AFTV/FATFA Conference:

'Vivre le français au 21e siècle: transition innovation, collaboration',

Melbourne University 25 and 26 July 2014

Paper presented by Jane Zemiro and Alan Chamberlain

« Jeter le bébé avec l'eau du bain ? »

How useful are past language teaching approaches in today’s classrooms?
Teaching methodology, the procedures for engaging students and developing their knowledge and skills in a given subject, is a vital issue for all teachers, none more so than those in the second language field. Over the course of their career language teachers constantly evaluate the results of their teaching in the light of evolving ideas and practices in classrooms, striving to define “best practice”. This is not an easy task because it seems clear that, after 100 years or so of proliferating and competing methodologies of “fads and fashions” (Nunan, 1998) we can be sure of two things only: there is no Holy Grail; conversely there is no method where students learn nothing! Indeed, many methods have come and gone and those of the past have at various times been condemned and rejected as old-fashioned, inadequate, based on outdated theories or too difficult to implement in mainstream schools. However, this paper argues that most, if not all, of these approaches have elements which are relevant and useful today in most language teaching contexts. In other words an integrated best practice approach can be constructed from the methods of the past. This approach would be an “eclectic” range of techniques to suit a range of student needs, a range of teaching styles for the effective teaching of different language skills, and for using digital resources such as E-books.

A summary of past language teaching methods and approaches

(This is a short summary as many teachers will have encountered this history in their teacher education courses. A full coverage of the subject can be found in Richards, Jack C. and Rodgers, Theodore S. 2001 (2nd edition) Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)

“In the beginning was the Grammar-Translation method”

The Classical or Grammar-Translation method was developed in Europe over centuries of teaching classical languages such as Latin and Greek and then applied to foreign/second languages. The focus was on studying grammatical rules and morphology, doing written exercises, memorizing vocabulary, translating texts from and into the target language. Another frequently used technique was dictation. Grammar-translation remained popular through the 20th century and several aspects of it are still in use today.
One quite popular but controversial relic of grammar-translation is what is known as the “sandwich technique”, the immediate oral insertion of a translation of L2 sentences into L1, in order to convey meaning as rapidly and completely as possible. Proponents of this bilingual technique (e.g. Wolfgang Butzkamm and John Caldwell, 2009), claim that it makes it facilitates the establishment of the foreign language as the working language of the classroom. Others claim that in fact it has a negative effect – students don’t make an effort to understand the L2 sentence, they just wait for the translation. Consequently their oral comprehension skills are seriously impeded. (See the reference list.)

**The Direct Method**

La méthode directe, based on the theories of François Gouin, radically changed the face of language teaching at the beginning of the 20th century. It started a revolution in language teaching by prioritising oral communication, excluding translation, banning the use of L1 in the classroom, teaching grammar inductively and explaining vocabulary through images, realia, demonstration and association of ideas. In fact many of its principles correspond to those of current best practice in language teaching.

However, the major problem with was that to be used effectively this approach required a teacher with native-like competence in the target language and a mastery of the techniques. Furthermore, like subsequent “methods” such as the audio-lingual and early audio-visual ones, it was rather intransigent and its proponents had little tolerance for deviations such as using the mother tongue to explain grammar.

**The audio-lingual method** The Audio-Lingual Method, which originated in the 1950’s and 1960’s, is based on the behaviorist belief that language learning is the acquisition of a set of correct language habits. The learner repeats patterns until able to produce them spontaneously. By combining the behaviourist theory of language learning with the latest sound technology, the tape recorder, the audio-lingual method was created. It was known in French as MAO (la méthode audio-orative).
The core of the teaching was intensive repetition of the language input, generally dialogues – this was to ensure good pronunciation. This phase was then followed by intensive and lengthy “reinforcement” of the grammar structures, i.e. “drilling”, mainly using the 4-phase drill on a two track tape.

Example of a transformation drill (M= Master track; S = Student track):

- **M**: Sentence and Stimulus: *Aujourd’hui je vais a la plage*. Stimulus: *Hier*
- **S**: Student reply: *Hier je – euh- aller a la plage*
- **M**: Correct response: *Hier je suis alle a la plage.*
- **S**: Student repeat of correct response. *Hier je suis alle a la plage*

**Audio-visual methods** The best known audio-visual methods were developed in France by the French language research centres BELC and Credif. The early methods, *La France en direct* and *De vive voix*, along with *Eclair* from the UK were quite popular in Australian schools in the 1970’s. Audio-visual methods had a lot in common with audio-lingual ones. The language input consisted of dialogues, which were followed by structure drills. The use of L1 was frowned upon and oral language was prioritised at the expense of reading and writing. What was different was the presence of visuals, namely projected slides, to help students infer the meaning of the dialogues. As in the direct method, the teacher and students had a common visual focus to facilitate a dialogue between the teacher and students.

Both audio-lingual and audio-visual methods made an important contribution to the profile of language teaching in that, because of the technology required (and possibly the prestigious connotations of “language laboratory”), many language departments were able to press for dedicated language rooms.

**The communicative approach** At first glance, the term itself seems redundant. Surely all language teaching and learning is about communication? The point was however that language teaching focused a lot on either grammar and translation or on repetition and structure drills, with the outcome of meaningful communication obscured by these preoccupations. The basis of the early communicative approach was the **functional-notional syllabus** (which had nothing to do with systemic - functional grammar). So it was an “approach”, not a “method”. It was flexible in
that it divided the syllabus into units of functional communication, not points of grammar. These functions included such things as greeting people, inviting/refusing/accepting, asking for and giving directions.

The communicative approach, which began in the UK with research on TES (Wilkins *Notional Syllabuses* was published in 1976) changed the face of language teaching once again. At the same time American researchers such as Krashen and Dulay and Burt came forward with another series of hypotheses, again stemming from ESL research:

- **The input hypothesis.** This states that learners progress in their knowledge of the language when they comprehend language input that is slightly more advanced than their current level. Krashen argued that language could only be acquired efficiently if learners were constantly exposed to *comprehensible input*, i.e. oral examples of the target language which they could comprehend but whose level was always a little above what they already knew.

- **The affective filter hypothesis.** This states that learners' ability to acquire language is constrained if they are experiencing negative emotions such as fear or embarrassment. At such times the affective filter is said to be "up", emotional stress hinders concentration and the students’ learning capacity is seriously compromised.

**Task-based language teaching**

Task-based language teaching/learning focuses on using authentic, i.e. language in a simulated real life situation, asking students to carry out meaningful tasks in the target language. Some examples of tasks might be: introducing people, exchanging information about pets, exchanging information about what you did last night/over the weekend, shopping in a grocery store etc. In some programmes the tasks are more complex, e.g. designing a house on the moon; preparing a bushfire safety brochure; describing a fictitious animal etc. The tasks are carried out in pairs or in a group, so it is considered as a branch of communicative language teaching. A major issue with pair work and group work tasks is the amount of scaffolding required to ensure success. Assessment is primarily based on task outcome (in other words the appropriate completion of real world tasks) rather than on accuracy of prescribed language forms.
The **lexical approach** is a method of teaching foreign languages described by Michael Lewis in the 1990s. The basic concept on which this approach rests is the idea that an important part of learning a language consists of being able to understand and produce lexical phrases as Instruction focuses not just on grammar but also on fixed expressions that occur frequently in dialogues.

**What aspects of the above methods and approaches are useful in today’s classrooms?**

**Grammar-translation:**
Teaching formal translation is not teaching language; translation is a specialised skill. Learning a language through translation may help students understand the structure of a language but it is a very inefficient means of acquiring language skills, particularly oral skills. When students continually understand the meaning of a text through translation, this process hinders direct understanding of the language and thereby makes it very difficult for the learner to “think in French/German/Japanese”; it reinforces a four stage thinking process:

1. Learner hears/reads *Bonjour! Ça va?* -->
2. Translates to “Hello! How are you?” -->
3. Finds appropriate response: “Fine thank you.” -->
4. Translates back into the target language: *Ça va bien, merci.* -->
5. Responds to the greeting

Nevertheless, translation is still useful in some contexts:

1. **At the lower levels:** Teachers know that even at the beginners level the target language can be made comprehensible by visuals, mime, situation, intonation etc. Translation is generally not needed. However, in quite a few cases these techniques do not work or are time consuming. Time can be saved by simply providing the English equivalent. Concept checking can also be efficiently done by asking students to provide the English equivalent.

Revision of key expressions such as those referred to in the Lexical Approach above can be done by asking students to match the expression with their English equivalents or its communicative purpose. This is done on a number of occasions in *Tapis Volant.* (See Appendix 1)
2. **Using language as a vehicle of culture:** comparing French and English at the beginner’s level, assuming students are old enough, develops their language awareness of both French and English and encourages thinking about language. When learning French, students have to “get their heads around” some very challenging concepts:

- the = *le/la/les* (only one definite article in English, three in French)
- *tu/vous* = you (two 2nd person subject pronouns in French, today only one in English)
- they ... *ils/elles* (the third person plural subject pronoun is marked for gender in French but not in English)
- *je parle* - > I speak/I am speaking (French has only one present tense, English has two – both of which can be used to talk about the future, as English has no future tense)
- learning where translation can get you into trouble, for example trying to translate colloquial expressions in many social situations can really cause embarrassment:

Refusing an offer of food at the dinner table

Translating from English would result in several possible replies, all grammatically correct but socially inappropriate
- *J’ai trop mangé.* (I’ve eaten too much.)
- *J’en ai assez.* (I’ve had enough.)
- *Je suis bourré(e).* (I’m stuffed.)
- *Je ne peux plus rien manger.* (I can’t eat any more.)
- *J’ai assez mangé.* (I’ve eaten enough.)
- *Non, merci.* (“No, thank you.” is not really polite.)
- *Je suis plein(e).* (“I’m full” is totally inappropriate.)

The most socially appropriate reply would probably be:

⇒ *Merci. C’est délicieux, mais j’ai très bien mangé.*

which is difficult to translate into English.

3. **Translation at the advanced level:** translation can be seen as “comparative stylistics”, a useful way to develop advanced writing skills. French and English have different ways of saying things and a different approach to “good” expression
Example 1. In terms of writing style, French makes much more use of nominalisation than English. For instance, a sentence such as ‘le prix du pain a augmenté, c’est inquiétant’ is grammatically acceptable, but not "une expression de bon aloi". A better style would imply nominalisation: L’augmentation du prix du pain est inquiétante. Nominalisation generally gives a degree of concision. In formal writing contexts students need to know the nouns that correspond to common verbs. This in turn highlights the importance of the traditional vocabulary exercise of word building.

Example 2: The chassé croisé phenomenon A large number of verbal expressions in English cannot be translated literally. Translation requires a double grammatical transposition:

blown away
emporté par le vent
look down
baisser les yeux

The case of dictation

In both English and French native speaker classrooms, dictation was one of the most common traditional language learning exercises. In the English speaking world it is often viewed today as an old fashioned activity that tests spelling. In the French speaking world it is still a daily activity at the primary level and a popular intellectual game – Bernard Pivot’s televised dictation shows are very popular in French and similar shows appear in other francophone countries. Dictations are also part of French history – “la dictée de Merimée” is well known and still today one can compare one’s own talents with those of the emperor Napoleon III and his family. (See Appendix 2)

Dictation today is considered as valuable activity in FLE classes. Is does not just practise spelling. It involves

- close listening
- determining phoneme/grapheme correspondences
- grammar and vocabulary: segmenting words (Àllô, à l’eau), understanding contractions, separating homophones (c’est, sais, sait, ces, ses)
- writing skills: learning to edit and correct
it is very useful for revising material studies in a previous class.

In other words, dictation is an extremely valuable integrative exercise. It is also a useful class management tool in that it brings the class together and is a good strategy to settle down a restless class. In *Tapis Volant 1* there is a recorded *dictée* in each unit of the Workbook (see Appendix 3). However, teachers can easily give their own *dictées* whenever they deem it necessary.

**The direct method**

Many features of the Direct Method are still used today – priority given to the oral language, presenting and practising new material through oral texts before moving on to reading and intensive practice and repetition of authentic models of the target language. Most relevant are the inductive techniques for explaining language using gesture, mime, questioning and of course visuals. One large visual element, text or illustration, which can be viewed by both teacher and students, is the most important aid in language teaching, whether it be through blackboard drawings, flashcards, posters, slides or OHP projections. Visuals in a text-book are of limited use in an interactive class because teacher and students do not have direct eye contact. The great innovation of recent digital technology such as E-books, online access and data projectors is that the teacher can present a full audio-visual version of the material to the class thus facilitating a full three-way interaction between the teacher, the student and the material. This can and should at last remove from language teaching the deadening “open your books and turn to page fifty-three”.

**The audio-lingual method**

The major problem of the audio-lingual method was that it was based on a totally inadequate theory of language acquisition. Chomsky clearly demonstrated that we do not learn a language just by repetition. It also prioritised oral language structure, neglecting vocabulary, reading and writing. Most important of all the constant non-communicative drilling was mind-numbingly boring.

However, what the audio-lingual method **did** do well was to facilitate good pronunciation of discrete sounds, as well as rhythm and intonation. through the repetition of authentic linguistic
models. This is why most modern French courses, including *Tapis Volant*, suggest intensive listening and repetition of the core oral texts of each unit. Modern technology greatly facilitates this as the bulk of the work does not have to be done in class. Students can practise and repeat as much as they like via the E-book, “animated” versions of the texts and visuals online or the audio cassettes. The *Phonétique et Graphie* and the *Dictée* recordings also provide authentic examples of spoken French. The *Tapis Vocab App* allows the students to hear the vocabulary item, to record their voice and then listen and compare the two pronunciations.

In spite of modern technology and the tendency to encourage learner autonomy, informed teacher directed activities with tried and tested techniques can be very useful in all aspects of language teaching, including pronunciation. One such technique in **backchaining**, a traditional method for teaching students to pronounce polysyllabic words or difficult expressions. The teacher pronounces the last syllable, the student repeats, and then the teacher continues, working backwards from the end of the word or sentence to the beginning. This is a useful and fun way to practise, even at the advanced level, fixed expressions such as *Pourriez-vous répéter la question?* or tongue twisters like *Les chaussettes de l'archi-duchesse, sont-elles sèches ou archi-sèches?*

**Audio-visual methods**

Most modern French course books are “audio-visual” in that the core texts, generally dialogues, are illustrated. The illustrations do not convey the full meaning of the text although they do provide a context where the global meaning is generally clear. Cognates in the text and prior learning help to clarify parts of it, as does the optional “warm up” segment described in the Teacher Resource Book, designed to help students predict the interaction. (See Appendix 4) The rest of the meaning can be inferred by students, guided by the teacher’s comments and questions as s/he points out certain aspects of the image such as key contextual features and the facial expressions, gestures and body language of the participants. Use of L1 should be avoided as far as possible in these sessions. However, as we have suggested, asking students (in French) to supply L1 equivalents is a useful way to check the accuracy of learning.
Many illustrations in course books lend themselves to vocabulary extension work and to oral interaction beyond the core dialogues. The Tapis Volant Teacher Resource Book draws attention to these possibilities, particularly with respect to the cultural photographs on the first page of each unit. With an E-book, illustrated dialogues can be annotated with sticky notes and highlighted by students – supplementary vocabulary in the picture, highlighting of key grammar structures and useful expressions and so on. (See examples of these in Appendix 5)

**The communicative approach**

All text-books today call their methodology “communicative”. The communicative approach is indeed reflected in their course outlines in that each unit is described in terms of “communicative tasks”, i.e. functions and notions and the grammar points embedded in them.

Pair and group work was an important feature of the communicative approach, the third and final stage of the “3 Ps”, the 3 stages of instruction: presentation of the new material, controlled practice to familiarise students with its grammar and vocabulary; and finally production, where “learners become users”, carrying out real life communicative tasks in the language. In the task-based approach, most of the programme is composed of such student-centred activities.

Pair and group work activities are powerful tools in developing confidence in language learners. They encourage collaboration among students, they provide extensive practice in real communication and in a stress-free environment – in pairs or small groups, not in front of the whole class. However, to be successful they require comprehensive preparation in the form of scaffolding, scaffolding which sets out the structure and sequence of the discourse and which familiarises them with the key language of the interaction. This is why, in Tapis Volant, BLMs are provided for every Activité orale in order to prepare students for the task. (See Appendix 6)

Pair and group work tasks are not always exclusively oral. In Tapis Volant, each unit ends with a Tâche Pratique in which students collaborative and individual research to create reports, documents and presentations on cultural themes. The Passons à l’action sections of the Mise au Point units ask students to create scenarios and produce multi-media versions of them – DVDs, cartoons or Powerpoint presentations.
The **affective filter hypothesis** reminded us of something that we have probably seen through our own experience – language learning, particularly listening and speaking can be a quite stressful activity, the stress exacerbated when a student has to perform in front of the class. The stress lowers concentration and has a negative effect on performance. For listening, the problem can be solved in two ways: firstly by allowing students to complete listening exercises out of class; secondly by considering listening not as a test but as a supportive activity to develop the skill: by playing the soundtrack several times, by pausing the track at times, by replaying segments and by encouraging students to work together and share ideas about the answers.

Similarly, for oral work, pair and group work tasks, whether real communication or simply reading out dialogues provides a more relaxed ambiance for students. (One need not go as far as the designer method of Suggestopedia, where students listening to Mozart in a darkened room before beginning the class, although the technique did produce excellent results.)

In the **comprehensible input hypothesis**, Stephen Krashen claimed that listening and understanding oral texts was “necessary and sufficient” for “acquiring” (not “learning”) a second language. This gave rise to the “natural approach” where students just listened to comprehensible language. To reduce stress they were not required to speak; they only spoke when they wanted to. Not surprisingly this approach was not very successful – although speaking in a foreign language may be stressful it is also exciting. All of us probably remember the first time we spoke in a foreign language to a real native speaker and he or she understood! This, after a period of “Krashen bashin’” it was generally accepted that comprehensible input a **necessary, though not a sufficient**, condition for acquiring a second language.

The consequences for teachers today are that we must ensure that our students get maximum exposure to the spoken language in order to make good progress. The corollary of this is that if L1 is over-used in the classroom, they will make little progress. This may sound like common sense but it took many years of research from many highly regarded language teaching specialists to reach this conclusion. Well, at least now it’s clear!
The *lexical approach* is the latest development in mainstream language teaching practice. It is more a way of analysing language than a new teaching method. However it does have ramifications for classroom practice and management. Firstly, students should be encouraged to organise their vocabulary notebooks into single items and useful phrases. *s’il vous plaît* would come under “phrases” as it appears early in a course and its acquisition as a useful phrase does not require extensive grammatical knowledge of the verb *plaire*. Further on in the course students could add other very useful expressions such as *ce quartier me plaît*; *il/elle me plaît, ce film m’a plu; ça t’a plu* ? This becomes even more important at the senior level where students need an extensive repertoire of useful expressions for the oral exam.

There are other methods which we have not had time to mention in detail but which can also provide resources for implementing useful classroom activities. Among them Asher’s Total Physical response (TPR), where the target language is introduced orally through commands which students follow and the more recent Accelerative Integrated Method, where students accompany their speaking with gestures, the latter helping them to remember the language.

**Digital technology and language teaching methodology**

There is no doubt that digital technology is having a significant effect on language teaching although how much it will change methodology is another matter. It does provide a number of new and exciting possibilities for both students and teachers both inside and outside the classroom.

Outside the classroom, with the *Tapis Volant* E-book and the online exercises, students can practise grammar and listening, record and listen to their own speaking, revise language material, annotate texts, insert links for what they have learnt in class and develop their cultural knowledge. Whatever course book they are using, they can also construct a vocabulary data base and communicate with other French speakers via skype, text messaging and voice messaging. The internet offers wide access to language resources, listening exercises, radio programmes, songs, cartoons and films and as well resources for independent cultural research.
Within the classroom digital technology provides a complete audio-visual presentation of each unit of *TapisVolant*, including the situations, the *Façons de dire*, the reading texts and the photos. However it should be stressed that digital technology in language teaching is not a whizz-bang panacea, nor should it dominate the teacher’s classroom techniques. It is a teaching aid, just like the non-electronic whiteboard, hard copy visuals and CD audio. For example, in the case of grammar, *Tapis Volant* provides Powerpoint summaries of each grammar unit. However, teachers may well prefer to use their own tried and tested explanations, probably via the whiteboard. This is quite understandable. All digital resources are optional, the choice is up to the teacher. On the other hand, digital technology may give the teacher more flexibility in organising students in classes of mixed ability by allowing learning groups.

**Conclusion:**
Currently there is no single dominant method or approach in second language teaching. This is probably a good thing. However it does put the onus on teachers to develop their concept of best practice. In a teacher’s career the first instinct may well be to adopt many of the techniques through which they themselves learnt. After all, language teachers were successful learners. This is probably why formal grammar and grammar exercises are still a part of most teachers’ methodology - in spite of the claims of many theorists that it does not help. We all think it does because it worked for us. However, there are many issues other than grammar and in our construction of our own best practice we can look at what we see as the pros and cons of past methods and from them build our own approach: how much L1 should we use in class and why? how should we address different learner needs? how should we deal with learner stress? how can we limit the use of L1 in pair work? when should we encourage students to help each other in reading and listening sessions? how can we “grab” an unmotivated class? These, along with many more, are the issues that we consider in our search for our own version of best practice.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Translation type exercises: matching French expressions to English ones and finding English equivalents

(i) *Tapis Volant 1* Workbook Unit 4 Ex.7

7 *Trouvez l’expression française.*
Find the appropriate expression in the speech bubbles and write it next to the English sentence.

- Les papiers sont en ordre.
- Ici c’est interdit au public.
- C’est un bon début.
- Dégage !

a. You tell your little brother to ‘get lost’.

b. You say that trespassing is not allowed.

c. You tell someone that things have begun well.

d. You say that the identity papers are in order.

(ii) *Tapis Volant 1* Workbook Unit 7 Ex.6

6 *Écrivez l’expression.*
Write out the full name for these words relating to school in France, then add the English equivalent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Français</th>
<th>Anglais</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>EPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>SVT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>CDI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>le labo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>l’interro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>la récré</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>la techno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>l’histoire-géo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2
« La dictée faisait partie des passe-temps de la cour de l'empereur Napoléon III. La dictée de l'écrivain Prosper Mérimée a été écrite puis récitée en 1857 à la demande de l'impératrice Eugénie afin de distraire la cour. Napoléon III aurait fait soixante-quinze fautes, l'impératrice soixante-deux, Alexandre Dumas fils vingt-quatre, Octave Feuillet dix-neuf et Metternich fils, ambassadeur d’Autriche, trois ! »

APPENDIX 3
Example of a recorded dictation Tapis Volant 1 Unit 8. This is a gap-fill dictation. Teachers can easily design their own dictations for the units.

Dictée: écoutez et écrivez
Listen to the CD and complete the sentences

a Vous êtes tous [bien préparés] pour [le contrôle]?
b Un [peu] de silence [s'il vous plaît]!
c Les portables [sont interdits] en [classe].
d C'est le [conseil de discipline] pour toi !
e [On est] le combien [aujourd'hui]?

APPENDIX 4
Suggestions for a « warm-up » Tapis Volant 1 Teacher Resource Book Unit 16

Warm-up (optional)
Ask students to infer the meaning of the title.
Ask students to describe the context:
– Où sont les cinq copains ? – Pourquoi ?
– Ils sont dans un restaurant. – C'est l’automne.
– Ils ont / portent des vêtements... chauds.
For students with prior knowledge: Il fait froid. (But note that this is introduced in frame 3.)
APPENDIX 5

Like a number of other cartoon frames, this illustration from Unit 10 shows Sylvie’s room. There are quite a number of vocabulary items shown. It is up to the teacher to decide which ones, if any, should be taught as extension vocabulary. If students have an E-book they can annotate the page with e.g. *un lit, un oreiller, un nounours, un poster, un parapluie* etc.

The Teacher Resource Book describes the photos on the first page of each unit. These contain cultural information but in many cases vocabulary is added. The example below comes from *Tapis Volant 2* Unit 2. Here again students can annotate the page in their E-book.
APPENDIX 6
BLM 2.1 from the *Tapis Volant 2* Teacher Resource Book CD-ROM: scaffolding for *Activité Orale 2.1*

**Activité orale : Travail à deux**

Avec votre partenaire échangez des informations sur vos routines quotidiennes.

**Exemples**
À quelle heure est-ce que tu te réveilles le matin ?
À quelle heure est-ce que tu te lèves ?
Comment est-ce que tu te prépares ?
Tu te dépêches pour aller au collège ?
Où est-ce que tu déjeunes ?
L’après-midi, qu’est-ce que tu fais ?
Tu t’occupes de tes frères et de tes sœurs ?
Tu te promènes ? Avec le chien ?
À quelle heure est-ce que tu dines ? Tu dines en famille ?
Le soir, tu te reposes un peu ?
À quelle heure est-ce que tu te couches ?

**Expressions utiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Se préparer le matin</th>
<th>Se reposer le soir</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Je prends une douche.</td>
<td>Je regarde la télé / des DVDs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je m’habille.</td>
<td>J’écoute de la musique.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je me brosse les dents.</td>
<td>Je joue aux jeux vidéo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je prends mon petit déjeuner.</td>
<td>Je parle avec mes copains en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Je ramasse mes affaires.</td>
<td>ligne.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>