DT people_NNS ._. Strictly_RB De_NNP Gaule_NNP had_VBD changed_VBN the_DT constitution_NN in_IN an_DT unconstitutional_JJ manner_NN ,_, but_CC it_PRP did_VBD not_RB really_RB matter_VB as_IN he_PRP had_VBD the_DT mandate_NN of_IN the_DT people_NNS ._. Other_JJ powers_NNS of_IN the_DT president_NN such_JJ as_IN the_DT promulgation_NN of_IN laws_NNS ,_, ability_NN to_TO appoint_VB leading_VBG members_NNS of_IN the_DT armed_JJ and_CC civil_JJ services_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- article_NN 14_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, the_DT right_NN to_TO pardon_NN through_IN article_NN 17_CD and_CC the_DT right_NN to_TO send_VB legislation_NN back_RB to_TO parliament_NN through_IN article_NN 10_CD clearly_RB demonstrate_VBP the_DT power_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP ._. The_DT stability_NN of_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN ,_, which_WDT is_VBZ now_RB the_DT second_JJ longest_JJS after_IN the_DT 3rd_JJ Republic_NNP proofs_NNS that_WDT despite_IN ambiguities_NNS in_IN the_DT constitution_NN ,_, actions_NNS of_IN the_DT President_NNP have_VBP helped_VBN clarify_VB the_DT boundaries_NNS of_IN his_PRP\$ powers_NNS ._. The_DT behaviour_NN of_IN Mitterrand_NNP when_WRB faced_VBN with_IN ``_`` cohabitation_NN "_". show_VB the_DT stability_NN of_IN

the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN and_CC its_PRP\$ ability_NN to_TO overcome_VB the_DT severest_JJS of_IN problems_NNS . . .

ICLE-BR-SUR-0029.1

Much_JJ of_IN this_DT ambiguity_NN arose_VBD from_IN the_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP was_VBD a_DT compromise_NN between_IN ` `` presidentialisme_NN ' _ " and_CC ` `` parlementarism_NN ' _ " . . . The_DT President_NNP was_VBD given_VBN the_DT traditional_JJ powers_NNS of_IN the_DT Head_NNP of_IN State_NNP as_RB well_RB as_IN becoming_VBG the_DT ` `` chef_NN cérémoniale_NN de_IN l'Etat_NNP ' _ POS , , a_DT similar_JJ rôle_NN to_TO that_DT of_IN our_PRP\$ Queen_NN , , and_CC as_RB well_RB as_IN becoming_VBG the_DT Chief_NNP of_IN the_DT army_NN . . . He_PRP was_VBD given_VBN a_DT lot_NN of_IN power_NN through_IN articles_NNS such_JJ as_IN 8_CD , , 12_CD and_CC 11_CD of_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP as_IN he_PRP did_VBD n't_RB need_VB the_DT ` `` contreseing_VBG ' _ " of_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP or_CC other_JJ ministers_NNS responsible_JJ . . . It_PRP was_VBD with_IN Article_NNP 8_CD that_IN the_DT main_JJ ambiguity_NN arose_VBD . . . It_PRP gave_VBD the_DT President_NNP the_DT power_NN to_TO name_VB the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP but_CC it_PRP remained_VBD ambiguous_JJ whether_IN he_PRP also_RB had_VBD the_DT power_NN to_TO sack_NN him_PRP . . . De_NNP Gaulle_NNP used_VBD this_DT to_TO his_PRP\$ favour_NN and_CC after_IN appointing_VBG Michel_NNP Debré_NNP in_IN 1958_CD he_PRP was_VBD forced_VBN to_TO withdraw_VB from_IN this_DT position_NN in_IN 1962_CD . . . De_NNP Gaulle_NNP saw_VBD him_PRP as_IN a_DT good_JJ Prime_NNP Minister_NNP in_IN war_NN time_NN but_CC after_IN the_DT Algerian_NNP war_NN he_PRP decided_VBD he_PRP no_RB longer_RBR had_VBD any_DT use_NN and_CC effectively_RB sacked_VBD him_PRP . . . In_IN choosing_VBG Georges_NNP Pompidou_NNP in_IN his_PRP\$ place_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP illustrated_VBD also_RB that_IN the_DT choice_NN of_IN Prime_NNP Minister_NNP was_VBD solely_RB his_PRP\$. . . This_DT interpretation_NN of_IN Article_NNP 8_CD was_VBD a_DT cornerstone_NN in_IN the_DT development_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP 's_POS power_NN . . . In_IN choosing_VBG initially_RB Debré_NNP , , de_FW Gaulle_NNP set_VBD a_DT precedent_NN in_IN that_IN he_PRP created_VBD a_DT ` `` domaine_FW réservé_FW " _ " for_IN the_DT President_NNP in_IN which_WDT the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP was_VBD not_RB to_TO interfere_VB . . . The_DT President_NNP was_VBD to_TO

deal_VB with_IN long_JJ term_NN issues_NNS especially_RB foreign_JJ and_CC defence_NN policies_NNS whereas_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP was_VBD to_TO deal_VB with_IN the_DT short_JJ term_NN domestic_JJ issues_NNS ._. This_DT autocratic_JJ and_CC authoritarian_JJ rôle_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP evolved_VBD throughout_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NN ._. Pompidou_NNP ,_, after_IN having_VBG been_VBN Prime_JJ Minister_NNP for_IN six_CD years_NNS carried_VBN on_IN dealing_VBG with_IN economic_JJ ,_, domestic_JJ and_CC financial_JJ policies_NNS ._. Article_NNP 11_CD was_VBD not_RB in_IN itself_PRP so_RB ambiguous_JJ ._. The_DT President_NNP could_MD put_VB important_JJ decisions_NNS to_TO the_DT people_NNS by_IN referendum_NN ._. De_NNP Gaulle_NNP used_VBD it_PRP in_IN 1961_CD to_TO ask_VB the_DT French_JJ whether_IN they_PRP thought_VBD the_DT Algerians_NNPS should_MD decide_VB their_PRP\$ own_JJ future_NN ._. In_IN 1973_CD Pompidou_NNP used_VBD it_PRP to_TO see_VB whether_IN there_EX should_MD have_VB been_VBN an_DT enlargement_NN of_IN the_DT European_NNP Community_NNP as_IN the_DT British_JJ wanted_VBD to_TO join_VB under_IN Heath_NNP ._. However_RB ,_, here_RB Pompidou_NNP was_VBD able_JJ to_TO use_VB Article_NNP 11_CD for_IN tactical_JJ reasons_NNS ,_, to_TO divide_VB the_DT opposition_NN ._. It_PRP was_VBD also_RB a_DT good_JJ way_NN to_TO increase_VB contact_NN with_IN the_DT people_NNS outside_IN of_IN the_DT normal_JJ methods_NNS ._. Where_WRB the_DT real_JJ ambiguity_NN lay_VBD was_VBD in_IN whether_IN you_PRP could_MD use_VB Article_NNP 11_CD to_TO revise_VB the_DT Constitution_NNP ._. There_EX was_VBD a_DT set_VBN procedure_NN for_IN constitutional_JJ revision_NN under_IN Article_NNP 89_CD but_CC de_FW Gaulle_NNP used_VBD Article_NNP 11_CD to_TO introduce_VB elections_NNS `_' on_IN suffrage_NN universal_JJ direct_JJ ' ' ._. Through_IN his_PRP\$ interpretation_NN he_PRP could_MD submit_VB an_DT idea_NN to_TO the_DT people_NNS without_IN having_VBG to_TO put_VB it_PRP to_TO the_DT Parliament_NNP first_RB ._. By_IN the_DT elections_NNS of_IN 1965_CD the_DT President_NNP had_VBD therefore_RB gained_VBN more_JJR power_NN as_IN a_DT matter_NN of_IN interpretation_NN ._. This_DT procedure_NN has_VBZ never_RB been_VBN used_VBN recently_RB and_CC is_VBZ unlikely_JJ to_TO be_VB used_VBN again_RB ._. More_RBR ambiguity_NN lies_VBZ in_IN Article_NNP 16_CD which_WDT purports_VBZ to_TO give_VB wide-reaching_JJ powers_NNS to_TO the_DT President_NNP in_IN a_DT state_NN of_IN national_JJ emergency_NN ._. It_PRP has_VBZ also_RB been_VBN used_VBN in_IN 1961_CD following_VBG the_DT `_'

putsch_NN ' ' of_IN the_DT Generals_NNS in_IN Algeria_NNP ._. The_DT President_NNP must_MD consult_VB the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ,_, the_DT presidents_NNS of_IN the_DT two_CD assemblies_NNS and_CC the_DT ` ` conseil_NN constitutionnelle_NN ' ' beforehand_RB but_CC in_IN 1961_CD they_PRP were_VBD not_RB all_DT in_IN agreement_NN that_WDT France_NNP was_VBD threatened_VBN ._. Nevertheless_RB through_IN this_DT ambiguity_NN de_IN Gaulle_NNP was_VBD able_JJ to_TO implement_VB Article_NNP 16_CD ._. Although_IN Article_NNP 21_CD says_VBZ that_IN the_DT Prime_NNP Minister_NNP should_MD ` ` devise_VB l'action_NNP du_NNP Gouvernement_NNP ' _POS in_IN practice_NN ,_, and_CC again_RB as_IN a_DT matter_NN of_IN interpretation_NN ,_, this_DT has_VBZ not_RB been_VBN the_DT case_NN ._. It_PRP 's_VBZ the_DT President_NNP who_WP 's_VBZ the_DT Head_NNP of_IN the_DT executive_NN and_CC under_IN Article_NNP 9_CD he_PRP claims_VBZ the_DT ` ` Conseil_NNP des_NNP Ministres_NNP ' _POS ,_, fixes_NNS the_DT order_NN of_IN the_DT day_NN and_CC generally_RB directs_VBZ the_DT policy_NN ._. Through_IN such_JJ ambiguity_NN the_DT President_NNP has_VBZ again_RB been_VBN able_JJ to_TO receive_VB larger_JJR powers_NNS and_CC develop_VB his_PRP\$ rôle_NN ._. When_WRB Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NN came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1974_CD he_PRP was_VBD obliged_VBN to_TO appoint_VB Chirac_NNP as_IN Prime_NNP Minister_NNP ._. Not_RB being_VBG a_DT gaullist_NN and_CC not_RB being_VBG the_DT leader_NN of_IN the_DT largest_JJS party_NN he_PRP often_RB ignored_VBD Chirac_NNP and_CC went_VBD straight_RB to_TO the_DT ministers_NNS ._. With_IN this_DT and_CC his_PRP\$ interference_NN in_IN financial_JJ matters_NNS ,_, Chirac_NNP resigned_VBD in_IN 1976_CD ._. Under_IN Mitterand_NNP ,_, advisors_NNS often_RB had_VBD more_JJR power_NN than_IN ministers_NNS ._. Through_IN such_JJ ambiguity_NN and_CC interpretation_NN the_DT President_NNP has_VBZ been_VBN able_JJ to_TO assume_VB wide_JJ powers_NNS ._. Uncontent_JJ with_IN his_PRP\$ Mitterand_NNP used_VBD interpretation_NN and_CC the_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT Algerian_NNP war_NN had_VBD traumatised_VBN the_DT nation_NN to_TO assume_VB more_JJR power_NN ._. For_IN example_NN he_PRP refused_VBD to_TO allow_VB Parliament_NNP to_TO sit_VB in_IN 1963_CD ._. Mitterand_NNP realising_VBG he_PRP would_MD lose_VB his_PRP\$ majority_NN in_IN the_DT National_NNP Assembly_NNP at_IN the_DT next_JJ election_NN used_VBD such_JJ powers_NNS to_TO put_VB men_NNS of_IN his_PRP\$ own_JJ choice_NN in_IN high_JJ positions_NNS ._. After_IN being_VBG elected_VBN in_IN 1981_CD ,_, since_IN the_DT National_NNP

Assembly_NNP had_VBD been_VBN elected_VBN in_IN 1975_CD and_CC had_VBD a_DT majority_NN ,_, he_PRP wanted_VBD a_DT majority_NN for_IN the_DT left_NN and_CC used_VBN Article_NNP 12_CD to_TO dissolve_VB it_PRP ._. The_DT ambiguities_NNS such_JJ as_IN in_IN Article_NNP 34_CD and_CC 37_CD over_IN the_DT way_NN legislation_NN is_VBZ past_JJ also_RB gave_VBD wide_JJ reaching_VBG powers_NNS to_TO the_DT President_NNP ._. All_DT in_IN all_DT it_PRP is_VBZ this_DT ambiguous_JJ nature_NN of_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP ,_, resulting_VBG from_IN the_DT compromise_NN it_PRP tried_VBD to_TO make_VB ,_, that_WDT led_VBD to_TO a_DT great_JJ development_NN in_IN the_DT rôle_NN of_IN the_DT President_NNP in_IN the_DT 5th_JJ Republic_NNP mainly_RB under_IN the_DT precedent_NN set_VBN by_IN Charles_NNP de_IN Gaulle_NNP ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0030.1

Demography_NN is_VBZ the_DT study_NN of_IN population_NN and_CC the_DT effect_NN that_IN its_PRP\$ general_JJ character_NN has_VBZ on_IN a_DT country_NN 's_POS society_NN and_CC economy_NN ._. Demographers_NNS claim_VBP that_IN it_PRP is_VBZ a_DT major_JJ factor_NN in_IN considering_VBG the_DT problems_NNS of_IN that_DT country_NN 's_POS evolution_NN -: for_IN example_NN ,_, it_PRP is_VBZ thought_VBN that_IN many_JJ of_IN France_NNP 's_POS problems_NNS during_IN the_DT twentieth_JJ century_NN have_VBP been_VBN caused_VBN by_IN a_DT premature_JJ decline_NN in_IN the_DT birth_NN rate_NN in_IN the_DT nineteenth_JJ century_NN ,_, and_CC the_DT consequent_JJ ageing_NN of_IN the_DT population_NN ._. At_IN the_DT beginning_NN of_IN the_DT 19th_JJ century_NN France_NNP had_VBD the_DT largest_JJS population_NN in_IN Europe_NNP ,_, after_IN Russia_NNP ,_, and_CC was_VBD also_RB a_DT major_JJ world_NN power_NN ._. Since_IN this_DT time_NN ,_, both_DT its_PRP\$ power_NN and_CC population_NN in_IN relation_NN to_TO the_DT rest_NN of_IN Europe_NNP ,_, have_VBP been_VBN in_IN steady_JJ decline_NN ._. By_IN the_DT beginning_NN of_IN the_DT first_JJ world_NN war_NN ,_, France_NNP 's_POS population_NN trailed_VBD far_RB behind_IN that_DT of_IN Germany_NNP ,_, which_WDT was_VBD one_CD reason_NN why_WRB Germany_NNP felt_VBD confident_JJ of_IN victory_NN ._. During_IN both_DT World_NNP Wars_NNP France_NNP not_RB only_RB lost_VBD thousands_NNS of_IN men_NNS ,_, but_CC the_DT birth_NN rate_NN also_RB dropped_VBD dramatically_RB ._. During_IN the_DT economic_JJ crisis_NN and_CC depression_NN between_IN the_DT

wars_NNS ,_, the_DT birthrate_NN was_VBD also_RB low_JJ ,_, because_IN it_PRP
was_VBD a_DT time_NN of_IN gloom_NN and_CC pessimism_NN ,_, with_IN little_JJ
hope_NN for_IN the_DT future_NN ,_, and_CC so_IN people_NNS could_MD n't_RB
afford_VB large_JJ families_NNS ._. The_DT consequence_NN of_IN these_DT
factors_NNS was_VBD that_IN by_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN the_DT second_JJ world_NN
war_NN ,_, the_DT adult_JJ population_NN in_IN France_NNP was_VBD greatly_RB
reduced_VBN ._. It_PRP was_VBD at_IN this_DT time_NN that_IN the_DT birth_NN
rate_NN suddenly_RB increased_VBD ,_, with_IN the_DT Babyboom_NNP ._. Between_IN
1946_CD and_CC 1964_CD the_DT birth_NN rate_NN increased_VBD 20_CD %_NN ._. -
_: this_DT was_VBD due_JJ to_TO decreasing_VBG infant_NN mortality_NN ,_, the_DT
introduction_NN of_IN social_JJ security_NN and_CC family_RB benefits_NNS ,_, a_DT
new_JJ optimism_NN for_IN the_DT future_NN ,_, and_CC an_DT abandoning_NN of_IN
former_JJ Malthusian_JJ attitudes_NNS ,_, in_IN favour_NN of_IN a_DT more_RBR
dynamic_JJ outlook_NN ._. The_DT birth_NN rate_NN had_VBD in_IN fact_NN ,_,
begun_VBN to_TO increase_VB before_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN the_DT war_NN ,_,
as_IN people_NNS took_VBD on_RP a_DT care-free_JJ attitude_NN ,_, with_IN little_JJ
feeling_NN of_IN responsibility_NN ._. At_IN the_DT same_JJ time_NN ,_, the_DT
death_NN rate_NN was_VBD decreasing_VBG ,_, due_JJ to_TO advances_NNS in_IN
medicine_NN ,_, and_CC living_NN conditions_NNS ._. This_DT meant_VBD that_IN
the_DT number_NN of_IN old_JJ people_NNS was_VBD steadily_RB increasing_VBG ._.
So_RB ,_, after_IN the_DT war_NN ,_, there_EX was_VBD a_DT reduced_VBN
number_NN of_IN adults_NNS ,_, to_TO look_VB after_IN ,_, and_CC produce_VBP
goods_NNS for_IN ,_, a_DT increased_VBN number_NN of_IN children_NNS and_CC
old_JJ people_NNS ._. This_DT ,_, and_CC the_DT need_NN to_TO build_VB the_DT
economy_NN ,_, led_VBD to_TO the_DT influx_NN of_IN immigrant_JJ workers_NNS
into_IN France_NNP ,_, with_IN has_VBZ in_IN turn_NN led_VBD to_TO many_JJ of_IN
today_NN 's_POS problems_NNS with_IN immigrants_NNS ._. During_IN the_DT
fifties_NNS ,_, the_DT school_NN system_NN had_VBD to_TO be_VB adapted_VBN
to_TO provide_VB for_IN the_DT Babyboom_NNP ;_: by_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN
the_DT 60_CD 's_POS ,_, they_PRP had_VBD reached_VBN the_DT Universities_NNS ,_,
which_WDT became_VBD overcrowded_JJ ,_, and_CC inadequate_JJ to_TO meet_VB
the_DT needs_NNS of_IN the_DT thousands_NNS of_IN extra_JJ students_NNS ._.
This_DT was_VBD one_CD of_IN the_DT direct_JJ causes_NNS of_IN May_NNP ' ' _POS
68_CD ,_, along_IN with_IN the_DT fact_NN that_IN there_EX was_VBD no_DT

guarantee_NN of_IN a_DT job_NN afterwards_RB ,_, with_IN so_RB many_JJ students_NNS competing_VBG together_RB ._. The_DT Babyboom_NN generation_NN is_VBZ now_RB working_VBG and_CC so_IN the_DT country_NN is_VBZ benefitting_VBG from_IN the_DT taxes_NNS which_WDT they_PRP are_VBP paying_VBG ._. But_CC ,_, at_IN the_DT same_JJ time_NN ,_, with_IN an_DT ever_RB decreasing_VBG death_NN rate_NN ,_, +_CC ever_RB increasing_VBG number_NN of_IN old_JJ people_NNS ,_, the_DT Treasury_NNP is_VBZ having_VBG to_TO pay_VB vast_JJ sums_NNS in_IN pensions_NNS ,_, +_CC care_NN for_IN the_DT elderly_JJ ._. Since_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN the_DT Babyboom_NNP ,_, the_DT birthrate_NN has_VBZ declined_VBN again_RB ,_, due_JJ to_TO the_DT legalisation_NN of_IN contraception_NN +_CC abortion_NN ,_, and_CC the_DT fact_NN that_IN many_JJ people_NNS see_VBP having_VBG less_JJR children_NNS as_IN a_DT way_NN to_TO better_JJR their_PRP\$ standard_NN of_IN living_NN ._. At_IN present_JJ ,_, the_DT birth_NN rate_NN is_VBZ around_IN 13,6_CD ?_./_: 00_CD ,_, while_IN the_DT death_NN rate_NN is_VBZ about_IN 9_CD ?_./_: 00_CD ._. This_DT means_VBZ that_IN the_DT base_NN of_IN the_DT pyramid_NN of_IN ages_NNS is_VBZ being_VBG eroded_VBN away_RB ._. The_DT consequences_NNS are_VBP that_IN the_DT population_NN is_VBZ becoming_VBG top_JJ heavy_NN ,_, with_IN a_DT smaller_JJR number_NN of_IN taxpayers_NNS having_VBG to_TO provide_VB for_IN the_DT pensions_NNS of_IN a_DT larger_JJR number_NN of_IN old_JJ people_NNS -: this_DT has_VBZ been_VBN worsened_VBN by_IN the_DT lowering_NN of_IN the_DT retirement_NN age_NN to_TO 60_CD ._. Furthermore_RB ,_, the_DT strain_NN on_IN the_DT taxpayers_NNS can_MD only_RB continue_VB to_TO get_VB worse_JJR ,_, unless_IN this_DT trend_NN is_VBZ reversed_VBN ._. This_DT is_VBZ why_WRB many_JJ French_JJ people_NNS now_RB support_VBP a_DT policy_NN of_IN encouraging_JJ people_NNS to_TO have_VB children_NNS to_TO halt_VB a_DT greying_JJ population_NN ._. The_DT consequence_NN for_IN business_NN is_VBZ that_IN it_PRP has_VBZ had_VBN to_TO adapt_VB its_PRP\$ production_NN away_RB from_IN baby_NN +_CC children_NNS 's_POS products_NNS ,_, to_TO those_DT required_VBN by_IN the_DT older_JJR generations_NNS ,_, in_IN particular_JJ medical_JJ supplies_NNS ._. They_PRP are_VBP also_RB having_VBG to_TO pay_VB more_JJR to_TO their_PRP\$ older_JJR workers_NNS ,_, due_JJ to_TO their_PRP\$ age_NN even_RB though_IN they_PRP do_VBP n't_RB produce_VB any_DT more_JJR than_IN the_DT decreasing_VBG number_NN of_IN young_JJ people_NNS do_VBP ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0031.1

The DT French JJ system NN of IN higher JJR education NN has VBZ always RB been VBN of IN a DT hierarchical JJ nature NN and CC divided VBN ._. It PRP was VBD so RB before RB mai FW ' ' 68_CD ,_, and CC despite IN attempts NNS at IN reform NN ,_, it PRP has VBZ been VBN determined VBN to TO remain VB so RB ._. Before IN 1968_CD ,_, French JJ universities NNS were VBD overcrowded JJ -LRB-_-LRB- the DT number NN of IN students NNS rose VBD from IN 122,000_CD in IN 1936_CD to TO 612,000_CD in IN 1968_CD -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, centralized VBN and CC impersonal JJ ._. In IN response NN to TO the DT events NNS of IN ' ' 68_CD ,_, the DT Faure NNP reforms NNS were VBD drawn VBN up RP ._. They PRP abolished VBD old JJ universities NNS as IN such JJ ,_, and CC gave VBD them PRP the DT opportunity NN to TO form VB themselves PRP into IN ` `` unités NNS d'enseignements NNS et FW de FW recherche FW ' ' ._. They PRP formed VBD their PRP\$ own JJ councils NNS ,_, and CC could MD group VB themselves PRP into IN new JJ universities NNS ._. These DT universities NNS had VBD their PRP\$ own JJ councils NNS made VBD up RP of IN staff NN ,_, teaching NN and CC non-teaching JJ ,_, and CC student NN delegates NNS ._. They PRP elected VBD the DT President NNP who WP fulfilled VBD a DT similar JJ role NN to TO that DT of IN the DT British JJ universities NNS ' _POS Vice-Chancellor NNP ._. The DT Faure NNP reforms NNS gave VBD the DT universities NNS a DT framework NN within IN which WDT to TO create VB a DT new JJ system NN of IN university NN education NN and CC to TO create VB new JJ personalities NNS for IN themselves PRP ._. These DT reforms NNS dealt VBN with IN the DT centralized VBN and CC impersonal JJ aspects NNS ._. But CC the DT universities NNS could MD not RB cope VB with IN their PRP\$ new JJ powers NNS ._. They PRP reverted VBD back RB to TO their PRP\$ interdepartmental JJ wrangling NN ,_, and CC when WRB it PRP came VBD to TO joining VBG together RB to TO form VB universities NNS ,_, the DT subjects NNS dominated VBN by IN the DT Left VBN ,_, such as VBZ sociology NN ,_, did VBD not RB want VB to TO combine VB with IN those DT subjects NNS dominated VBN by IN more JJR Right-wing NN professors NNS ._. The DT apolitical JJ sciences NNS did VBD not RB want VB to TO be VB ` `` contaminated VBN ' ' by IN the DT Left-wingers NNPS ._. Within IN the DT new JJ universities NNS ,_, the DT departments NNS were VBD out RB to TO protect VB their PRP\$ own JJ

positions_NNS and_CC to_TO protect_VB their_PRP\$ share_NN of_IN the_DT global_JJ budget_NN ,_, so_RB there_RB was_VBD little_JJ tendency_NN to_TO create_VB new_JJ inter-disciplinary_JJ courses_NNS as_IN Faure_NNP had_VBD hoped_VBN ._. The_DT universities_NNS are_VBP very_RB much_RB out_IN of_IN touch_NN with_IN the_DT needs_NNS of_IN the_DT outside_JJ world_NN ._. Their_PRP\$ DEUGs_NNS and_CC licences_NNS were_VBD very_RB much_JJ theoretical_JJ and_CC literal_JJ and_CC of_IN no_DT use_NN in_IN finding_VBG jobs_NNS in_IN specialized_VBN industry_NN ._. Many_JJ professors_NNS wanted_VBD to_TO keep_VB universities_NNS as_IN ` `` la_DT finalité_NN culturelle_NN ' _" ._. Donot_NNP want_VBP interaction_NN with_IN patrons_NNS ,_, etc._FW ._. But_CC this_DT is_VBZ necessary_JJ to_TO make_VB degrees_NNS more_RBR relevant_JJ to_TO job_NN requirements_NNS ._. Also_RB left_JJ wing_NN departments_NNS resisted_VBD any_DT attempt_NN by_IN State_NN for_IN reform_NN ._. Refused_VBN to_TO see_VB such_JJ attempts_NNS as_IN sincere_JJ or_CC benevolent_JJ ,_, always_RB suspected_VBN state_NN of_IN ulterior_JJ motives_NNS ._. Gulf_NNP between_IN universities_NNS and_CC Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP slightly_RB bridged_VBN by_IN Instituts_NNP Universitaires_NNP de_IN Technologie_NNP ,_, but_CC governments_NNS leave_VBP Grandes_NNP Ecoles_NNP to_TO themselves_PRP as_IN serve_VB France_NNP well_RB and_CC were_VBD not_RB infected_VBN by_IN virus_NN of_IN ' _" 68_CD ._. Politicisation_NN of_IN struggle_NN for_IN reform_NN ._. Measures_NNS brought_VBD in_RP by_IN Savary_NNP to_TO reduce_VB influence_NN of_IN professors_NNS in_IN councils_NNS revoked_VBN by_IN Right_RB when_WRB returned_VBN to_TO power_NN ._. Reaction_NN against_IN Devaquet_JJ projet_NN was_VBD unfounded_JJ ._. It_PRP would_MD have_VB retained_VBN ` `` bac_NN ' _" as_IN means_NNS of_IN selection_NN for_IN entry_NN but_CC would_MD have_VB eased_VBN pressure_NN on_IN crowded_JJ universities_NNS ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0032.1

At_IN the_DT beginning_NN of_IN the_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP ,_, education_NN reforms_NNS had_VBD not_RB been_VBN implemented_VBN because_IN of_IN political_JJ instability_NN ,_, other_JJ priorities_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- notably_RB the_DT Second_JJ World_NNP War_NNP -RRB-_-RRB- and_CC the_DT notorious_JJ French_JJ concept_NN of_IN academic_JJ tradition_NN and_CC élitism_NN ._. The_DT problems_NNS to_TO be_VB solved_VBN were_VBD that_DT of_IN modernization_NN ,_, democratization_NN and_CC secularization_NN ._. At_IN that_DT time_NN -LRB-_-

LRB- 1959_CD -RRB-_-RRB- most_RBS children_NNS stayed_VBD at_IN primary_JJ school_NN ,_, only_RB 35_CD %_NN were_VBD progressing_VBG to_TO secondary_JJ education_NN -LRB-_-LRB- the_DT sixième_NN year_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. Berthoin_NNP was_VBD the_DT first_JJ minister_NN of_IN education_NN to_TO address_VB the_DT problem_NN of_IN democratization_NN ._. He_PRP tried_VBD to_TO prolong_VB school_NN life_NN for_IN a_DT large_JJ number_NN of_IN pupils_NNS by_IN making_VBG education_NN compulsory_NN until_IN the_DT age_NN of_IN 16_CD ,_, abolishing_VBG the_DT entrance_NN examination_NN to_TO the_DT ` `` sixième_NN ' _" and_CC abandoning_VBG the_DT ` `` classe_FW de_FW la_FW fin_FW des_FW études_NNS ' _POS ,_, where_WRB children_NNS stayed_VBD at_IN primary_JJ school_NN until_IN 14_CD ._. He_PRP introduced_VBD the_DT concept_NN of_IN orientation_NN and_CC observation_NN ,_, whereby_WRB a_DT pupil_NN could_MD be_VB directed_VBN towards_IN the_DT school_NN mostly_RB suited_VBN to_TO his_PRP\$ needs_NNS -LRB-_-LRB- the_DT prestigious_JJ lycée_NN and_CC the_DT College_NNP d'Enseignement_NNP Général_NNP -RRB-_-RRB- ,_, whilst_IN trying_VBG to_TO bring_VB the_DT two_CD schools_NNS closer_RBR together_RB ._. The_DT lycée_NN had_VBD always_RB been_VBN the_DT bastion_NN of_IN élitism_NN ,_, with_IN its_PRP\$ Napoleonic_JJ tradition_NN ._. In_IN 1963_CD Fouchet_NN created_VBD the_DT College_NNP d'Enseignement_NNP Secondaire_NNP ,_, a_DT lower_JJR common_JJ secondary_JJ school_NN ,_, to_TO try_VB and_CC encourage_VB upward_RB social_JJ mobility_NN ._. Jean_NNP Capelle_NNP ,_, a_DT leading_VBG figure_NN in_IN the_DT initiative_NN had_VBD very_RB much_JJ admired_VBN ,_, and_CC tried_VBD to_TO emulate_VB the_DT English_NNP comprehensive_JJ schools_NNS ._. But_CC in_IN an_DT article_NN by_IN Hain_NNP Gaziel_NNP ,_, his_PRP\$ efforts_NNS were_VBD a_DT failure_NN ._. The_DT creation_NN of_IN 3_CD ` `` filières_NNS ' _POS were_VBD basically_RB a_DT division_NN between_IN prospective_JJ lycée_NN and_CC C.E.G._NN students_NNS ._. The_DT third_JJ stream_NN was_VBD theoretically_RB intended_VBN to_TO push_VB pupils_NNS to_TO the_DT upper_JJ two_CD streams_NNS ,_, but_CC in_IN practice_NN transfer_NN was_VBD difficult_JJ -_: only_RB 1_CD %_NN managed_VBD it_PRP ._. It_PRP was_VBD dubbed_VBN the_DT ` `` pouvelle_NN ' _" of_IN the_DT system_NN ._. These_DT two_CD reforms_NNS came_VBD at_IN the_DT time_NN of_IN a_DT population_NN expansion_NN which_WDT demanded_VBD education_NN of_IN any_DT kind_NN and_CC prevented_VBD proper_JJ reforms_NNS -_: giving_VBG away_RP a_DT

little_JJ in_IN order_NN to_TO conserve_VB a_DT great_JJ deal_NN ._. School_NNP pupils_NNS became_VBD disillusioned_JJ ,_, seeing_VBG the_DT school_NN as_IN an_DT agent_NN of_IN social_JJ discrimination_NN ._. The_DT lycées_NNS were_VBD for_IN the_DT bourgeois_NN ,_, cadres_NNS supérieurs_NNS ,_, while_IN the_DT chances_NNS of_IN the_DT children_NNS of_IN an_DT ` `` ouvrier_NN ' "' getting_VBG anywhere_RB near_IN higher_JJR education_NN were_VBD remote_JJ ._. It_PRP seemed_VBD that_IN equality_NN of_IN opportunity_NN and_CC high_JJ academic_JJ standards_NNS were_VBD incompatible_JJ ._. The_DT demonstrations_NNS of_IN May_NNP 68_CD led_VBD to_TO an_DT era_NN of_IN dialogue_NN between_IN parents_NNS ,_, teachers_NNS and_CC government_NN ._. The_DT resulting_VBG Haby_NNP reforms_NNS brought_VBD about_RB the_DT ` `` tronc_NN commun_NN ' "' in_IN the_DT C.E.S._NNP ,_, where_WRB over_IN 50_CD %_NN of_IN pupils_NNS now_RB attended_VBD ._. This_DT type_NN of_IN ' "' école_JJ unique_JJ ' "' had_VBD been_VBN demanded_VBN by_IN idealists_NNS such_JJ as_IN Compagnons_NNP de_IN l'Université_NNP over_IN 50_CD years_NNS before_RB ._. It_PRP involved_VBD mixed_JJ ability_NN teaching_NN up_IN to_TO the_DT age_NN of_IN 16_CD ,_, an_DT attempt_NN at_IN ensuring_VBG that_IN equality_NN of_IN opportunity_NN was_VBD obtained_VBN ._. But_CC schools_NNS found_VBD ways_NNS of_IN streaming_NN pupils_NNS ,_, under_IN pressure_NN from_IN the_DT parents_NNS of_IN abler_JJ children_NNS ._. When_WRB Beullac_NNP became_VBD minister_NN in_IN 1978_CD ,_, he_PRP was_VBD instructed_VBN not_RB to_TO apply_VB the_DT Haby_NNP laws_NNS too_RB rigidly_RB and_CC there_RB was_VBD discretion_NN as_IN to_TO how_WRB far_RB schools_NNS could_MD stream_NN their_PRP\$ pupils_NNS ._. Haby_NNP had_VBD said_VBN that_IN his_PRP\$ reform_NN involved_VBN ` `` the_DT same_JJ opportunities_NNS in_IN every_DT satchel_NN ' "' but_CC was_VBD criticised_VBN for_IN subordinating_VBG education_NN to_TO the_DT needs_NNS of_IN the_DT economy_NN ,_, producing_VBG a_DT versatile_JJ but_CC poorly_RB qualified_VBN workforce_NN and_CC providing_VBG education_NN on_IN the_DT level_NN of_IN the_DT ` `` SMIC_NN culturel_NN ' "' ._. Elitism_NNP was_VBD reintroduced_VBN as_IN abler_NN pupils_NNS were_VBD able_JJ to_TO take_VB German_JJ lessons_NNS ._. Under_IN the_DT Socialists_NNPS since_IN 1981_CD ,_, the_DT move_NN to_TO integrate_VB private_JJ schools_NNS into_IN the_DT State_NN system_NN was_VBD dropped_VBN under_IN public_JJ pressure_NN and_CC now_RB 17_CD %_NN of_IN pupils_NNS are_VBP members_NNS of_IN that_DT clique_NN ._.

Savary_NNP left_VBD office_NN to_TO be_VB replace_VB by_IN Chevenement_NNP who_WP advocated_VBD to_TO return_VB to_TO the_DT conservative_JJ values_NNS of_IN discipline_NN &_CC hard_JJ work_NN ,_, while_IN introducing_VBG modern_JJ ,_, technological_JJ subjects_NNS ._. But_CC still_RB ,_, government_NN was_VBD trying_VBG to_TO fit_VB new_JJ reforms_NNS into_IN the_DT existing_VBG system_NN and_CC lycées_NNS remained_VBD virtually_JJ unchanged_JJ ._. For_IN the_DT less_JJR privileged_JJ child_NN ,_, the_DT outlook_NN is_VBZ still_RB grim_JJ ._. He_PRP has_VBZ a_DT 43_CD %_NN chance_NN of_IN getting_VBG to_TO higher_JJR education_NN ,_, as_IN opposed_VBN to_TO 80_CD %_NN for_IN the_DT child_NN of_IN a_DT ``cadre_NN supérier_NN ' ' ._. In_IN England_NNP ,_, the_DT chances_NNS of_IN a_DT working_VBG class_NN child_NN to_TO progress_NN is_VBZ much_RB higher_JJR ,_, even_RB in_IN the_DT élitist_NN Oxbridge_NNP ,_, 50_CD %_NN are_VBP non-public_JJ school_NN ._. With_IN the_DT introduction_NN of_IN GCSE_NNP 's_POS ,_, the_DT social_JJ stigma_NN of_IN having_VBG CSE_NNP 's_POS rather_RB than_IN O_NN levels_NNS is_VBZ removed_VBN ,_, and_CC there_EX is_VBZ less_JJR pressure_NN to_TO continue_VB to_TO A_DT levels_NNS ._. In_IN France_NNP ,_, there_EX is_VBZ no_DT half-way_NN house_NN ._. The_DT baccalauréat_NN is_VBZ all-important_JJ ,_, a_DT national_JJ obsession_NN ,_, with_IN those_DT who_WP do_VBP not_RB obtain_VB it_PRP becoming_VBG ``zéros_NNS ' ' ._. This_DT segregation_NN of_IN ``bacheliers_NNS ' ' and_CC ``non-bacheliers_NNS ' ' is_VBZ likely_JJ to_TO worsen_VB as_IN the_DT Rocard_NNP government_NN has_VBZ stated_VBN its_PRP\$ aim_NN of_IN 80_CD %_NN of_IN pupils_NNS taking_VBG the_DT bac_NN ._. exam_NN by_IN the_DT year_NN 2000_CD ._. Critics_NNS ,_, including_VBG the_DT magazine_NN Paris_NNP Match_NNP ,_, see_VB this_DT creating_VBG a_DT ``ghetto_NN du_NNP désespoir_NNP ' ' as_IN those_DT without_IN the_DT bac_NN ._. will_MD be_VB discriminated_VBN against_IN for_IN the_DT rest_NN of_IN his_PRP\$ life_NN ._. The_DT chances_NNS are_VBP that_IN the_DT majority_NN of_IN the_DT 20_CD %_NN of_IN ``zéros_NNS ' ' will_MD be_VB of_IN lower_JJR social_JJ categories_NNS ,_, children_NNS of_IN ``ouvriers_NNS ' ' or_CC ``salariés_NNS agricoles_NNS ' ' ._. As_IN it_PRP is_VBZ ,_, the_DT percentage_NN of_IN these_DT children_NNS having_VBG to_TO repeat_VB a_DT year_NN is_VBZ 25_CD %_NN higher_JJR than_IN those_DT from_IN better-off_JJ backgrounds_NNS ._. Secondary_JJ school_NN now_RB involves_VBZ 2_CD years_NNS of_IN observation_NN ,_, 2_CD of_IN orientation_NN and_CC then_RB to_TO

the_DT lycée_NN d'Enseignement_NN Generale_NNP or_CC Lycée_NNP
 d'Enseignement_NNP Professionnelle_NNP -LRB-_-LRB- equivalent_JJ of_IN an_DT
 English_JJ Technological_JJ College_NNP -RRB-_-RRB- ._. The_DT ` `` brevets_NNS
 ' _POS gained_VBN at_IN the_DT L.E.P._NNP do_VBP not_RB gain_VB as_RB much_JJ
 admiration_NN and_CC prestige_NN as_IN they_PRP should_MD ,_, since_IN the_DT
 French_NNP are_VBP still_RB bound_VBN by_IN their_PRP\$ academic_JJ tradition_NN
 ,_, high_JJ standards_NNS and_CC élitism_NN ._. Does_VBZ this_DT has_VBZ to_TO
 suffer_VB at_IN the_DT expense_NN of_IN social_JJ equality_NN ?_. In_IN England_NNP
 ,_, selection_NN to_TO higher_JJR education_NN is_VBZ a_DT fact_NN of_IN life_NN ._.
 If_IN you_PRP follow_VBP the_DT theory_NN that_IN the_DT higher_JJR the_DT
 social_JJ class_NN ,_, the_DT better_JJR the_DT A_DT level_NN grades_NNS -_: then_RB
 social_JJ selection_NN may_MD be_VB a_DT problem_NN ._. But_CC the_DT
 comprehensive_JJ system_NN with_IN streaming_NN and_CC special_JJ help_NN for_IN
 remedials_NNS means_VBZ that_IN this_DT is_VBZ less_RBR likely_JJ ._. In_IN
 France_NNP ,_, the_DT bac_NN ._. certificate_NN is_VBZ a_DT ticket_NN for_IN
 university_NN ,_, without_IN further_JJ selection_NN ._. But_CC the_DT social_JJ
 discrimination_NN has_VBZ already_RB taken_VBN place_NN ,_, with_IN the_DT
 likelihood_NN of_IN a_DT ` `` lower_JJR class_NN ' _" pupil_NN gaining_VBG the_DT
 bac_NN ._. much_RB lower_JJR than_IN that_DT of_IN his_PRP\$ more_JJR privileged_JJ
 contemporary_JJ ._. The_DT English_JJ system_NN of_IN course_NN has_VBZ its_PRP\$
 elitist_JJ elements_NNS ,_, the_DT public_JJ school_NN causing_VBG much_JJ
 controversy_NN and_CC often_RB giving_VBG a_DT child_NN a_DT better_JJR
 chance_NN to_TO progress_VB to_TO higher_JJR education_NN ._. French_NNP has_VBZ
 a_DT history_NN of_IN elitism_NN ,_, since_IN the_DT time_NN of_IN Napoleon_NNP
 and_CC is_VBZ determined_VBN not_RB to_TO sacrifice_VB its_PRP\$ academic_JJ
 standards_NNS ._. But_CC for_IN the_DT less_JJR privileged_JJ child_NN ,_, the_DT
 education_NN system_NN is_VBZ ,_, according_VBG to_TO Charles_NNP Vial_NNP ,_,
 a_DT ` `` cursus_FW d'obstacles_FW ' _" ._. He_PRP has_VBZ only_RB a_DT 6_CD
 %_NN chance_NN of_IN getting_VBG the_DT prestigious_JJ C_NN bac_NN ,_, if_IN
 he_PRP is_VBZ the_DT child_NN of_IN a_DT ` `` salarié_NN agricole_NN ' _" ._. A_DT
 balance_NN must_MD be_VB struck_VBN ._. To_TO keep_VB standards_NNS high_JJ
 and_CC to_TO ensure_VB equality_NN of_IN opportunity_NN ._. Even_RB when_WRB
 these_DT children_NNS make_VBP it_PRP to_TO university_NN ,_, they_PRP are_VBP
 50_CD %_NN more_RBR likely_JJ to_TO fail_VB their_PRP\$ D.E.U.G._NNP than_IN

children_NNS higher_JJR up_IN the_DT social_JJ scale_NN ._. This_DT can_MD not_RB be_VB coincidence_NN -_: maybe_RB the_DT French_JJ should_MD look_VB to_TO the_DT English_NNP comprehensive_JJ school_NN ,_, as_IN Fouchet_NN and_CC Capelle_NNP tried_VBD to_TO do_VB in_IN 1963_CD ,_, to_TO try_VB and_CC find_VB a_DT compromise_NN ._.

ICLE-BR-SUR-0033.1

The_DT Fifth_NNP Republic_NNP inherited_VBD the_DT limitations_NNS and_CC dissatisfaction_NN of_IN the_DT Fourth_JJ ._. The_DT education_NN system_NN needed_VBD immediate_JJ modernisation_NN and_CC democratization_NN ._. The_DT first_JJ reform_NN which_WDT aimed_VBD at_IN achieve_VB these_DT was_VBD the_DT Berthoin_NNP reform_NN which_WDT was_VBD issued_VBN by_IN decree_NN under_IN de_FW Gaulle_NNP 's_POS emergency_NN powers_NNS with_IN no_DT opportunity_NN for_IN parliamentary_JJ debate_NN ._. Under_IN this_DT reform_NN ,_, the_DT school-leaving_JJ age_NN was_VBD raised_VBN to_TO 16_CD ,_, thus_RB ensuring_VBG a_DT longer_RBR span_NN of_IN education_NN ._. A_DT cycle_NN of_IN observation_NN of_IN 2_CD years_NNS was_VBD introduced_VBN for_IN pupils_NNS at_IN the_DT age_NN of_IN 11_CD ,_, the_DT idea_NN being_VBG that_IN during_IN these_DT 2_CD years_NNS pupils_NNS ' _POS progress_NN would_MD be_VB observed_VBN and_CC at_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN the_DT cycle_NN each_DT pupil_NN would_MD be_VB guided_VBN by_IN teachers_NNS into_IN either_CC the_DT lycée_NN or_CC the_DT CEG_NN -LRB-_-LRB- collège_NN d'enseignement_NN général_NN -RRB-_-RRB- as_IN best_JJS suited_VBN the_DT individual_NN ._. Berthoin_NNP hoped_VBD this_DT would_MD reduce_VB social_JJ discrimination_NN since_IN all_DT pupils_NNS would_MD follow_VB the_DT same_JJ syllabus_NN ._. However_RB ,_, this_DT cycle_NN of_IN observation_NN took_VBD place_NN in_IN different_JJ institutions_NNS -_: the_DT lycée_NN ,_, the_DT CEG_NNP and_CC the_DT primary_JJ school_NN -_: and_CC little_JJ transfer_NN of_IN pupils_NNS actually_RB took_VBD place_NN -LRB-_-LRB- 1_CD %_NN of_IN pupils_NNS transferred_VBN to_TO the_DT lycée_NN on_IN average_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._. In_IN these_DT institutions_NNS syllabuses_NNS were_VBD harmonized_VBN but_CC this_DT was_VBD inefficient_JJ and_CC insufficient_JJ as_IN far_RB as_IN equality_NN of_IN opportunity_NN was_VBD concerned_VBN ._. The_DT Fouchet_NN reforms_NNS of_IN 1963_CD sought_VBD to_TO relieve_VB the_DT continued_JJ dissatisfaction_NN of_IN the_DT political_JJ Left_VBN ,_, primary_JJ

teachers_NNS and_CC trade_NN unions_NNS by_IN improving_VBG on_IN the_DT
 Berthoin_NNP reforms_NNS ._. Fouchet_NN tried_VBD to_TO introduce_VB a_DT
 common_JJ middle_JJ school_NN for_IN all_DT pupils_NNS -: the_DT CES_NN -:
 which_WDT would_MD cover_VB the_DT 11_CD to_TO 14_CD age_NN span_NN ._.
 It_PRP was_VBD to_TO be_VB formed_VBN by_IN converting_VBG the_DT junior_NN
 classes_NNS of_IN the_DT lycée_NN into_IN separate_JJ units_NNS and_CC by_IN
 transforming_VBG the_DT CEG_NNP 's_POS ._. At_IN the_DT end_NN of_IN the_DT
 CES_NNP ,_, entry_NN to_TO the_DT lycée_NN would_MD be_VB by_IN the_DT
 pupils_NNS carte_VBP scolaire_JJ not_RB by_IN exam_NN ._. Lycée_JJ teachers_NNS
 feared_VBD a_DT drop_NN in_IN standards_NNS ,_, and_CC middle_JJ class_NN
 parents_NNS feared_VBN tougher_JJR competition_NN for_IN their_PRP\$ children_NNS
 ._. Hence_RB conversion_NN was_VBD resisted_VBN -: in_IN the_DT opinion_NN of_IN
 the_DT Legrand_NNP report_NN ,_, the_DT CES_NNP never_RB actually_RB came_VBD
 into_IN existence_NN ._. However_RB the_DT CES_NN such_JJ as_IN it_PRP was_VBD
 did_VBD provide_VB for_IN an_DT increased_VBN equality_NN for_IN pupils_NNS
 but_CC the_DT biggest_JJS drawback_NN was_VBD the_DT streaming_NN system_NN -:
 the_DT 3_CD filières_NNS ,_, of_IN which_WDT filière_JJ number_NN one_CD had_VBD
 the_DT bad_JJ teachers_NNS and_CC was_VBD dominated_VBN by_IN children_NNS
 of_IN the_DT middle_JJ class_NN ._. This_DT led_VBD to_TO a_DT continuation_NN
 of_IN social_JJ selection_NN for_IN the_DT lycées_NNS and_CC a_DT further_JJ
 setback_NN for_IN democratization_NN ._. There_EX was_VBD not_RB great_JJ
 reform_NN of_IN secondary_JJ education_NN after_IN the_DT events_NNS of_IN
 May_NNP 1968_CD but_CC by_IN the_DT early_JJ 70_CD 's_POS it_PRP was_VBD
 realized_VBN that_IN Fouchet_NN 's_POS reforms_NNS of_IN 1963_CD were_VBD
 still_RB not_RB good_JJ enough_RB ._. In_IN 1975_CD René_NNP Haby_NNP was_VBD
 appointed_VBN Minister_NNP of_IN Education_NNP ._. He_PRP attempted_VBD to_TO
 re-structure_VB the_DT system_NN of_IN education_NN but_CC in_IN fact_NN his_PRP\$
 reforms_NNS were_VBD fitted_VBN into_IN the_DT existing_VBG system_NN ._.
 He_PRP renamed_VBD the_DT CES_NNP `` `` collège_NN unique_JJ ' ' and_CC
 introduced_VBN 2_CD cycles_NNS ._. The_DT first_JJ lasted_VBN 4_CD years_NNS ._.
 The_DT first_JJ 2_CD years_NNS consisted_VBD of_IN a_DT common_JJ course_NN
 for_IN all_DT pupils_NNS ,_, designed_VBN to_TO offer_VB a_DT minimum_JJ level_NN
 of_IN education_NN -LRB-_-LRB- le_DT SMIC_NN culturel_NN -RRB-_-RRB- ._.
 Classes_NNS were_VBD to_TO be_VB of_IN mixed_JJ ability_NN ,_, the_DT only_JJ

streaming_NN would_MD be_VB by_IN age_NN ._. Weak_JJ pupils_NNS received_VBD extra_JJ tuition_NN as_IN did_VBD bright_JJ pupils_NNS -_: so_IN the_DT ones_NNS who_WP suffered_VBD were_VBD those_DT of_IN average_JJ ability_NN ._. Treating_VBG inequals_NNS equally_RB did_VBD not_RB work_VB ._. The_DT final_JJ 2_CD years_NNS of_IN the_DT first_JJ cycle_NN contained_VBD a_DT basic_JJ core_NN of_IN subjects_NNS and_CC options_NNS were_VBD introduced_VBN ._. The_DT 2nd_JJ cycle_NN covered_VBD the_DT final_JJ 3_CD years_NNS of_IN secondary_JJ education_NN ._. In_IN the_DT lycées_NNS générales_NNS ,_, pupils_NNS studying_VBG for_IN the_DT bac_NN took_VBD a_DT common_JJ curriculum_NN for_IN 2_CD years_NNS and_CC specialised_VBN in_IN the_DT final_JJ year_NN ._. Options_NNS coming_VBG later_RB would_MD give_VB pupils_NNS a_DT longer_JJR time_NN to_TO develop_VB their_PRP\$ true_JJ potential_NN ,_, Haby_NNP thought_VBD ._. Technological_JJ subjects_NNS were_VBD introduced_VBN to_TO modernize_VB the_DT syllabus_NN ._. To_TO conform_VB to_TO Giscard_NNP 's_POS notion_NN of_IN citizenship_NN for_IN an_DT advanced_JJ industrial_JJ society_NN ,_, manual_JJ subjects_NNS became_VBD compulsory_JJ ._. Implementation_NN of_IN the_DT reforms_NNS took_VBD time_NN ._. Haby_NNP was_VBD replaced_VBN by_IN Beullac_NNP who_WP sought_VBD a_DT closer_RBR alignment_NN between_IN the_DT economy_NN and_CC education_NN ._. From_IN 1979_CD pupils_NNS were_VBD given_VBN probation_NN periods_NNS in_IN industry_NN ._. This_DT gave_VBD a_DT positive_JJ face_NN to_TO the_DT Haby_NNP reforms_NNS which_WDT had_VBD failed_VBN to_TO democratize_VB the_DT system_NN by_IN offering_VBG equality_NN of_IN treatment_NN ._. Mitterrand_NNP came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1981_CD ;_: Alain_NNP Savary_NNP was_VBD appointed_VBN Minister_NNP of_IN education_NN ._. He_PRP spent_VBD 18_CD months_NNS negotiation_NN in_IN order_NN to_TO achieve_VB a_DT plan_NN for_IN a_DT united_VBN secular_JJ system_NN of_IN education_NN ._. He_PRP reached_VBD a_DT compromise_NN which_WDT satisfied_JJ neither_CC Left_VBN nor_CC Right_RB ;_: after_IN a_DT massive_JJ Right_NNP wing_NN demonstration_NN in_IN 1984_CD his_PRP\$ Bill_NNP was_VBD withdrawn_VBN and_CC he_PRP resigned_VBD ._. He_PRP was_VBD replaced_VBN by_IN Chevènement_NNP for_IN whom_WP equality_NN of_IN the_DT system_NN took_VBD second_JJ place_NN to_TO modernisation_NN ._. He_PRP aimed_VBD at_IN modernizing_VBG the_DT system_NN to_TO bring_VB French_JJ children_NNS into_IN the_DT new_JJ era_NN of_IN technology_NN ._. French_JJ ,_, maths_NNS and_CC

technological_JJ subjects_NNS were_VBD given_VBN top_JJ priority_NN on_IN the_DT curriculum_NN ._. He_PRP targeted_VBD the_DT lycée_NN and_CC the_DT baccalaureat_NN in_IN his_PRP\$ plans_NNS :_: 1_LS -RRB-_-RRB- he_PRP wanted_VBD to_TO achieve_VB Lycée_NN attendance_NN of_IN 80_CD %_NN of_IN all_DT pupils_NNS by_IN the_DT year_NN 2000_CD 2_LS -RRB-_-RRB- renew_VB humanities_NNS in_IN the_DT lycée_NN 3_CD -RRB-_-RRB- give_VBP greater_JJR autonomy_NN to_TO the_DT lycée_NN 4_CD -RRB-_-RRB- restructure_NN the_DT bac_NN into_IN 8_CD series_NN 5_CD -RRB-_-RRB- increase_VBP the_DT number_NN of_IN bacheliers_NNS in_IN the_DT technological_JJ field_NN ._. However_RB ,_, time_NN was_VBD against_IN him_PRP and_CC the_DT Left_VBN lost_VBD its_PRP\$ majority_NN in_IN 1986_CD ._. René_NNP Monony_NNP erased_VBD these_DT plans_NNS but_CC following_VBG the_DT demise_NN of_IN the_DT loi_NN Devaquet_NN in_IN November_NNP 1986_CD ,_, Chirac_NNP suspended_VBD all_DT social_JJ reforms_NNS ._. The_DT constant_JJ attempts_NNS to_TO introduce_VB a_DT comprehensive_JJ school_NN on_IN the_DT English_NNP model_NN have_VBP been_VBN frustrated_VBN by_IN the_DT centralised_JJ system_NN of_IN education_NN ._. Reforms_NNS are_VBP made_VBN to_TO fit_VB into_IN the_DT existing_VBG structure_NN where_WRB they_PRP meet_VBP firmly_RB entrenched_JJ vested_JJ interests_NNS which_WDT oppose_VBP their_PRP\$ implementation_NN ._. Consequently_RB the_DT reforms_NNS are_VBP unsuccessful_JJ ._. The_DT Lycées_NNS teachers_NNS have_VBP constantly_RB feared_VBN a_DT drop_NN in_IN standards_NNS and_CC hence_RB have_VBP opposed_VBN all_DT attempts_NNS to_TO convert_VB their_PRP\$ junior_JJ classes_NNS into_IN a_DT comprehensive_JJ middle_JJ school_NN ._. The_DT lycées_NNS exist_VBP as_IN a_DT kind_NN of_IN equivalent_JJ to_TO English_JJ 6th_JJ form_NN colleges_NNS with_IN junior_JJ classes_NNS attached_VBN ._. Despite_IN the_DT lack_NN of_IN entrance_NN exam_NN for_IN the_DT lycées_NNS ,_, the_DT French_JJ system_NN resembles_VBZ that_IN of_IN the_DT English_NNP pre-comprehensive_JJ system_NN with_IN its_PRP\$ superior_JJ grammar_NN schools_NNS and_CC inferior_NN secondary_JJ modern_JJ schools_NNS ._. Options_NNS in_IN France_NNP are_VBP chosen_VBN later_RB in_IN the_DT hope_NN that_IN this_DT will_MD allow_VB each_DT pupil_NN to_TO develop_VB his_PRP\$ full_JJ potential_NN ._. In_IN England_NNP ,_, options_NNS come_VBP earlier_RB but_CC it_PRP is_VBZ not_RB until_IN ``_`` A_NN "``_`` levels_NNS are_VBP reached_VBN that_IN pupils_NNS really_RB have_VBP to_TO make_VB an_DT important_JJ decision_NN -LRB-_-LRB-

this_DT is_VBZ still_RB earlier_JJ than_IN French_JJ specialization_NN for_IN the_DT bac_NN -RRB-_-RRB-_. Furthermore_RB ,_, the_DT French_JJ education_NN system_NN is_VBZ linked_VBN more_RBR closely_RB with_IN the_DT economy_NN than_IN its_PRP\$ English_NNP counterpart_NN ._. In_IN England_NNP ,_, changes_NNS are_VBP made_VBN according_VBG to_TO technological_JJ developments_NNS not_RB economic_JJ ones_NNS ._. There_EX tends_VBZ to_TO be_VB social_JJ differentiation_NN in_IN England_NNP between_IN State_NNP schools_NNS and_CC private_JJ fee-paying_JJ schools_NNS -: the_DT latter_JJ attracting_VBG middle_JJ class_NN children_NNS ._. In_IN France_NNP the_DT difference_NN is_VBZ that_IN social_JJ differentiation_NN exists_VBZ within_IN the_DT State_NN system_NN itself_PRP ,_, hence_RB the_DT attempts_NNS to_TO create_VB a_DT more_RBR comprehensive_JJ system_NN to_TO achieve_VB democratization_NN ._. ._.

Appendix V – Penn Treebank tag set

The following table is taken from Santorini (1990), page 6.

Tag	Part of speech
CC	Coordinating conjunction
CD	Cardinal number
DT	Determiner
EX	Existential <i>there</i>
FW	Foreign word
IN	Preposition or subordinating conjunction
JJ	Adjective
JJR	Adjective, comparative
JJS	Adjective, superlative
LS	List item marker
MD	Modal
NN	Noun, singular or mass
NNS	Noun, plural
NP	Proper noun, singular
NPS	Proper noun, plural
PDT	Predeterminer
POS	Possessive ending
PP	Personal pronoun
PP\$	Possessive pronoun
RB	Adverb
RBR	Adverb, comparative
RBS	Adverb, superlative
RP	Particle
SYM	Symbol
TO	<i>to</i>
UH	Interjection
VB	Verb, base form
VBD	Verb, past tense
VBG	Verb, gerund or present participle

VBN	Verb, past participle
VBP	Verb, non-3 rd person singular present
VBZ	Verb, 3 rd person singular present
WDT	Wh-determiner
WP	Wh-pronoun
WP\$	Possessive wh-pronoun
WRB	Wh-adverb