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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.
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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 onderwijsstijd), 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) nativelike 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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR1T1A</th>
<th>Native N=18,129</th>
<th>RAD1210 N=535</th>
<th>RAD1220 N=404</th>
<th>RAD1253 N=481</th>
<th>RAD1277 N=330</th>
<th>RAD1280 N=433</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (total)</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attr. adj.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (compound or unmodified)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

*Results of the quantitative analysis of LONGDALE yr2t3, percentage scores*

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

Table 3

*Results of the quantitative analysis of LONGDALE yr3t2, percentage scores*

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

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 yrt1a 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, yrt1a)

(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 VB 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 VB 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, yrt1t1a)

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

“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.

“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:

“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).

“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)

(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 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)
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 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 nativelike 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 nativelike. 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 nativelike 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 nativelike 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 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)

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*

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

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.
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*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR1T1A</th>
<th>Native N=18,129</th>
<th>RAD1210 N=535</th>
<th>RAD1220 N=404</th>
<th>RAD1253 N=481</th>
<th>RAD1277 N=330</th>
<th>RAD1280 N=433</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean sentence length</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>20.08</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>16.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>14.04</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR2T3</th>
<th>Native N=18,129</th>
<th>RAD1210 N=827</th>
<th>RAD1220 N=795</th>
<th>RAD1253 N=728</th>
<th>RAD1277 N=684</th>
<th>RAD1280 N=730</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean sentence length</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>22.30</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>24.20</td>
<td>23.14</td>
<td>22.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>11.86</td>
<td>10.18</td>
<td>11.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YR3T2</th>
<th>Native N=18,129</th>
<th>RAD1210 N=470</th>
<th>RAD1220 N=1,024</th>
<th>RAD1253 N=717</th>
<th>RAD1277 N=422</th>
<th>RAD1280 N=881</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean sentence length</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>22.09</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>24.88</td>
<td>28.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>9.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The current study N=18,129</th>
<th>De Haan &amp; Van der Haagen (2014) N=47,850</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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 the British system of required grades and interviews."

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.”

(69b) “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.”

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

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

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.”

(71b) “I might have to get some help from the students to transcribe this accurately.”

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 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)

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.
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Appendix I – LONGDALE yr1t1a (tagged)

**RAD1210**

There _you_ are. You have made the transition from elementary school to university. There 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. It is understandable that such a task ahead may cause some stress and perhaps even panic among freshmen. Luckily, there are a few basic steps every new student can take in order to enlarge the chance of succeeding. This short essay argues three of these steps, hoping to provide some comfort to those in need. Althought 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. You can contact lecturers or other members of staff to ensure you always know what is going on, what needs to be handed in and what is expected of you. Do not wait for things to come your way, take matters into your own hands and you will find things will go much smoother. Studying in your spare time is of the utmost importance._
Do not forget though, relaxation is also a big part of your everyday life. Try to cooperate some spare time into your planning. Provide yourself with stress-free periods. Plan to have a relaxing warm bath every Friday, get yourself a new magazine every Thursday and promise yourself Sunday morning to be spent with friends. This way you will ensure you are not overworking yourself. You will be able to keep up a steady pace of studying for a longer period of time. If you neglect spare time, you may find yourself used up before your freshmen year has even started.

In extend to the first tip about active participation:

there is another tip to keep in mind. Do never procrastinate. It is as simple as that. If you have the time to get some work done, do not indulge yourself in useless activities with the excuse that you have some time to do things later. Procrastination will always bring more stress and more negative energy. Again, take matters into your own hands and use time wisely. The transition from elementary school to university is a huge one, frightening maybe. Keep in mind that millions of students before you have done it, why could not you do it too? Keep these basic steps in the back of your head: do not procrastinate, plan yourself some spare time and most of all, take matters into your own hands. Those steps combined with a healthy dose of curiosity, intelligence and motivation will get you towards a successful study.
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 VB to TO make VB sure JJ is VBZ that IN you PRP are VBZ thoroughly RB organised VBN _. This DT means VBZ you PRP need VB 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 VB _. If IN you PRP are VB 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 VB 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 VB 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 VBZ 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 VB 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 fellow students go through the same things as you do and it can be very useful to work together. You can help each other with exercises or difficult texts. If there is something that you could not get your head around, they can help you. It is also much more fun to work together on an exercise, but make sure it is not all fun and games and that you get some actual work done. At first, university is very scary, but it all matters getting used to the new regime. It is all up to yourself if you want to be successful at university, but if you enjoy it, it will not be a problem to be successful.

When going to college there is one thing all students want, which is to graduate. Though not all students will be able to graduate; might be because they have a lack of discipline, might be because the level of education is simply too high. In most cases the student can determine whether or not he or she will graduate. To become a successful student you have to take certain steps that will lead them to their goal of graduating college. The first step a student could take is to come to all of their classes. Students have to come to class for multiple reasons. The first of all is that they have to have a minimum attendance of eighty percent. When students are less than eight percent, but more than fifty percent, the student is not allowed to have a second chance of doing the examination. When attendance is less than...
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_PRPs$ books_NNS . Students_NNS that_WDT do_VBP not_RB understand_VB the_DT topics_NNS of_IN their_PRPs$ classes_NNS will_MD not_RB be_VB able_JJ to_TO pass_VB their_PRPs$ 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 . Therefore_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_PRPs$ assignments_NNS . Again_RB there_EX are_VBP more_RBR reasons_NNS why_WRB a_DT student>NN should_MD make_VB their_PRPs$ 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 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.

RAD1277

Being a first-year student myself, I know the first weeks in college can be difficult. Everything is new to you: the fellow students, professors, grand lecture rooms, and let’s not forget the vast amount of assignments for every class. On top of that, you need to start doing your own grocery shopping, laundry, dishes, and unfortunately, your room is not going to tidy itself. At first, this whole new life can be tricky. Do not worry, though, my dear freshmen, because first-year students can take specific steps to make sure they are successful in college. First of all, I would like to emphasise the importance of lecture-attendance. 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. So please, do yourself a favour and listen attentively to what your professors have to say. Secondly, it is not a bad idea to complete the assignments you are given, for they often contain a hint of test subject-matter. By doing these exercises, you will get acquainted with the peculiarities of the subject in question. This will save you time when cramming all the need-to-
know information inside your head, a phenomenon also known as studying. In the third place, I would like to warn you against the consequences of the adage `Work hard, play harder.`

Although partying is a lot of fun, and definitely part of the university life experience, the study load should not be underestimated. To go out the night before an important exam is never a wise decision, keep that in mind. In conclusion, go to class, finish your assignments and pass the tests. That way, you will make your mother proud and won't have to take the resits, which saves you a lot of time. Congratulations, you have just killed two birds with one stone.

RAD1280

The first year of going to university is a fun and most scary year. All of these new impressions, new friends, new courses and new teachers may look scary but actually they are not bad. In fact, making a fresh start is an opportunity that must be taken seriously. In the end, everybody is there to help one another.

However, if you are truly terrified by the idea of your first year in university, there are some basic steps to make even your worst imaginable year to a successful one. Firstly, remember that this is your first year of all of your classmates. Everybody is nervous about making VBG new friends and hoping for acceptance within the class. Be aware of your classmates and find topics which relates VBG to TO other classmates. This will help you to find a way to start a...
For example, since this is your first year, you could talk about the expectations of courses you will be attending together. Having friends within your class is one of the keys in making your year successful. Students can help each other when they are facing problems, this will make your year much easier. Secondly, the courses that you will be attending, are all very interesting. Think about those courses in a positive way and make sure that you come well-prepared to the course. Finish your homework in time and be active when you are discussing homework. You should have the right books and bring them to class if necessary. You are not taking this course nor the teacher seriously when you come to class unprepared.

Studying the chapters and making your homework makes you understand the courses better and it will improve your skills. Even when you already know something, more practice will only make you better. Thirdly, you have chosen to attend this course. In a way you are saying that this is where your interest is in.

Normally, you should be interested in most of the subjects you will be following and if this is not the case you should ask yourself whether you have chosen the right educational programme. When you find you are in the wrong courses, please contact your study advisor and discuss with him what the possibilities are. There are a lot of ways to come to a solution, when you just tell people what is on your mind.

To sum up, there are three key elements in making your year successful. Stick to the points
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 ._.
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_NN 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_BN 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-_ Treherne_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$ ::
``_`` Thanne_FW comth_FW oure_NN verray_NN gentillesse_NN of_IN grace_NN ::
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 wdt litel_VBP wonder_NN is_VBZ thogh_IN I_PRP walwe_VBP and_CC wynde_VBP "_" -LRB-_LRB-_ Treherne_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$ poverte_NN _,
I_PRP holde_VBP hym_NN riche_NN _, al_NNP hadde_NNP he_PRP nat_VBD a_DT
The knight then accepts her words as the truth and this is the second step in his inner transformation. The last and most important part of his transformation can be found in the way he treats women. He started out as a knight who raped women, who took form without regard for their feelings or wishes. The answer to the question was: "Women desire have sovereignty as well as their house and love, and for to been in maistrie hym above."

The witch proposes the deal to him and he answers with the following: "My lady and my love, and wyf so deere, I put me in your wise governance; Cheseth yourself which may be most plesance, and most honour to you and me also." He has understood the lesson the witch was trying to teach him and his transformation is complete. After the knight's quest for the answer to the queen's question, it turns out that he was being tested all along. The witch proposed him with a choice: either she would change into a beautiful and unfaithful wife or she would remain old and ugly and would stay with him forever. The knight then passes his test by letting her make the decision: he is the one who changed, not the witch.

All the information the witch has given has opened his eyes and has given him spiritual enlightenment. The witch never changed, the knight never changed the VT.
knight is just able to appreciate her for the beautiful human being that she is.

RAD1220

It is known that there are very few fabliaux existing in the Middle English language. Other than the fabliau Dame Siriñe and some stories written by Chaucer, there are hardly any fabliaux known to be written in Middle English.

The fabliaux are a separate, though marginalised genre in literature. Often written in verse, they contain octosyllabic couplets. Their scope is around fifty to approximately 1,000 lines. As a theme, deceit is at the fabliau's core. Thus, the fabliaux genre has standard set characters, namely: the trickster, the dupe, the desirer and the desired. These characters incline to make lots of rash promises, which the trickster dutifully takes advantage of. The trick played by the trickster is also named cointise or engin, terms that stem from the fabliaux's French origins. The fabliaux feature ordinary people, such as monks, priests, clerks, merchants and peasants. It has a concrete setting, mostly urban or rural. Even though the fabliaux were popular in France, they never got through to the English literary tradition because of its French origin, and the manuscript culture and oral traditions. The fabliaux are part of the French literary tradition and are thus not inherently English. It is a genre that came to life in France in the twelfth century, but became popular in the thirteenth century.
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-_LRB- . 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 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-_LRB-. 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.PRPR 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.PRPR were_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- -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- -RRB- 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 of society, and to finally replace French as the main language. When that happened, the fabliaux were picked up by Chaucer, who gave us the Canterbury Tales. 

There are many questions raised about The Wife of Bath’s Tale, such as if the girl he raped was a peasant? Or whether the knight actually belonged to the knights of king Arthur as he does not show very courtliness behaviour. The one of most controversy would be whether the wife of bath actually undergoes a physical transformation. Some say that she transforms herself, others say that she puts a spell on her husband so he perceives her differently. But even though many people claim that she does, the old hag does not transform physically in the transformation scene of The Wife of Bath, because she breaks the spell as soon as he gives her what she wants and because she transforms the knight by giving him a lecture on gentilesse. She breaks the spell, when he gives her all what 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. The answer to the question is that all women want to be in control over their husbands and loved ones. The queen and her fellow judges decide the knight must live, but...
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 IJS 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 .

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 IJS 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 .

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 .

He finds VBZ this DT idea NN repulsive JJ as IN she PRP is VBZ old JJ and CC ugly JJ .

The 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 gentilesse 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 gentilse 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 JJ 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 to transform his way of thinking, but completely assured that he has changed completely. As soon as he makes her choose, he shows that he does not matter whether she is beautiful or not. He proves himself a man of true gentilesse. He was tested and now he has proven himself, she breaks the spell, which makes him able to see the woman she already was. The answer to the question whether or not the old hag transforms herself is that she does not, in fact she transforms the knight. 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 fulfill 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. At first he rejects her for the wrong reasons, but during her lecture on gentilesse she transforms his mind into that of a man of true gentilesse.

Based on Ovid and Virgil’s versions of the story, the lay of Sir Orfeo certainly shows some similarities with the classic myth. At the time in which Sir Orfeo was composed, which is the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century, "imitation, not...
originality, was the rule in English writing. The text is not completely the same, however, as it has been altered extensively in order to suit the tastes of its medieval readership. Thus, Sir Orfeo is a retelling of the myth of Orpheus and Eurydice, only revised in such a way that it would please its medieval audience. Both in the classical and the medieval versions, Orpheus / Sir Orfeo wins back his beloved one by playing music - Kittredge. In the medieval adaptation, Sir Orfeo is a "menstrel" - Kittredge, 3rd ed._. In the medieval adaptation, Orfeo is a "menstrel" - Kittredge. Orpheus /: Sir Orfeo wins back his beloved one by playing music - Kittredge._. In the medieval adaptation, Sir Orfeo is a "menstrel" - Kittredge. Elements such as the harp, which was immensely popular among Celtic people, and Sir Orfeo being a minstrel made the story more relatable for its early fourteenth century audience. Another difference between the older and newer versions of Orpheus’ story is the location. There is quite an extensive difference between the stories, as "Orfeo’s journey takes him not to Hades but to a land of fairy" - Burrow._. This Otherworld exhibits certain Celtic features such as fairies. As Treharne notes, "Celtic sources may have played a formative role in the narrative composition, particularly..."
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_VB not_RB really_RB go_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_IN NNP wilderness_VB 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_NNPS _,_ 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 classical myth of Orpheus and Eurydice, only revised in such a way that it would please its medieval audience. The author of the story has given Sir Orfeo some medieval characteristics, e.g. he is a minstrel who plays the harp. 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 author of the story has given Sir Orfeo 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.

The Canterbury Tales is a set of tales written and, unfortunately, not completely finished, by Geoffrey Chaucer in the late 14th century. The tales are presented as a sort of story-telling contest held amongst pilgrims. One of these tales is called "The Wife of Bath's Tale" and is probably amongst the best known tales of Chaucer, with a prologue which is almost twice as long as her tale. This tale speaks of a young knight who is set to find out what women most desire and who 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 will be a beautiful woman. When reading the text, it becomes clear that the Loathly Lady is actually fair and good. In lines 1219 up until 1227 the Loathly Lady asks the knight to choose what he prefers. "Now choose yourself, whether that you like," - Chaucer. The knight responds to this by saying that she must choose for him and as an argument for this he says, "I do not foresee the wheither of the two; For as you like, it suffiseth me." 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 becomes both fair and good. There are people such as Theodore Silverstein, who suggest that the old hag has been put under a curse and that this spell is dissolved after the knight has given the Loathly Lady the maistrie she needed. And because the spell is lifted, she is now fair and good.

Although this seems an adequate interpretation of the text, there is a quite different and far more likely interpretation to be found. One without miraculous spells or curses but with virtue and the true nature of somebody, rather than a curse or spell that has to be lifted, it is a change of heart which causes the Loathly Lady...
to actually be a young, beautiful, and truthful woman. It all starts with the knight as the bad guy because he raped a girl and is therefore a sinner. Because of vici- ousness, the knight’s vision is impaired. He sees true virtue as a foul thing and thinks that beauty is the most important thing in the world. This is the case until the Loathly Lady gives him the dilemma. The knight could have chosen young and beautiful because that is what he used to desire. But instead he gives the choice to Loathly Lady and says that whatever she chooses is fine with him. This shows that the knight has changed from being vicious to being virtuous. This change and the victory over temptation has led to a purified vision of the knight. The change of heart, from viciousness to virtue makes the knight see that true virtue is actually not foul but beautiful thing. "The transformation of the Loathly Lady is thus the natural consequence of his own corrected vision and insight rather than a miraculous transformation of herself. She was truly beautiful and truly gentle all along."

The Loathly Lady was not so loathly after all. It was because of the knight who did not perceive the world correctly and did not perceive true beauty. Despite the fact that some people say the Loathly Lady really did transform because she was put under a spell and she needed maistrie to dissolve this spell and be forever young, beautiful, and true. It can also be argued that the Loathly NNP Lady NN did not transform, but that the knight’s
change of heart made the knight recognise beauty and saw true beauty in the Loathly Lady who he first believed to be an old hag. Thus, it was the knight who changed, rather than the Loathly Lady.
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 VBP 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 controvers_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 __.
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The broader context of my research is second language acquisition, spoken English and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, or CEFR for short, was issued by the council of Europe in 2001. The CEFR has been very influential so far in curriculum, planning, language examinations and testing. Moreover, the CEFR has had a positive effect on the promotion of plurilingualism since the CEFR can be used for many languages - Hulstijn 2005. It is a descriptive framework that covers reading, writing, listening and speaking set out over six different Common Reference Levels, starting at A1 and ending at C2, which is the highest level - North 2015. Each level and scale is defined by ‘can do’ statements involving tasks and goals that language learners can learn in order to master a language. Though it needs to be said that being an A2 or a B1 learner does not mean they are at that level across the whole scale. A learner may be B1-level in oral communication skills, but be at C1-level in reading. As a result, the Council of Europe has stated that using a general term as B1 may be too restricting when assessing the learner’s abilities - North 2015. I will thus choose only one fluency scale as to prevent this research from becoming too elaborate. Despite the positives effects that the CEFR has had, many scholars criticise the framework. For instance, there has not been enough research concerning the descriptive scales and L2 learners. For instance, Hulstijn argues that...
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_NN .. 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>NN ._. 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>NN 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>NN 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_VB 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 Corputool_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 the_DT statistics_NNS in_IN Corputool_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 the_DT CEFR_NNP needs_VBZ reviewing_VBG _.
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The_DT article_NN ``_`` Information_NNP Structure_NN :_: The_DT final_JJ hurdle_NN ?_: The_DT development_NN of_IN IN syntactic_JJ structures_NNS in_IN -LRB-_: LRB-
very_RB -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 PRPS research NN on IN a DT corpus NN of IN English-German NNP translations NNS _,_ and CC Doherty NNP supports VBZ their PRPS 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 JJ S 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 PRPS 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 PRPS 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 PRPS 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 PRPS 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, such as the mean length of utterance -MLU- of previously published articles on this subject focus on children with Specific Language Impairment -SLI-, and how they often experience an extended stage of optional infinitive production. I intend to focus, however, on children without any impairments, although I might make some comparisons occasionally. The possible presence of a correlation between the size of a child's MLU and the extent to which they use optional infinitives will be my main point of focus. In "The acquisition of Dutch" syntax, Wijnen and Verrips have done extensive research into the use of optional infinitives, and its potential relation to the mean length of utterance. I expect to derive a great deal of information from their work. Schaerlaekens' textbook on children's language development includes a couple of sections in which she explains in basic terms how optional infinitives function and what their purpose is. I will study her work for essential background information. Furthermore, I intend to analyse the works of Haegeman -1995-, Krämer -1993-, Wexler -1994-, and Freudenthal et al. -2006-. My hypothesis is that children that use finite verbs are capable of producing longer sentences than when they were still using non-finite verbs in places where grammar dictates using finite verbs. It seems only logical that a child that knows how and when to apply finiteness will also be able to incorporate objects and perhaps even adjectives and adverbs into the sentence, thus extending the mean length.
I intend to test my hypothesis by analysing many transcripts in CHILDES. My schedule allows, and then comparing to the transcripts it has found in academic articles. My contribution will probably be minimal, since I will not be aggregating child speech data. However, I hope 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.

RAD1280

The Common European Framework for Reference for language - CEFR is a guideline which is used to describe students' proficiency during the process and eventual result or fossilization when acquiring a foreign language. The CEFR levels range from A1 being a beginner and C2 being the highest level possible. CEFR is often used in educational contexts, and learners, language teachers, and employers find the framework very helpful in setting the curricular system in various countries and regions. In many countries, it claims that the CEFR is, of course, not perfect, but it is good enough to be improved upon and developed further. Hulstijn claims that the CEFR is, of course, not perfect, but it is good enough to be improved upon and developed further.
In order to find out what exactly can be improved, the main research question will try to find an answer. In which ways CEFR is used in evaluating second language learners and how this framework can be improved. Hulstijn, Anderson and others have suggested that the CEFR is a good initiative, but is not yet perfect and needs improvement. This research question will look at how the CEFR framework is used by language learners and teachers and might show what aspects of the framework work as hoped and what can be improved. After finding what can be improved about the framework, a proposal to certain changes can be made, which in turn may lead to a better functioning CEFR. Previous research has shown that the CEFR is a good starting point. Some say it is far from perfect and needs more improvement whilst others say, including CEFR itself, that this project has been set up to develop Reference Level Descriptions specifically for English, but Alderson claims that this project was flawed from the beginning because of its narrow focus on students who have taken a Cambridge ESOL exam.

Another study which is all about Anchor Items for Foreign Language Skills, it aims to be more transparent.
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_JJR 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 clip and afterwards they have to describe what they saw in the clip. After that, the experimenter will ask a set of five questions in order to get some spontaneous speech produced by the students. To round off the experiment there will be a short questionnaire in which there will be questions about what they thought about the experiment, about CEF and what they find difficult whilst using CEFR as a framework. The oral experiments will be recorded and the students, the teachers, and the native speakers of English will be asked to assign a CEFR level to each student. After all the data has been collected, I will analyze the data and see whether there are any differences between the assigned CEFR levels. Through the motivation which students, teachers and native speakers gave, I will try to find out what the choice was for that specific level. Ideally for this research, students, teachers, and native speakers will think that a student could be assigned two different levels. Based on this information, combined with the teachers' and CC native speakers' motivation for a specific level, and the questionnaires about the functionality of CEFR, I will try to redefine or improve the descriptions of the CEFR levels.
Before we can discuss the situation of French education today and in the recent past we should look at its history as this helps to explain the elitism in the system. We need to go back to the late 18th century when Napoleon put forward his views on education. He believed that people should be educated in order for the state to run smoothly. He did not really believe in the right of people to be educated just in the need of the state for people to be educated. As most of the population were involved in agriculture at that time, there was only need for a very basic primary education for the majority of people. This left mainly up to the church as he believed the church would promote social cooperation. Secondary and Higher education were more important as these would train the professionals which the country needed, and this section of education was therefore run by the state. At this stage we can already see the opportunity for a gap between primary and secondary education which remained in fact until relatively recently, despite attempts at reforms which I will go into later. This system of education did not lead to much social mobility as the children from poorer social backgrounds left school after primary, “école primaire” , whereas the children from richer backgrounds could go on to secondary and higher education. These “bourgeois” children would then go on to Lycée and either to University or “Les Grandes”
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 VBN linked VBN to TO the DT Lycées NNP 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 NN 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 -_: prévend'études_NNS professionelles_NNS . After_IN two_CD years_NNS you_PRP receive_VBP a_DT CEP_NN -_: certificat_NN d'enseignements_NNS professionelles_NNS and_CC after_IN 3_CD years_NNS a_DT CAP_NN -_: certificat_NN d'aptitude_NN professionelles_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 study_NN for_IN 1_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 JJJ 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 VB 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'Estaing 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 cur-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>NN _. The_DT fact_NN that_IN the_DT men>NN in_IN the_DT society>NN left_VBD to_TO fight_VB meant_VBN that_IN the_DT number>NN of_IN births>NN 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>NN ,_, 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>NN 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>NN 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>NN War>NN _. In_IN this_DT war>NN France_NNP did_VBD not_RB suffer_VB as_RB many_JJ casualties>NN and_CC deaths>NN 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>NN 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 depleated_JJ _. There_EX was_VBD an_DT urgent_JJ call>NN for_IN immigrant_JJ workers>NN 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>NN came_VBD home>NN ,_, and_CC families>NN 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 ._. The_DT gouvernment_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 medecine 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 payments being made for third children, other payments being greatly increased. This does not seem to have won over the current materialism of the society of today. If the graph studied than we can see that demography is definitely related to the economic, cultural and social trends of a country. The current situation of the population today is that there are more old people in society than young, and that when the children born during the baby boom reach old age, there will be more old people than young, which may lead to an "immobilisme" of society where there are no new ideas and fresh blood. Recent studies show that marriage is now being favoured again, and not being delayed as it was earlier, although there are no signs that materialism is decreasing, and with the current economic situation, where there is great job instability and high unemployment there is not today, a very favourable environment to encourage birth, even though all possible is being done to encourage it as regards allowances, lodging, job security, and child-minding. France is again in difficulty, and it remains to be seen when it will be able to remedy the situation, as mainly the economic situation is the problem. The roots of the problems in higher education lie with Napoleon's policy on education which was to educate a well-trained small elite to run the country, while guaranteeing that the country remained.
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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 VBN entitled VBN through IN the DT constitution NN to TO a DT university NN education NN _, the DT system NN is VBN still RB characterised VBN by IN major JJ inequalities NNS _. The DT system NN of IN non-selection JJ for IN all DT univerisity JJ courses NNS -LRB- _-LRB- with IN a DT few JJ exceptions NNS such JJ as_IN dentistry NN and CC medecine 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 VBN 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 VBD 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 VBD 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 VBN little JJ scope NN for IN cross JJ fertilization NN of IN disciplines NNS _. A DT licence NN _, does VBD 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_VB 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 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 ex-students_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 enroled_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 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, courses in the Grande Ecoles are far more general in nature and they have established a network of links in industry and with the business world. A graduate of a Grande Ecole will be set up for life, not only by the guarantee of a good job but also through the "old-boys" network, through which graduates from the same school will always do each other favours. Higher education is still the privilege of the middle and upper classes, with only about 6% of the university population coming from working class backgrounds, compared to 30% in British Universities. This is even more accentuated in the Grande Ecoles, which are largely the domain of the children of "cadres supérieurs," male, and from the Parisian region. Attempts have been made to make higher education more accessible, for example the establishment of the University of Vincennes for non-bacheliers and through the introduction of "Instituts Universitaires de Technologie" which lead to diplomas with a technical and vocational bias. However, the snobbery within the French system meant that these qualifications were accredited with low prestige. However, employers are now beginning to accept them. It has been argued that the Universityes are the "car-parks" for the student proletariat, while "Les Grandes Ecoles"...
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 outdated_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 ._.
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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-_:_, 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_PRPS 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- Conféderation_NNP Générale_NNP du_NNP Travail_NNP -RRB-_:_. RRB- the_DT
largest JJS union with ca_MID 1.2_CD million members -LRB- ...-LRB- it_PRP claims_VBZ more_RBR -RRB- -RRB- has_VBZ always_RB had_VBN strong_JJ communist_NN affiliations ... 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- -LRB- _-LRB- Force_NN Ouvrière_NN -RRB- -RRB- has_VBZ a DT more_RBR reformist_JJ stance_NN _,_ and_CC the_DT FO_NN -LRB- -LRB- -LRB- 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 had_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 patrimoinial_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 witness a lot of patronat control, an excess of `_`` contractualisation '_'' : patronat agreements with individual workers, a lack of collective negotiations, despite the comité d'entreprise. The unions, in particular the CGT, spent its time showing its allegiance to the international proletariat and the Soviet Communists by organising sporadic, ineffective one-day strikes which were ineffective. Then in 1968, as a result of the massive demonstrations and frustration, the unions won the right to organize at the workplace. Union members were ceded noticeboards and a greater part in negotiations. In 1973 at the time of the first oil shock, the CGT saw this as a chance to finally bring down capitalism and used strikes to exacerbate the government's attempts to bring down inflation. The unions demanded higher salaries but in the face of high inflation and unemployment, these demands were totally unrealistic. The patronat began to get annoyed and between 1975 and 1977 refused categorically to discuss salaries, a reduction in working week and holidays with the unions. Union membership fell drastically as employees tried desperately to cling on to their jobs by agreeing to any type of contract with the patronat. When Mitterrand came to power in 1981, despite the lack of links between French unions and the Socialist party, the unions were hopeful that workers' rights would improve. The French government has always been interventionist and in truth, workers have done better from state legislation than from the political games of the unions.

In 1982, we see a turning point in French industrial
Firstly, the DT workers were granted the long-awaited reduction in working hours to 39 a week. There was to be a `Réglement Intérieur` stating all rules of firm practice, so that employees would know when they were infringing on their employers’ terms. Any discipline case could be referred to the `Conseil de Prud’hommes`, to assure that there had not been arbitrary disciplining and that the penalty fitted the infringement: Workers had the right to elect their own members to this body. The right of negotiation and wage-bargaining by the unions was extended to firms of less than 50 employees, and the comité d’entreprise had now to discuss salaries and working hours on an annual basis. Union representatives were protected from discrimination by hostile bosses, and granted the right to do union work on firm time: in some cases they even got offices. With the new change in negotiations and as a result of the oil shocks, there was also a change in the bosses’ attitudes. There has been an increase in the number of `patron Saint-Simoniens` who have begun to realise the potential of a cooperative and happy workforce. Workers also have the right to express their opinions directly to management as a result of the loi Auroux, instead of having to go via the comité d’entreprise or their `délégué syndical`. There were management-inspired improvements to working conditions and Labour relations.
Two examples of such enlightened bosses were Carayon and Bougeneaux. Carayon tried to reduce monotony by forming production teams in semi-autonomous groups, so that the workers could fulfill projects completing between learning from each other, giving each worker a sense of achievement and worth, and team spirit. This move was successful in increasing productivity and is widely adopted in France, although the CGT were suspicious and had him removed from power. Bougeneaux used staff-participation schemes to encourage staff to participate in the running of their firm, to increase innovation, and a sense of belonging. This worked well too.

The Eighties marked the era of individualism, when workers preferred to form individual links with bosses rather than collective negotiation. This may be because, as union membership fell, the unions appeared weak and the unions have lost power. They organised strikes as a measure of protest against the politique d'austérité in 1983, but apart from the disruptions of 1986 over salaries, have been fairly inactive. French industrial relations have been characterized by a strong authoritative patronat but one which has evolved in the face of economic pressure; a state which protects workers by intervening in otherwise largely hostile relationships; and a series of individual agreements between management and workers which looks as if it will continue throughout the 90's.
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 predudices 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 JJ 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 NNP 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 strucked 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- -RRB- PCF_NN -RRB- PCF_NN -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- -RRB- 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 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- -RRB- Confédération_NN française_NN démocratique_NN du_NNP travail_NN -RRB- -RRB- . This_DT is_VBZ a_DT group_NN form_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_NN Socialiste_NN -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 rise_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 present relations improving. TU membership in France is approximation 3-4 million. French unionization was approximately 23% in the 70s and has fallen to around 11% now. Collective-bargaining has been introduced but is very difficult due to all the representatives needed from each TU. The government began very interventionalist in its efforts to rebuild the economy. It also had to act as a go-between for the employers and employees who refused to get on: the employers refused to recognize the trade unions as legitimate and safe partners. Relations remained hostile and unco-operative until the events of May 1968 frightened the employers into believing there would be a revolution. They therefore began to listen more closely to employees, speaking directly and so making the Trade Unions redundant. The TUs were at the time not being looked on favourably, after accepting the Grenelle agreements proposed immediately after the events of May 1968. The workers felt that they had been compromised. The elections of 1986 were a first, as the trade unions gave no specific indications or directions to their members, as previously done, on how to vote. The CGT were doubtful of the Communists success, which was well anticipated as they did not do too healthily. It seems very doubtful that any trade union will ever gain concessions from a government, be it left or right. Employers regret the lack of unionism and have no leadership; concession groups led by political activists usually...
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 are_VBP consultative_JJ bodies_NNS .
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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- ,_, 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 `_`` baccalauréat_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 _. Chevènement NNP aimed_VBD more_RBR at_IN reconstructing_VBG than_IN reforming_VBG _, with_IN the DT encouragement NN of_IN an_DT `_`` école_JJ démocratique_NN `_`` as_IN opposed_VBN to_TO the_DT idea NN of_IN `_`` école_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 Collège 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 Lycée NNP but_CC instead_RB encouraged_VBD to_TO find_VB a_DT job NN at_IN an_DT earlier JJ 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 lycée 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 attatched_VBN to_TO it_PRP because_IN acquiring_VBG a_DT `_`` bacalauréat_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
Another DT course NN ,_, which WDT leads VBZ to TO the DT ``` Certificat NNP d'aptitude NNP professionel 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 liklihood 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 JJJS 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_VZB 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_VZB 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 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>NN of_IN merit>NN but_CC to_TO a_DT certain_JJ extent>NN in_IN terms>NN 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>NNN and_CC Cambridge>NNN do_VBP take_VB on_RP students>NN 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>NN in_IN policies>NN ,_, 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>NNN 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 VBG not RB at IN the DT mercy NN of IN Parliament NNP . yet RB is VBG 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 Presidnet 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 be seen to overlap with the President’s function to ensure the smooth running of the country, assigned to him by Article 5.

This was open to varying interpretation. The maximalist interpretation was generally accepted. This meant that the President, instead of being limited to the ‘domaine réservé’, i.e. the powers attributed to him under the Constitution, he was justified by virtue of this article in intervening in policy-making and its implementation. The President was also independent in carrying out this function: he was not accountable to Parliament by virtue of Article 68 and not even directly accountable to it via ministers or the Prime Minister for their ‘contreseing’—was not required by him. Whereas it had previously been the normal French practice and was that of other European democracies to confer the most significant powers to those most accountable, this was not the case under the 5th Republic at least while the President was supported by a parliamentary majority. Under these circumstances the President has been largely free to fulfil this maximalist interpretation and thus be assumed to be the head of the Executive. This ‘gouvernement présidentiel’ can be explained for various factors. Because of de Gaulle’s enigma, the wish of the French people and a friendly and somewhat submissive relationship between de Gaulle and his Prime Minister it was soon realized that the President’s role would surpass that as outlined in the Constitution. De Gaulle realized that the President could lose this position in two situations: if...
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_PRPs 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_PRPs 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_PRPs 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_PRPs 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 interventionalist_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 deforming>NN of_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP as_IN his_PRPs 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_PRPs `:\` 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 ,_, Mitterand_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, as followed by the oil crisis in 1975, their demands would be ineffective and membership would drop. This is what happened in France. Membership fell as the unions deemed ineffective in securing worker demands. The unions have always been political in nature which limited their membership. Once membership dropped, those who were left tended to be those who identified with the political views of the unions. Before 1968, unions were not legally allowed in the workplace in France and there were few negotiations. The little that was was at a general and regional level far removed from the average worker's demands, and this did not help the falling membership numbers. Employers ended up being suspicious of unions and did not see them as a valuable means of worker representation. This was because the great majority of firms in France were small family concerns which had sprung up in the 19th century. The boss was seen as a patriarch who should not be challenged. The period of industrial relations in France under the 5th Republic can be divided into three periods. During this time, the State was highly interventionist in its approach to the economy, regulating pay and price levels and investing in and developing the economy. Employers were wary of unions, so the state had to act as an intermediary between them. However in May 1968 there were worker strikes and riots, and employers saw their PRPs...
authority in question, and were forced to stand down. Trade unions were legalised in the workplace. As well as being legitimised in the workplace, unions could also put up candidates for the "comités d'entreprise" - a sort of joint employee/employer council for discussion and debate - and for the "comités d'entreprise" - a sort of joint employee/employer council for discussion and debate - and for the industrial tribunals. Their powers were dramatically increased therefore, paradoxically at a time when membership was beginning to fall. The Genelle Agreements also raised minimum pay and pay in certain industries - e.g. the railway industry. From this time on employers became more modernist in their thinking and trade unions could get the changes they wanted by negotiating collective contracts. The prominent positions in the CNPF were taken by this new generation of entrepreneurs. It should be mentioned here that the CNPF is an organisation set up in 1946 to protect employers. With the oil shock and ensuing recession of 1973, the third period in French industrial relations began. The recession, and the increased competition from the Common Market meant that firms had to increase their productivity and competitiveness, and this meant laying off workers. The trade unions were powerless to stop the rising unemployment, and were often wrongfooted as they could not gain better pay for their members during the recession. This meant membership would fall. When the socialists came to power in 1981 with the election of Mitterrand, no one was quite sure how they would act in the field of industrial relations. As it turned out, the Auroux Laws of 1982 and 1983 completely modernised industrial
relations and changed a third of the code du travail. The Auroux laws had four main aspects. The first was that employees would now be able to voice their opinions directly via trade union channels and collectively, and employers would be forced to listen to their points of view. Secondly, discrimination against a worker would not be allowed. The company would have to draw up rules for a code of practice, which would be made known to all employees and to the Ministry. Thirdly, if an employee did something wrong, he could not be punished arbitrarily. He was to be invited to attend a preliminary interview with his employer to see what he had done wrong, and could have a union representative present if he so wished. Presiously only industrial tribunals could help employees. Finally, there was great encouragement to collective bargaining. It was hoped that negotiation would become a regular part of industrial relations, not just something used in crisis situations. Any firm with over 100 employees could have a comité d'entreprise and should negotiate regularly on a firm level. There would also be industry negotiations every so often to decide pay levels in the sector. However, the Auroux laws on collective bargaining were not compulsory and could only act as an encouragement. But it is encouraging to see negotiation becoming a more normal and everyday part of industrial relations. The collective bargaining which was used at the "height of the unions success" was not without weaknesses. The DT negotiations were often carried out at a DT general.
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_PRPs 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 _._
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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 and create a strong Executive, which, he hoped he would lead. His importance in shaping the 1958 constitution can not be overestimated and, though it can be said that the 1958 constitution was tailor-made for him as a result of constitutional amendment and changes in political life. On drafting the text two conflicting notions had to be reconciled. De Gaulle favoured a return to the old Bonapartist tradition of the President having full, almost omnipotent powers but others fearing this style of power concentrated in the hands of just one source wanted the government to have more power. A compromise was reached in which power would be shared by a strong Executive comprising a president and a cabinet headed by a Prime Minister responsible to Parliament. De Gaulle ended by strengthening the Executive in favour of the presidency and his interpretation of the most ambiguous word in the text, "arbitrage" has been untouched for more than 30 years. In Article 5 the word "arbitrage" can be interpreted differently: on one hand it can mean that the president is an impartial observer and does not deal with problems but on the other hand it can mean that he is in charge of the daily run of the country, obviously having a more dynamic and interventionist role. De Gaulle chose the second interpretation and quickly established presidential preeminence and authority. This interpretation has been upheld by his successors and the Gaullist legacy has continued. What then were his powers and how have they...
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_PRP 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 , ruthless_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- _-RRB- 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_PRPS 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 reasons behind de Gaulle’s and Pompidou’s success to keep presidential authority strong lies in the large majority enjoyed by the Gaullists. This was the key and cornerstone to presidential preeminence. In 1974 Valéry Giscard d’Estaing, Pompidou’s former Finance Minister, narrowly beat the socialist candidate, François Mitterrand, to become the 3rd president of the Fifth Republic. D’Estaing further enhanced the presidency by embracing social and environmental fields. He promoted an advanced liberal society and succeeded in the social domain to reduce the voting age to 18, legalise female contraception and abortion and he retained his tight hold over the financial area. In the environmental field he promoted protection of the environment, by obstructing plans to build concrete motorways and ugly edifices and maintained the natural beauty of the French countryside. François Mitterrand has seen his party, the socialists, occupying seats in the opposition and has thus been forced to “cohabit” with his non-socialist Prime Minister, M. Rocard, and divide some of the powers between him. Mitterrand has also been obliged to fall back on the text of the constitution where in articles 20 and 21 it states the prime Minister deals with the nation’s affairs. The ambiguity of the text has favoured the presidency according to the political climate at the time. Presidential authority has been the most salient factor of the 5th Republic and since de Gaulle the office has grown in strength, prestige and has enhanced powers ranging from Chief policy maker in defence and foreign affairs, modernising the French economy and
advocating an advanced liberal society. Under Mitterrand, we have seen the nationalisation of firms and a new balance of power in Parliament. The text is more adhered to now as Mitterrand has not got a majority to back up his policies in Parliament. But he still enjoys the privileges and wields power in the same manner as his predecessors.
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When General de Gaulle came to power in 1958, it was generally expected that the role of president would be given a new status in the policy of decision making. De Gaulle's speech and subsequent centrings made it clear that a clearly visible president was required, who would be the 'keystone' to the parliamentary régime. The constitution of 1958 honoured this, by placing the President first among the members of parliament. There is however a fundamental difference between the powers that the constitution and those that those who drafted it gave the President and the powers that he subsequently acquired. The result is a very interesting example of how circumstances and personality can change the constitution. The constitution had originally left the power to dissolve parliament would, according to Michel Debré, only allow a short exchange with the public. According to the constitution, the President was only to assume the role of constitutional dictator in times of grave trouble.

When the President was VBG an advanced liberal society. Under Mitterrand, we have seen the nationalisation of firms and a new balance of power in Parliament. The text is more adhered to now as Mitterrand has not got a majority to back up his policies in Parliament. But he still enjoys the privileges and wields power in the same manner as his predecessors.
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When General de Gaulle came to power in 1958, it was generally expected that the role of president would be given a new status in the policy of decision making. De Gaulle's speech and subsequent centrings made it clear that a clearly visible president was required, who would be the 'keystone' to the parliamentary régime. The constitution of 1958 honoured this, by placing the President first among the members of parliament. There is however a fundamental difference between the powers that the constitution and those that those who drafted it gave the President and the powers that he subsequently acquired. The result is a very interesting example of how circumstances and personality can change the constitution. The constitution had originally left the power to dissolve parliament would, according to Michel Debré, only allow a short exchange with the public. According to the constitution, the President was only to assume the role of constitutional dictator in times of grave trouble.
Michel Debré said that the role of President was to be that of an arbiter, to oversee the constitution, and beyond politics and the political parties. This seems somewhat unrealistic. Neither the war in Algeria, nor the personality of de Gaulle would let him be the arbiter of the constitution. The referendum in 1962 gave the President the legitimacy of the public vote. Now he was directly answerable to the people. In 1964 Charles de Gaulle realistically defined his role as President. He was still prepared to play the role of arbiter when absolutely necessary. According to him he was the head of Parliament and no other institution either social or judiciary was higher than him. He saw parliament as sitting around him. According to him, article 16 was the absolute defence of “La Patrie”. Because of Article twelve, the President can dissolve Parliament at any time that he thinks is opportune to him and so he can directly interfere with the organisation of Parliament. When he thinks that the constitution is being abused, he can enroll the conseil constitutionnel, and according to de Gaulle, when the conseil Constitutionnel cannot be used, as arbiter of the constitution, the President can interfere himself. General de Gaulle himself only ever used article 16 once when their trouble in Algiers, and order was quickly restored. The President can be tried for high treason. It has been shown however that in times of trouble, those in power of communications often regain control. This...
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 primeJJ 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 betwen_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
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 prime_JJ ministers_NNS and_CC the_DT 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- 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- _. 
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Whatever it became clear that the case strengthened presidential power and made the executive responsible to parliament. Before discussing the ambiguity and the role of the president I will briefly mention the functions of the prime minister. Much of his original power as defined by the constitution has been usurped by successive presidents and their interpretation of their function such that now his main role is to take interest in areas which do not interest the president, coordinate government policy, liaise with parliament to enable the smooth passing of a law, maintain friendly contact with the largest coalition party, and arbitrate in conflicts between coalition parties. The original role given to the president of the 5th Republic was a continuation of that of the 4th Republic in that he could nominate and dismiss the prime minister and other ministers, he is chairman of the Constitutional Council, he can negotiate and ratify international treaties, sign decrees, promulgate laws and grant pardons. However, the constitution did not allow for an extension of the role granting him new powers; for example, the ability to dissolve the national assembly and ask the Constitual Council to judge on the constitutionality of a law—previously the prime minister’s role. It is because of article 5 that the definition of the president’s functions is ambiguous because in this article the president can either be directly involved in or kept apart from decision making and is sufficiently vague to have allowed successive presidents to interpret it as they wished. Whatever the aim of the initiators...
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 patromony 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 war. For the first four years of the Republic it was Algeria...
which kept the other political parties from acting against de Gaulle and other political parties. He allowed VBN to abuse the constitution, consolidate his personal position and strengthen his office. Despite using his own personality to expand his role, he did not leave some decision making to his ministers. He was mainly responsible for foreign and defence policies, colonial and French community questions and economic questions. Having failed in his aims with the referendum of 1969, de Gaulle resigned but the practice was firmly established for his successor, Pompidou to use it to gain power over and alongside parliament. He continued to rule in the same way as de Gaulle which surprised a lot of people showing how "Gaullist" tradition has become embedded in the 5th Republic. He used the referendum in '72 with reference to UK entry into the EC and to dismiss Chaban-Dalmas. Pompidou expanded the role of foreign and economic and industrial policies. He was obsessed with the economical development of France and transforming the nation into a great industrial power. He was responsible for the devaluation of the franc in '69 but did not give a lot of control to his ministers. Giscard d'Estaing came to power in 1974 and increased the role of the president once more, showing how it has evolved over time. He was unwilling to relinquish any of the previous presidential powers and added to this his own special fields of finance, social and environmental questions. He was more centrist and interventionist. He nominated Chirac as his prime minister but Chirac did not like the way the president intervened so much so he resigned. He was
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 defait_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_N ,_, 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 the_DT government_NN ._. Certain_JJ function_NN defined_VBN in_IN the_DT Constitution_NNP but_CC is_VBZ rather_RB ambiguous_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_PRPs 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
The term ‘arbiter’ is sufficiently vague to allow presidents to interpret it as they wish. De Gaulle claimed it empowered him to rule the nations and his successors all acted as if it meant playing an interventionist role. According to the constitution the president has five basic functions. He is the ceremonial head of state, the head of the executive, guardian of the national interest, the spokesman of the government and lastly the appointer of the prime minister and other key people in key positions. The presidential interpretation of the last point has been rather elastic. Not only have prime ministers been appointed, they have been dismissed. According to this article, the president appoints ministers with the aid of the Prime Minister but over time the president needs merely the formal consent of the prime minister. So the priority given to these functions has very much depended on the personality and temperment of the presidents. General Charles De Gaulle was the first president of the fifth Republic. He was elected in 1958 and stayed in power for ten years. He argued that the reason for the collapse of the Fourth Republic was the lack of a strong executive authority. Too much power was given to the parliament and not enough to the president. The president could only exercise his power depending on the mood of the parliament. De Gaulle had seen his beloved country collapse - the squabbling politicans of the 30's, the cowardice of the political élite in the 40s and
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 interferred_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_W 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_PRPs speeches_NNS and_CC his_PRPs 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_PRPs 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 domains_VBZ he_PRP would_MD intervene_VB in_IN _-_. So_RB although_IN De_NNP Gaulle_NNP defined_VBD his_PRPs 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 _-_.
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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 Giscard_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>NN 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>NN 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>NN since_IN being_VBG an_DT ex-banker>NN he_PRP was_VBD interested_JJ in_IN these_DT issues>NN __. In_IN 1973_CD Valéry>NN Giscard>NN NNP D'Estaing>NNPS came_VBD to_TO power>NN __. Having_VBG been_VBN finance>NN minister>NN under_IN Pompidou>NN 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>NN __. However_RB in_IN 1976_CD Raymond>NNN Barre>NNNP was_VBD appointed_VBN Finance>NNNP Minister>NNNP and_CC he_PRP was_VBD not_RB as_IN accommodating_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
financeal_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 ._. Mitsérand_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
Mitsérand_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 ''_"
__. Mitsérand_NNP was_VBD obliged_VBN to_TO fall_VB back_RB to_TO the_DT
powers_NNS of_IN the_DT presidential_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 mecanism_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 of coalition governments whose power had been very limited due to endless compromises of its constituent elements, there was a real need in France for a strong government base. Matters had come to a head in 1958 with the uprising and unrest in Algeria. De Gaulle had outlined his plans for the constitution in 1946 with his famous speech at Bayeux, but he had slipped back into the shadows of the Fourth Republic. De Gaulle and the referendum passing the new constitution received an 85% "yes" vote. This was in sharp contrast to the apathetic 53% vote on a 35% second turn out which marked the start of the Fourth Republic. The new constitution of the Fifth Republic aimed to separate the legislative, executive and judiciary, with the powers of the executive not stemming from the executive. If there had been any doubt, which there had about exactly where the power lay, then De Gaulle by his very actions soon began to show who was in charge. There are several bones of contention about the definition of the Presidents' functions. Firstly article 16 grants the President special powers in times of national emergency. However, there is no distinguishing criteria for what constitutes a national emergency. In 1961 De Gaulle used these special powers. The cause of the time of emergency according to De Gaulle was in Algeria but this was strigently debated at the
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 NNP - , 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 PRPS 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 VZVZ 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 PRPS 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 NNP$ 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 Gaulle 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 Gaulle 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 Gaulle 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-.-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 VBJ now RB the DT second JJ longest JJJS 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 5th Republic and its ability to overcome the severity of problems.
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Much of this ambiguity arose from the fact that the Constitution was a compromise between presidentialisme and parlementarism. The President was given the traditional powers of the Head of State as well as becoming the `chef de l'Etat`, a similar role to that of our Queen, and as well as becoming the Chief of the army. He was given a lot of power through articles such as 8, 12 and 1 of the Constitution as he did not need the `contreseing` of the Prime Minister or other ministers responsible.

De Gaulle used this to his advantage and after appointing Michel Debré in 1958 he was forced to withdraw from this position in 1962. De Gaulle saw him as a good Prime Minister in war time but after the Algerian war he decided to sack him effectively.

In choosing Georges Pompidou instead of Debré, De Gaulle set a precedent in that he created a `domaine reservé` for the President in which the Prime Minister was not to interfere. The President was 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 Minster_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 universel_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 `:` __
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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 ` _ ` ` divid_VB l'action_NN 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 to_TO receive_VB larger_JJR powers_NNS and_CC develope_VB his_PRP$ rôle_NN ._. When_WRB Giscard_NNP d'Estaing_NN came_VBD to_TO power_NN in_IN 1974_CD he_PRP claims_VBZ 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 develope_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_VB 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 had been elected in 1975 and had a majority for the left and used Article 12 to dissolve it. The ambiguities such as Article 34 and 37 over the way legislation is past also gave wide reaching powers to the President. All it is ambiguous nature of the Constitution, resulting from the compromise it tried to make, that led to a great development in the role of the President in the 5th Republic mainly under the precedent set by Charles de Gaulle.

Demography is the study of population and its general character has on a country’s society and economy. Demographists claim it is a major factor in considering the problems of that country’s evolution - for example, it is thought that many of France’s problems during the twentieth century have been caused by a premature decline in the birth rate in the nineteenth century, and the consequent ageing of the population. At the beginning of the 19th century France had the largest population in Europe, after Russia, and was a major world power. Since this time, both its power and population in relation to the rest of Europe, have been in steady decline. By the beginning of the 19th century only Germany was one of the reasons why Germany felt confident of victory. During both World Wars France not only lost thousands of men, but the birth rate also dropped dramatically. During the economic crisis and depression between the...
the birthrate was also low, because little hope for the future and so people couldn't afford large families. The consequence of these factors was that by the end of the second world war, the adult population in France was greatly reduced. It was at this time that the birth rate suddenly increased, with the Babyboom. Between 1946 and 1964 the birth rate increased 20%. This was due to decreasing infant mortality, the introduction of social security and family benefits, a new optimism for the future, and an abandoning of former Malthusian attitudes, in favour of a more dynamic outlook. The birth rate had begun to increase before the end of the war, as people took a care-free attitude, with little feeling of responsibility. At the same time, the death rate was decreasing, due to advances in medicine and living conditions. This meant that the number of old people was steadily increasing. So, after the war, there was a reduced number of adults, to look after and produce goods for, and an increased number of children and old people. This, and the need to build the economy, led to the influx of immigrant workers into France, which led to many of today's problems with immigrants. During the fifties, the school system had to be adapted to provide for the Babyboom; by the end of the 60's, they had reached the Universities, which became overcrowded and inadequate to meet the needs of the thousands of extra students. This was one of the direct causes of May '68, along with the fact that there was no...
guarantee of a job afterwards, with so many students competing. The Babyboom generation is now working and so the country benefits from the taxes they are paying. But, at the same time, with an ever decreasing death rate and an ever increasing number of old people, the Treasury has to pay vast sums in pensions and care for the elderly. Since the end of the Babyboom, the birthrate has declined again due to the legalisation of contraception and abortion, and the fact that many people see having less children as a way to better their standard of living. At present, the birth rate is around 13.6, while the death rate is about 9. This means that the base of the pyramid of ages is being eroded away. The consequences are that the population is becoming top heavy, with a smaller number of taxpayers having to provide for a larger number of old people. This has been worsened by the lowering of the retirement age to 60. Furthermore, the strain on the taxpayers can only continue to get worse, unless this trend is reversed. This is why many French people now support a policy of encouraging people to have children to halt the greying population. The consequence for business is that it has had to adapt its production away from baby products to those required by the older generations, in particular medical supplies. They are also having to pay more to their older workers, due to their age even though they do not produce any more than the decreasing number of young people.
The French higher education system has always been of a hierarchical nature and divided. It was so before mai 68, and despite attempts at reform, it has been determined to remain so. Before 1968, French universities were overcrowded - the number of students rose from 122,000 in 1936 to 612,000 in 1968, centralized and impersonal. In response to the events of 68, the Faure reforms were drawn up. They abolished old universities as such, and gave them the opportunity to form themselves into `unités d’enseignements et de recherche'. They formed their own councils, and could group themselves into new universities. These universities had their own councils made up of staff, teaching and non-teaching, and student delegates. They elected the President who fulfilled a similar role to that of the British Vice-Chancellor. The Faure reforms gave the universities a framework within which to create a new system of university education and to create new personalities for themselves. These reforms dealt with the centralized and impersonal aspects. But the universities could not cope with their new powers. They reverted back to their interdepartmental wrangling, and when it came to joining together to form universities, the subjects dominated by the Left, such as sociology, did not want to combine with those dominated by more Right-wing professors. The apolitical sciences did not want to be `contaminated' by the Left-wingers. Within the new universities, the departments were out to protect their own.
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 , FW 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_VBD 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-_
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- the_DT sixième_NN year_NN -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 _`` sixième_NN études_NNS '``_.'_, 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_PRPs needs_NNS -LRB- the_DT prestigious_JJ lycée_NN and_CC the_DT College_NNP d'Enseignement_NNP Général_NNP ,_, 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 ,_, a_DT 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_PRPs efforts_NNS were_VBD a_DT failure_NN ._. The_DT creation_NN of_IN 3_CD ``` filières_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 _`` poubelle_NN '``_.'' of_IN the_DT system_NN ._. These_DT two_CD reforms_NNS came_VBD at_IN the_DT time_NN of_IN any_DT kind_NN and_CC prevented_VBD proper_JJ reforms_NNS -_: giving_VBG away_RP 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
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little to conserve a great deal. School pupils became disillusioned, seeing the school as an agent of social discrimination. The lycées were for the bourgeois, cadres supérieurs, while schools of children of the 'ouvrier' got nowhere near higher education. It seemed that equality of opportunity and high academic standards were incompatible. The demonstrations of May 68 led to an era of dialogue between parents, teachers and government. The resulting Haby reforms brought about the 'tronc commun', where over 50% of pupils now attended. This type of 'école unique' had been demanded by idealists such as Compagnons de l'Université over 50 years before. It involved mixed ability teaching up to the age of 16, an attempt at ensuring equality of opportunity was obtained. But schools found ways of streaming pupils. When Beullac became minister in 1978, he was instructed not to apply the Haby laws rigidly and there was discretion as to how far schools could stream their pupils. Haby had said that his reform involved 'the same opportunities in every satchel' but was criticised for subordinating education to the needs of the economy, producing a versatile but poorly qualified workforce and providing education on the level of the 'SMIC culturel'. Elitism was reintroduced as able pupils were able to take German lessons. Under the Socialists since 1981, the move to integrate private schools into the State system was dropped under public pressure and now 17% of pupils are members of that clique.
Savary left office to be Chevenement who advocated return to the conservative values of discipline & hard work, while introducing modern technological subjects. But government was trying to fit new reforms into the existing system and lycées remained virtually unchanged. For the less privileged child, the outlook is still grim. He has a 43% chance of getting to higher education, as opposed to 80% for the child of a `cadre supérieur'. In England, the chances of a working class child to progress is much higher, even in the elitist Oxbridge. With the introduction of GCSE's, the social stigma of having CSE's rather than O levels is removed, and there is less pressure to continue to A levels. In France, there is no half-way house. The baccalauréat is all-important, a national obsession, with those who do not obtain it becoming `zéros' and non-bacheliers. This segregation of `bacheliers' and `non-bacheliers' is likely to worsen as the Rocard government has stated its aim of 80% of pupils taking the bac by the year 2000. Critics, including the magazine Paris Match, see this creating a `ghetto du désespoir' as those without the bac will be discriminated against for the rest of their lives. The chances are that the majority of those `zéros will be of lower social categories, children of `ouvriers' or `salariés agricoles'. As it is, the percentage of these children having to repeat a year is 25% higher than those from better-off backgrounds. Secondary school now involves 2 years of observation, 2 of orientation and then to...
"brevets" of an English Technological College - the brevets gained at the L.E.P. do not gain as much admiration and prestige as they should, since the French are still bound by their academic tradition, high standards and élitism. Does this have to suffer at the expense of social equality? In England, selection to higher education is a fact of life. If you follow the theory that the higher the social class, the better the A level grades, then social selection may be a problem. But the comprehensive system with streaming and special help means that this is less likely. In France, the bac certificate is a ticket for university, without further selection. But social discrimination has already taken place, with the likelihood of a "lower class" pupil gaining the bac much lower than that of his more privileged contemporary. The English system has its elitist elements, the public school causing much controversy and often giving a child a better chance to progress to higher education. French has a history of elitism, since the time of Napoleon and is determined not to sacrifice its academic standards. But for the less privileged child, the education system, according to Charles Vial, has only a 6% chance of getting the prestigious C bac, if he is the child of a "salaried agricole". A balance must be struck to keep standards high and to ensure equality of opportunity. Even when these children make it to university, they are 50% more likely to fail their D.E.U.G. than...
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 existance_NN _:. However_RB the_DT CES_NNP 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_NN 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 VB 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 attatched 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 ressembles 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 `` JJ 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 earllier_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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag</th>
<th>Part of speech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>Coordinating conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Cardinal number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Existential <em>there</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW</td>
<td>Foreign word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Preposition or subordinating conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJR</td>
<td>Adjective, comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJS</td>
<td>Adjective, superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS</td>
<td>List item marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Modal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Noun, singular or mass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNS</td>
<td>Noun, plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Proper noun, singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPS</td>
<td>Proper noun, plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT</td>
<td>Predeterminer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td>Possessive ending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Personal pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPS</td>
<td>Possessive pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBR</td>
<td>Adverb, comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBS</td>
<td>Adverb, superlative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RP</td>
<td>Particle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYM</td>
<td>Symbol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td><em>to</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UH</td>
<td>Interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Verb, base form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBD</td>
<td>Verb, past tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBG</td>
<td>Verb, gerund or present participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBN</td>
<td>Verb, past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBP</td>
<td>Verb, non-3rd person singular present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBZ</td>
<td>Verb, 3rd person singular present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDT</td>
<td>Wh-determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Wh-pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPS</td>
<td>Possessive wh-pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRB</td>
<td>Wh-adverb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>