

MAY 7 1993

**SUBMERSION / IMMERSION AT THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL LEVEL:
A CASE STUDY**

A monograph submitted to the Department of Education in
Second Languages, McGill University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the
Degree of Master of Education
(Education in Second Languages)

by

Susan Robert

Montreal, Canada

August, 1992

AGM 3617

SUBMERSION / IMMERSION AT THE ELEMENTARY
SCHOOL LEVEL: A CASE STUDY

Susan Robert

1992

ABSTRACT

This study examines the experiences of ten grade six Quebec anglophone students, five of whom have been in a French submersion situation since kindergarten and five who have been in a French immersion program for the same length of time. Results from the analysis of the data collected indicate that students and parents from both groups are generally satisfied with their respective programs and that the students are highly motivated to learn a second language although they do not achieve native speaker levels in oral and written French production. Slight differences between the groups are apparent in their French proficiency, their use of French outside the classroom and in their social experiences in their respective schools.

Findings show that the submersion students are slightly more proficient than the immersion students in oral and written French. Submersion students use French outside the classroom slightly more than the immersion students, although neither group uses it extensively. Submersion students experience more difficulty in the earlier grades because of poor French skills than do the immersion students. The submersion students may also experience denigration of their mother tongue by their peers. The immersion students do not.

RESUME

Cette étude considère les expériences de dix élèves anglophones de sixième année au Québec; cinq de ces élèves ont étudié dans une école française depuis la maternelle et les cinq autres ont étudié dans une classe d'immersion à l'intérieur d'une école anglaise pendant le même nombre d'années. L'étude des données montre que d'une part, les parents autant que les élèves sont en général satisfaits des programmes; d'autre part, les élèves sont extrêmement intéressés à acquérir une autre langue, sans cependant atteindre le niveau des élèves de langue maternelle française dans leurs productions orales et écrites. De légères différences apparaissent entre les deux groupes au niveau de leur utilisation du français en dehors de la classe, leur production en français et leurs expériences sociales à l'intérieur de l'école.

Les recherches montrent que les élèves qui étudient dans une école française sont légèrement plus habiles que les élèves de la classe d'immersion dans leurs productions orales et écrites en français. Les élèves de l'école française utilisent le plus souvent le français en dehors de la classe, cependant aucun des deux groupes n'utilise le français d'une façon intensive. Les étudiants du secteur français rencontrent plus de difficultés au premier cycle à cause de leur manque de connaissances en français. Il est possible aussi que ces mêmes élèves aient à subir une attitude négative de la part de leurs compagnons de classe. Les élèves du secteur anglophone n'ont pas à subir de tel rejet.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Laurenval School Board and, in particular, Mr. Howard Schwartz. Thanks are also given to the principals, teachers, parents and students who participated. Their cooperation made the project possible. Heartfelt appreciation is extended to Dr. Nina Spada for her invaluable assistance and understanding.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	I
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	III
LIST OF TABLES.....	V
INTRODUCTION.....	1
OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY.....	3
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	4
METHODOLOGY.....	13
RESULTS: Parent Questionnaire.....	17
Student Questionnaire.....	25
Teacher Questionnaire.....	45
Oral French Test.....	47
Written French Test.....	55
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS and IMPLICATIONS.....	62
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	69
APPENDIX.....	72

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1:	Parental Reasons for Choosing Program.....	18
TABLE 2:	Parental Help with Homework.....	20
TABLE 3:	Parental Satisfaction.....	21
TABLE 4:	Students' Regular Language Use.....	26
TABLE 5:	Students' Self-Rankings of French Proficiency.....	31
TABLE 6:	Students' Reasons for Learning French.....	36
TABLE 7:	Student Attitudes.....	38
TABLE 8:	Language Ability Profile.....	46
TABLE 9:	Language Use Profile.....	47
TABLE 10:	Average Scores for Each Student on the Oral French Test.....	48
TABLE 11:	Average Scores for Each Group on the Oral French Test.....	50
TABLE 12:	Written French Test: Range of Scores.....	56
TABLE 13:	Written French Test Scores: Group Averages.....	56
TABLE 14:	Written French Test: Percent of Errors for Each Group.....	60

INTRODUCTION

"Any Canadian who wishes to become bilingual should be encouraged to do so. The well-being of our nation depends on it. The need for understanding between our two main cultures demands it. The desire of many Canadians for personal advancement and useful service requires it." (Hammerly, 1989, p.3)

In Quebec, French is the majority language and it would therefore seem to be natural and necessary that anglophone children learn it. Apart from the idealistic notion that speaking more than one language is a "gift", in Quebec it is also a highly practical endeavour. Many English speaking parents in the Province have, in the last twenty years, encouraged their children to become bilingual, or at least proficient in French, by enrolling them in French immersion programs. This type of program provides a bilingual education in which French, as well as English, is used for curriculum instruction during the child's elementary and/or secondary education. Others have enrolled their children in the French school system. This choice is commonly referred to as "submersion".

Children who qualify for an English language eligibility certificate (that is, a child whose parent received his/her elementary education in English in Canada) have several options available to them to learn French: 1) core program - French as a second language (FSL) is taught from sixty to one

hundred twenty minutes per week from grades one to six; 2) extended core program - students are exposed to FSL one hour per day from grades one to six with a content subject (for example, Sciences Humaines) also being taught in French at the second cycle level; 3) immersion programs of which there are several forms - early or late, partial or total in any combination (Swain, 1981). Early or late indicates the start time of the program. The most common start times are at the kindergarten (early) or the grade four, six or seven (late) levels. Total or partial refer to the amount of class time in the student's schedule that takes place in French. Programs labelled as total immersion are generally "total" in kindergarten, grades one and sometimes two. English is introduced at the grade two or three level and other content subjects are added on an increasing scale from grades four to six. By the end of grade six, approximately sixty percent of class time has been spent in French, forty percent in English. Partial immersion programs maintain a fairly equal balance between English and French throughout the program; 4) French school in an English school system - students follow the same curricula as students in a French school in a French school system but are likely to have anglophone or allophone classmates; 5) French school in a French school system or submersion - the anglophone student is submersed in a French school where he/she is likely to have mainly French speaking classmates and where the language of instruction is always

French except for ESL (English as a second language) class in grades four to six.

It is no doubt a complex problem for anglophone parents to confront the many options available to their children to learn French and make a suitable decision. Will they learn to speak French well enough? Will they suffer emotionally or cognitively because of the choices made? Will their English suffer? How proficient do anglophone children need to be in their second language? Is being able to communicate sufficient? Do they want or need to sound native-like when they speak French?

OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to broaden our understanding of two of the several options currently available to anglophone students in the Province of Quebec to learn French. The early total immersion and submersion options are investigated from several perspectives. A case study approach is used to examine different facets of five anglophone students' experiences in submersion since kindergarten and five anglophone students' in immersion since kindergarten. Their French language proficiency (oral and written) is tested and compared. The results are also compared with those of five francophone students (controls) from the same classes as the submersion students. A second avenue of

inquiry focuses on "customer satisfaction". To what extent are parents and students satisfied with their respective programs? Why did they choose the program? The third area of investigation probes the French language use and experiences of the two groups.

The first section of the monograph reviews the literature that is relevant to the questions being considered in the present study. First, a selection of immersion literature that focuses on French proficiency is reviewed, followed by comments about submersion literature in the same area. Next, the literature relevant to attitudes and motivation for learning a second language is examined. Several sources are cited that have relevance for the type of instruments used to collect data for the present study. The second part of the monograph outlines the methodology and procedures. The third section presents the results obtained from the five data collection instruments used in the study. These include a parent questionnaire, a student questionnaire, a teacher questionnaire, an oral French test and a written French test. Finally, the results are integrated into a summary and conclusions and implications for further research are drawn.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

IMMERSION LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

Unlike much of the literature, this study focuses only on

grade six students. Lambert and Tucker (1972), Cowan and Sarmed (1976) and numerous others have studied immersion students at all grade levels with an emphasis on grades one, three and six. They often found lags in proficiency (first and second languages) in grades one and three. By grade six the students catch up. As the present study does not consider developmental aspects of second language acquisition, only grade six students were chosen for the sample.

Spolsky and Cooper (1978) comment on the careful tracking of French immersion students in the years after the inception in 1965 of the first St. Lambert French immersion kindergarten class. In general terms, results indicate: in written French, students are behind in vocabulary (compared to native speakers) and their compositions are less rich in content; in oral French, immersion students make more grammatical errors and correct themselves when they make errors related to content not form, but other elements are basically the same; in French phonology, immersion students exhibit a number of traits that are not native-like. Harley (in Genesee, 1987) reports that immersion students' language systems are less complex and less redundant than native speakers' although they are still functional and effective. They are also distinctively non-idiomatic. Swain and Barik (1976) find that there is little need for alarm concerning the English writing skills of French immersion students, however further instruction related to their French writing skills is of greater concern.

Harley and Swain (1977) suggest that the verb system of immersion students is simplified. The students can convey the message but may use the inappropriate grammatical form. The authors suggest this may be due to the fact that once they can make themselves understood, there is no incentive to encourage the students towards native speaker norms. Early immersion students "can convey a rich range of meanings in French but that (sic) way of doing so remains non-native".

In self-reports, French immersion students in grades six and eleven listed their strengths in second language proficiency in the following descending order: listening, accent, reading, ability to understand, writing, ability to speak correctly and ability to say what they want (Genesee, 1978).

Swain (1972) cautions that the school alone may not be able to provide sufficiently varied conditions for the acquisition of balanced verbal fluency because of the lack of contact with French peers. In a later study (Swain, 1989) she suggests that the language immersion students hear in the classroom may be functionally restricted: for example, up to three quarters of the verbs used and heard are in the present or imperative tense. Genesee (in Teaching Second Languages in Primary and Secondary School, 1984) proposes that more frequent and better quality contact with French is needed to improve efficiency.

SUBMERSION PROFICIENCY LITERATURE

Compared to the large volume of literature on immersion education there is a great lack of submersion documentation that has relevance for Quebec. Much has been written about the American submersion experience (that is, immigrants learning English in English medium schools) as well as certain other identifiable ethnic groups such as Scandinavian migrant workers (Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa, 1976). Unfortunately, this corpus of research is not easily applicable to the submersion situation in Quebec. Mackey (1972) classifies language learning situations in terms of the patterns of language use in the home, the curriculum, the community and the nation where the school is and the status of the languages themselves. The American and Scandinavian experiences differ from that of Quebec anglophones in the last two categories. In Quebec the language of the community may be French and/or English. The nation, though officially bilingual, is predominantly English in many areas: that is, Quebec anglophone students' first language has official status unlike the first languages of the American or Scandinavian immigrant/migrant children. English is also recognized as a high status language on an international level. These two factors preclude using most of the submersion literature as a source of relevant information for the study's submersion subjects.

Although the applicability of previous submersion research to the present study is limited, there are several extensively researched premises that DO relate: Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa

(1976) argue that without proper first language development the second language cannot be learned well and semi-lingualism will result. Cummins (1981) has investigated this issue extensively and concurs. He suggests that the reason many minority language children do not succeed in a majority language school is because they do not develop the communicative skills in either the first or second language that are necessary for learning in the school context. Lambert (1980) agrees but adds that sociocultural factors also add to the risk of failure of minority language students in majority language schools when the home language and culture are denigrated and even threatened.

A report by Chun (1979) comparing the French oral production skills of students learning French in a naturalistic setting (that is, a submersion situation) to students in an immersion program is the most directly relevant to the interests of this study. Submersion and immersion students are more similar to each other in oral proficiency than to native speakers (who generally performed best on the measures used). Submersion students have more native-like pronunciation and better vocabulary than immersion students. Immersion students have better accuracy (errors/utterance). These results may be due to the fact that the submersion group had only one year of French while the immersion group had five years.

ATTITUDES, MOTIVATION

Bilingual education reflects the recognition of the legitimacy within one society of two or more cultures and two or more languages (Swain, 1972). In Canada, both English and French have official as well as international status.

Genesee (1987) explains that immersion programs in Canada were developed by English speaking parents in Quebec so their children could better learn French and therefore bridge the cultural and linguistic gap that separates English from French Canadians. It was not intended that the children become French. In an earlier study (1978) he questioned grades six and eleven students in immersion to determine their motivation for learning French. They indicated that they were motivated primarily by instrumental reasons. That is, their goals in learning the second language are functional: for example, career advancement. They were motivated secondarily by integrative (wishing to identify with the French culture) and personal reasons and least of all by peer pressure. He also found that second language use outside school was a reflection of the community and/or family situation. Netter and Spain (1989) add to the discussion of instrumental/integrative motivation by suggesting that integrative motivation favors acquisition more than instrumental motivation. However, instrumental motivation can be highly effective if there is an urgent need to learn the second language.

In this study, the students, and to a lesser degree the parents, are questioned about their attitudes towards French and

towards learning a second language. Stern (1983) believes there are three types of attitudes relevant to second language learning: attitudes toward the second language community and its speakers; attitudes toward the second language to be learned; and, attitudes towards languages and language learning. Lambert (1975) maintains that immersion education is not a threat to the student's personal or cultural identity nor to the maintenance of his/her first language. The child is in the program by choice and may leave at any time should he/she so choose. Cowan and Sarmed (1976) find that parents who send their children to bilingual schools (in this case, immersion) have a commitment to encouraging their child to learn a second language and believe that knowledge of the second language is a necessity for advancement in most fields of endeavour. Cummins (1981) identifies possible reasons for the success of minority students in submersion situations: the student is highly motivated to learn the second language and to identify with the second culture; the parents place a high value on education; the student has a strong sense of pride in his own culture.

One of the main goals of this study is to determine if the students and parents are satisfied with their respective programs. Swain and Lapkin (1981) report that most immersion students and their parents are generally satisfied with the program and results, and like the idea of going a step further to French school in a French system. Cziko et al (1978) showed that early

immersion students see the merits of continuing in French at the high school level. Submersion is seen as a radical step that might adversely affect the child's identity and first language competence. Cohen (1975) suggests that in a submersion situation, the student may be teased because of an imperfect second language, the first language may be forbidden in the classroom or at least not endorsed and teacher expectations for student success may not be high (which can become a self-fulfilling prophecy).

TESTING

In the process of developing appropriate instruments for the study it became clear that there was not one particular method that could confidently be implemented to test second language production skills. Teitelbaum (1977) argues that there is no agreement among researchers on the differential efficacy of various language tasks for ascertaining the extent of bilingual skills. He proposes that interviewer judgements are the best predictors of tasks in oral proficiency testing, teacher ratings correlate moderately and students' self ratings correlate the least. In this study, self reports are not used as predictors of proficiency but as barometers of the student's self perceptions of and satisfaction with their levels of competence.

Swain and Lapkin (1981) caution that tests used in educational evaluations may be problematic: language tests measure skills rather than communicative, creative or aesthetic aspects.

Test data need to be complemented by other data of a more subjective, non-quantifiable nature. It is to this end that parent and student questionnaires as well as informal discussion with the subjects are combined with language test results to give a comprehensive picture in the present study.

Dobbert (in Macdonald and Mitchell, 1989) argues that "validity and reliability are not absolute terms that can be applied to all research data in the same way, but rather that they must be defined in terms of the intended goals set by the researcher". In the present study, data collection through different instruments, multiple raters and informal discussion combine to ensure validity. The information gathered is treated by cross-referencing and collating to give a report of group patterns.

Apart from Chun's (1979) study which has direct applicability to the present study, the literature cited above is not to be proved or disproved per se. Rather, the information provides background information about the language proficiency of immersion and, to some extent, submersion students and about their and their parents' attitudes towards and motivations for learning a second language. The main purpose of this study is not to confirm these findings (although mention is given in each section as to whether the groups' data confirm the literature or not) but to examine the ways in which the groups are similar or dissimilar to each other.

METHODOLOGY

SUBJECTS

Fifteen grade six subjects were selected from two schools under the jurisdiction of the same school board. This Protestant school board is located to the north of the island of Montreal and is responsible for fourteen elementary and five high schools. Twenty-five years ago, the school board ran only English schools. Because of demographic changes in the area, six of the fourteen elementary schools and three of the five high schools are now French. Of these six elementary schools, two are entirely French while the other four operate separate English and French programs. Of the three "French" high schools, one is entirely French.

The two participating schools include an all-French school and an English school where an early French immersion program is available. The French school has 371 students of which approximately 25% are English. The history of the school is interesting: a French group of Jehovah's Witnesses were faced with a dilemma. Historically, those who are not of the Catholic faith attend schools under the aegis of protestant school boards and, also historically, these school boards are English. The group did not fit into either profile. They asked the Protestant school board to open a French school in the area. The school board did. The subjects and controls from this school have received all their instruction in French from kindergarten to grade six except for

150 minutes/week of ESL from grades one to six. The library collection is almost entirely French.

The English school has a population of 556 students of which 44% (for this school year) are enrolled in the immersion program. The total amount of time spent studying in French from kindergarten to grade six is about 72% which is more than many immersion programs. The principal indicated that this is slightly more than was offered in the past at the school. The breakdown over the seven years is as follows: kindergarten- 96%, grade one- 93%, grades two and three- 80%, grade four- 70%, grade five- 60% and grade six- 50%. The large school library is as well stocked with French and English books.

The criteria for the selection of ten anglophone subjects (five from each school) was that the student be in his/her seventh year of study in the same program, that his/her mother tongue be English and that English be the language most usually spoken at home. The selection process was not random. Five English subjects from the French school were selected from the small pool available (anglophones whose parents agreed to participate in the study and allow their child to participate as well). These students were rated for their general proficiency in French by their teachers. One was classed as strong, two as average and two as weak. The teachers were then asked to select five francophone subjects whose French proficiency fell into the same ranges as the anglophone subjects. These students were to

serve as controls for the language proficiency part of the study. The immersion teacher also selected five subjects who fit the same profile.

PROCEDURES

A letter (see Appendix A) was sent to the parents of the ten subjects and five controls asking permission to speak with and use samples of their child's written and oral work. The parents were also invited to participate.

Data were collected over a period of two months. Three sessions were held with each English group and two with the control group. At the first meeting with each English group, the students were asked to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix B) which examined their use of French in their daily routine, their attitudes toward it, their recollections of their learning experiences and their self perceptions of their knowledge of French. The session ended with an informal round table discussion which added further insight to the areas explored in the questionnaire.

A questionnaire was sent to the parents (see Appendix C) at the end of the first meeting and was collected at the second meeting. The parents' questionnaire basically explored the same avenues as the student questionnaire. The student and parent questionnaires were developed using previously tested instruments as models. Questionnaires/surveys from the following researchers

were consulted: Cziko, Holobow and Lambert (1978), Genesee (1978), Lambert and Tucker (1972), Lightbown and Spada (1989), Macdonald and Mitchell (1989) and Swain (1981).

A questionnaire was also developed for the classroom teachers (see Appendix D). The teachers were asked to evaluate each student's language skills and language use patterns. These were collected later and used as another data source.

The second meeting with each anglophone group consisted of individual interviews which were tape recorded. The student was given two children's books - Snow White and Goldilocks and the Three Bears- and asked to choose one. Each book was well illustrated and the dialogue was hidden. After a short time to reflect, the student told the story in his/her own words in French using the illustrations as cues. The tapes were evaluated by six native French speakers.

The third meeting was again a group session. The Examen de Rédaction from the MEQ (Ministère de l'Education) was administered. This test is normally administered in both schools near the end of the school year. The compositions were read and evaluated by two grade six French teachers. This test was chosen to examine written production for two reasons: though laborious to correct, the test comes with a detailed grille for evaluation purposes allowing very specific items to be considered; the raters were experienced in using this instrument. In this study, the June 1991 exam was used.

The two meetings with the French controls were the same as the second and third sessions with the English subjects.

RESULTS

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The questionnaire distributed to parents was designed to elicit the reasons for their choice of program on behalf of their child, their expectations, the degree of home support and their opinion of the program. The parents' responses to the items on the questionnaire were recorded, tabulated and examined for similarities and differences across groups.

The analysis of the questionnaire data indicated that the main reasons for choosing the immersion option were economic, social and educational. Three out of five parents indicated they chose immersion because of cultural and political reasons. One parent explained further that " a lack of mutual respect has given rise to social and political tensions in Canada today and that one way to solve the problem is through better communication. It is therefore necessary that Canadians learn to speak both official languages". The parents who chose submersion listed social reasons most frequently followed by educational and cultural, and least importantly, economic and political reasons. These results are indicated in Table 1.

Table 1: Parental Reasons for Choosing Program

parent reason	submersion					immersion				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
economic				x	x		x	x	x	
social	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
educational		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
cultural		x	x	x		x			x	x
political				x	x		x	x	x	

In two families (out of ten) there was one single reason that the particular program (in these cases, French school) was chosen. The parent who chose submersion for social reasons only explained that most of their friends and social activities are French and as a result they chose French school for their five children. In the family that chose submersion solely for cultural reasons, one parent is French speaking and the other English speaking. The home language is English and they chose French school for their child in order that he would be able to better communicate with his French speaking relatives. These two parents' comments indicate they were motivated by integrative reasons in deciding to send their child to French school. Several parents commented that they wanted their children to have more career options available to them. These are clearly instrumental reasons. For further discussion of integrative/instrumental orientations refer to p. 35.

None of the submersion option parents felt that their

child's personality had any influence on their choice of program. However three out of five immersion parents did. They indicated that their child was outgoing and /or studious and that they therefore felt he/she would be able to meet the demands of the program.

All parents indicated that if their child had experienced difficulty academically or emotionally they would have pulled him/her out of the program. One submersion and two immersion parents qualified this by saying that they would have resorted to this only as a last measure after all other options failed.

The submersion parents all expected their children to be bilingual by the end of elementary school. The immersion parents, however, were split: two parents expected bilingualism and three did not. Of these three, two had initially had aspirations for their child to be bilingual but over the course of the past seven years had revised their expectations. They now felt that if their child could communicate efficiently in French, the goal would have been achieved. One parent commented that she hoped her daughter would be bilingual by the end of high school.

French is not spoken often in most of the ten homes. When asked if they speak French with their child at home, responses ranged from no (two parents) to rarely (one) to very little (one) to sporadically (one) to not often (one) to

sometimes (three) to yes (one). These results are evenly distributed between the two programs and are confirmed by the students in their questionnaire (see p. 23). According to Cummins (1981), not using the second language in the home is desirable if the speakers have limited proficiency. He suggests that if the second language is used in the home, the kinds of language experiences necessary to prepare children for the types of language skills needed for school are restricted (because of the limited proficiency). To get the necessary wide range of language experiences it is better to use the first language at home.

It is clear that in most cases there has been support at home in helping with both written and oral homework. All parents helped with written homework at the grade one level and four out of five parents in each group helped with oral work as well. Help with homework continues through to grade six for three of the submersion and two of the immersion students. See Table 2 below.

Table 2: Parental Help with Homework

grade	one	two	three	four	five	six
written homework	5-5*	4-5	4-4	3-4	3-3	3-2
oral homework	4-5	4-4	4-4	3-3	3-2	3-2
projects	4-3	4-3	4-4	4-3	4-3	4-3

* - the first of the two numbers in each column is the number of submersion parents. The second number is the number of immersion parents.

Parents were asked if they were satisfied with various aspects of their child's education. They were asked to comment on the program in general, the amount of time spent in English/French, their child's language skills and their attitude toward school. (Table 3 below)

Table 3: Parental Satisfaction

parent	submersion					immersion				
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<u>program in general</u> S*	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
<u>time in French</u>	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	NS	S
<u>time in English</u>	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	S	NS	S	S
<u>French oral</u>	S	S	SS	S	S	S	S	S	SS	SS
<u>French written</u>	S	SS	SS	S	S	S	S	S	SS	SS
<u>English oral</u>	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
<u>English written</u>	NS	S	NS	NS	NS	S	S	NS	S	S
<u>attitude</u>	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S

* - "S" indicates "satisfied"
 "NS" indicates "not satisfied"
 "SS" indicates "somewhat satisfied"

All the parents were satisfied with the program. Only one immersion parent felt that more time should have been accorded to French, while all five submersion parents (as well as one immersion parent) felt more time was needed in English. Another immersion parent was of the opinion that because French is a

complex language, especially in the area of grammar, it is remarkable that students do the first two grades only in French.

Four out of five submersion parents were satisfied with French oral and written skills. The one less satisfied parent is French-speaking and there is likely a link between that and her perception that her son's oral skills are not as strong as she had hoped. Three of five from the same group are satisfied with French written skills; the aforementioned parent is somewhat satisfied and one other parent rated his son's written French skills at 8 on a scale of ten, indicating that he too is not totally satisfied.

Three of the immersion parents are satisfied with both oral and written French skills. The two other parents are somewhat satisfied. One parent explains, "They (French skills) are much better than they would have been if she had attended English but not nearly as good as if she had attended French school". All parents are satisfied with English oral skills. However, only one parent in the submersion group is happy with English written skills while only one in the immersion group is dissatisfied. When asked if they had worried that their child's English skills would ultimately suffer, the majority of immersion parents (four out of five) replied " No". The one parent who replied "Yes" felt that her child's written English skills were weak. Three out of five of submersion parents felt their child's English skills would not suffer and that if they did they (the parents) would give extra help at home and/or would send the child to English high school.

These results reflect their feelings about the amount of time spent in English except in one submersion parent's case.

Parents were asked if there had been difficulties. The immersion parents reported basically trouble-free years at elementary school except for one who commented that there had been a lot of homework. Most of the submersion parents, on the other hand, told of difficult, and at times disheartening, experiences in the early grades due to lack of proficiency in French. One parent talked of problems during the first three months of kindergarten while three said that it had been difficult through grades one and two. One parent reported no difficulties.

When asked to list the three best aspects of their child's experience in submersion/immersion the parents became quite loquacious. There were common trains of thought running across the two groups' replies. All felt their child has a good command of the French language and is confident in using it. One of the submersion parents is most impressed with her child's large French vocabulary. Parents from both groups credit a measure of their child's success to the teachers and staff of their respective schools. One immersion parent appreciated the fact the teachers were native speakers of French and another felt the teachers had done an excellent job in balancing the "ideal" with the "practical" in terms of what might be expected in French language development. Yet another said that not only did her child have an appreciable knowledge and understanding of French, but she had not

lost out on the English side of her education. The submersion parents were happy with the fact that their children have French friends and two parents stated their children have a good grasp of French culture. Along the same lines, an immersion parent felt that her child accepts and respects other cultures as a result of the program and also has a real commitment and determination to become bilingual.

The parents had less to say when asked to list the three worst aspects of their child's elementary education experience. Three of the immersion parents had nothing to contribute. The fourth felt the lack of French "atmosphere" made the task more difficult and that there was not enough creative writing done. The fifth parent spoke again of the homework load and the fact that her child had become discouraged from time to time.

The submersion parents referred once more to poor English written skills and to the academic as well as social problems resulting from a poor command of French (at least in the early years). One parent felt it regrettable that they had not been able to help their child very much in acquiring the second language because they themselves were not proficient. A final comment came from a submersion parent who lamented the fact that the focus of learning was limited to Quebec culture not Canadian.

All parents responded with an unqualified "Yes" to the two questions, "Would you make the same choice again?" and "Would you enrol a younger sibling in the same program?". One immersion

parent stated that immersion should be available to all students across Canada.

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

The first part (A) of the questionnaire measured the use of French in the students' daily routines. Each student responded to thirty four questions. Therefore, each group answered 170 questions in total (5 students x 34 questions). Each student's answers were recorded and tabulated into group results. These results were then examined for differences and similarities between the groups. Group results are shown on the following page.

Table 4: Students' Regular Language Use

	never	rarely	some- times	often	always	n/a
1.parents**	1-0*	2-4	1-1	1-0		
2.siblings	3-0	1-2	0-2		1-0	0-1
3.relatives	2-0	1-3	1-0	0-1	1-1	
4.telephone		3-4	1-1	1-0		
5.friends	2-0	2-1	0-1	0-1	1-2	
6.friends' parents	2-1	1-0	2-4			
7.church	1-3				2-1	2-1
8.team/coach		1-0		1-0	0-1	3-4
9.group/club	0-1	1-0		1-1		3-3
10.clerk/waiter		1-1		1-3	3-1	
11.camp		0-1		0-1	2-1	3-2
12.teacher in class					5-5	
13.teacher out/class				1-1	4-4	
14.classmates-in	0-1	0-2	2-1	2-1	1-0	
15.classmates-out	0-3	1-2	1-0	3-0		
16.other students	1-2	2-0	1-2	1-1		
17.radio	4-0	0-1	1-3		0-1	
18.T.V.	3-0	1-1	1-3	0-1		
19.plays/concerts	3-1	1-4		1-0		
20.movies	4-5	1-0				
21.tapes	3-3	0-2	2-0			
22.books	1-2	1-1	1-1	2-1		
23.comic books	5-4	0-1				
24.newspapers	5-3	0-2				
25.magazines	2-2	2-3		1-0		
26.count	0-1	1-1	4-1	0-2	0-0	
27.pray	0-4		1-0	1-0		3-1
28.daydream	5-4		0-1			
29.diary	1-3		0-1			4-1
30.letters	2-3	0-1	3-1			
31.dream	5-5					
32.French speaker?	1-0		0-1	3-3	1-1	
33.French speaker			2-0	2-1	1-4	
34.seek French	0-1	4-1	0-1	1-1	0-1	
situations						
TOTAL	56-52	27-38	24-25	23-19	22-23	18-13
TOTAL(regrouped)	83-90		24-25		45-42	18-13

- * - The first number of two in each column indicates the number of submersion students who chose that answer. The second number represents the immersion students.
- ** - Key words are used to indicate each question. Refer to Appendix B to see the questionnaire in its entirety.

As a group, the submersion students were not able to respond to 18 of 170 (10.5%) questions because the questions did not apply to them: for example, "I speak French with my teammates or coaches", "I speak French at summer camp", "I write my diary in French". The immersion group had 13 of 170 (7.6%) of their answers fall into this category.

When considering the results, it is useful to consider the two categories "often" and "always" as evidence of regular use of French. "Never" and "rarely" can then be considered to represent virtual non-use of French and "sometimes" to mean exactly that. These three broader categories (regular use, sometime use and non-use) permit clearer comparisons across groups. Total group responses regrouped into the three categories are found at the bottom of Table 4.

If we consider the total group responses to the questions answered (factoring out the questions that did not apply to any one student) we see that the submersion group does not use French in the situations described 54.6% of the time (83 of 152 possible responses) and the immersion group 57.3% of the time (90 of 157 possible responses). The submersion group "sometimes" uses French 15.8% of the time and the immersion group 15.9%. They regularly use French 29.6% and 26.7% of the time respectively. These are not remarkable differences between the two groups. The immersion students avoid French slightly more than the submersion students and use it slightly less.

When we regroup the questions by type of situation, the differences become slightly more apparent. Most of the students use French "often" or "always" mainly in situations where they do not have much of a choice. Questions 10, 12, 13, 32 and 33 all place the student in conversation with a French speaker. The students use French. The reverse is also true: in questions 17-31 the student is queried about personal habits and it is obvious that they do not use or expose themselves to much French outside school.

Questions 1-9 and 11 ask questions relating to the student's interactions with family, neighbours, social groups, etc. and questions 14-16 probe their language use with classmates. The students confirm the parents' reports of language use at home in questions 1-3. The one submersion student who reported speaking French with a younger sibling said she did so in order that her sister would not have as much trouble as she herself experienced when she started French school. Questions 4-6 reflect the language patterns of the student's friends and neighbourhood. As the students also indicated in conversation, they generally use whichever language is appropriate. Although questions 7-9 did not apply to all students, those who replied based their answer on what language was most commonly spoken in the given situation.

As mentioned previously, both groups used French with identifiable French speakers (questions 10,12,13,32 and 33). There is not much difference between the two groups' responses except in

question 33: the immersion group seems slightly more willing to accommodate a French speaker than the submersion group (5 vs 3). In conversation with the groups, it was apparent that some of the children from the submersion group sometimes choose to speak English almost as an affirmation of their English-ness. The immersion students did not talk about this phenomenon. The submersion children may have more need to affirm their first language and culture than the immersion students because they may feel more at risk of being assimilated into the second language and culture by virtue of the time spent in a French setting (school).

In questions 8, 9, 11, 27 and 28 the students who responded followed the same patterns. In personal situations they used English and in social situations they accommodated the other speaker or speakers by using their language choice. It is clear that all the students are able and most are willing to use either language as the situation warrants.

When speaking with fellow students (questions 14-16), the submersion group is more likely to converse in French than the immersion group. This is no doubt a reflection of the student population's majority language in each school.

The majority of the questions (#17-31) examine the students' language practices in their personal out-of-school time. The great majority of answers reflect the fact the students do not find much use for French outside the school situation. The

submersion students indicate slightly more frequent use of French than the immersion students. The submersion group figures show they do not ever or rarely use French 73.5 % of the time in the situations described in questions 17-31 (listening to the radio, writing letters, watching T.V., daydreaming, etc. while the immersion group avoids French 78.1% of the time. These figures represent the percentage of "never" and "rarely" answers of the total number of possible answers (the "not applicable" answers having been factored out) in questions 17-31: that is, 50 of 68 answers for the submersion group and 57 of 73 answers for the immersion group. These data support the premise that students in both groups use French primarily as a school language although the submersion students use it slightly more than the immersion students in out-of-school contexts.

Only two questions elicited the same response from all students: "I speak French with my teacher(s) in class" to which all students replied "Always"; and, "I dream in French" to which all replied "Never". It would have been surprising if either of these questions had been answered differently.

In the second part (B) of the student questionnaire the subjects were asked to rate their own French abilities. As previously stated, this part of the questionnaire was not intended to be an accurate barometer of their actual ability, but to give insight as to how functional the students perceive themselves to

be in French. Results are shown in Table 5 below.

Table 5: Student's Self-Rankings of French Proficiency

	very poor	poor	avg.	good	very good	exc.
1.understand French				1-2	4-2	0-1
2.accent				2-3	1-0	2-2
3.read French			1-0	4-2	0-3	
4.others understand			1-0	2-2	1-2	1-1
5.write French		0-1	2-1	1-2	2-1	
6.speak correctly			1-0	0-3	4-1	0-1
7.understand French T.V./radio			1-0	2-2	1-3	1-0
8.say what you want				3-2	2-3	
9.tell French jokes			1-3	2-2		2-0
TOTAL		0-1	7-4	17-20	15-15	6-5*

* - The first number in each column represents the number of submersion students who chose the ranking and the second number represents the number of immersion students.

Except for one immersion student who rates her French written skills as poor, all other students rate all their abilities from Average to Excellent which indicates they are content with their French language skills. The submersion students rate themselves as "Average" more often than the immersion students. This is likely attributable to the fact they are comparing themselves with native speakers of French (their classmates) while the immersion students are comparing themselves with their anglophone peers and other schoolmates. This premise can also be applied, in reverse, to the "Good" and "Very good" responses: the immersion students, as a group, rate themselves

slightly higher than the submersion group. Question #9 may not be a reliable appraisal of French skills. Telling jokes in a second language is one of the more difficult and later skills to be acquired. It is possible that the students answered this question in terms of their joke-telling ability rather than their FRENCH joke-telling ability. The two submersion students who rated themselves as "Excellent" in this category rated themselves only as "Good" in ability to make others understand them (question 4) and in ability to say exactly what they want to say (question 7). If this is a valid argument, then the statement that the immersion students rate themselves slightly higher than the submersion students is supported again.

The only question that had a fairly large response in the category "Excellent" was accent. Four students (two from each group) perceive their accents to be excellent. This is interesting in view of the findings of the oral production section of the project which show that French speaking raters classify the students' accents as distinctly non-native with the immersion students rated as exhibiting more pronounced accents than the submersion group. However, in terms of the students' confidence and satisfaction regarding their accent, they appear to be quite satisfied.

If an arbitrary numeric value is assigned to each category (excellent=5, very good=4, good=3, average=2, poor=1 and very poor=0) it is possible to establish a rank order for the abilities

and compare the results to Genesee's (1978) findings. The rank orders are as follows:

<u>submersion students</u>	<u>immersion students</u>	<u>Genesee(1978)</u>
accent (20)	accent (19)	listening
listening (19)	be understood(19)	accent
speak correctly(18)	listening (18.5)	reading
be understood (17)	reading (18)	be understood
say what you want(17)	speak correctly(18)	writing
writing (15)	say what you want(18)	speak correctly
reading (14)	writing (13)	say what you want

Reading is ranked differently by each group. The immersion group ranks reading close (one rank lower) to Genesee's group but the submersion group ranks it last. This may be explained by the fact that the submersion group is probably exposed to more difficult texts than the immersion group. Also, by the time the students reach grade six in immersion about half of their school schedule is in French: they are not required to read as much French as the submersion group and may therefore not notice lacks of proficiency as readily as the submersion children. The immersion group are also closer to Genesee's group in speaking correctly and being able to say what one wants. Both groups rank these skills at or near the bottom of the order while the submersion group rank them in the middle. The Genesee group rated these skills lowest because they did not have adequate opportunity to practise out-of-school skills. They perceived a difference between the "type" of French learned at school and the French

needed for out-of-school communication. It is also possible that in 1978 there was less time available during classtime to actually talk. These theories are also supported by the higher ranking for reading and writing by this (Genesee's) group. The immersion and submersion students' rankings for oral skills probably reflect, in part at least, the amount of time the students have been able to talk in French in and out of school.

The immersion group ranks their ability to be understood higher than the other groups. Based on their documented patterns of the use of French (mostly at school), their interlocutors (teachers and fellow anglophone classmates) may be willing to give them more of an opportunity than the submersion group is accorded (by their French speaking teachers and classmates) to make themselves understood in their second language. Genesee's group ranks the ability to be understood at the same level as the submersion group. This may reflect the two preceeding premises: it is lower than the immersion group because of less opportunity to speak in class and it is higher than the other two oral skills because of the atmosphere of the immersion class that allows them to have the chance to make themselves understood.

Accent and listening are ranked high by each group. Perhaps the first-place ranking for listening for the Genesee group reflects classroom practices of the late seventies where instruction may have focussed more on receptive rather than productive skills.

The third part (C) of the questionnaire elicits why the students think it is important to learn French. They were asked to rate seven different reasons for learning French in terms of their relative importance (not at all important, slightly important, important or very important). Results are more clearly delineated between groups in this section than in the first two. The results confirm only somewhat Genesee's (1978) findings that immersion students are motivated to learn French primarily by instrumental reasons, secondarily by integrative and personal reasons and least of all by peer pressure. Let us consider the last two responses ("important" and "very important") as evidence of positive motivation and the first two as lack of evidence of positive motivation. Four questions are representative of instrumental motivation (# 1, 2, 4 and 6), two (# 3 and 5) of personal reasons and one (#7) of peer pressure. Question #4 could be classed as representative of integrative or instrumental motivation. As Ellis (1985) points out, the integrative-instrumental schema is really best explained on a continuum rather than as a dichotomy. "To make French friends" in certain contexts might have an inherent integrative goal. The subjects in this study have given no indication that they wish to become French or integrate themselves into French culture. Therefore, the question is counted as instrumental although it must be pointed out that two of the submersion students (see p.16) may be more integratively motivated than the other eight subjects.

In fact, these two subjects ranked this question as "important" and "very important". Results are presented in Table 6 below.

Table 6: Students' Reasons for Learning French

	not at all imp.	slight- ly imp.	impor- tant	very imp.
1.help me get a job			3-1	2-4
2.speak in neighbourhood	0-1	4-0	0-3	1-1
3.travel in foreign places	1-1	1-1	1-1	2-2
4.make French friends		2-1	2-2	1-2
5.nice to know L2		1-1	2-1	2-3
6.movies, T.V., books	0-1	4-1	1-3	
7.friends doing same	1-1	3-0	1-2	0-2
TOTAL	2-4	15-4	10-13	8-14*

* - The first figure in each column represents the number of submersion students who chose the answer and the second figure represents the number of immersion students.

All students in both groups are instrumentally motivated by the prospect of future job opportunities. This is the only question that has a unanimous response and for the immersion group it has the most "very important" responses. The majority (four out of five) of the the same group also feel it is important to speak French if they want to live in their community. For the submersion students, this is much less important. This may simply be a cause-effect reaction to the language patterns of their respective neighbourhoods. Neither group is highly motivated to learn French in order to go to French movies etc. although the immersion group finds it more important than the submersion group. The majority of each group think learning French helps make French

friends with the immersion group showing slightly more support. Both groups react the same way to the questions in the "personal reasons" category. Learning French to learn a second language is well supported in each group (four of five are motivated by it). This supports the view that one of the sociocultural characteristics of immersion programs is that children as well as parents regard the acquisition of a second language as a positive addition to the child's repertoire of skills (Genesee, 1983). Learning French as an adjunct to travel is also important though slightly less so (three of five in each group).

Peer pressure (question #7) is of little importance to the submersion group and of importance to the immersion group. Perhaps this is a reflection of their respective communities. There may be a feeling among parents who choose the immersion option in the English school that immersion is the popular choice (for many reasons) and their child will profit. The submersion parents do not have the same numbers in their community that have chosen the French school option (as shown by the number of anglophone students in the French school) so the students would not then be likely to rate this as important.

Overall, the immersion students place more importance on the different motivations than the submersion students. They are motivated in equal measure by instrumental, and peer pressure and least by personal reasons. The submersion group is primarily motivated by personal reasons, secondarily by instrumental reasons

and least by peer pressure. The lack of similarity to Genesee's findings may be due to the small number of questions asked, the small number of subjects and/or the reasons discussed above.

The fourth section (D) is an inquiry into the students' attitudes toward French and learning French. Results are presented in Table 7 below:

Table 7: Student Attitudes

	yes	no	in-between
1.happy with school	2-5 *		3-0
2.was more work	2-3	3-0	0-2
3.advise same for sibling	3-4		2-1
4.good way to learn French	5-5		
5.prefer all-English school	3-0	1-5	1-0
6.continue learning French	1-5	2-0	2-0
7.go to French high school	1-3	3-0	1-2
8.want to use French more	1-4	3-0	1-1
9.when talking to English person			
feel a)comfortable	5-5		
b)confident	5-4		0-1
c)embarrassed		5-5	
10.when talking to French person			
feel a)comfortable	3-2		2-3
b)confident	3-2		2-3
c)embarrassed		3-3	2-2

* - The first figure in each column represents the number of submersion students who chose the answer. The second figure represents the number of immersion students.

These results underscore the generally positive attitudes toward learning French held by the immersion students and the less positive (though certainly not negative) feelings of the

submersion group. All the immersion students are happy to have been in their school. The three out of five submersion students who chose "in-between" as an answer indicated that it had not always been an easy task.

The immersion students were proud that their program meant more work for them. They told me repeatedly that one could only succeed in immersion if one was ready to work REALLY, REALLY hard. This was not a negative, but rather a point of pride. Two of the submersion students who had ambivalent feelings in question #1 also said it had been more work (than if they had gone to English school).

All students said that their respective program had been a good way to learn French, but three of the ten could not decide if they would recommend it to a sibling. All the parents, on the other hand, indicated they would enrol another child in the same program. The fact that not one immersion student indicated he/she would rather be in an all-English school and that only one submersion student felt likewise, coupled with the fact that all the immersion students are definitely committed to continuing to learn French while only one (not the same one) submersion student expressed the same commitment, lead us to the conclusion that at some level the submersion students are not as satisfied. Section E of the questionnaire helps to clarify this through personal comments.

One submersion student will go to French high school. This

student was the most outgoing and positive in outlook during informal discussions. She was also the only one of the group to speak French with a sibling. She seemed to be intrigued with the language learning process. Three others of the group will go to English high school and expressed the fact they were happy about the choice. Their parents had indicated that this had always been the long-term plan. These students thought they would probably go into a post-immersion program. The one student who was as yet undecided did not mind in which language he continued. Of the three immersion students who said they would continue in French high school, one will actually go to a French school while the other two will enrol in post-immersion in an English high school. The two remaining immersion students had not yet decided between French high school and post-immersion. The immersion students want more exposure to French. This may be a result of the actual lack of opportunities they have to use French not only out of school but in school as well (as compared to the submersion group).

It is an interesting point of semantics that the immersion students consider they go to French school even though they technically attend an English school and that the submersion students felt they would be attending English school (although they would study in post-immersion).

All the students are predictably at ease in conversation with an English speaker. The one immersion student who indicated some lack of confidence was nervous and giggly and this is likely

reflected in her answer. The children's feelings are less clear when they are asked how they feel when speaking with a French speaker. Half feel comfortable and confident while the other half are somewhere in between. The difference between group scores (three immersion vs two submersion students in the comfortable and confident categories and the reverse in the in-between) is not great enough to claim a noteworthy difference between groups. These results may, once again, reflect the individual students out-of-school contacts. The more contact experienced, the more at ease the child is with French speakers.

In the final section (E), the students were asked to describe the three best and three worst aspects about doing elementary school in French. There were more similarities between the two groups for the " best aspects" than for the " worst aspects". Eight students (four from each group) listed learning French or a second language as their first "best aspect". The submersion group chose the term "learning a second language" while the immersion students said "learning French". One of the immersion students used both terms and counted them as separate points. This dichotomy in terms may reflect the point from which the individual student's language learning motivation stems. Are the immersion students more instrumentally motivated? They are happy to have learned French in order that they may have more contact with that community (see further comments below) while the

submersion students are happy to have had the experience of learning a second language. One submersion student pointed out that she had learned to speak GOOD French. She elaborated by saying that she would not be able to speak such good French if she had gone to immersion. One immersion student told of the fun she had doing other things in French such as math, reading and writing compositions. This is clear support for the theory that language must be used in order to be acquired.

Four of the submersion students talked about the good teachers and teaching. This supports the parents of the group who felt this was an important part of the success of the program. One student pointed out that the teachers were easy to understand. When asked to explain further, he said that sometimes he didn't understand French speakers but he ALWAYS understood his teachers. Another student was pleased that she could now decide which language was easier to use in any given situation and that she could talk two languages to her friends. There is a sense that she feels empowered because of her language skills. Two students reported having made new or more friends because of attending French school. Only one student made a comment relating to the future: he said it would be "better for when I grow up".

The immersion students were more forward- and outward-looking in their comments. Three stated that as a result of having gone through the immersion program they would 1) be able to get a better job and 2) get it more easily: for example, "When

I grow up I'll know French perfectly so I'll be able to get a French speaking job". There were four comments (three of which came from one child) relating to French outside school: "All the kids on my street speak French and since I know French I can talk with them", "One day I'll be able to go to France", "I can have french friends" and "It helped me talk to those outside of school". The first three comments are from the same child who clearly feels enabled to do wonderful things because of her language ability. It was interesting to find that many of the individual comments from both groups mirrored how the respective parents had responded to the same question in their questionnaire. Parental motivations have been successfully transmitted to the children.

There is virtually no accord between the groups for the question about the worst aspects of their experiences. The immersion group was "stumped" when they reached this question. They asked if they really had to answer. I said "No" but asked them to reflect a little longer. Each student put one answer only. Three of them said the worst aspect had been the "accord des noms adjectifs". One said kindergarten was harder and the fifth student said, "Nothing really, but we've had more homework". All in all, a rather satisfied group.

The submersion group had much more to say. One child related her three comments to the learning of French: learning a whole new language all over again and, in particular, learning all

the verbs and tenses as well as all the exceptions were the worst things. Interestingly enough, this response is from the one student who is continuing on to French high school next year and gave every indication that she had enjoyed the challenge of learning a second language. However, in comparison with some of the other students' replies, (see discussion following) her comments may reflect a normal reaction to second language learning. Only one other student related a comment to the language-learning process in saying that grammar and spelling were hard to learn. One boy's comment that the homework and work in class were the worst aspects had to be clarified: he explained that they were difficult because it was all in French. And one girl worried that "I loose (sic) a little English". Another student felt that when he first started school it had been difficult and that he had a lot of work because it was his second language.

Four students spoke of social problems relating to their mother tongue. Comments such as "Some of the French kids make fun of my language" and "Some of the French kids bug me because I speak English" indicate that their school days have sometimes been difficult. Although they are not in the same type of submersion situation as, for example, the students in Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa's (1976) study, they still are experiencing some of the typically negative aspects of submersion. Emotionally, these children have, at some point in elementary

school, suffered. In view of the fact the comments were written in the present tense it can be assumed that it is an on-going problem. None of the submersion parents talked of this problem. It would be interesting to know if they are aware of it. The submersion group is satisfied as far as second language skills are concerned but clearly have had to weather difficulties of a sort not experienced by the immersion group.

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (see Appendix D)

As explained under METHODOLOGY, a teacher questionnaire was used for two reasons: to provide confirmation (or not) of the parents' and students' language proficiency evaluations and language use patterns; and to test Teitelbaum's (1977) argument that teachers' ratings correlate moderately to language proficiency. The first section of the questionnaire deals with language ability and the second with language use. In both groups it was the French teacher who answered both parts of the language ability profile. Unfortunately, the teacher ratings for English language ability cannot be considered. The English teacher in each school should have responded rather than the classroom (French) teacher. They rate all students as fluent in all four modes of English proficiency. The parents agree with the oral assessment but 8 of 10 disagree with the English written assessment. Without English proficiency tests to confirm or deny we cannot conclude one way or another except to say that it is

likely that the parents would have had more opportunity to actually see samples of their child's written English work than the French teacher and are therefore better able to assess.

The teachers' assessments of French proficiency can be compared to the parents' appreciation of their child's French skills, the students self-evaluations and the two proficiency tests which were administered. The teachers rate all the students high (8 as fluent, 2 as very good) in speaking and understanding. Reading is rated slightly lower and writing is the weakest skill. Results are presented in Table 8 below.

Table 8: Language Ability Profile

How well does the child:	not at all	poor- ly	ade- quately	very well	flu- ently
1.speak French? *				1-1	4-4
2.understand French?				1-1	4-4
3.write French?			1-2	2-3	2-0
4.read French?					5-5
5.speak English?					5-5
6.understand English?					5-5
7.write English?					5-5
8.read English?					5-5

* - The first figure in each column represents the number of rankings for the submersion group. The second figure represents the rankings for the immersion group.

The teachers confirm the use of English at home in the majority of cases. The French school teacher did not know what the home language was for two students but this has already been established by the parent/student questionnaires. See Table 9

below.

Table 9: Language Use Profile

How much French/ English does the child use when:	French only	more French than English	French and Eng- lish e- qually	more English than French	Eng- lish only	don't know
1.talking with English speak- ing children in class?			0-2	0-3	5-0	
2.talking with English speak- ing children on the play- ground?					5-5	
3.when asked a question in French by the teacher?	5-5					
4.when initi- ating a con- versation with a French-speak- ing teacher?	5-5					
5.at home					3-5	2-0*

* - The first figure in each column represents the submersion group and the second figure the immersion group.

ORAL FRENCH TEST

Each student from each group (submersion, immersion and control) was recorded individually as he/she retold a familiar fairy tale. The student was given two picture books in which all script was covered: Boucle d'Or et les Trois Ours and Blanche

Neige. After selecting one, the student had a short time to reflect and then told the story in French using his/her own words and using the pictures as cues. Six native speakers of French rated the tape recordings on four levels: accent, vocabulary, syntax and grammar. Average scores for each student for each element are presented in Table 10 below:

Table 10: Average Scores for Each Student on the Oral French Test

student	accent(5)	vocabulary(4)	syntax(4)	grammar(4)
<u>Submersion group</u>				
1.	3.7*	3.8	2.7	2.3
2.	3.8	3.8	2.6	2.4
3.	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.2
4.	1.8	1.9	1.6	1.1
5.	2.5	2.1	1.6	2.0
<u>Immersion group</u>				
6.	1.8	2.3	2.0	2.4
7.	1.2	2.1	1.4	1.0
8.	1.0	1.7	1.7	1.0
9.	1.2	2.1	1.0	1.2
10.	1.2	1.9	1.6	1.8
<u>French control group</u>				
11.	5.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
12.	5.0	2.9	3.5	2.5
13.	5.0	2.0	1.5	1.0
14.	4.8	3.1	3.6	3.3
15.	4.2	2.7	2.6	2.8

* - Scores in the first column are out of 5.
 Scores in the second, third and fourth columns are out of 4.

Accent is rated on a scale of one to five with "one" signifying "un accent très prononcé avec presque tout les sons à tendance anglophone" and "five" meaning "definitivement francophone avec aucun son anglophone". The submersion group shows the greatest range of scores. The three students with higher scores may use French in different ways than the other two: one is the student who will continue in French high school, another is the student whose parents' friends and social activities are French and the third is the student whose mother is French although the home language is English. These students may find themselves in situations where they want to integrate to some degree with French speakers (at school, socially, or with relatives respectively) and are therefore motivated to speak as well as possible in the same way a young child gains a parent's approval by speaking well in his mother tongue. The two other submersion students have strong accents but still score higher than most of the immersion group.

The immersion group students are all rated as having pronounced English accents. In view of the fact that the only native speaker model available to the students during school hours is the teacher and that they do not use French a lot out of school, it is not surprising they use distinctively non-native phonology. One of the raters commented that as soon as the students said "parfait" and/or "gruau" it was clear they were non-native speakers.

The French controls all rate high for accent except for student number 15: She told me that she was raised speaking both languages (French father, English mother) but used French more. Her phonology system is no doubt a reflection of this fact. The two English speaking groups are closer to each other than to the French controls in average group scores and the immersion group has the most pronounced accent (see Table 11). This supports Chun's (1979) findings.

Table 11: Average Scores for Each Group on the Oral French Test

group	accent(5)	vocabulary(4)	syntax(4)	grammar(4)
submersion	2.7*	2.8	2.0	1.6
immersion	1.3	2.0	1.5	1.5
French control	4.8	2.9	3.0	2.7

* - Scores in the first column are out of 5.

- Scores in the second, third and fourth columns are out of 4.

In evaluating vocabulary, the raters considered appropriateness and richness. In most cases they found the vocabulary was very simple. This may be a result of the choice of instrument: thirteen of the fifteen children chose Boucle d'Or et les Trois Ours which is normally told using repetitive simple vocabulary. Two of the controls and two of the submersion group did have a richer vocabulary: they used, for example, words such as "apercevoir", "intrigué", "empoisonné", "fabriquer" and "cerceuil". In both the submersion group and the immersion group, certain students made occasional to frequent use of English words.

The submersion student who did this the most slipped in English words (and even a complete sentence) without hesitation. The immersion students resorted to English after a hesitation to find the correct French term failed. The students pronounced all English words with a French accent. No group is rated very high (out of 4) but the submersion group is almost on a par with the French controls (2.8 vs 2.9) while the immersion students receive the lowest scores.

Syntax was explored on two levels: were sentence structures correct and did the students use complex sentences? Once again, the French controls score highest although there is a wide range of scores within the group. The low scoring student was a stutterer. Possibly this affected the perception of his oral production on the vocabulary, syntax and grammar elements. Neither of the English groups was rated high for this element. The two groups are more similar to each other than to the French speaking students.

Two French students out of the fifteen children used the passé simple and used it well. The stories should properly be told using this literary tense. One submersion student used it once in his narrative. No other anglophone attempted to use it. A child who has not done a lot of reading in French would probably not be able to use the passé simple effectively.

The immersion students (except #6) and three of the submersion group used simple verb systems and if attempting to use

more complex structures (for example, the conditional or passé composé) would sometimes stop and rephrase more simply. Neither of the anglophone groups used subordinate clauses very often or very well. Simple sentences (subject + verb + object) were well formed by all groups.

At least one student in each group used "puis", "puis-là" or "là" at the beginning of many sentences. This structure is commonly heard in informal conversation and has no place in a more formal task such as this one. In this context it is probably used as a strategy to gain time so the speaker can organize his/her thoughts. Two of the immersion students relied on "après" to initiate many of their sentences. The immersion students had more pauses in their stories. They were comfortable with the pauses which shows they are used to being accorded the time necessary to think through what they want to say before saying it. Only one other student used this strategy. She is a French control who 1) chose Blanche Neige (the more complex story), 2) used complex structures (passé simple, subordinate clauses), 3) used enriched vocabulary and 4) used the hesitations for dramatic effect.

The lowest rankings are at the level of grammar. This section rates how well the students produce grammatically correct utterances. Do nouns and adjectives agree? Do verbs and pronouns agree? Are verbs conjugated correctly? Once again, the two English groups are closer to each other than to the French controls, with the submersion group ranked only slightly higher than the

immersion. Chun (1979) finds that immersion students have more grammatical accuracy than submersion students. This is not upheld by these results but this is the category in which the English groups are the most similar.

Most of the immersion students (4/5) and two of the submersion group have problems with masculine/feminine agreements: for example, " du mère", "la chaise était mou", " ma repas", " ma lit". More immersion than submersion students have difficulty with verb conjugation: for example, "après les ours a revenus", "ils est allés".

All the students self-correct but unlike Spolsky and Cooper (1978) who suggest that immersion students make more content self-corrections than native speakers, the immersion group makes the same number of content self-corrections (14) as the French controls while the submersion group makes eleven. These results may again be a function of the nature of the task. Retelling a simple and well known fairy tale may perhaps be likened to near-recitation. With the illustrations to guide them, the children did not have an extremely context-reduced task to perform and therefore did not have many content self-corrections. The two students (one from the immersion and the other from the French control group) who chose Blanche Neige had more self-corrections than the other students. With that in mind, the three groups are about equal in content self-correction.

The immersion group does, however, make more grammar

self-corrections than the other two groups. They self-correct for grammar eight times as opposed to four times for the submersion group and once for the French controls. These self-corrections reflect the order of scored grammatical proficiency of each group: the immersion being the least proficient (1.5 average score), followed closely by the submersion (1.6 average score) and the French controls (2.7 average score).

It must be noted that though both anglophone groups scored lower than the French controls in all aspects, the raters all agreed that ALL the subjects were able to tell the story so that any native speaker could easily understand it. This supports Genesee's (1983) conclusion that immersion students' productive skills are less than native-like but are communicatively very proficient. The submersion group has shown the same type of profile in their oral production: they perform better than the immersion students but not as well as the French controls. Swain (1972) argues that students must be exposed to varied conditions (including exposure to French peers) to get balanced verbal fluency. This is a possible factor why the submersion students outperform the immersion students (more exposure to different conditions and to French peers) but are still considerably below native speakers (less exposure to French as compared with the French controls).

WRITTEN FRENCH TEST

The written test was administered at the last meeting with each group. As each school had already been disrupted a number of times for this project, it was felt that the test could not be administered using the same time frame (2 1/2 hours) normally suggested by the MEQ. The time allotted was 1-1 1/4 hours. This meant that explanations were kept to a minimum and that the students were not required to produce a final copy. Their working copies became the final result. It can be argued that because of the reduced time the results may not be as reliable as they might have been. Indeed, the results might have been better with a longer time frame but for purposes of inter-group comparisons this is a moot point as each group had the same amount of time in which to write. Students were permitted to consult their dictionaries and grammar books.

In terms of MEQ parameters, the compositions were short. Compositions under 250 words are classed as short: the submersion group averaged 142.8 words, the immersion group 150.4 words and the control group 146.2 words. One child from each group wrote over 200 words and another from each group wrote less than 100.

The test was marked using the MEQ correction grille. Ten elements are normally marked: 1)choix des informations, 2)choix du vocabulaire, 3)cohérence: logique, 4)cohérence: liens entre les phrases, 5)découpage du texte, 6) ponctuation, 7)structure des phrases, 8) orthographe d'usage, 9)accord des noms et des

adjectifs and 10) conjugaison et accord des verbes. Although all elements were marked, only numbers 2, 7, 8, 9 and 10 were examined in detail. These elements cover the three aspects of written French that were chosen to be evaluated in the study: vocabulary, grammar and spelling. The markers also made comments relating to these elements. Marks out of ten were accorded for elements 2, 7 and 8. Elements 9 and 10 were combined and averaged to give a mark on ten. Table 12 shows the range of marks (out of ten) for each element for each group (submersion group, immersion group and the francophone controls). The five marks for each group were then averaged (see Table 13) in order that comparisons between groups could be made.

Table 12: Written French Test Range of Scores

	submersion	immersion	Francophones
vocabulary	4-6*	3-6	4-6
phrase structure	3-6	2-8	2-6
grammar	7-9.5	2-9	4.5-10
spelling	8-10	4-9	6-10

* - Each set of figures represents the high and low scores out of ten for each group.

Table 13: Written French Test Result Averages

	submersion	immersion	Francophones
vocabulary	4.8*	5.2	4.6
phrase structure	4.2	3.2	4.0
grammar	8.1	6.1	7.3
spelling	9.6	7.0	8.8

* - Each figure represents the group average mark out of ten.

The raters judged all the compositions weak in vocabulary. The highest mark awarded was 6/10 which was given to one immersion, one control and two submersion students. Each group sometimes used imprecise vocabulary: for example, using "affaire", "choses" or "faire" when a more precise word is required. The submersion and immersion groups also used words that, though not incorrect, were not appropriate: for example, "bord" instead of "côté", "plein" instead of "beaucoup". The immersion students also used incorrect vocabulary: for example, "falloir" instead of "devoir", "monnaie" instead of "argent". Some of the incorrect vocabulary choice is due to language transfer: for example, "monnaie" above or "juste" instead of "seulement". The average score results do not support the premise that immersion students are behind in vocabulary compared to native speakers. The immersion group scores the highest of the three groups. As the children wrote their compositions, the immersion group was the only group that consulted their dictionaries often. The control group never used them and the submersion group used them occasionally. This may be a factor in the vocabulary scores.

No group was rated high in sentence structure. The control group's compositions were characterized by longer sentences that were complex but sometimes difficult to understand because of lack of punctuation, improper use of conjunctions and/or prepositions, incomplete clauses or a tendency to sound like oral language. Only one student used the conditional correctly.

The submersion students generally used simpler constructions and when using complex sentences had trouble using prepositions correctly (for example, "pour" placed before "si" to introduce a sentence). One student used non-idiomatic constructions: for example, "...et en plus il n'aurais personne à agacer et se chicaner avec."

The immersion students proficiency in sentence structure was rated as very poor. Only one student used the conditional. She made errors (specifically in the use of "si") but otherwise was correct in most other sentence constructions. The other students, however, exhibited difficulty. One used infinitives almost every time the imperative was required. This may be more a spelling error than a sentence structure error but the raters included it in this section. Nevertheless, it is clearly an item that has been learned incorrectly and is well entrenched in the student's written production repertoire. Two students regularly used English sentence forms: for example, "n'avoir personne pour jouer avec".

All the immersion students except one had trouble with prepositions (forgetting them or not choosing the correct one) and negatives. Another tended to forget the subject in her sentences: for example, "Et pas surveillé nos frères ou soeurs."

The three groups scored higher in grammar. As with sentence structure (above) and with spelling (following) the submersion group is ranked best, followed by the control group and the

immersion group. The French children only had problems with verb agreements: for example, "tu n'a pas besoin...". They made mistakes most often when they used the conditional. They made mistakes in any person (2nd person singular, 3rd person plural, etc.).

The submersion students made infrequent errors. Verb agreements were correct except for the 3rd person singular and plural: for example, "Il y en a qui dise___" or "ils me semble". Three of the students make errors (infrequent) in noun-adjective agreements: for example, "des goûts semblable_".

Two of the immersion students made only a few errors in "les accords" but the others made them more often than not. Very few of their noun-adjective agreements nor their verb conjugations are correct: for example, "Moi, si j'étais un enfant unique, je serai_ probablement(sic) très gâtés_".

One of the readers pointed out that most of the immersion students (individual students were not identified by group for the raters) wrote using a limited grammatical repertoire. She felt that the grammar they used was well learned, but that they were very limited in scope. She commented that she felt that the constructions they used were taken directly from the grammar books they had by their sides. Her observations support the view that immersion students use distinctly non-idiomatic structures (Genesee and others).

All three groups received their best results in spelling.

The controls made their errors in the middle of more difficult words such as "intérressant", "ambision", "ennuiyeuse", etc.. The submersion and immersion students had more difficulties with word endings: for example, "accors", "touss" when "tout" was required, "travaillee" for "travail" and "mieus" for "mieux". The difference between the two groups lies in the frequency of errors. The immersion group commits double the number than the submersion group.

The percentage of errors in each student's composition was calculated for phrase structure, grammar and spelling. These results were then combined by group and averaged. The results are represented in Table 14 following.

Table 14: Percent of Errors for Each Group

	submersion	immersion	Francophones
phrase structure	3.56%	6.16%	4.22%
grammar	4.02%	7.44%	5.48%
spelling	1.72%	3.72%	2.72%

The results from the three tables (12-14) show the submersion students as the strongest group on all measures but vocabulary, in which the immersion group is ranked highest. The control group which ranks second in all but vocabulary (where they rank third) is closer to the submersion than the immersion group. These results are contrary to what the research suggests. We would

normally expect the controls to be ranked highest on all measures. In view of time of exposure, we would probably then expect the submersion students to rank second and the immersion students third as per the results for oral French. Why the unpredicted results?

There may be two factors which influenced the written work. Firstly, the submersion students have perhaps learned to be more attentive to their second language than the controls are to their native language. Because they have had to learn a whole new language system, they may actually become more sensitized to the mechanics of language and may therefore attend more to details whereas the majority of the controls write as they speak. Secondly, when the subject selection was done, the controls and immersion students were chosen relative to the strengths in French of the submersion subjects. This may actually have confounded the written French results: the English groups may have actually been stronger academically than the control students but were rated by their teachers as the same in French proficiency and were therefore chosen to participate in the study. If the English students are more academically gifted, then this might explain the unpredicted rankings. In spite of the language deficiencies due to the fact they are being asked to write in their second language, most of the English students' compositions are richer in content and perhaps vocabulary than the controls'.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Through interviews, questionnaires and the collection of samples of oral and written French it has been possible to explore some of the similarities and differences between submersion and immersion students at the grade six level. It is not possible to reflect on the information collected and arrive at the conclusion that one system is "better" than the other or that one is more appealing than the other for English students wishing to become bilingual or at least proficient in French. However, it has been possible to describe the experiences of these two small groups of children who have spent their elementary school years in one system or the other.

All the parents have confirmed the legitimacy of two cultures and languages in Quebec by choosing to enrol their children in schools where students study in French (Swain, 1972, Genesee, 1987). The children and parents are primarily motivated by instrumental and personal reasons. All the immersion students, all the parents from both groups and most of the submersion students have positive attitudes toward French and the acquisition of it. None of the subjects have attended their school with the intention of becoming French. They all attend by choice and have the option to leave. This confirms Genesee (1987), Lambert (1975), Cowan and Sarmed (1976), Stern(1983).

Submersion is not perceived as a radical choice by the

parents who choose it and the submersion students do not suffer identity loss. This contradicts Cziko's (1978) premise that submersion is a radical step that might affect the child's identity. The children do indicate that they are sometimes teased because of their first language. This confirms Cohen's findings (1975). The first language is endorsed by the school, however, by the fact that English is not banned from use in the playground or halls. Lambert's (1980) concern that minority language students may be at risk of failure in a submersion situation because of the denigration of or threat to the home language and culture is not substantiated in the study. The teasing the submersion students experience because of their mother tongue, although hurtful, does not appear to have precluded success for them. This group of submersion students exhibit some of the traits of successful minority students in submersion (Cummins, 1981): they are highly motivated to learn the second language (though not to identify with the second culture), they are proud of their own culture and their parents value education highly. These traits are also attributable to the immersion group. Therefore, although the language education of minority children in the United States would seem to point away from submersion because it is seen as damaging (Spolsky, 1972), submersion in the Quebec context for English children seems to be viable. The dangers of semilingualism in a submersion situation as described by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976) are not a problem here. It appears the submersion children

have proper first language development (although this was not measured directly). as well as strong ethnic and language identity. The one area of concern to the submersion parents is English written skills. This issue cannot be assessed within the parameters of the present study as no data was collected for English proficiency. One submersion parent said that when an older sibling went to English high school he caught up in written English within a year.

According to Gaarder (in Spolsky, 1972) immersion schools develop the students' skills in both languages in all domains to form balanced bilinguals. In reality, the immersion students are not bilingual although they are very proficient. The submersion students are slightly more proficient.

Neither group is native-like in written or oral production. The submersion group is generally ranked higher than the immersion group. In oral production, the submersion group is closer to the native speaker group in vocabulary but closer to the immersion group in accent, syntax and grammar. Both groups use simple language and non-idiomatic expressions which is typical documented behaviour for immersion students (for example, Harley and Swain, 1977). In written production, both groups score higher in relation to the control group but this may be for the reasons discussed in that section. According to Spolsky and Cooper (1978) the immersion students should be behind in vocabulary which these students were not. Except for vocabulary, the submersion students

had the best rankings in written French.

As predicted by Teitelbaum (1977) the students are not good evaluators of their own language proficiency and the teachers were fairly accurate for French but not necessarily for English. The teachers' ratings tended to be high compared to the results from the written and oral tests. It is clear that the language tests are problematic (as Swain and Lapkin, 1981 suggest): did they measure skills or communicative aspects?

Neither group uses French very much out of school, although the submersion group indicates slightly more regular use. Several immersion parents as well as Swain (1972, 1988) and Genesee (1984) feel that the school situation (in immersion) precludes efficient acquisition of French. The immersion classroom may use an almost artificial French (Genesee, 1983) because it is made up of students who regularly speak English at home. The submersion option offers more varied conditions for the students to learn French.

Overall, six general conclusions may be drawn from the data collected:

- 1) both submersion and immersion parents are happy with the choice of school they made for their child;
- 2) the majority of submersion and immersion parents and children are satisfied with the child's level of French proficiency but the submersion parents worry their child's written English is weak;

- 3) submersion students are more proficient in oral and written French tests than immersion students but neither are native-like;
- 4) submersion students use French outside the classroom slightly more than the immersion students do;
- 5) submersion students have a more difficult time in the early grades because of poor French skills and may experience denigration of their first language by their peers but seem to overcome these obstacles. Immersion students do not experience these problems; and
- 6) both submersion and immersion students are highly motivated to learn French.

There are several limitations to the study which should be noted. As evidenced in the proficiency testing (especially written production), the subjects were probably not well matched for academic aptitude. This may have skewed the results in favor of both anglophone groups. Rather than using the students' French marks as the criteria for selection, perhaps their overall academic performances should have been considered.

It would have added greater insight to our understanding of the parents' motivations for choosing their respective program if they had been asked to rank order question #2 of the Parent Questionnaire. Part C of the Student Questionnaire might also have yielded richer information about the students' attitudes towards

learning a second language had they been asked to rank order the items.

In reading the parents' comments, it became clear that the childrens' English language proficiency should also have been tested. As discussed earlier, the submersion parents, in particular, were concerned about their child's written English skills. The small amount of insight that might have been garnered relating to the students' English language skills was virtually inadmissable. This was due to the fact that the French teachers completed the English proficiency section of the Feuille d'Evaluation à Utiliser par le Professeur. It had not been clearly specified to these teachers that the English Second Language (ESL) teacher should respond to the questions pertaining to English skills.

Further investigation of the different programs (see Introduction, p.1) available to anglophone students in Quebec would be of interest to second language acquisition researchers, school board administrators, teachers and parents in order to better understand the projected outcomes of seven (kindergarten to grade six) years exposure to French in different contexts. More varied instruments (for example, oral picture description tests, dictation) could be used to provide a more comprehensive picture of the students' language proficiencies (French and English). A larger sample would be helpful in providing enough data to allow more definitive conclusions or relationships to be drawn. Finally,

classroom observation would be a valuable tool in the investigation of the students' language use in the classroom.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Chun, J. (1979) The importance of the language learning situation: Is "immersion" the same as the "sink or swim" method? Working Papers on Bilingualism, (18), 131-164.
- Cohen, A.D. (1975) Successful immersion education in North America. Working Papers on Bilingualism, (5), 39-46.
- Cowan, J. and Sarmed, Z. (1976) Reading performance of bilingual children according to type of school and home language. Working Papers on Bilingualism, (11), 74-114.
- Cummins, J. (1981a) Bilingualism and Minority Language Children. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Cummins, J. (1981b) The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In School and Language Minority Students: A Theoretical Framework. Los Angeles: Evaluation, Experimentation and Assessment Center.
- Cziko, G.A., Holobow, N. and Lambert, W.E. (1978) Early and Late French Immersion: A Comparison of Children at Grade 7. Montreal: McGill University. (mimeo)
- Cziko, G.A., Lambert, W.E., Sidoti, N. and Tucker, G.R. (1978) Graduates of Early Immersion: Retrospective Views of Grade 11 Students and Their Parents. Montreal, McGill university. (mimeo)
- Ellis, R. (1985) Understanding Second Language Acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Genesee, F. (1978) Second language learning and language attitudes. Working Papers on Bilingualism, (16), 19-41.
- Genesee, F. (1983) Bilingual education of majority language children. Applied Linguistics, (4), 1-46.
- Genesee, F. (1987) Learning Through Two Languages. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.
- Hammerly, H. (1989) French Immersion: Myths and Reality.

- Calgary, AB: Detselig Enterprises.
- Harley, B. and Swain, M. An analysis of verb form and function in the speech of French Immersion pupils. Working Papers on Bilingualism, (14), 31-46.
- Lambert, W.E. (1975) Culture and language as factors in learning and education. In A. Wolfgang (ed.) Education of Immigrant Students. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Lambert, W.E. and Tucker, G.R. (1972) The Bilingual Education of Children: The St. Lambert Experiment. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Lightbown, P. and Spada, N. (1989) Etude des Effets à Longue Terme de l'Apprentissage de l'Anglais, Langue Seconde, au Primaire. Concordia University and McGill University. (mimeo).
- Mackey, W. (1972) Bilingual Education in a Bilingual School. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Macdonald, E. and Mitchell, C. (1989) A Qualitative Exploration of Linguistic and Cultural Aspects of Language Acquisition: A Study of French Immersion in Prince Edward Island. Charlottetown, University of Prince Edward Island. (mimeo).
- Netter, J. and Spain, W. (1989) Interaction patterns in the French immersion classroom: Implications for levels of achievement in French language proficiency. The Canadian Modern Language Review, (45), 485-501.
- Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and Toukomaa, P. (1976) Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Sociocultural Situation of the Migrant Family. Helsinki: Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.
- Spolsky, B. and Cooper, R.L. (eds.) (1978) Case Studies in Bilingual Education. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Stern, H. (1983) Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Swain, M. (1972) Bilingual Schooling: Some Experiences in Canada and the United States. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Swain, M. (1988) Manipulating and complementing content teaching to maximize second language learning. TESL Canada Journal, (6), 68-83.
- Swain, M. and Barik, H. (1976) Five Years of Primary French Immersion. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Swain, M. and Lapkin, S. (1981) Bilingual Education in Ontario: A Decade of Research. Toronto: Ministry of Education, Ontario.
- Teitelbaum, H. (1977) The validity of various techniques measuring children's bilingualism. Working Papers on Bilingualism, (13), 92-120.

APPENDIX A:
FORM LETTERS TO PARENTS

APPENDIX A

Montreal, Quebec

Dear Parents,

I am currently working towards completion of a Master of Education degree at McGill University. I am conducting a small research study of anglophone French Immersion students and anglophone students who are studying in a French language school. In order to do the study I seek your permission to speak with your child with regard to his/her language learning experiences during elementary school and to use a sample of his/her written and oral work. I will not identify your child by his/her name.

In addition, I would ask you to complete a questionnaire dealing with your observations of your child's elementary school experiences. Should you wish, we could also meet at your convenience to discuss your perspectives.

Thank you for your time and interest.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Robert

I authorize Mrs. Susan Robert to speak with and use samples of the school work of _____ yes _____ no _____
(name of child)

I am willing to complete the questionnaire for parents. yes _____ no _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Montréal, Québec

Chers parents,

Je suis actuellement en train de préparer une maîtrise en Education à l'Université McGill. J'aimerais faire une recherche avec votre enfant et utiliser deux de ses travaux écrits et oraux.

Je n'identifierai pas les élèves par leur nom.

Je vous remercie à l'avance de votre collaboration.

Susan Robert

Susan Robert

J' autorise Madame Susan Robert à utiliser les travaux de

_____. oui _____ non _____

Signature des parents _____

Date _____

APPENDIX B:
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

<u>PART A</u>	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Doesn't apply
1. I speak French with my parents.						
2. I speak French with my brother(s)/ sister(s).						
3. I speak French with my other relatives.						
4. I speak French on the telephone.						
5. I speak French with my friends in my neighbourhood						
6. I speak French with my friends' parents.						
7. I speak French with people at my church/synagogue.						
8. I speak French with my teammates or coaches.						
9. I speak French with my friends or leaders in other groups or clubs (for example, Scouts, Guides, chess club).						
10. I speak French with the person who serves me in a store or restaurant.						
11. I speak French at summer camp.						
12. I speak French with my teacher(s) in class.						
13. I speak French with my teacher(s) out of class.						

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Doesn't apply
14. I speak French with my classmates in class.						
15. I speak French with my classmates out of class.						
16. I speak French with other students who are not in my class.						
17. I listen to French radio.						
18. I listen to French T. V..						
19. I go to French plays or concerts.						
20. I go to French movies.						
21. I listen to French tapes.						
22. I read French books.						
23. I read French comic books.						
24. I read French newspapers.						
25. I read French magazines.						
26. I count in French.						
27. I pray in French.						
28. I daydream in French.						
29. I write my diary in French.						
30. I write letters in French.						

	Never	Rarely	Sometime	Often	Always	Doesn't answer
31. I dream in French.						
32. When I meet someone I think speaks French, I start talking to him/ her in French.						
33. When a French speaker starts talking to me in French, I answer back in French.						
34. I try to find situations where I will have a chance to speak in French.						
<u>PART B</u> How good do you think you are <u>IN FRENCH</u> in the following:	Very poor	Poor	Average	Good	Very good	Excellent
1. your ability to understand others in French						
2. your accent when you speak French						
3. reading in French						
4. your ability to make other people understand you when you speak French						
5. writing French						
6. your ability to speak correctly in French						
7. your ability to understand French T.V. or radio						
8. your ability to say exactly what you want to say in French						
9. your ability to tell jokes in French						

<u>PART C</u> I think it is important to learn French because:	Not at all important	Slightly important	Important	Very important
1. it will help me get a job when I am finished school.				
2. it is necessary to speak French if you want to live in Laval/ St. Eustache.				
3. then I can travel more in foreign countries.				
4. then I might be able to become friends with some French Canadians.				
5. it is nice to know another language.				
6. it will make it easier to go to French movies, watch French T.V. and read French books.				
7. most of my other friends are also studying French.				

<u>PART D</u>	Yes	No	In between
1. Are you happy to have been in this school?			
2. Do you think that by being in this school you have made more work for yourself?			
3. If you had a younger brother or sister who was going to start school next year, would you advise him/ her to come to this school?			

	Yes	No	In between
4. Do you think coming to this school was a good way to learn French?			
5. Would you rather go to an all- English school?			
6. Do you want to continue learning French?			
7. Will you go to a French high school next year?			
8. Would you like to be able to speak French more often with French - speaking people?			
9. When you talk in English to someone who is also English, how do you feel? a) comfortable			
b) confident			
c) embarrassed			
10. When you talk in French to someone who is French-speaking, how do you feel? a) comfortable			
b) confident			
c) embarrassed			

PART E

What have been the three BEST things about doing elementary school in French?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

What have been the three WORST things about doing elementary school in French?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

APPENDIX C:
PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX C

PARENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Do you expect your child to be "completely" bilingual by the end of elementary school? _____

2. Why do you want your child to learn French?

economic reasons _____

social reasons _____

educational reasons _____

cultural reasons _____

political reasons _____

other _____

3. Do you speak French with your child at home? _____

4. Have you helped your child with homework?

	Grade One	Grade Two	Grade Three	Grade Four	Grade Five	Grade Six
written homework						
oral homework						
projects						

5. Did your child's personality play a role in your choice of French school / French Immersion? _____

6. Would you make the same choice again? _____

7. Did you worry your child's English skills would suffer? _____

8. If your child had experienced difficulty (academically and/ or emotionally) would you have pulled him / her out of the program? _____

9. Would you enrol a younger sibling in the same program? _____

10. Are you satisfied with:

the program in general _____

the amount of time spent in French _____

the amount of time spent in English _____

your child's French oral skills _____

your child's French written skills _____

your child's English oral skills _____

your child's English written skills _____

your child's attitude toward school _____

11. Were there difficult times for your child at school? If so, at what level and what was the nature of the difficulty? _____

12. What have been the three BEST aspects of your child's experience in French school/ French Immersion? _____

13. What have been the three WORST aspects?' _____

If you feel you have other comments to offer, please use the space below.

Thank you very much for agreeing to answer this questionnaire.

APPENDIX D:
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX D

FEUILLE D'EVALUATION A UTILISER PAR LE PROFESSEUR

Nom de l'élève _____ Date _____

Année _____ Langue maternelle de l'élève _____

MAITRISE DE LA LANGUE

Mettre une croix dans la colonne de votre choix. Donner votre appréciation sur la façon dont l'élève:	Pas du tout	Très peu	Moyennement	Bien	Couramment
s'exprime en français					
comprend le français					
écrit en français					
lit en français					
parle anglais					
comprend l'anglais					
écrit en anglais					
lit en anglais					

USAGE DE LA LANGUE

Placer une croix dans la bonne colonne. A votre avis, quelle langue entre le français et l'anglais l'élève choisit-il d'utiliser dans les situations suivantes:	Seulement le français	Plus de français que d'anglais	Autant le français que l'anglais	Plus d'anglais que de français	L'anglais seulement	Ne sait pas
durant une conversation avec des élèves anglophones en classe						
durant une conversation avec des élèves anglophones dans la cour de récréation						
quand le professeur lui pose une question en français						
quand il commence une conversation avec un professeur parlant français						
chez lui						