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Abstract

French Immersion as a bilingual educational alternative has been in existence in Canada for some thirty years. Considerable research has been conducted to prove its effectiveness. Most of it has centered around second language learning, language acquisition, and learning through a second language. The research concerning mastery of the mother tongue and transfer of knowledge acquired in a second language to the first language has been a part of the general studies regarding the effects of bilingual education upon the cognitive and linguistic development of children.

In the Early French Immersion programme in British Columbia, English Language Arts are formally introduced in Grades 3 or 4. This is called the Transitional Year. This survey was directed to a sampling of teachers of Transitional Year English. The aim was to learn how the programme functions and how it could be improved.

Transitional Year English in the study schools occurred in either Grade 3 or Grade 4. Sometimes it was taught by the French Immersion teacher to her own class, sometimes by a different French Immersion teacher and occasionally by an English Language Arts teacher.

There is no scheduled time set aside for the team of English and French Language Arts teachers to plan and coordinate their dual programmes. However, often it is the same individual who teaches both academic subjects, and so conference time is not required. When there are two teachers involved, they meet informally on their own time.

The questionnaire attempted to learn how the various skills and concepts of Language Arts were coordinated between the two languages. Where possible, the teachers taught for transfer of knowledge and to avoid interference.

The teachers find the materials provided to be satisfactory, however they see a need for the development of materials for new teachers of Transitional Year English and of materials and guides specifically for Transitional Year English to enable them to make the
best use of the limited time. The teachers themselves could be a valuable resource for developing such materials and guidelines.
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CHAPTER I
LITERATURE REVIEW

A. Introduction

It has been some thirty years since French Immersion had its inception with Harry Giles in Toronto in 1962 (Obadia, 1990) and nearly 300,000 students are currently enrolled across Canada (Day, Shapson and Desquins, 1993). Since its beginning, there have been numerous studies on its success (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Cummins, 1984; Genesee, 1985) and on its imperfections (Obadia, 1990; Bibeau, 1984; Tardif, 1985; Lyster, 1987). It was found that in this French "bath" in which the young learners are immersed, the mastery of the French language is superior to that of their comrades in the "core French" programme. Moreover, they learn content areas, such as Mathematics, Social and Natural Sciences, for example, through this second language. Furthermore, after a brief delay, they master English just as well as their peers in the English/core French programme who receive many more hours of instruction in English (Lapkin & Swain, 1984). In fact, some French Immersion students even surpass them in English (Cummins & Swain, 1986).

This study investigated how the English Language Arts component of the French Immersion programme is taught in the year in which it is introduced, known as the Transitional Year. It took the form of a survey directed to a sampling of teachers of Transitional year English. The survey asked closed-ended and open-ended questions about the teachers' professional backgrounds; the physical set-up of the programme; the curriculum; the teaching strategies; and the degree of teacher satisfaction with the support they received from their districts and from the Ministry of Education in terms of curriculum guides, books, professional development and so on.

The object of this literature review is to summarize the results of the various studies which have been performed to evaluate English Language skills in Early French
Immersion, to examine the variables which played a part, and to review the teaching methods employed in immersion language classes and the learning strategies discovered. In this way, one should discover how the programme functions and how it could be improved.

B. Definitions and Assumptions

Before beginning the review, it would be helpful to the reader to present some definitions and assumptions. When speaking of immersion in its Canadian context, one could say that it is not only a way of teaching the French language to young anglophones, but it is also the entire education of the whole child (Tardif, 1985), in the classical sense of "education", as Obadia states (1990). The expected result is functional bilingualism: that the graduate will be capable of leading his life either in English or in French with equal ease. Often the question arises, "What sort of French have these graduates learned?" The object of the programme is not to make a linguist of each student but to enable every one to function socially and in the workplace in both French and English. Research has shown us that the graduates are functionally bilingual (Lambert & Tucker, 1972 and 1984; Pawley, 1985; Burns, 1986).

C. Psychological Implications of Bilingualism

This notion of bilingualism, until recently, was feared by certain groups of psychologists. If one uses the analogy of human mental capacity as being an empty vessel which waits to be filled with information, one could imagine that at a certain point it would be full. Bearing this in mind, it becomes clear that if this space were equally occupied by two languages, it could contain only half the knowledge that could be contained if it were all held in a single language. Therefore it was believed that bilingualism had a detrimental effect on intelligence. Moreover, the act of continually changing the code from one language to the other would lead to mental confusion. The mind was seen as being the
product of its environment. In this case the environment was the two languages. This environmentalist account of the negative influences of bilingualism helped bolster the hypothesis of behaviourism, which was prevalent until the 1950s (Hakuta, 1985).

At the beginning of this century, such was the most widely-held belief concerning bilingualism. From the 1920s to the 1950s, the research was conducted on minority ethnic groups of a low socio-economic level. There was concern about their poor performance on intelligence tests. Generally these were groups of immigrants in the United States who wished to assimilate as quickly as possible in their new country. Thus there was no high status associated with their mother tongue nor with the culture. Such a situation of bilingualism where the mother tongue is replaced by the second language, which is the majority language, is called "subtractive bilingualism" by Lambert (1978).

But a contrary situation exists in immersion: the pupils are normally children of the majority language group and the affluent socio-economic class (Genesee, 1985; Burns, 1986; Burns and Olson, 1989). In immersion the mother tongue is not replaced by the target language: the argument here is that the first language is enriched by the second. Lambert (1978) called this sort of bilingualism "additive bilingualism". Peal and Lambert conducted their study in the 1960s, an era when a new metaphor for the mind was presented: the mind was seen not as an empty vessel to be filled, but as a problem-solving device. This was the cognitivist view (Hakuta, 1985; Savignon, 1987).

There is also a third situation which lies between the two cited above which is found amongst the minority Finns in Sweden and amongst the Hispano-Americans and Amer-Indians in the United States (Cummins, 1984). Here, due to the ghetto situation of low socio-economic status in which these peoples reside, and related to socio-political and historical factors contributing to this and creating an ambivalence between the home and majority languages and cultures, these bilingual speakers succeed in speaking neither language fluently. Currently the effort is to use the good example of the success of French
immersion in Canada to raise the prestige of both languages being learned and thus to improve the minority language group's status, an educative initiative beyond reproach (Cummins, 1984).

Cummins (1984) postulates, in examining these ideas of additive and subtractive bilingualism, that there is a "threshold level" of competence which must be attained before enjoying the cognitive benefits of bilingualism. Since language is a vehicle employed by human beings to react to their social and conceptual environment, there must be a certain level of linguistic competence in order to participate. The hypothesis of the threshold level does not give the indices of what skills and abilities constitute attaining the threshold, however Cummins suggests there are perhaps two thresholds according to the degree of competence in the two languages. For example, one might be capable of speaking and understanding the mother tongue while being unable to read or write it, yet able to function at an academic and cognitive level in the second language. Once one is able to function at an "advanced" level in both languages, one is considered to have reached the second threshold.

It is at this second threshold, where one is able to react with the environment through language, that the speaker profits from the cognitive benefits of bilingualism. At the lower threshold, there is no effect upon cognition, whereas it is the attainment of the second "threshold" level of proficiency in both languages that contributes to the cognitive benefits of bilingualism. He adds that it is not only immigrants in a minority situation who suffer from the subtractive effects of bilingualism. On the contrary, often the children of immigrants fare better in school in a minority situation than their peers who speak the majority language. The attitudes and aspirations of their parents and the role these play in the children's success must also be considered.
D. Parental Influence

In Canada, parents of children enrolled in immersion classes are often deeply involved in their children’s education (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Cummins, 1977; Chmilar, 1984). Foremost, it is a programme of choice, and historically it was the elite who chose this educational option (Burns, 1983). The programme began upon the insistence of the parents, whose association, Canadian Parents for French, was involved in the advancement of the programme, its promotion, research and extra-mural activities.

Aside from the initial difficulty of establishing the programme, there remain the difficulties of transportation; the disconcerting difficulty of being unable to understand their children’s homework; and public scepticism. There is a perpetual fear that one will lose his identity and maternal language, and thus be handicapped with a weakness in English language skills.

With the strong interest parents of children in French Immersion take in their children’s education, and the high hopes for success they have in this “experiment”, the chances of success for the child are increased. In his study in British Columbia, Shapson (1988) states that the French Immersion clientele recognizes a value in knowing a second language from childhood. The reasons cited for this value are cognitive, educative and global.

In Ontario, the reasons parents chose French Immersion were mainly economic and integrative (Halpern, 1984). Whatever the motivation, the aspirations of these parents are particularly high with regard to the achievement of their children. No doubt teachers and administrators of the programme can confirm the great interest of this group of parents in their children’s progress. And it goes without saying that such an expectation can have only a favourable influence upon the results.

As for the English component of immersion, when it occurs, often parents are eager to help their children with work in a language they can finally understand (Motut,
1983; McDermid, 1985). Kendall, Lajeunesse, Chmilar and Shapson, in a long-term study on English-language skills in children in Kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2 in Immersion (1987), found that the parents of these children had a greater tendency to read to them than had the parents of children in the regular programme. McDermid advises us to profit from this parental interest to bolster the English component. In the Ministry Guide there is even an example of a letter which the teacher of the English component of the "transitional year" (normally Grade 3, when English instruction begins) might send home. Implicit in this letter is the idea that the parent will closely supervise the pupil's progress.

E. Examples of Immersion Programmes

1. The St. Lambert Experiment

What are, then, the abilities with the mother tongue of anglophones beginning their formal education in a second language? There have been several studies responding to this question, while bearing in mind the particularities of the French Immersion situation. The best known study is that of Lambert and Tucker (1972) upon the first class of Early Immersion in public school, The St. Lambert Experiment.

At the end of the first year, this class and an English control were tested on their English language skills, amongst other tests of achievement. In vocabulary and reading, the Immersion class was not as advanced as the control. But in comparison with American national norms, they achieved as well as the general average. All the tests demanded a certain amount of reading. When it was a question of associating a word with an image, the children in Immersion showed themselves quite capable. However, when it became necessary to read sentences and paragraphs, their achievement was below average. Yet with no academic training in English, they demonstrated transfer from their French reading skills to reading in English. Moreover, on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test they were
able to identify several concepts about which they had undoubtedly learned in French. Thus there was evidence of conceptual transfer across language.

The conclusion of the first tests were that the children, having spent Kindergarten and Grade 1 in a second language, had not lost their mother tongue. They could understand oral English, express themselves in English, and even read a bit. In their spoken English, they made more grammatical errors than their English control peers, and it took them longer to recount a tale in English. Lambert and Tucker anticipated an increase in measures of intelligence, as predicted by Peal and Lambert in their research of 1962. On the contrary, there was a slight delay in comparison with the one control, and no significant difference in comparison with the other. One wonders if this could be explained by the "threshold level" later postulated by Cummins (1984), or the mental confusion suggested by the environmentalists. According to the researchers, after only nine months of schooling, it is a bit early to judge.

The following year, the researchers tried to replicate the battery of tests with the following class. This time, at the end of the first year, the English achievement results were more or less the same as the previous year for both groups, with the exception of the tests of oral skills, where the experimental group surpassed the control. The pupils showed no difficulty with English grammar, unlike the preceding class, and they used a more rich and varied language than the controls in telling a story. The researchers found no linguistic or cognitive delay, but instead evidence of reading skills from French to English, which was interpreted "...as a fascinating instance of transfer of essential skills from French to English, suggesting to us that the learning of French for these children may in part take place through English" (Lambert and Tucker, 1972, p. 67).

In Grade 2 the teaching of English Language Arts began for these pupils. Each week there were two thirty-minute lessons of English taught by a specialist. Due to administrative difficulties, Music, Art, P.E. and Library were also conducted in English.
total of 40% of the Curriculum was taught in English (Lambert and Tucker, 1972, p. 70). Again the experimental group achieved as well as the control: there was no delay in the development of the mother tongue. What the researchers found surprising was that, with minimal formal training, the experimental group did just as well as those who had spent their time performing detailed and laborious exercises to learn the same thing (such as grammar and spelling for example). They wondered if our teaching is so slow that one can take a year "off" without really missing anything, or if it is a question of the child's maturity, and if, at a later age a child learns more quickly. However in studying the tests and the results, they concluded that these children were processing information received in the second language as well as in the mother tongue. The new concepts they were learning were received in a code (the French language) which they had to decode and associate with the code they already knew (English).

It has often been argued by specialists of the classical languages that training in Latin or Greek develops a deeper awareness and understanding of one's native language (at least for speakers of languages linguistically related to Latin or Greek). Similarly we propose that learning through a second, linguistically related language may have a favourable influence on children's performance in their native language. The possibility will also be discussed below that this contrastive linguistic experience may favourably affect the mastery of academic content as well (Lambert and Tucker, 1972, p. 82).

The richness of English language produced by the pilot and follow-up classes at the end of the second year of bilingual schooling, and after only one year of formal English instruction, was comparable between the experimental classes and the controls. A slight delay in spelling was observed, but the vocabulary was more developed in the experimental classes, and again there was evidence of conceptual transfer from French to English.
At the end of the third year, the results of English achievement showed difficulty with English punctuation and capitalization, but for the rest: vocabulary, word use, reading and aural comprehension and oral production, the results were comparable with those of the controls. Lambert and Tucker suggested that there are differences between English and French styles of punctuation and capitalization that were not given special attention by the teachers of the experimental programme (Lambert and Tucker, 1972, p. 126).

After five years of evaluation of the experimental classes at St. Lambert, Lambert and Tucker concluded by saying that the programme furnished an effective bilingual education. They suggested that the pupils could, with a bilingual education, become equally competent in both languages, however this goal would depend upon their attitudes and the opportunities they took for fostering such linguistic and cultural exchanges beyond the confines of the classroom.

2. Immersion in the United States

Genesee (1985) describes the results of three types of immersion programmes implemented in the United States which were inspired by the success of the St. Lambert experiment. Their raison d'être is not exactly the same as here in Canada, but the immersion approach is very similar, and the results in English confirm what had already been found: that bilingualism is a viable educational alternative.

i. Spanish Immersion in Culver City

A Spanish immersion programme was launched in Culver City, California in 1971. The experiment was viewed by the parents as cultural and linguistic enrichment for their children. As in the immersion classes in Canada, the teachers presented themselves to the children from Kindergarten onwards as unilingual. In Grade 2, the formal teaching of English began. However whereas in the St. Lambert experiment English was taught by a
specialist, here it was the same teacher who dealt with both subjects. Gradually the teaching of subjects in English increased until it reached 50% of the curriculum.

The evaluation of the English component of the programme by researchers at the University of California, Los Angeles, found a slight delay in the development of English in Kindergarten and Grade 1, when there was no formal teaching of English. But after one year of English, these pupils achieved as well as the controls, as in the St. Lambert study.

ii. French Immersion in Maryland

A similar enrichment programme was begun in Montgomery County, Maryland. Here teaching was in French for all subjects except P.E. and Music, for which there were specialists who spoke English. This time, English as a subject was first taught in Grade 3. The English achievement of these pupils showed no significant difference in comparison with the controls except for a slight delay in spelling and punctuation, which is consistent with the findings of the St. Lambert experiment.

iii. Magnet Schools in Cincinnati

Another form of immersion in the United States was the "Magnet Schools". The idea was to reach a balance between different ethnic, linguistic and socio-economic groups. Genesee (1985) explains that the first example of the programme was in Cincinnati in 1974. What he found most interesting in this programme was the inclusion of black children who spoke a minority English dialect. As for their English achievement, there was no significant difference between the control groups and the immersion groups.

iv. Two-Way Bilingualism in San Diego

A different type of immersion programme, "Two-Way Bilingualism," officially called the San Diego Bilingual Demonstration Project, began in San Diego in 1975 (Genesee, 1985). Up to this point, bilingual programmes entailed teaching in the target
language in order to teach the second language. However here it became a type of "receiving class" for young hispanophones of Southern California which included anglophones in an immersion situation. The ratio of hispanophones to anglophones was 60:40. From pre-school, there were twenty minutes of English each day, then thirty minutes in Kindergarten, and sixty in Grades 2 and 3. There was considerable emphasis on oral language prior to teaching literacy. In Grades 4, 5 and 6, teaching was half in English and half in Spanish. A bilingual teacher taught the Spanish components, and a different, English-speaking teacher taught English Language Arts.

A difficulty in interpreting the results lies in the combining of the test results of the two language groups, so that one group's results may have inflated those of the other group. The English achievement results were not surprising: after a slight delay at the beginning of the programme, the pupils showed themselves to be quite competent with the English language. It appears that the programme ended at this point.

Genesee points out that the aim of immersion programmes is to develop bilingual proficiency and so be additive. The San Diego project was a bilingual receiving class designed primarily to improve the English language skills of non-proficient or limited English-proficient children. The philosophy of this programme from the point of view of the hispanophones was different from that of the anglophones which were included, in that the hispanophones were being taught reading skills in their mother tongue (Genesee, 1979). "Immersion programmes were designed for English-speaking majority group children." (Genesee, 1985, p. 556).

3. Canadian French Immersion Outside Quebec

Let us return to Canada to examine the results outside Quebec. On the other side of the continent, during an academic conference at the Faculté St. Jean in Alberta, the issue of the academic achievement of immersion pupils was discussed (Motut, 1983). The topic
was the results of the study by Lapkin and Swain in Ontario. The principal outcome of the conference at the Faculté St. Jean was that some of the success of the programme was due to the parents, their attitudes and the advantage of their socio-economic status. These children came from an environment which encouraged their success. Motut (1983) adds that Carey, who presented his research at this conference maintains that:

"the comparison between immersion and regular students in English language arts must take into account the advantaged attitudes of immersion students, teachers and parents toward academic achievement and bilingual competence, as well as the fact that immersion students spend approximately ten hours a day using English as the language of communication in families and social settings where the quality of the language may be superior to that of regular students as a whole." (Motut, 1983, p. 27).

i. Transfer and Interference

In British Columbia, Chmilar (1984) conducted a study of reading strategies employed by Grade 1 French Immersion pupils in comparison with those of pupils in the regular stream. Moreover, she examined the immersion students' English reading attempts to see if, how and to what point there was transfer. She expected to find interference. She was also interested in the influence of their parents upon the English reading competency of this level of beginners, who had had no reading instruction except in French.

As expected, the pupils in Grade 1 immersion were unable to read in English as well as their cohorts in the regular programme. Chmilar classed their efforts into three groups: (1) use of English reading strategies; (2) use of French reading strategies; and (3) combination of English and French strategies or no strategy. It appears that those pupils who used English reading strategies were able to decode words according to certain
English spelling rules, for example the CVC (consonant-vowel-consonant) combination and CVCe (consonant-vowel-consonant plus "e") which influence the pronunciation of the vowel. Those who used French strategies decoded letters and words using what they knew of French, for example the consonant blend "ch" in English was pronounced as one would pronounce it in French.

Almost one quarter of the 50 pupils in immersion tested achieved well on the test of reading in context, and were classed amongst the first group. A little fewer than a quarter fell in the second group: they pronounced English words as if they were French words. More than a third read English words as if they were English words, but it was often the wrong word they gave. They were classed in the third group with a combination of abilities. A fourth little group was often incapable of responding. These pupils had difficulties with reading in French and had no strategy to use.

Chmilar's study confirmed the transfer found in the other studies, but went further in underlining examples of transfer and interference that occurred naturally in primary immersion classes before the formal introduction of English. Also she showed the broad range of abilities in an immersion class.

Kendall et al (1987) performed a longitudinal study on transfer and interference of certain combinations of letters to see how the Provincial Guide helps teachers of English during the Transitional Year (1978). The Ministry Guide, like the guide prepared by the District of Coquitlam and other manuals, presents a list of consonants, vowels, digraphs and diphthongs among other peculiarities of French and English, some very obvious, such as the "H-muet" in French and the English "apostrophe - s" that indicates the possessive, as well as others rarely seen, such as the use of "x". They tested the reading skills of children at the beginning of Kindergarten, and at the end of Kindergarten and Grades 1 and 2. For the most part, the results confirmed what had already been found: that the English controls read in English much better than the experimental immersion classes, and that each year
each group made progress, which must be expected, considering there was teaching each year. What was interesting here was that the immersion students demonstrated that they were able to differentiate between English and French reading. In the qualitative analysis of the results, it was evident that the immersion pupils could distinguish between the different ways of pronouncing certain letters and combinations of letters which were not pronounced the same way in both languages.

ii. Practical Advice to Teachers

The advice these researchers give teachers of English during the Transitional Year is to do an evaluation of their pupils before launching themselves into a programme. There will be students who are quite capable in English, whilst others will need considerable help. It would be best to adapt the programme to the needs and interests of the pupils. Speaking of interests, Kendall et al (1987) did not overlook the influence of the role of the parents in all this, and they interviewed a sample of parents from the two groups. Again the results were hardly surprising: the parents of pupils in immersion classes read to their children far more frequently than did the parents of the controls in the regular classes. Kendall et al, referring to Durkin (1980), declare that if children are interested in reading, they will not be damaged by a confusion of strategies between home and school, and that it is quite acceptable for parents to become implicated in the interests of their children by responding to their questions about reading in English.

Normally the teaching of English Language Arts in early immersion classes begins in Grade 3, but there are instances where it begins in Grade 2 and others in Grade 4. Whatever the case, the English teacher arrives in this class with a big challenge: here are pupils who know, for the most part, how to read and write, but many not fluently in their mother tongue. How to begin? Moreover, some are quite capable in reading English, others will quickly catch up, and yet others are going to have difficulty. The amount of
time available to teach the entire English curriculum is very limited, and the children are eager to begin (McDermid, 1985).

Research shows us that these pupils are very competent in oral English production. McDermid and Welton (1982) suggest beginning at a level where the pupils are very comfortable to put them at ease in this new situation. Since listening is a well-developed skill amongst these pupils, they suggest beginning with listening activities such as poems, leading to structured activities where one listens to choose a good title or the main idea.

It is suggested reading begin with the language experience approach (McDermid and Welton, 1982; Gartland and Swann, 1990). Seeing that the communicative approach is used in immersion (Obadia, 1990), it would be quite logical to continue with a learner-centred approach. No matter which name may be given to such an approach, the object is to put the child at the centre of his learning. This is hardly a new strategy (cf. Wincott, 1983), but it carries several labels. The caveat is that it would not be advisable to begin English reading in Grade 3 as if it were Grade 1, with all the pupils reading in chorus out of a primer: those with grade level reading skills would soon be bored and lose interest. For the same reason it would be inadvisable to treat all the pupils as if they were capable of reading at a Grade 3 level and to take a Grade 3 basal reader as a point of departure: those with no English reading skills would find themselves lost and would lose interest.

Moreover, the maturity of the pupils precludes the use of a "baby" book just as the delay in abilities precludes the use of a book which is too difficult. With the added consideration of the time constraints of the English Language Arts programme, it would be most efficient rapidly to uncover the varying abilities and weaknesses of the individuals. In this way, the teacher could enlarge on the abilities and teach specifically to the weaknesses by using a diagnostic, prescriptive procedure.

Hymes' concept of communicative competence\(^2\), which is so often acted upon these days in immersion classrooms, lends itself to interpretation as an individualized
programme. A similar approach in English provides continuity from French. The procedure of putting theory into practice is demystified by Wincott (1983), who describes in a small book her philosophy and strategies for teaching reading in an individualized manner and beginning with what the child already knows. She calls her method "writing to reading" because she begins with the children writing about their own experiences, and leads them to the reading of their own words. In this way she creates a positive learning environment in which her pupils develop positive self-esteem and literacy in a pupil-centred classroom. Her little book reflects the joy of her success as she sees her pupils blossom. She teaches according to the current child-centered model and describes her methods and strategies without resorting to the current jargon.

In French there are two approaches to teaching reading which are often used in our schools: "le Sablier," which is phonetic, and "la méthode dynamique," which is wholistic. McDemid and Welton (1982) suggest an approach in English which combines the two approaches from French. They favour, like Wincott (1983), beginning with the established abilities of the children and proceeding to new challenges. Those children who arrive in the Transitional Year already capable of reading in English they suggest placing in books appropriate to both their reading level and interests. The non-readers in English require more time to begin. They could benefit from a language experience approach until they develop English decoding skills, suggest McDerrmid and Welton.

McDermid and Welton (1982), on the other hand, view writing as a vehicle for teaching reading. The "writing process", which is the current label for a creative writing teaching technique which begins with the interests of the child, having him write and "publish" his own stories. Here the child recognizes the connection between reading and writing through producing and sharing, often aloud, his own stories from his own words. The theory is that children are more motivated to write when they see a reason for writing (here to "communicate" through reading their own words), and they are encouraged to
express themselves through the written word and to express their thoughts and ideas through their writing. This final "publication" of their work can be the reading aloud of their own written words.

English spelling is a skill which poses difficulty for immersion pupils. McDermid and Welton propose a highly structured spelling programme from the start of the English component. They do not hesitate to solicit parental help with practice of the spelling words. The format of their suggested programme closely parallels the Ves Thomas programme. Its format for learning spelling begins with a pretest of a list of words, continues through practice with the difficult words, and culminates with a final test. The word list can come from a spelling programme or be adapted to suit the pupils' needs.

McDermid and Welton offer still more practical advice: how the English and French teachers can share the management of the classroom to the good of all. They speak of the benefits gained from reinforcement of routines and strategies by one teacher of the other. Burns and Olson (1989) lead the idea of sharing responsibilities even further when they speak of the "team" involved in the implementation of the programme. It is understood that the teacher is the driving force behind his class. But when English instruction begins, there are two teachers who share the language programme. These two must be able to work together as a team for the best results of the dual tracks of the bilingual programme. They need time for consultation. Often they share not only the pupils and the goals of the programme, but also the same physical space: the classroom.

iii. A Conceptual Model

In the Immersion programmes reviewed here, the teacher was sometimes a specialist brought in to teach the English Language Arts component, as in the St. Lambert Experiment, and sometimes the regular classroom teacher, as in the Spanish Immersion programme in Culver City. The literature tells very little about these teachers, what their
native language was, their training, or their teaching methods, such as whether they taught specifically for transfer. Yet the pupils' test results indicated that satisfactory learning took place. One could conclude that whether the teacher is a specialist or not makes little difference to the success of the programme.

The literature stresses that success is due not only to the teaching that took place, but also to the privileged socio-economic and majority-language status of the pupils. This meant that the pupils came from homes where the standard of the mother tongue was high; where opportunities for cultural enrichment were presented; where there was considerable parental involvement in the child's education; and of course where the child was surrounded by the English language. All these factors contributed to the proven success of the various programmes. How English language mastery would be affected were these factors not at play was not examined. However Genessee (1985) mentioned that in the Magnet Schools in Cincinnati, where minority-dialect black children were included, the test results were not adversely affected: indeed, there was no significant difference.

Therefore it would seem also that, based upon the literature, there is no significant difference if the teacher is the same teacher for both the target language and the mother tongue, or a specialist in the mother tongue. Lambert and Tucker (1972) made mention that the differences in punctuation and capitalization between French and English that were noted in the test results could be attributed the teachers not having given this area of interference special attention. Thus it could be recommended that when the teacher for both languages is not the same teacher, then the two teachers be in communication with each other regarding areas where transfer and interference occur in order to maximize the teaching opportunities. For this sort of teaching for transfer and to avoid interference to occur, the teacher or teachers of each language would need to be sufficiently familiar with both languages to be aware of such facilitators to and impediments of learning.
In this researcher's vision of the ideal Transitional Year English classroom, both languages would be taught in the same geographic space, and the pupils' work would be posted on bulletin boards in both languages. This would reinforce the additive nature of the bilingual programme (Lambert, 1978). Ideally the same teacher would teach both languages to maximize efficient use of the constrained time. In this way, the teacher for each component being the same, conference time for two teachers to plan jointly would not be necessary. This would also retain consistency across languages for behaviour and discipline in the classroom, work habits, integration of subjects and languages, and parental involvement.

iv. Summary

The literature review has shown that some of the variables to be considered in an immersion programme are majority language and culture status; socio-economic status; parental influence, involvement and aspirations; the effects of transfer and interference upon learning; and the philosophical basis for the implementation of an immersion programme.

Now this study investigates which guidelines and materials are currently available for this component, who teaches the English language component and when and where it is taught, as well as which strategies are employed by the teacher. Finally, it is the purpose of this study to indicate how the English Language Arts component functions and the areas for further development.
CHAPTER II
METHODOLOGY

A. The Sample

Six school districts, based on the size of the French Immersion population served, were selected for this study. The researcher elected to choose 2 large districts, 2 medium-sized districts and 2 small districts. The relative size of population was construed to have some bearing upon the sizes of schools, the number of teaching specialists available, and administrative details which affect timetabling.

The Ministry of Education's Report Number 1574A, Headcount of French Enrollment by School Type, Organization Type, and District as at September 30, 1993, was the document from which the statistics were drawn.

The 2 large districts, serving populations of between 2000 and 3000 Early French Immersion students, are Coquitlam and Vancouver, both located in the Lower Mainland. The two medium-sized districts, serving between 1000 and 2000 Early French Immersion students are Richmond and Delta, which serve closest the mean population of 1500 each. The 2 small districts, serving between 1 and 1000 Early French Immersion students are Courtenay and Prince George, each serving closest the mean of 500. It may be observed that as the districts decrease in size, so they also distance themselves from the Lower Mainland, the population hub of the province.

Appendix A lists the elementary schools in the 6 sample districts which have Early French Immersion. The district offices informed the researcher that Lakewood Elementary in Prince George and Robb Road Elementary-Junior Secondary in Courtenay have no Transitional Year English classes. Therefore all the schools listed except these two were mailed questionnaires and forms for approval by the principal to conduct the study. A total of 34 schools was mailed the questionnaire.
B. The Questionnaire

The researcher designed and pilot tested a questionnaire according to the guidelines provided in Chapter 9 of Earl Babbie's *The Practice of Social Research* (1986). The form of a questionnaire as a test instrument was chosen as this is deemed appropriate for exploratory purposes such as this study.

In an effort to make it as simple and straightforward to complete as possible, it was divided into three main sections, each having sub-sections. A brief introduction to each section stated the purpose of posing the questions. The respondent was generally asked to check off the appropriate box in a matrix format. Occasionally some writing was requested when it was anticipated responses might vary widely. Whenever possible, Likert response categories were used for their convenience and simplicity for both the respondent and for the analyst interpreting the results.

Although the questionnaire appears to be long, it was decided to make it uncluttered and spread out, as Babbie advises (p. 204). Space inviting comments was left at the end of each of the three sections. See Appendix B for a sample questionnaire.

The purpose of the first section of the questionnaire is to learn about the teacher of the Transitional Year English component. It asks about the teacher's own languages, training and experience as a teacher of this programme. Lambert and Tucker (1972) suggest that a contrastive linguistic experience may affect the mastery of academic content. This researcher hypothesized that a bilingual or multilingual background might well be found amongst the teachers of Transitional Year English, who might use this background to enhance their programmes. Their years of training above and beyond the basic requirements for their job, if such were the case, might indicate a certain dedication to the task and to professional development. Likewise, they might draw upon their own teaching experience to the benefit of their pupils.
The second section of the questionnaire inquires into the programme itself, the physical set-up of the classroom, and the amount of time spent in the English language. Sub-sections inquire into the use of that time by the English teacher under headings of the four skills of Reading, Writing, Listening and Speaking. This division into the four basic skills of Skinnerian theory (Savignon, 1987) was made according to the skills the teachers were probably originally trained to teach as discrete skills before the advent of the integrated whole language approach (Elementary Language Arts, 1978) and the four modes referred to in the current guide (Position Statements, CG0291, 1990, p.13). This sort of division was a device for breaking into digestible portions, organizing and highlighting many of the facets of language skills which were probably being taught. The researcher wished to delve into details in an effort to examine the foci of lessons being conducted in Transitional Year English.

Grammar was inserted as a subsection because, although it is no longer fashionable to teach grammar as a separate entity (Language Arts English, CG0291, 1990, p. 19), various aspects of grammar are, no doubt, the focus of certain lessons. Spelling was included too because, although the current guide does not specify spelling as a goal per se, nonetheless it is a skill that has been measured and noted in the testing of experimental programmes, and has been observed to present a lag in development. The matrix for responses allows the teacher to indicate whether or not the English programme is coordinated with the French programme.

The final section of the questionnaire asks if the district has produced materials for the support of the Transitional Year. The literature reviewed made little reference to materials used in or developed especially for the Transitional Year. However the researcher wondered if any of these study districts have produced published or unpublished materials, beyond those mentioned in the literature review, specifically for Transitional Year English. It would be interesting to know if these teachers have been involved in the development of
such materials. The main purpose of the third part of the survey is to determine the teachers' level of satisfaction with the programme as it stands and the direction, if any, for further development.

C. Procedure

Approval from each school district was needed in order to carry out the survey. A sample of the letter used is included in Appendix C. The appropriate forms were acquired, duly submitted in March, 1995, and subsequently approved by each district involved.

Since Simon Fraser University Ethics Committee required the approval from each principal of the schools involved as well as from the District, approval forms were sent to each principal in March with stamped, self-addressed envelopes. Some principals, in returning the forms, provided the name of the teacher to whom the questionnaire should be addressed.

Of the 34 schools involved, approval was granted by 22, 3 denied permission, giving reasons ("Not applicable", "Teacher illness" and "No time"), and 9 failed to reply at all. See Table 1: Number of Study Schools Which Participated Per District, for a summary of the results.
Table 1

Number of Study Schools Which Participated per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study School District</th>
<th>TotalImmersion Schools in the District</th>
<th>Schools granting permission for the Study</th>
<th>Schools which completed the survey</th>
<th>Percentage of district participation in the study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vancouver</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coquitlam</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courtenay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Schools 34 22 14 41%

Implicated in Study:

* It is assumed that permission was granted, since it is the Vancouver School board which handles these matters, except for the cases where it was denied by the principal on the form mailed out.

In the largest district, only 2 schools returned the "Principal's Approval" form, however, this sort of work is handled by the Board Office and not by the principals in that district. In the 2 small districts, all the principals replied. In the second-largest district and in the 2 medium-sized districts, some principals replied and some did not.
The Vancouver School Board handles all requests regarding research and studies in its schools, and after consultation in April, 1995 with the individual principals by telephone and with the School Board office, it was made clear by both the principals and the District Supervisor of Educational Research that permission given through her office was sufficient.

One might conclude that Vancouver, the largest district, leaves the task of replying to such requests to the School Board because, being a large district in a university centre, it is inundated with requests, an explanation which the Board Office supplied. Therefore it is logical to presume that in the small districts the principals reply because requests of this type are rare. These principals certainly responded unanimously. The Teacher Questionnaire was mailed out on March 31, 1995. Self-addressed, stamped envelopes for the return of the completed questionnaires were included.

The response rate for the returned questionnaires was monitored as the completed questionnaires were received. One week from the date of mailing was allowed for delivery of the surveys. The completed questionnaires were not returned as rapidly as the researcher had anticipated, and reminder letters were sent out May 8 and June 14. The June 14 letter was a combined reminder/thank-you. (See sample in Appendix D.) No completed surveys were received after June 30, 1995, when the school year ended.

D. Evaluation

The responses were recorded by hand on a master sheet for final tallying as the completed questionnaires were received. The responses were tallied by district and then consolidated on one tally sheet. The responses were analysed on a percentage basis and as units, since the study number was small. The open-ended questions were analysed qualitatively. Periodically respondents appeared to have misunderstood the question and gave responses that were not exactly related to the question, for instance stating in Section
B 2 iii that there are only 16.5 minutes of French instruction per week. Sometimes the comments pertained to the programme, and sometimes to the structure of the questionnaire, so that they provided two completely different types of qualitative feedback. However overall the questionnaires were very thoroughly completed, and many comments were made. It would appear that the respondents gave generously of their time and consideration to this study.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS, ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The results are presented according to the sections of the questionnaire. To focus the discussion, it seems appropriate to repeat here that the object of this study is to indicate the strengths of the Transitional Year English component of the Early French Immersion programme and to uncover the areas for further development. The study has attempted to do this by examining the current teaching practices in the Transitional Year English Language Arts classes of a sample of Early French Immersion classes, discovering who teaches the programme, how it is taught, what materials are used, and by asking directly what, if any, materials the teachers would like to see developed that are not currently available.

A. Teacher Background

The purpose of the first part of the questionnaire was to gather information about the teachers of the English component of the Early French Immersion Programme in the Transitional Year, what their linguistic and cultural background is, and whether or not they have received any special training for this type of work.

In the St. Lambert experiment and many other American bilingual programmes, the English language component was taught by a specialist. Although the question was not asked specifically, it would appear that the English language component in our study schools was often taught by the regular classroom teacher, the French Immersion teacher (8 out of 14 respondents). This information is revealed indirectly through Table 6 (below), where it can be seen that 8 Early French Immersion teachers are also Transitional Year English teachers in their own classes, with 1 more teaching in a shared class situation. This means 9 teachers out of 14 teach their own Transitional Year English to their own Early French Immersion classes. Five teachers taught English to other French Immersion
classes, not to the classes they registered. These could be other French Immersion teachers, or they could be teachers from the English stream. The study did not uncover this detail. One taught in a shared classroom situation, where the French Immersion teacher taught in French in the morning and she taught in English in the afternoon. She taught not only Language Arts, but other subjects in English, too.

The pertinence of whether it is the French Immersion teacher who teaches her own English or a different teacher altogether, and the logistics for such arrangements, are stated in the Positions Statements of the Language Arts English Guide (page 35). The idea is that if the French Immersion teacher presents herself as unilingual to the pupils, the use of the French language in her presence is reinforced. Considerations such as timetabling play a role in who teaches what to whom. For instance, sometimes the French Immersion teacher and an English stream teacher switch classes and the French Immersion teacher teaches Core French to the English stream class while the English stream teacher teaches Transitional Year English to the French Immersion class. This preserves the ability of the French teacher to present herself as unilingual to her Immersion class.

Out of a total of 22 questionnaires mailed to participating schools, 14 were returned completed. It was postulated that there might be some trend in large districts which would differentiate them from small districts. However since the total individual response was low, with 4 being the largest response number from a single district, the search for district comparisons was rendered insignificant. Of the 6 school districts invited to participate in the study, 5 responded. Therefore the 5 individual district tally sheets were combined onto one consolidated sheet for examination and interpretation. This number is a limitation of the study, thus it is deemed inappropriate to make generalizations based on such small numbers, so that the results may or may not apply to the province as a whole.

Not all respondents answered all questions, and in a few cases the responses given indicate that the question was misunderstood. Also, in the comments made on the first
section of the questionnaire, two comments pertained to the programme and two to the form of the questionnaire, so that individual respondents appear to have different interpretations of the intent of the question.

English was the native language of 10 (71.4%) respondents, and French that of the other 4 (28.5%). Table 2 shows the other language spoken by the teachers of Transitional Year English to be primarily French (80% of the English speakers, with 75% of these respondents ranking themselves as fluent in French). Only 1 teacher whose mother tongue was not French said with respect to "other languages" that her French was poor, and 2 indicated they knew no French at all. One of those 2 was conversant in Gaelic. The teacher who was versed in Latin was an anglophone also fluent in French. One teacher was unilingual English.

Table 2
Other Languages and Level of Proficiency of the 10 Native English Speakers Teaching Transitional Year English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1 (poor)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (fluent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaelic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The total number exceeds 10 because 3 spoke more than 1 other language. One was unilingual.

Of the 4 native French-speakers who taught the Transitional Year English programme, 2 ranked themselves as fluent in English, one as being somewhat less than
fluent, and one as being fair. She spoke no other language. It may be noted that one of those who indicated fluency in a language other than English did not specify the language, however the researcher supposed this to be English since the English-language questionnaire was completed thoroughly and comments in English were included. This is how the researcher included her response in Table 3, so that instead of showing 1 fluent in English, 2 are shown.

Table 3

Other Languages and Level of Proficiency of the 4 Native French Speakers Teaching

Transitional Year English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. The total number exceeds 4 because 2 spoke 2 other languages.

All these other languages are linguistically related to English, and one could suppose that the knowledge of these languages which are related to English could enhance the teaching of English by giving the teacher greater sensitivity to linguistic subtleties (cf. Lambert and Tucker, 1972). Gaelic has close cultural ties with the British and Breton heritage, and so enhances the English/French Bilingual programme. German is one of the major language contributors to English. Spanish is a romance language and related to French. Latin, of course, is the fundamental romance language.

One might consider the children in the francophone-taught classes to be disadvantaged in terms of their English language learning. Nevertheless, as the literature
reminds us, the children being taught in this programme generally come from anglophone homes where English is the language in which their daily affairs are conducted. Moreover, the English to which these children are exposed is generally the enriched language of an advantaged background (Burns & Olson, 1989; Motut, 1983). Therefore the teaching of English by a teacher who ranks herself as less than fluent in English should have little effect upon their learning of formal English in the Transitional Year.

In this study, no tests were performed to determine the English language capabilities of the pupils in these classes, therefore it cannot be said whether or not these pupils achieve as well in English as their English language stream counterparts, or whether having a francophone English language teacher has any effect upon their English skills.

As for the teachers of the programme, one of the 14 indicated she spoke only English, but all the 13 others spoke more than one language, some "fluently", some "fairly" and some "poorly". Six respondents were acquainted with more than one other language. The languages other than English that were spoken by the teachers were all linguistically related to English. As Lambert and Tucker (1972) suggest, the knowledge of a linguistically related language can enhance the knowledge and understanding of both languages. Thus the linguistic abilities of these teachers could have a positive influence upon their teaching methods and strategies and so also upon the learning of their pupils.

These 14 teachers have a total of 79 years of college and university education amongst them. This averages out to 5.64 years each. Between them, they hold a total of 17 Bachelors degrees, 4 Masters degrees, and 7 Certificates and Diplomas. Table 4 below shows the universities they have attended. Nine respondents have attended more than one university and 10 hold more than one degree or certificate.

Two of the 3 native French speakers also attended university in Quebec. One of the 2 subsequently attended U.B.C., where she obtained a teaching certificate. The other 2
francophone teachers attended university in Alberta and in British Columbia. It was an anglophone who attended U.B.C. and later Laval.

Table 4 illustrates the diversity of universities attended, and also that the major attendance has been at British Columbian Universities. Thus the teachers of Transitional Year English pupils are mainly educated within the province and mainly at English-speaking universities. One could then presume that their own command of English is of a high standard, as being acceptable to universities, which would seem a natural prerequisite for the successful teaching of English language and literature.
### Table 4

**Universities Attended by Teachers of Transitional Year English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Attended</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.B.C.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.F.U.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Alberta</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQTR (Quebec)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laval (Quebec)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Quebec</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto (Ontario)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's (Ontario)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Washington University</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen's (Northern Ireland)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** The total number exceeds 14 because 9 respondents attended more than one university.

The training the teachers have undertaken for their jobs has amounted to an average of five years of University each. Ten teachers have earned more than one degree or professional certificate. This indicates that they have all completed post-secondary studies and that the majority have undertaken further studies, some in diploma programmes and some in graduate studies. One might conclude that they have considerable interest in their careers to have undertaken more than the basic required teacher training.
The teachers were asked about professional development they may have undertaken pertaining to the English Language Arts Component of the Early French Immersion programme. Only 4 (28.6%) had attended courses or workshops of this nature, and 10 (71.4%) had not. The comments below were made by those who participated in courses or workshops relating to English Language Arts in French Immersion.

One teacher noted that she uses "a lot of ESL (English as a Second Language) strategies" she learned in completing an ESL diploma in 1995. A Vancouver teacher said she had attended too many workshops to list them all, and gave only the most recent ones. She reported that the focus of the topics was novels and themes. Table 5 below lists some of the Vancouver School Board based Professional Development workshops she had attended. The workshop titles give an idea of the content of the workshops one teacher of Transitional Year English found to be of interest. The dates indicate a frequent attendance at such workshops. Such frequency could indicate a need on the part of the teacher for help in this teaching area, and a dedication to fulfill the need. It would appear that teacher training and professional development in the area of literature and teaching reading provide a field for further development.
A teacher from Coquitlam School District said she had attended a district conference in 1988. Another teacher had attended APPIPC (Association Provinciale des Professeurs d'Immersion et du Programme Cadre) conferences in Vancouver and in Edmonton. Yet another teacher had taken a summer course in Victoria for teaching English in Programme cadre de français in 1979. It appears most of the courses have been presented by the Vancouver and Coquitlam School Districts and by APPIPC.

However very few (4 out of 14) have attended courses or workshops especially for teaching Transitional Year English. The courses and workshops attended by these teachers were given by Vancouver School District, which is the largest district in British Columbia; by Coquitlam School District, which is the second largest school district; and by APPIPC, the Association Provinciale des Professeurs d'Immersion et du Programme Cadre. A response in Section D 2 of the questionnaire indicated that 13 of the 14 teachers surveyed would like more opportunities for professional development in this teaching subject. It remains to be seen who should and could provide such services, however it seems that

---

Table 5

Vancouver School Board Based Professional Development Workshops for Transitional Year English Language Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Nations Literature</td>
<td>Oct., 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young Readers' Conference</td>
<td>March, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Intermediate Literature</td>
<td>Apr., 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using Literature to Explore Changing Roles</td>
<td>Feb., 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's Literature to Affirm Diversity</td>
<td>April, 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
those teachers located away from the Lower Mainland are geographically isolated from the courses that have been given.

When asked if they had participated on Curriculum Committees related to Transitional Year English, again the overwhelming response was negative (11 individuals of the 14 respondents, or 78.6%). Those who had (2 individuals, or 14.3%), had served their districts, 1 in Coquitlam in 1994 and the other in Delta, "in the early 1980s (Delta), when little was available and we needed a resource of some kind!" No mention was made of any work at the provincial level. Again, it can be seen that not all respondents answered all questions.

Assuming that teaching experience is a valuable asset to the programme, the teachers were asked about the number of years' experience they had teaching in general in British Columbia, in Canada outside B.C., and elsewhere in the world. Teaching experience in British Columbia ranged from a minimum of 3 years to a maximum of 27; in Canada outside B.C. from a minimum of not at all to a maximum of 25 years; and elsewhere from not at all to a maximum of 2 years. Of the 14 teachers, 7 had taught in Canada outside B.C., and 3 had taught elsewhere, outside Canada. None of the teachers participating in the study was a new teacher, and all had some previous experience, ranging from a minimum of 5 years to a maximum of 27 years. One respondent was discarded from the analysis because her response totalled 52 years, and normally a teacher would have retired before then.

One respondent provided the following outline of her experience: she had been a primary teacher, then 'core' French teacher for all grades K-7 (plus 5 years half-time Elementary French Coordinator) next a teacher-librarian, planning cooperative units with teachers of Early French Immersion to be presented in French, as well as with English stream teachers. She added, "I feel my related curriculum committee work (Primary 1989-
90, Socials 1991-93) gives me an awareness and certain expertise to teach ELA to Grade 3 EFI students."

The study shows us that the teaching experience these teachers bring with them has helped them in their teaching with the Transitional Year English component. The fact that teachers' salaries are based on a two-fold scale of increments combining years of university with years of experience indicates the perceived value of these two criteria. The teachers themselves in their responses on the survey tell us that their past experience and that of the teacher who taught the programme before them are what help them get through what seems to be the most difficult phase of the Transitional Year English component: getting started.

Some teachers rely on their own previous experience, such as one who reported she had taught English to French Immersion students for more than ten years. Others rely on the experience of their predecessors. One such respondent volunteered, with regard to documents and materials used on planning for and teaching the Transitional Year English, that she used mainly teacher-made materials collected from the teacher who taught the programme the previous year.

Section D 2 of the questionnaire confirms the difficulty with getting started where 9 of the 14 teachers indicated a need for more detailed Ministry Guidelines for implementing the Transitional Year English. The comments regarding the sort of document teachers would like to see produced to facilitate the planning for and teaching of the Transitional Year English Language Arts component support the point (cf. p.54). One teacher stated she was unaware of the availability of such documents, and others reported that they need to know how to get started.

Apparently once they get started, the teachers find the task flows along satisfactorily and the programme continues on its own impetus. What teachers want is some direction in how to begin teaching Transitional Year English.
Respondents were invited to comment at the end of this first section. They made the following remarks:

The questionnaire should list the current teaching position.

I've taught English to French Immersion students for more than ten years.

This is my first year of teaching the Grade 3 English Language Arts Transitional program to French Immersion students.

The researcher agrees that the questionnaire should indeed list the current teaching assignment, however at the time the questionnaire was prepared, this was not seen to be necessary, as the qualifying criterium for completing the questionnaire was that the respondent be currently teaching the Transitional Year English Language Arts, and that was considered sufficient for the purposes of this survey. It is recommended that a future study include this information.

B. The Programme

The purpose of this second section was to discover the physical set-up of the programme in terms of location, duration, programme structure and materials.

1. Grade

The first question was to ascertain in which grade the Transitional Year takes place. In 3 of the 6 study districts (57.1%) it occurs in Grade 3 and in 2 of the 6 study districts (42.9%) in Grade 4. There appears to be no relation to district size and grade choice: the large district of Coquitlam, and medium districts of Delta and Richmond have the Transitional Year in Grade 3; the large district of Vancouver small district of Prince George have it in Grade 4. No other grades were given.
In the St. Lambert experiment, English Language Arts was formally introduced in Grade 2. In the study schools in British Columbia it began in some districts in Grade 3 and in others in Grade 4. The question of the optimum time for formal English instruction to begin is a topic beyond the scope of this paper.

2. Physical Set-up

i. Classroom

The second question was to determine where this teaching takes place. The researcher was attempting to determine if English and French are taught in the same classroom, if the French Immersion teacher teaches it to her own class, or if there is a special room for English. Of the 14 respondents, 7 taught English to their own French Immersion classes in their own classrooms, and 5 did not. Of the 7 who taught English to their own French Immersion classes, 8 indicated they taught it in their own French Immersion classrooms. Upon examining the individual questionnaires for this discrepancy, the researcher believes 1 respondent neglected to indicate that she teaches English Language Arts to her own French Immersion class, as appears to be the case from the information she has provided. Therefore one may conclude that 8 taught English to their own French Immersion classes in their own classrooms, that 5 did not, and the 14th respondent gave the following explanation: "Not applicable: Shared Classroom: one teacher trades French Immersion in the morning Monday to Friday. I teach English in the afternoons (not only Language Arts) Monday to Friday." Section B2i of the questionnaire explores this question further.

Of the 5 who indicated they teach English Language Arts to one or several French Immersion classes, 4 move to the French Immersion classroom to teach (although 1 moves for only one period) whilst 2 do not, and 1 teaches it in the library. There was 1 respondent who had her own English Language Arts classroom. Again the results of the
survey are peculiar. One respondent did not reply to all the questions, but marked only one box, therefore the researcher has responded for her based on the information she provided about her programme in an effort to make the numbers add up. Table 6 below, The English Language Arts Classroom, summarizes the responses.

Table 6
The English Language Arts Classroom

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The English Language Arts Classroom</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I teach English Language Arts to my own French Immersion class.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; I teach this in my own classroom.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I teach English Language Arts to a (several) French Immersion class(es).</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; I move to the French Immersion classroom to teach English Language Arts.</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; I have my own English Language Arts classroom.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One respondent marked an asterisk and noted she does this for one period only.

The question of the physical setting of the English Language Arts classroom did not feature in the literature, however the researcher considered the logistics to be of consequence. The idea behind this linguistic separation of classrooms and teachers was that the pupils would associate one language with one classroom and one teacher, and another language with the other classroom and the other teacher. Upon seeing the French teacher in the French classroom, they would switch to French, and upon seeing the English teacher in the English classroom, switch to English. This would avoid linguistic confusion. It was postulated in this study that such provision might also be considered for the physical setting, however in these days of restraint, undoubtedly budgeting is a major consideration.
ii. Bulletin Boards for English

Pupils' work is often displayed on bulletin boards in the classroom and in the hallways of the school. In the French Immersion programme, displays are normally in French, therefore the question arises as to the location of English Language Arts displays. Table 7 below shows that in 8 out of 12 (75%) of the cases where both English and French are taught in the same classroom, there are display areas for both languages. In 4 of the 5 the cases where both English and French are taught in the same classroom, there is no place for English displays. Respondents obviously replied to more than one category, since the total classrooms add up to 17, but only 14 participated in the study.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Bulletin Boards for English</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are bulletin boards for English in the French classroom.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both French and English are taught there.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French only is taught there.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bulletin boards for English are in the English classroom.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are bulletin boards for English Language Arts work by French Immersion pupils in the hallways.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 also shows that in 3 schools the display areas for English work are in the English Language Arts classroom. Since respondents indicated only one designated English Language Arts classroom in the survey, and that is the school library, one could suppose that the pupils move to a classroom different from the French Immersion classroom for English, and that the display of their work is there. In 11 of the 14 schools,
there are bulletin boards for English in the hallways, and in 3 of the schools there are none in the halls.

French Immersion classrooms tend to try to give maximum French language exposure to the anglophone pupils who leave the French classroom atmosphere to enter an anglophone milieu. Therefore classroom displays tend to be in French. Those teachers who taught both English and French in the French Immersion classroom had displays in both English and French. Those who taught English in another teacher’s French Immersion class did not display the children’s English work there. It would appear that in the classrooms where both languages are taught, generally the children’s English work is displayed in the hallways as well as in those classrooms, as 11 teachers responded it is. Thus French Immersion classrooms are generally French-only zones, unless English also is taught there by the classroom teacher. When another teacher comes into the French Immersion classroom to teach English, she posts displays of the children’s work in the hallways, not in the French Immersion classroom.

iii. Instructional Time.

The researcher attempted to determine the amount of instructional time spent on English Language Arts as compared with the amount of time spent in instruction in the English language in other subjects, such as Music or Physical Education. The Ministry of Education declares a minimum total instructional time of 1545 minutes per week. The questionnaire asked respondents how many minutes of instructional time were spent on French Language Arts and how many on English. Six of the 14 respondents did not indicate the number of minutes devoted to French, but all responded to English and most gave times for other subjects taught in English. However the overall results are unreliable, as the second respondent gave numbers that do not seem to correspond to minutes, to hours, or to lessons. (For example, it is unreasonable that 16.5 minutes a week are spent
studying English and 3 minutes a week are spent doing art in English. This does not translate logically into hours or lessons either.) The seventh respondent also gave peculiar responses that varied greatly from all the rest, reporting that 80 minutes a week are spent studying French language arts and 20 minutes studying English, whilst over 400 minutes are spent studying other subjects in English. In reviewing the actual questionnaire, it would appear that the questions were misunderstood. Therefore the figures supplied by the second respondent will be excluded from this section. Table 8 shows a summary of the Use of Instructional Time.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Instructional Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Total Instructional Time = 1545 mins./wk. (Min. of Ed.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Language Arts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Language Arts:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other subjects taught in English:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time in the French language:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total time in the English language:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. One response to questionnaire item B2iii, "Amount of time spent in English instruction in the Transitional Year" was omitted from the above calculation since it appears to be illogical. That respondent must have misunderstood the question.

The total time spent in the French language was calculated by subtracting the total time spent in the English language as reported by the respondents from the minimum instructional time allotted by the Ministry of Education. From the numbers reported, it can
be seen that 75% of Transitional Year pupils' time is spent in the French language, and 25% in English. The total time spent in English Language Arts instruction is 14.34%, which is 57.36% of the time spent in instruction in the English language.

As in the St. Lambert experiment, not only English Language Arts were taught in English, but also other subjects as well, such as Social Studies, Science, Library, P.E., Music and Computer. This, of course, increases the pupils' exposure to English in a formal setting. To round off the figures, approximately 200 minutes per week are spent in English Language Arts Instruction and a further approximately 200 minutes per week are spent in instruction of other subjects in English. The pupils spend about 450 minutes per week in French Language Arts instruction. Therefore their Language Arts time in French is approximately double that of their Language Arts time in English. It was the problem of time constraints that made the researcher wonder if the teachers found it difficult to fit the current English Language Arts programme into the timetable. This precise question was not posed, which is a limitation of the questionnaire, however one teacher volunteered the concern with these words:

The children in the Grade 3 Transitional Year have a wide variety of abilities and needs. It is extremely difficult in 60 minutes a day or less to meet their needs, particularly with the lack of district support.

Another teacher allays the fear of being unable to encompass in the Transitional Year all the teaching that has occurred in the English stream primary English Language Arts programme with this comment:

What I realize as I am filling the questionnaire is that: (1) I have never encountered a child who enters Grade 4 without any knowledge of reading/writing in English. So far all my students entered Grade 4 with
skills equal if not more advanced, to those of French Language Arts; (2) I have always treated new Grade 4 students as "Grade-4-English-students"; and (3) The only difficulty I have encountered was if the students had not been previously exposed to literature-based language arts and consequently were more hesitant in English because of their lack of critical/creative thinking skill development in French,

A wider survey would be required to determine if time constraints really do pose a difficulty or not, and to what extent.

iv. Programme Coordination.

Some of the English Language Arts teachers are also the French Immersion teachers, and some are not. The questionnaire failed to pose this precise question, however it did ask in section B2i if the teacher responding taught English Language Arts to her own French Immersion class, to which 50% answered "Yes". Section B2iv asked if there was time set aside for the English teacher and the French teacher to meet for purposes of programme planning. It was considered (a) that there are time constraints imposed upon the English Language Arts component such that the time devoted to English Language Arts teaching is much less in immersion than in the English stream and (b) that about half the quantity of time devoted to French Language Arts is available for English Language Arts, and finally (c) that since there is considerable overlap of topics covered and also transfer of learning from French to English, that perhaps (d) the planning of course material is undertaken jointly by both the French Immersion teacher and the English Language Arts teacher. Do these teachers, in the instances where they are not both the same teacher, confer together, and is there time allocated for such conferences? There was only one response category marked amongst all the questionnaires, and that was "No", answered by 7, or 50%. It might be presumed that these are the 7 teachers who do not teach English to
their own French Immersion classes, but teach English to a class they do not register. Their comments, "We meet informally when required," "We talk after school," "When needed," and "We do it on our own time" indicate that communication and planning between the two parts of the programme take place, but in an unscheduled and informal manner.

The idea of coordinating the French and English Language Arts components of the Early French Immersion programme appears to be a new idea to the respondents. Evidently this concept posed them some difficulty, and in not addressed in the literature reviewed. The issue can be explained thus: there are time constraints imposed upon the English Language Arts component. The amount of time devoted to English Language Arts teaching in French Immersion is much less than in the English stream. Indeed, the time allocated for English Language Arts in French Immersion amounts to about half the quantity of time devoted to French Language Arts. Since there is considerable overlap of topics covered and also transfer of learning from French to English, it was considered that perhaps the planning of course material is undertaken jointly by both the French Immersion teacher and the English Language Arts teacher. Do these teachers, in the instances where they are not both the same teacher, confer together, and is there time allocated for such conferences?

The study shows that 8 of the 14 teachers surveyed teach English Language Arts to their own French Immersion classes. Since the same teacher teaches both subjects, she is aware of the material being covered by each subject. Of the other teachers, 5 English Language Arts teachers teach English to a class they do not register, and 1 teaches in a shared class situation. These teachers indicated that there was no time set aside for joint planning with the French Immersion teacher. However their comments indicate that such conferences do take place, but informally and as needed, on the teachers' own time.
The situation in British Columbia differs from that in the St. Lambert experiment and in the Maryland immersion programme reviewed in the literature (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Genesee, 1985). In the latter two programmes, a specialist taught English. However in the Culver City Spanish Immersion programme, as in British Columbia, the regular classroom teacher taught both language components. This might be advantageous for the pupils: Lambert and Tucker suggested that the delay in English punctuation and capitalization might be due to lack of special attention by the teacher to the differences in styles across languages (Lambert and Tucker, 1972, p. 126). If the same teacher teaches both components, it is easier for her to point out the differences than if two teachers work in a coordinated fashion, and certainly better than two teachers teaching in isolation.

3. Programme Structure

The third part of Section B, Programme Structure, inquired about the composition of the programme. It was divided into two main columns, one for responses pertaining to the English component, and the other asking if this was coordinated with the French component. Again, not all respondents answered all questions, thus frequently the total number of responses to an item is less than 14.

From the responses given, and especially from the comments made, it is evident that the idea of coordination between English and French Language Arts teaching was not made clear. The researcher's intent by this distinction was to determine if the English and French Language Arts components were in any way taught one in conjunction with the other to facilitate transfer of knowledge from one language to the other. Since studies have shown that French Immersion can facilitate and even enhance English language learning and skills amongst anglophones (Lambert, 1978; Cummins, 1984), the researcher postulated that the English Language Arts teacher might work in conjunction with the French Language Arts teacher to capitalize on this phenomenon.
The questionnaire divided English Language Arts into the five skills of Reading, Writing, Spelling, Grammar and Oral Language. The rationale for such distinctions is outlined below. Listening skills were neglected in the questionnaire. It is interesting to note that none of the respondents mentioned the oversight.

The 1990 Ministry of Education Language Arts English Primary-Graduation guide is contained in four documents, published together in one binder. Each volume treats a different aspect of curriculum development: the Curriculum Guide; the Positions Statements; The Research Base; and a Teaching Strategies Resource Book. On page 11 of the Curriculum Guide, four "communication strands" are named: "speaking, listening, reading and writing", and it is stated that this guide adds two new strands: "viewing and representing." The term "effective communication" is a recurring theme in the guide. In the Position Statements on issues in education, the issue of integration is discussed on page 13. Here the authors describe how a teacher might integrate the various "strands" of the English curriculum, and then refer to four "language modes", listening, speaking, reading and writing. On page 35, the issue of Language Arts English in French Immersion is discussed, and paragraphs are individually devoted to such pertinent considerations as (1) the amount of instructional time, (2) anglophone achievement in English, (3) spelling, (4) punctuation, (5) interference, (6) the teacher, and (7) transfer. Thus this researcher, based on the literature, the various nomenclature, the current educational trends, the consideration of what is easily transferred from French to English in Transitional Year English, and the anticipated desires, anxieties and challenges of the pupils, elected to select the four particular skills of Reading, Writing, Spelling and Oral Language for detailed study. Grammar was added because it is a controversial topic (CG 0290 pp. 19-20), and aspects of it are indeed studied in French.

Not all participants in the survey responded to every item. The researcher presumes that in the instances where the teachers were unsure of their response, or unsure of the
applicability of the item to their individual situation, they omitted it. The interpretation of responses applies to those marked, not those left blank.

i. Reading.

Some advice given in the literature by Kendall et al (1987) suggests that teachers of English Language Arts evaluate their pupils' language competency at the beginning of the school year. In this way, teachers can better adapt their programme to the pupils' needs, having determined what those may be. Often at the beginning of the school year, testing takes place to help the teacher assess the pupils' abilities. Of those who undertook the survey, 2 said they pretested for English reading, 5 said they did not, and 6 said they sometimes tested. When asked if this was coordinated with French testing, 3 said it was, 4 said it was not, and 3 said sometimes it was. According to the comments given, no standardized tests were used, but teacher-made tests and informal evaluation were common responses. Those who replied "No" to testing also used informal evaluation and teacher-made tests. Of the 14 teachers surveyed, it would appear that no formal testing is done at all, but that all the teachers used informal, teacher-made tests to evaluate their pupils. This was generally not coordinated with any French testing that may have been undertaken.

Is formal testing not done because no suitable tests are available? What do teachers consider to be suitable tests? Do suitable tests need to be developed, or is formal testing unnecessary? These questions arise from the survey.

Only 1 respondent divided her class into ability groupings, which numbered three. She used a basal reader called "Impressions." She was the only teacher who regularly used a basal reader programme, and three said they sometimes used one. Nine used no basal readers at all. The basal readers used were Ginn (3) and Nelson (2), and others specified were "Novel Studies" and "The Canadian Spelling Programme 4". The spelling
programme is not a reader: perhaps this respondent understood "others" to mean "other text books".

Since the basal reader approach to reading is no longer in vogue, it was hardly surprising that only one teacher divided her class into ability groups. This teacher used the basal reader "Impressions" only sometimes, but generally employed another approach. The response rate to which approach was used to teach reading was very low. Although 13 of the 14 teachers replied to the question regarding the basal reader approach to teaching reading (9 in the negative, and 3 stating "sometimes"), only 8 replied to the question asking whether, then, some other approach was used. One would presume that reading is indeed taught, but that the teachers are unaware of the name for the approach they employ. When asked which genres of literature they used, 12 teachers said "short stories", and this was the highest response rate of any of the categories. "Poetry" had 11 responses and "novels" had 9. These were the next highest response rates. One can conclude that the teachers generally use children's literature in the form of short stories, poems, letters and novels, and supplement that with extracts from basal readers. As such, with each child reading his own book, the programme is individualized.

Generally another approach to teaching reading is used, such as individualized, emergent, or wholistic. Only 8 responses were given to this question, but 6 replied "Yes". In only 2 cases was it coordinated with French. Overwhelmingly the genres of literature chosen for study were short stories, poetry, novels, letters, and to a lesser extent myths and legends and non-fiction. English books for independent reading were available in 10 French Immersion classrooms, and not available in 3.

"Reading to children is probably the best way to help them become literate," states the Ministry Language Arts English Curriculum Guide in its third volume, The Research Base: Research About Teaching and Learning (CG 0292, 1990, p. 10). The literature shows us that parents of French Immersion students tend to be highly involved in their
children's education, and among other things, read aloud to their children more often than parents of children in the English stream (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Chmilar, 1984).

Teachers tend to model this by reading aloud to their classes. Uninterrupted sustained silent reading (USSR) is practiced in many classrooms and goes by various acronyms. Of our study group, 11 practiced USSR. Of those, 7 said that it was practiced daily, one qualifying that it was done on alternate weeks, and another that it was done daily at home, whereas 2 said it was done weekly. Despite the limited time for English, USSR is practiced in most Transitional Year English classes, however only sometimes on a daily basis. Only 1 teacher said she did not practice it. Sometimes it is done three times a week, and sometimes on alternate weeks. One teacher indicated that this is done at home every day, and not in school. This would be the home reading programme, discussed below.

The literature shows us that parents of French Immersion students tend to be highly involved in their children's education, and among other things, read aloud to their children more often than parents of children in the English stream (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Chmilar, 1984). To capitalize on parental involvement, teachers often embark upon an English language home reading programme. In total, 10 teachers surveyed indicated they run some type of English home reading programme, and 5 indicated it was in some way coordinated with a similar programme in French.

The idea of a home reading programme follows the prescriptions of the Ministry Guide according to the research upon which the guide is based. The guide (CG 0292, 1990, p. 10) outlines an approach to home reading. Research would need to be done into the form reading takes in the home to determine if it is actually conducted in the way outlined. However the proposed format of reading materials of high quality to children, of reading beyond the years at which the child can read independently, of reading materials beyond the child's reading level, and of discussion of the meaning of the literature, is generally what occurs in classrooms under the teacher's direction and in libraries under the
librarian's direction. This study did not inquire into the details of the form reading aloud takes in the classroom, however it can be safely presumed that teachers follow the above schema, which is generally considered to be normal classroom practice.

Coordination between English language reading and French language reading tends to be based on common themes treated in both languages, such as social studies or science, seasonal events, fairy tales, and so on. The teachers try to avoid repetition, but try to reinforce the learning across the two languages. With such common threads, literature is used to develop ideas and concepts in both languages simultaneously and thus to benefit from the bilingual experience. Hence the "additive bilingualism" referred to by Lambert (1978) is attained.

Another way in which reading is coordinated between the two languages is through the alteration of the teacher reading aloud a novel in one language, and then reading aloud a novel in the other language. The coordination achieved in this way is that of reading aloud by the teacher in both languages not simultaneously but subsequently. This sort of reading would take place at intervals over a period of a couple of weeks until the entire book had been read.

In 8 out of 14 cases, the use of the library was required in English class. The respondents qualified how they used the library with comments regarding Social Studies, report writing and especially home reading, where 6 respondents said its use was encouraged. Library use in English was required by 8 of the teachers surveyed and encouraged by 6 others. Regarding the use of the library, the following comments were made by respondents:

We use the library to a point.

It is used for report writing. I use a Social Studies 4 program. I make up volumes of reading and writing exercises corresponding to the
programme. Social Studies and Reading/Writing are integrated to a large extent.

All (genres of literature) are touched upon in required home reading.

We refer to the library for home reading.

Thus it would appear that the library is used for research and for home reading.

Eight respondents indicated that parental involvement with English home reading is encouraged, and in 5 of these cases it is coordinated with French home reading. No respondents replied in the negative to this item. In 5 instances home reading was a formal programme and in 5 others it was not. Only 10 of the 14 teachers responded to this item. The formal programme was not coordinated with French. In 1 case English home reading was a daily programme coordinated with French home reading. In summary, there were 5 respondents who ran a daily English home reading programme, 2 who ran a weekly one and 2 teachers commented that the programme was "up to the parent" and "up to the parents and students."

The teachers provided these comments about how English reading is coordinated with French Language Arts:

I try to do a theme using materials in both languages. If I assign a big project in French, I ease up on the English homework.

I tried to find units which are adaptable to both programmes (eg. Legal Safari, etc.).

All teaching is based on literary or Socials or Science themes. We alternate French and English novels or non-fiction studies. Science and Socials are always in French but we may read related works in English.
We collaborate on certain assignments, such as speeches. We try to avoid repeating lessons, but sometimes we try to reinforce each other's work.

I try to highlight some themes.

I coordinate the rules of grammar and novel study units.

We use themes, seasons and festivals.

Parents are encouraged to read with their child (or listen to him read) in either language.

The same theme (i.e. fairy tales) may be studied at the same time of year.

Only 2 or 3 respondents indicated that some of the various aspects of the English Reading programme listed were actually coordinated with French Reading.

**ii. Writing.**

One section of the questionnaire pertains to Writing. Once again, there were few respondents who indicated anything at all in the boxes for coordination of English and French writing. Two of the 3 francophone teachers indicated considerable programme coordination.

In response to how often the class practices writing, 8 indicated daily and 5 indicated weekly. Again, not all respondents marked all categories. The types of writing practiced, in descending order of frequency of responses, are: short stories (10); poems (9) and letters. (9); research (8) and journals (8); expository (7); practice with dialogue (6); and others (7), where the following items were specified:

- spelling assignments and tests
- questionnaires
The teachers explained how they coordinated English Writing and French Writing:

I alternate 'big' assignments between the 2 languages so they don't have two major things due at the same time.

I use an English/French student home journal.

I use the same format for Reading. If we are studying an English novel all related writing is done in English. Writing occurs on a daily basis.

We don't do much, but some (speeches).

Again we coordinate through themes.

The same topic or theme (i.e. thank you letters or research) may be done at same time of year.

English language writing activities are generally not coordinated with French language writing activities. The 2 respondents who did indicate some coordination were both francophone French Immersion teachers teaching Transitional Year English to their own classes. The 1 teacher who indicated that both Language Arts programmes are coordinated achieved this through themes and through a bilingual student home journal. The use of themes tended to be the coordinating factor for other teachers who achieved some coordination, too.

The use of themes to integrate subjects is common practice amongst teachers at this grade level, and is encouraged by the Curriculum. Thus if, for example, a teacher were to take "The Pond" as a theme, the pupils would be given arithmetic activities based on
numbers having to do with the pond, such as perhaps measuring it for volume, calculating
the numbers of creatures living in a certain amount of pond water, and so on. They might
in science class use a microscope to inspect the microscopic organisms living in the pond
water. In art class they might construct a cross-sectional mural depicting the creatures
dwelling at the various levels in the pond. In reading class they might read about ponds,
and in writing class they might use poetry-writing to express an appreciation for the pond.
The spelling list for the week could be words having to do with a pond. There might be a
field trip to a pond to collect water to study in an aquarium in the classroom. After all this
research into the pond is completed, the children might make oral presentations of their
discoveries. Any of these activities could take place in either English or in French, or both.
The objective of such integrative teaching is to meet the goal of Lifelong Learning, the
theme currently addressed by the Ministry in its Curriculum (CG 0290 p. 6).

However this study indicated that such integration did not often take place between
French and English Language Arts. This could be due to the desire of the teacher to
separate French language activities from English language activities by avoiding linguistic
confusion through basing the study materials on different themes in instances when the
same teacher teaches both languages. When two teachers share the class, one for each
language, it could be due to lack of communication between the two teachers who just
simply have not the time to meet and plan together.

As indicated in their comments, the teachers tend to use a theme as a means to
integrate subjects and languages. Seasonal themes are often chosen.

iii. Spelling.

Another section of the questionnaire inquires into the Spelling programme. Only 2
teachers said they used an authorised programme, and 7 said they did not. One said she
used one sometimes. Of the programmes used, 2 used Ves Thomas, 1 used Canadian
Spelling, and I used Steck Vaughn. One commented that she used "needed words generated from writing/research." Most (8) used a teacher-generated word list with words from pupils' reading (5) and words from pupils' writing (8). Six used a student-generated word list. Many of those who did not answer "yes" to the above-suggested categories, responded "sometimes". The response total is greater than 14 because some teachers used most than one method of list generation.

When asked if they used seasonal themes in teaching spelling, 5 answered "yes", 3 answered "no" and 5 answered "sometimes".

Twelve said they used spelling to teach a pattern or concept, such as contractions, and the one "no" added "only when necessary".

The method most frequently used (7) was the pre-test/post-test method. However 6 said they did not use this method, and the following approaches to teaching English spelling were given:

I give assignments and practice, then test.

I use target words in a specific piece of writing.

I tell the children what will be the focus of the next written production.

I use Mary Tarasoff and Jo Phenix Spelling Strategies.

The teacher and student together generate a list of criteria for reading, writing, researching. These lists are used for teacher evaluation and for self-evaluation.

I have my own method of copy (check), study/practice, and then test.

I use mainly post-tests; spelling exercise accompany a weekly word list.
I refer to oral reading and creative writing for language structures and ideas.

Sometimes the spelling programme relied on parental involvement (5), sometimes it did not (4), and sometimes parents were only occasionally involved (4).

The teachers' comments are enlightening as to the functioning and tailoring of the Spelling programme to suit individual needs:

I gauge spelling needs, depending on class. My class this year is very strong in spelling, reading and writing skills, so a formal programme was not necessary. I began using Ves Thomas, but I quickly realized it was "busy work" for 90% of the students.

I give a pre-test each day (one sentence in English, one in French) and give the full sentences on Friday morning.

A unit of suffixes/prefixes could be taught in the context of both language arts. So could compound words. Whenever the concept is the same in English and French, I usually teach it in both languages to allow for double exposure, transfer and reinforcement.

Since we will be continuing a theme in both languages, the same type of vocabulary shows up as being necessary as spelling words.

The English spelling programme was generally not coordinated with French spelling, yet 1 teacher did coordinate the two. There appeared to be no particular programme to which the teachers adhered. Most teachers used some sort of word list and a study and test method, however others seemed to have a more casual approach to spelling. Only 2 respondents said they used an authorised programme. Parental involvement to further the learning of English spelling was highly favoured.
This casual approach to spelling is in accordance with current curriculum goals, where "invented" spellings are permissible, and the ideas expressed are considered more important than the mechanical skills used in their expression (CG 0290 p. 41). In the Early Intermediate Years, pupils are encouraged to use "a variety of cues to decode and spell words... such as sight vocabulary, context, morphemic analysis, phonics, the dictionary, and a computer spelling checker" (CG 0290 p.32). The use of the computer could well occur during computer class time, which teachers indicated was one of the "other" subjects taught in English to French Immersion pupils. If the computer is used as a word processor, then the use of the spell-checker could be supposed to be included in the lessons. The survey did not inquire into how the computer was used by the various school districts.

iv. Grammar.

No authorized text was used to teach English grammar (13), and one comment was added: "pulled from different grammar books". In 2 instances, teachers responded that they coordinated English grammar with French grammar, and 4 said they did not. The following concepts were taught in English, in decreasing order of frequency: sentence structure (11), capitalization (11) and punctuation (11); use of quotation marks (10); paragraph structure (9); origin of words (5), parts of speech (5) and conjugation of verbs (5); and parallel speech (5). The teachers volunteered that other concepts taught were, "adjective agreement", "singular, syllables, plurals", "agreements, adjectives". Three teachers said they taught grammar daily, one adding "alongside spelling", 2 said they taught it three times a week, 1 taught it weekly, and 7 said "as deemed appropriate". One teacher commented, "Don't have time. Do incidentally. Done in French."

The comment that "adjective agreement" was taught in grammar was made by a francophone teacher who taught English to her own French Immersion class. Since
adjective agreement is something which occurs in French and not in English, it would appear she might have responded to this item with regards to French grammar and not English. The other teacher who taught "agreement, adjectives", an anglophone, was probably also referring to the French grammar she taught her class, because the box she checked beside the comment was the "Yes" box under the heading "Is it coordinated with French," exactly the same as the francophone respondent.

Here is how English Grammar teaching is coordinated with French Language Arts by the teachers surveyed:

I sometimes use comparisons between the two languages both in French and in English.

I teach it in context within our unit or sometimes using their journal.

See the previous comments. ("A unit of suffixes/prefixes...")

Nouns, verbs, adjectives are taught only in French.

Punctuation, paragraphing etc. are transferable from one language to another; verbs, endings are taught solely in French.

Where there are grammatical differences between the two languages, the English/French differences are coordinated; i.e. I do not teach subject/predicate; but nouns, verbs, capitalization are taught.

There exist English grammar texts for use in elementary schools, however they appear to be seldom used. None of the teachers surveyed used an authorised grammar text in a formal grammar programme, however one teacher volunteered that she pulled material from various grammar books. The teachers surveyed taught basic concepts for written composition, such as sentence structure, paragraphing and punctuation, and nearly a third of them coordinated the teaching of these concepts in English with their teaching in French. These 5 teachers all taught English Language Arts to their own French Immersion classes.
Generally grammar is taught as the teachers deems it appropriate and necessary. Three teachers have daily grammar lessons, and 2 teach it three times a week. The researcher is curious to know how the 2 teachers who specified that they teach agreements and adjectives in the grammar section accomplish this. These are both teachers who indicated they coordinate the French and English grammar components. Perhaps they have confused their responses and are referring to French grammar, as adjective agreement is important to French grammar and spelling, but not to English. The teacher's comment at the end of the section give the best indication of how grammar is taught in English to French immersion students. As one teacher pointed out, "punctuation and paragraphing are transferable from one language to another." No doubt she points out that it is the same thing, and moves on. Another teacher said that she manages to coordinate the teaching of French and English grammar where there are differences between the two languages, such as capitalization.

Although French is taught in a communicative fashion in immersion classes, nevertheless verb conjugations and adjective agreements are still taught as such. Pupils of French tend to know what nouns are, and how to use adverbs. The Ministry guide for Language Arts English (CG 0291 pp. 19-20) contains a lengthy argument against the formal teaching of grammar. It would seem logical to this researcher that pupils who learn in two languages could benefit from some formal teaching of grammar. The literature reviewed examined the effects of immersion programmes on the linguistic and general educational development of the pupils involved, but did not inquire into the topic of comparative grammars. The quote from Lambert and Tucker (1972) regarding classical languages merely hinted at the possibilities. This would be an interesting topic to examine in a further study. It is this researcher's contention that a comparative study of grammars, at the developmental level of the pupils throughout the programme, would be beneficial to their understanding and appreciation of the development of human communication through
the medium of language and would facilitate the study any further languages they may wish to learn.

v. Oral Language.

A section of the questionnaire examined the teaching of Oral English. When asked if their classes engaged in public speaking, 4 said, "Yes," 4 said, "No," and 3 said, "Sometimes". Of those who engaged in public speaking, 2 did this daily, 1 weekly, and 2 monthly. Under "other," these comments were made: "linked to thematic unit of the time," and "formal speech once a year."

The types of oral practice the pupils have, in descending order of frequency, are: discussion (9); plays (5); speeches and recitation of memory work (4); debates (3); and choral speech (2). The teachers described other types of oral speech practice the pupils are given:

The class does oral reading.

The presentation of reports (Socials/Science) are given orally.

We've done a lot of group work involving oral discussion, reporting, and presentations once a week.

We sing songs.

The children read aloud to the class, and give oral presentations of projects, etc.

The Readers' Theatre is oral.

The class reads folk tales to other primary classes during our folk tale festival, 1-2 p.m. on two days.

Each one reads a paragraph or the question on the activity sheet

They read their creative writing in front of the class.
In Readers Theatre in French with their own teacher, each is assigned a part.

The only comment regarding the coordination of English Oral Language and French Language Arts was, "See previous comments" ("A unit of suffixes/prefixes...").

Canadian Parents for French, the national lobby group for bilingual education, sponsors, amongst other activities, a French public speaking contest for French Immersion pupils. This is a voluntary activity, and not all schools or classes participate, however it certainly helps to promote oratory skills. The researcher was curious to know if any formal training is given to develop public speaking skills in English. The survey shows that there is little attention given to public speaking skills in Transitional Year English. Only 4 classes do public speaking on a regular basis. In 2 classes English public speaking is coordinated with French public speaking. Another 3 classes engage in "some" public speaking. Most of the speaking activities appear to be discussion (9 responses). One class makes formal speeches once a year. The other formal speaking activities are drama activities or reading activities.

Speaking in public is a highly transferable skill, since standing up to make a speech in one language is very much like standing up to make a speech in another, assuming one is at equal ease with both languages. The area that tends to pose a problem is that of public performance and self-consciousness. One would suppose that the pupils would be more at ease in their mother tongue than in French, and so this skill would require little formal teaching, but only reinforcement in English. One would also suppose that Early French Immersion pupils, having been taught using the communicative approach, would be used to oral practice and performance in French and so have little difficulty with timidity in English oral performance. However such questions were not the focus of this study and could be further inquired into in another study.
The results, which indicate that little time overall is spent in formal speaking activities, raise the question of the teachers' perceived importance of oral expression, their perceived need for oral practice, and the pressure of time constraints referred to both in the literature and by the respondents to the survey. Presumably the pupils enrolled in immersion programmes are anglophones (Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Chmilar, 1984; Genesee, 1985), and anglophones from an advantaged background (Burns, 1983; Motut, 1983). The researcher's concern with these widely-accepted facts is that they may be no longer true. The recent census has confirmed that the city of Vancouver is no longer an English-speaking city in the home environment. This is the result of a huge influx of non-English-speaking immigrants from Asian countries in recent years. Is the immersion enrollment limited to the English-speaking population, or do the non-English-speaking immigrants enroll their children in this bilingual alternative, too. If the school system is expected to provide these multilingual children with their English language skills, then perhaps their population in the schools needs to be considered and their particular needs assessed and met. Currently it is accepted that a great deal of English language learning by immersion pupils takes place in the enriched anglophone environment of their homes.

It is interesting to note that the questionnaire neglected to include a section on Listening Skills. McDermid and Welton (1982) suggest beginning the teaching of English Language Arts with listening activities, since research has shown that listening is a highly developed skill amongst Early French Immersion pupils. Beginning at a level where the children are at ease will make them more comfortable in this new situation, they suggest. Yet not only did the questionnaire neglect this point, but not one of the respondents gave any indication of noticing this oversight, nor did they divulge any use of specific listening activities.

These comments were made regarding the second section of the Questionnaire, The Programme:
I am having some difficulties with the concept of 'coordinating with French.' I find it frustrating and I wish I knew what you mean by it, exactly.

The layout is unclear - confusing.

It doesn't cover my teaching situation....It seems to make assumptions that the same teacher teaches French Immersion and the English programme.

It is difficult to separate the components of English, as I teach English in an integrated approach, whereby we do not always do the same routine every day. Also, I am not sure of what you mean by 'Is it coordinated with French?' - I took it to mean 'Is the same thing taught in French during the same time span?' Sometimes I do similar things in my French and English periods, but I try not to overlap too much, as the students don't like to do (what they perceive as) the same thing twice.

Once again, it was assumed by the researcher that the concept of coordinating the teaching of English and French language skills would be evident, and that the purpose for such a thing would be to facilitate transfer. However only 1 teacher amongst the 14 who completed the survey commented on teaching for transfer of knowledge. Some of the others surveyed checked many of the boxes on both the English and French sides of the response sheet, however all checked a few here and a few there, never every box across the response scale. This means that the response rate for how English Language Arts was taught was high, but the response rate for the coordination of English Language Arts with French Language Arts was low.
C. Teaching Strategies

Early French Immersion pupils arrive in the Transitional Year English Language Arts class with a knowledge of reading and writing which has been taught in French (Chmilar, 1984; Kendall et al, 1987). Reading and writing skills may or may not have been acquired in English. Certain concepts and skills transfer easily from French to English. However in certain areas there is language-dependent interference, such as in phonetic encoding and decoding (Gartland and Swan, 1989). For example, the sound /k/ may be spelled "k," "ck," or "que" in English, whereas in French it is spelled "que." The English sound produced by the digraph "th" is non-existent in French. On the other hand, the concept of "rhyme" is the same in either English or French.

This section of the questionnaire asked the teachers to indicate where they encountered transfer and interference, and whether or not they gave special emphasis in teaching these areas in the Transitional Year. The three response categories were "Teach as English only", "Highlight the similarity to/difference from French" and "No special provision". As one teacher pointed out in her comment, the pupils she receives in the Transitional Year (which in her case was Grade 4) arrive with a certain knowledge of reading and writing in English. This knowledge may have been acquired at home, or have transferred from French. In this section of the questionnaire, the intention was to ascertain whether special provision was made to encourage such transfer.

Table 9 illustrates the distribution of responses in a quantified manner.
Table 9
Areas of Observed Transfer and Interference from French to English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Teach as Highlight No Special</th>
<th>Transfer/Interference</th>
<th>Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>English Only</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interference</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Not all teachers responded to all categories in the matrices.

Not all possible subskills were included in the questionnaire to avoid making responding an onerous task, but instead examples were given to illustrate exactly what the researcher meant. This also provided a method of quantifying responses to measure the comparison between English and French programmes more exactly. The large number of responses indicates that some respondents checked both the "English only" and the "Highlight similarity to/differences from French" boxes.

As one teacher pointed out in her comment, the pupils she receives in the Transitional Year (which in her case was Grade 4) arrive with a certain knowledge of reading and writing in English. This knowledge may have been acquired at home, or have transferred from French. In this section of the questionnaire, the intention was to ascertain whether special provision was made to encourage such transfer.
1. Transfer of Reading Skills

Section C 1 examined areas of transfer from French to English in reading, and suggested that the skills or concepts in the questionnaire had probably been taught in French. It asked how the teachers presented them in their classes.

Table 9 above shows that about half (44%) the respondents highlighted the similarity between certain English and French reading skills, and about half (47%) taught these skills as pertaining to English only. Generally 1 or 2 (9%) marked the column "No special provision". Those skills highlighted were such things as the names of letters of the alphabet, phonics, consonant blends and digraphs, the concept of a sentence and of a paragraph, literary forms, making inferences and predictions, skimming text, finding the main idea, sequencing, summarizing, vocabulary (word meaning and origins of words), library skills, dictionary skills, USSR, and the home reading programme. Noteworthy comments were that as regards teaching the concept of a sentence, one teacher stated that she teaches the differences from French and not the similarities to French. Another comment was that this sort of thing was not done formally, but incidentally. Four teachers indicated that they also teach research and note-taking, and those in English only; 1 checked that she highlights the similarity to French; and 1 said she makes no special provision for this.

Generally about half the respondents taught the various reading skills (decoding, literal and inferential comprehension) as pertaining to English only, without any reference to those skills already learned in French, and the other half of the respondents drew attention to the similarity between English and French reading. Indeed, reading and comprehending in one language is very much the same as reading and comprehending in another. It is a question of decoding the printed symbols into sounds, and applying meaning to those sounds. The symbols representing a particular sound in one language may represent a different sound in another language, and a sound uttered in one language
may have a different meaning when uttered in the context of another language. Nonetheless, the strategy employed in decoding the symbols into sounds is similar. The question raised by this is: does it make any difference to the pupils' abilities if they are specifically directed in the transfer of this skill? Is transfer encouraged by pointing it out, or does it occur in equal quantity naturally of its own accord? To give a specific example, does it facilitate learning to have pointed out that "poison" in French and "poison" in English mean the same thing, and to have the phonetic differences compared? This is not to advocate the teaching of translation and to expect drills and tests in translation and comparisons, it is merely to be used as a tool, as a device, for facilitating bilingualism.

2. Transfer of Writing Skills.

Regarding writing skills, again the distribution of responses was fairly consistent across the "Teach as English Only" and the "Highlight its similarity to/difference from French" columns. The response ratio is 44%:42%. The "No special provision" column was checked somewhat more frequently for writing than for reading. One of the skills or concepts suggested that may be transferred in writing was penmanship, for which in 5 cases no special provision was made, and for which of those 3 who checked the "English only" response, 2 added comments: "Reinforce," and "taught in French only". Writing conventions such as capitalization and punctuation were taught as English only by 6 and the similarity to or difference from French was highlighted by 11 teachers.

Spelling was taught as English only by 11 and the similarity to or difference from French was highlighted by 7. Grammatical constructions were taught as English only by 8 and French similarities and differences were highlighted by 10. Generally conventions of compositions, the development of ideas in a composition, of plot in a story, and of characters in a story or a play, the enrichment of language using devices such as synonyms, similes, metaphors, and so on, were taught as English only by a slight
majority, the ratios being 7:5 and 8:5. Three to 4 respondents made no special provision for transfer in their teaching. Again, the high response numbers indicate that some teachers checked more than one box.

Writing is an area in which transfer easily takes place, from such simple skills as penmanship to more complicated stylistic devices. Again the results showed more or less equal division between those who taught the skills and concepts as English only and those who highlighted the similarity to or difference from French. Once again, one wonders if this really makes any difference to the pupils' writing abilities when transfer is facilitated by the teacher.

3. Transfer of Speaking Skills.

With regard to speaking skills, the responses were more evenly scattered amongst the three categories of "Teach as English only", "Highlight its similarity to/difference from French" and "No special provision." Public speaking was taught as pertaining to English only by 6 respondents; the similarities and differences were highlighted by 7; and no special provision was made by 3. Plays and memory work received scores that were almost even. Recitations were treated as English only by 2, with one "N/A", similarities and differences were highlighted by 5 and no special provision was made by 5. Oral reading was treated as English only by 7; similarities and differences were highlighted by 4; and no special provision was made by 4. Choral reading was treated as English only by 4; 1 marked "N/A"; similarities and differences were highlighted by 5; and no special provision was made by 4. Under the heading "Other", the comments "Organization of work" and "Organization of books" were made pertaining to English only. Again, the scores indicate that some teachers marked more than one box in some cases, and not all boxes in others.
About a third of the teachers surveyed highlighted the similarity to or difference from French in teaching oratory arts, plays, recitations, choral reading etc. Almost as many taught these items as pertaining to English only, and slightly fewer made special provision for them. This, of course, says nothing about the pupils' oral abilities, their enunciation and articulation. It merely tells of teaching styles and practices.

4. Interference.

Section C 4 dealt with interference from French to English. Again respondents were asked to indicate if these areas for possible interference were dealt with by teaching the concept as pertaining to English only, if the difference from French was highlighted, or if no special provision was made for encountering any interference. Most often the difference was highlighted as a teaching strategy. For instance, in teaching capitalization, 5 taught the English use of capitals as English only, and 12 highlighted the difference between English and French usage. For the use of quotation marks, the ratio was slightly smaller for teaching to avoid interference at 8:10. The use of the apostrophe was taught by 9 as English only, whilst 8 highlighted the difference.

Comments made on the third section of the questionnaire were as follows:

I sometimes highlight differences, but not always.

See comments on the previous section. They also apply here. ('unclear' etc.)

I found these hard to classify as requested. I do teach these skills and concepts as English only but whenever it is necessary I relate to the French language for comparison and contrast.

We learned about contractions this year and discussed use of the apostrophe (in English). But the children are already quite familiar with the
apostrophe since it is used frequently with "l'" (l'avion, l'oiseau etc.). But I would mention the difference between both languages.

In the instances where interference is observed, the English Language Arts teacher generally makes an effort to highlight the difference in English from French, thus teaching to avoid interference. This is particularly noticeable in areas such as capitalization, spelling and quotation marks. However things such as syllabication and use of the apostrophe, which differ widely from French, are generally taught as English only.

From their comments, it would appear that the teachers point out differences from French to English or similarity between the two languages as they naturally appear in the course work, and do not make any special lessons around the ideas of transfer or interference. The teachers demonstrate an awareness of transfer and make use of the knowledge transferred to advance their teaching.

D. Direction and Support

The fourth and final section of the questionnaire was entitled "Direction and Support" and sought to determine the teachers' degree of satisfaction with the direction they receive and freedom they have in terms of curriculum guides and materials from their districts and the Ministry of Education. Also it intended to discover whether the districts surveyed have created locally developed materials and opportunities for teachers of Transitional Year English Language Arts in Early French Immersion, if the teachers use these resources, and if they see a need for such specialty items.

1. Curriculum Guides, Materials and Support Services

Section D1 asked respondents to indicate on a Likert scale their feelings about the materials, guides and support services provided by the Ministry of Education and the school district. The scale had five categories, from "Very dissatisfied" to "Not satisfied", "Ambivalent", Satisfied" and "Very satisfied". To simplify reporting results from the small
number of respondents, the researcher has chosen to combine the "Very dissatisfied" and "Not satisfied" responses into "Dissatisfied", as responses were balanced across the two, and the "Satisfied" and "Very Satisfied" into "Satisfied", since there were considerably more "Satisfieds" than "Very Satisfieds".

i. Ministry Guides and Local Support Services.

The response rate for this section of the questionnaire was very high. Seven teachers indicated that they were dissatisfied with the Ministry Guidelines for implementing the transitional year English, 4 were ambivalent and 3 were satisfied. Most were satisfied with the suitability of English books provided for pupil use (9), 2 were ambivalent and 3 were dissatisfied. Five teachers were dissatisfied with the opportunities for collaborative planning with the French language teacher, 3 were satisfied, 2 were ambivalent, 1 indicated N/A, no doubt because she was the French teacher too, and one noted that indeed, she was the French teacher too. Most teachers (7) were dissatisfied with the opportunities for professional development in Transitional Year English Language Arts, 4 were ambivalent about them, 1 adding that it was "not necessary", and 2 were satisfied. The feelings about the accessibility of support services such as remedial help and gifted programmes were evenly balanced, with 7 dissatisfied, 7 satisfied, and 1 ambivalent. (However, of the 7 dissatisfied, 4 were "very dissatisfied" and 2 were "not satisfied", whilst of those satisfied, there were 4 satisfied and 2 "very satisfied"). There was general dissatisfaction with the availability of materials developed especially for the Transitional Year English Language Arts (7), 3 were ambivalent and 2 were satisfied. Responses were exactly the same for the amount of material developed especially for the transitional Year programme: 7 dissatisfied, 3 ambivalent and 2 satisfied. The teachers were generally ambivalent (8) about opportunities to serve on committees for the further development of the Transitional Year programme, with 4 dissatisfied and only 1 satisfied (and she was "very satisfied").
teacher volunteered, regarding the last three points, that she was "unaware of these materials or services". Another said:

We do it (collaborative planning with the French teacher) on an on-going basis in our own time. (There is) not much material (developed especially for the transitional year programme). We do have material available in our district for use. It's not very good! I mostly use my own material. I adapt the regular material to my own needs and the students seem capable of handling that.

ii. Documents Used.

Section D 1 ii asked which documents teachers used to assist in planning for and teaching Transitional Year English Language Arts. They were asked to give the title, source, date etc. as convenient. Here is the information they supplied:

I use the Knowledge Framework (Mohan) as a planning tool. I use novels (The Lion, the Witch & the Wardrobe, Charlotte's Web). I usually develop my own theme-based, interest-based approach to teaching phonics, comprehension, reading, writing and grammar. It works well for me!

I use Mountains are for Climbing - Ginn.

I use self-made documents, research and experience.

None. Everything is literature-based or Social/Science theme oriented. I create all materials or the students do.

I use the reading list recommended at the School level.

I give lots of freedom of choice according the levels of the children.

I use a report completed about 10 years ago by a group of Coquitlam teachers was useful at first.

I collected materials from teachers who taught the class last year.

I use mostly 'teacher-made' materials.
I use *You Can Survive!* by Garrett and Gillis, Delta School District and the Mini-Lessons from the Delta programme.

I use the Ves Thomas Spelling Programme, Grade 3.

I use the Journeys and Impressions reading series which I had to borrow from the English primary teachers.

I use English units prepared by other teachers.

I use the Ministry Curriculum Guide and the Delta Language Arts Guide (see iii below).


I use Evaluating Reading & Writing Across the Curriculum.

I use Criteria Reference Sets.

I do planning with the other Transitional Year English Language Arts teacher in our school.

iii. Locally Prepared Materials.

When asked in D1 iii if there were documents created by their school districts to facilitate the Transitional Year English Language Arts programme, this is how they responded:

Not many.

Not to my knowledge.

Yes. Our school district has prepared some materials, available through the resource centre.

Not sure.

Same as above. (Mini-Lessons)

There are other documents created 10 years ago but nothing current.
There are some specific units eg. Beas study (school developed) and themes.
Not that I know of.

2. Directions for Further Development

i. Perceived Needs

Section D 2, Directions for Further Development, asked what were the perceived needs for further development and how strongly the need was felt. Again, because of small numbers, the Likert response categories either side of "Ambivalent" have been combined. Thus the "Not needed" and "Little need" responses are combined into "Little need", which had the largest total response of 7, compared to 1. The "Some need" and "Greatly needed" are combined into "Needed", the ratio being a total of 45:42.

More detailed Ministry Guidelines for the implementation of Transitional Year English are needed by 9 of the 14 respondents, 3 are ambivalent about the need, and 1 feels they are not needed. More suitable English books need to be provided for pupil use for 9, are not needed by 4, and 1 remains ambivalent about the need. Greater opportunities for collaborative planning with the French language teacher are needed by 10, 1 is ambivalent about the need, and 1 commented "not necessary for me!". She is probably teaching both components.

Greater accessibility of support services such as remedial help and gifted programmes are needed by 11, and not needed by 2, one of which added that they are "already good". Greater availability of materials developed especially for transitional Year English is needed by 13. More materials developed especially for Transitional Year
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English are needed by 13. More opportunities to serve on committees for the further development of Transitional Year English are needed by 9, not needed by 1 and 2 remain ambivalent about the idea.

ii. Suggestions.

Section D 2 ii was the most subjective part of the questionnaire. It asked what sort of document teachers would like to see produced to facilitate the planning for and teaching of the Transitional Year English Language Arts Programme. The respondents were generous with their comments, presented below:

We need a brief curriculum guide listing resources, strategies, ideas etc. Ideally the materials would accompany the guide.

We need hands on material.

We need Art activities adapted for our classes and access to French computer software.

(The latter appears to be a comment pertaining to the French component, not the English one, and was made by a francophone teacher who indicated her English language abilities as "good" but not "fluent".)

We need a useful, easily obtained & understood document with some specific information.

This is my 4th year as a Grade 4 French Immersion teacher teaching my own English L.A. I had not realized that there could be such a document available.

A document indicating to parents the expectations for children in French Immersion, both short and long term on English Language Arts would be useful.
It is particularly difficult for new teachers (or teachers new to this Transitional Year) to know what to expect. A collection of examples of writing, decoding etc. by French Immersion students - and how to use this raw data to discover where students are - is needed.

Some kind of progressive programme which covers spelling, aspects of grammar, punctuation etc. done in a fun and interesting manner, leaving time for creative writing, journalling etc. would be helpful.

I would like to see a document that reflects the needs of the Grade 3 Transitional Year student with suggested materials and resources.

A practical guide that gives specific guidelines as to which objectives should have the most time spent on them, as well as unit outlines developed with an integrated approach in mind would be of most value.

We need good guidelines.

These comments indicate that the teachers feel the pressure of time, the weight of parental expectations, and the need for materials appropriate for these students.

Generally teachers indicated satisfaction with the English books available for their pupils. Yet they said they would like to see more suitable English books provided for pupil use. From the wording in the questionnaire, this question arises: would these teachers like more books, or books that are more suitable? In their comments, many teachers indicated they develop their own units and materials for use in their classes, or gather units made by previous teachers of the same programme. Thus one might conclude that it is books that are more suitable that are desired. However to confuse matters, one teacher said that what she would like is hands on material, art activities adapted for these classes, and access to French computer software. These sound more like comments pertaining to the French
component than the English, and the researcher supposes that the francophone teacher who commented thus was referring to the French component.

Presumably those who wish for more opportunities for collaborative planning with the French teacher are those who come into the French Immersion class to teach English to a class they do not register, whilst those who are satisfied with collaborative planning opportunities teach English to their own French Immersion classes. Some teachers have noted that this is indeed the case. Given the chance to ask for more opportunities for collaborative planning, however, only 1 teacher remained ambivalent, adding that such was not necessary for her, no doubt because the English and French teachers were one and the same. Otherwise, 10 teachers spoke out in favour of further opportunities.

The researcher wondered whether the number of years' of teaching experience had any relation to the level of satisfaction with the opportunities for professional development in this teaching specialty. There was a teacher with over thirty years' experience who expressed satisfaction, and another with over thirty years' experience who expressed dissatisfaction. Likewise, those with fewer than ten years' teaching experience were equitably distributed across the choices. Professional development opportunities might then be a matter of personal interest in the profession and related to the amount of time one wishes to devote to the job.

3. Comments on the Direction and Support Given

Below are the comments on the final section of the questionnaire. They are very individualized and pertain to each teacher's own experience:

What I realize as I am filling the questionnaire is that:

(1) I have never encountered a child who enters grade 4 without any knowledge of reading/writing in English. So far all my students entered grade 4 with skills equal if not more advanced, to those of French L.A.
(2) I have always treated new grade 4 students as "Grade-4-English-students".

(3) The only difficulty I have encountered was if the students had not been previously exposed to literature-based language arts and consequently were more hesitant in English because of their lack of critical/creative thinking skill development in French.

We need to know HOW TO GET STARTED in English to French Immersion, especially the wide differences in reading abilities when they first take English.

Re: remedial help - Our L.A. allotment is limited. Students are helped as best they can.

The children in the Grade 3 Transitional Year have a wide variety of abilities and needs. It is extremely difficult in 60 minutes a day or less to meet their needs, particularly with the lack of district support.

The Grade 3 Transitional Year students I have taught have always been the smaller part of a 3/4 split class.

The accessibility of support services such as remedial help and gifted programmes met with equally divided feelings: 6 were satisfied and 6 were not satisfied. Only 2 teachers said there was little need for greater accessibility to these programmes, one noting that such services were "already good". However 11 respondents indicated some need for more accessibility, and 5 of those indicated that more accessibility to these services was greatly needed. These services are supplied at the district level, yet teachers in the same district gave divided opinions on the same subject. Vancouver is an example, where 2 teachers were "very dissatisfied" and 2 were "satisfied". The key to this discrepancy might lie in the fact that this is a matter of personal opinion, and opinions differ across
individuals. It might also be a matter of varying school policy regarding the eligibility of early French Immersion pupils for learning assistance, or even the availability of funding for such programmes.

A category which had fairly consistent responses was that regarding materials developed especially for Transitional Year English. Most respondents were not satisfied with their availability, and the demand for greater accessibility was unanimous by those 13 who responded. The teacher who did not respond noted that she was unaware these materials existed. The teachers indicated they were not satisfied with the amount of materials developed especially for Transitional Year English, and they saw a great need for more materials to be developed.

As for opportunities to serve on committees for the further development of the Transitional Year programme, most teachers felt ambivalent about such extra work. However 4 indicated they were dissatisfied with the opportunities presented, and a total of 9 agreed that there was a need for greater opportunities to serve on such committees. Only 1 teacher felt little need to serve on committees. The teacher who was satisfied with the opportunities to serve on curriculum committees had already performed related curriculum work, and felt herself to be well-prepared for her job.

The documents used in planning for and teaching Transitional Year English are varied across the 12 individual respondents who volunteered these details. Seven used teacher-made documents, 2 used a document prepared by Delta School District, 2 referred to the Ministry Guide, and 1 referred to a report by Coquitlam School District. There was little consistency. Is it important to be consistent in a public education programme? If so, could consistency be achieved by providing the sort of guidelines these teachers have indicated would be helpful?

The districts of Vancouver, Coquitlam and Delta have all produced documents to assist with the teaching of Transitional Year English, however not all the teachers in these
districts are aware of the existence of them. Neither do the teachers seem aware of documents from other districts which could be made available for their use. The teachers' comments about the age of the documents give the impression they consider 10 years old to render them out of date.
CHAPTER IV
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Teacher Background

The teachers of Transitional Year English included in the survey were generally native English speakers who also spoke French and sometimes another language as well. The researcher postulates that this knowledge of other languages linguistically related to English would make them more sensitive to the bilingual skills of their pupils and help these teachers facilitate the transfer of knowledge and avoid interference. This phenomenon has yet to be studied. In those classes where English Language Arts are taught by a francophone, a study of pupil achievement could be conducted to see what, if any, effect this has upon their English skills.

All the teachers were University graduates, and about two-thirds of them held more than one degree or professional certificate. Therefore the teachers were trained as required for their jobs, and many held added qualifications. However only about one-third of them were specially trained or in-serviced for the Transitional Year English programme. Of the 14 respondents, only 2 had participated in Curriculum Development projects for Transitional Year English, and none had done any such work at the provincial level. It remains to be seen if such in-service or specialized training would benefit these teachers. From their comments, it can be ascertained that some sort of special training would assist teachers teaching this programme for the first time.

Although one teacher said this was her first year teaching this particular programme, she was not new to teaching. All the teachers surveyed were experienced teachers. From the comments made, it is evident that their teaching experience has helped these teachers in their task with Transitional Year English. It appears from comments made in the survey that the difficulty with the programme is how to begin, and that once begun,
the programme flows on its own impetus. The teachers reported that they drew on their own prior experience and on the experience of their predecessors in implementing the programme. However they need to know how to get started. The provision of recommendations and an approach for launching the Transitional Year programme, with some accompanying materials for practical use, as requested by respondents to the survey, is needed.

B. The Programme

1. Grade

In the St. Lambert Experiment, upon which British Columbian Early French Immersion programmes are modelled, English Language Arts was formally taught as a subject in Grade 2. However in the British Columbian schools surveyed, this began in Grade 3 in some schools and in Grade 4 in others. It is not the purpose of this study to determine the optimum time for the introduction of formal English teaching, but to report on the actual occurrence of it on our schools. The year in which it is begun varies, and the reason for such variance is not inquired into by this study. This aspect could be of interest to some other researcher.

2. Physical Set-up

i. Classroom,

Nearly half (8 out of 14) of the English Language Arts teachers surveyed taught Transitional Year English to their own French immersion classes in their own classrooms. Thus the "team" often referred to by McDermid and Welton (1982) is often only one person. About a third (4 out of 14) of the English teachers came to the French Immersion classroom to teach English, 1 taught English to pupils who went to her in the library, and 1 taught in a shared classroom situation where all the morning's lessons were in French and
all the afternoon’s lessons were in English, including English Language Arts. Generally, then, English Language Arts is taught in the French Immersion classroom. The researcher supposes this is done for the economic reasons of time needed to move children from one room to another and maximum use of existing classrooms.

The question of whether having two languages taught by the same teacher in the same physical setting leads to linguistic confusion, as suggested above in Chapter 2, was not inquired into in this study nor discussed at length in the literature, and so is open to investigation.


English work written by the pupils is generally displayed in the classroom where such work takes place, and often also in the hallways. In classrooms where French only is taught, displays are in French only to maximize the children’s exposure to French in an anglophone milieu where their exposure to French is minimal. This outcome confirmed the researcher’s expectation, and appears to be reasonable.

iii. Instructional Time.

Not only English Language Arts are taught in English, but other subjects also. The total time spent in English language instruction in the transitional year is about 25% of the total instructional time. Of that time spent in instruction in the English language, slightly over half that time is spent on English Language Arts. About twice as much time is spent on French Language Arts as on English Language Arts.

The teachers have commented on both sides of the question of time constraints, one saying that it is difficult in the short time allocated to meet the needs of the pupils, and another commenting that the pupils seldom arrive at the beginning of the English lessons without any knowledge of reading and writing in English, and that she finds her students have English language skills equal to if not better than their French language skills. The
latter teacher referred to pupils entering the Transitional Year in Grade 4. These two comments open the question of optimum time for beginning teaching English Language Arts to French Immersion pupils, and also raise the question of how these informally acquired English skills compare with those of English stream peers. This is another topic open to further research.

iv. Programme Coordination.

The survey showed that there was no time set aside for any of the English Language Arts teachers to meet with the French Immersion teachers to plan a Language Arts programme. However in half the cases, it was the same teacher who taught both subjects, and so such meeting time for joint planning would not be necessary. In the instances where the teachers of each subject were different people, the comments made indicated that they did meet informally from time to time and on their own time to discuss their programmes.

Would it facilitate the teachers' work, in the situations where two teachers teach the two Language Arts components, if such planning time were periodically set aside for them? If so, the duration and frequency of such planning sessions would need to be determined. Would the teacher who teaches both English and French Language Arts require this sort of planning time, too, or a portion of it? These are questions for further study.

3. Programme Structure

The apparently novel idea of coordination between the English and French Language Arts components of the Early French Immersion programme met with general confusion from the teachers surveyed. The questionnaire did not elaborate on the concept, the researcher having erroneously considered the idea to be self-evident. Future questionnaires could possibly be better responded to if terminology not in common usage were defined and perhaps also examples given.
The idea of programme coordination supposed the possibility of similar language structures and concepts being taught at the same time in both languages, such as direct speech, or the forms of letter-writing, for example. The researcher wondered if this sort of thing occurred, and if it facilitated the teaching of certain concepts. A study devoted to the transfer of knowledge and the teachers' use of transfer in teaching would respond to this question.

i. Reading.

At the beginning of the Transitional Year, the teachers surveyed tended to engage in informal evaluation of their pupils' abilities rather than to pretest formally. The purpose of such evaluation is to determine the current level of abilities of each pupil so as to teach to the needs of the individual. It would be interesting to know precisely what methods of evaluation were used, and it could be useful to develop a standardized set of tests for this purpose of placing the children at an appropriate level.

Classes were generally taught as a whole in an individualized manner rather than divided into ability groups. This individualized approach is the current educational practice. Basal readers have fallen out of vogue, but are still used as a resource. English books for independent reading were available in most French Immersion classrooms.

Nearly all the teachers said their classes practiced Uninterrupted, Sustained Silent Reading (USSR), but not generally on a daily basis in English. Considering the time constraints, this is understandable.

About half the respondents required use of the library in English and the rest encouraged it. The library appeared to be used mainly for research and report writing. Thus part of the English Language Arts curriculum appears to include research skills and the actual writing of reports.
The structure of this informal, individualized, pupil-centered approach to reading is the same as the approach taken by Language Arts teachers in the English stream. There appears to be no particular deviation for the French Immersion pupils learning English in a formal setting for the first time, nor is there any indication that such special provision is necessary.

Nearly all the teachers who responded to the survey read aloud to their classes, half of them on a daily basis and the rest less frequently. Reading aloud to children is encouraged as a means to promoting literacy as evidenced by the amount of time devoted to this activity in a programme with severe time constraints.

Most respondents ran some sort of home reading programme for English. Some teachers ran a formal programme, and some let it be informal. It would be interesting to know the structure of the formal programmes and the degree of freedom in the informal programmes, and then to compare the reading abilities and progress of the pupils involved in each one. There are English stream teachers who run home reading programmes, too. It would be interesting to discover how many English stream teachers do this and to make a comparison of the English stream and French Immersion English home reading programmes and also French Immersion French home reading. These are questions for further study.

Studies have shown that parental involvement in the children's education tends to be higher amongst French Immersion pupils than amongst English stream students (Motut, 1983; Kendall et al, 1887; McDermid, 1985). This parental involvement includes reading aloud to the children and exposure to a wide variety of cultural experiences, and results in more advanced language skills in the children. Studies have also shown that the children in French Immersion classes tend to come from socio-economically favoured homes where the level of language and culture is of a high standard (Burns & Olson, 1983). Motut (1983) points to new trends in immersion, suggesting that French Immersion is no longer
the elitist programme it once was. Since this study confirms that teachers rely on parental involvement to assist their programme, as previous studies have already shown, it could be beneficial to the programme to determine the amount and type of parental involvement found currently in French Immersion programmes, and to compare the present level of English language abilities of today's pupils with the level of their predecessors of the previous studies of ten to fifteen years ago. Has the socio-economic level of the pupils actually changed over the years; has the amount of parental involvement changed; has the level of English changed; and if so, in what way?

There is some coordination of English and French language arts in the Transitional Year. This is generally achieved through the use of themes, or by alternating the study of an English novel with study of a French novel. According to the survey results, there is little formal coordination between the two components. Would coordination between the two Language Arts benefits the Immersion programme, and in what way? Moreover, how could the transfer of French reading skills to English reading assist the pupils in their progress? These questions remain to be answered.

ii. Writing.

Transitional Year English writing activities occurred daily in about half the classes, and weekly in the rest. The responses reflected an average English Language Arts curriculum: writing activities included writing short stories, poems and letters, research and journals, and so on. Any coordination between English and French writing was accomplished through use of themes and through alternating "big" assignments, such as novel studies and research between French and English projects.

iii. Spelling.

Spelling was taught based upon a weekly word list by half the respondents. The list was generated in various ways. Generally an authorised text book was not used.
word list came from needed words from the pupils' reading and writing, and so was pupil-centered. The procedure in about half the cases was to pre-test, practice and post-test. This is the method presented by Ves Thomas in his Canadian Spelling series. Of the other respondents, about half used a practice-test method, and the others tended to focus on certain target words as they appeared in written assignments and reading, evaluating spelling in an integrated manner rather than as a separate subject.

Three respondents indicated they coordinated English and French spelling. They explained they achieved this through alternating of English and French spelling dictations; through teaching a transferable concept; and through the use of a common theme.

iv. Grammar.

About a third of the respondents indicated they coordinated the teaching of English grammar with that of French grammar. These were all French Immersion teachers teaching English Language Arts to their own classes. From this it could be extrapolated that these teachers are using transfer to reinforce their teaching and pointing out areas where interference could cause confusion. The use of this sort of teaching strategy is evidenced in the comments made by the teachers.

Grammar text books to teach a formal grammar programme were not used by any of the respondents, however grammar was indeed taught, but in an integrated and informal way. From time to time material was pulled from grammar books to teach a concept as the need arose as evidenced by the pupils' work. This, too is a pupil-centred, needs-based approach such as is the current educational practice.

v. Oral Language.

The formal teaching of oral language appears to play a minor role in the English Language Arts component of the Transitional Year. Speaking activities tend to be limited to
discussion and reading activities. It remains to be seen if this is a formal discussion, however, the researcher, from personal teaching experience, expects that this is informal.

Half the 14 teachers who responded to the study had their classes engage in public speaking, and of those, only 2 practiced this skill daily, 1 weekly, and 2 monthly. Once teacher reported he class made a formal speech once a year. The types of activities were mainly discussion, oral reading, and presentation of reports. In current second-language classes, the communicative approach to language learning emphasizes oral production as a means to fluency in language learning. Transitional Year English is a subject taught in and about the mother tongue, in which one would assume the pupils have a certain mastery. However if Early French Immersion pupils no longer come from English majority homes, perhaps more emphasis needs to be placed on oral production.

vi. Testing Pupil Achievement.

The pupils in the St. Lambert Experiment (Lambert & Tucker, 1972) were tested for their English language skills in the Kindergarten and Grade 1 year preceding this formal introduction of English, and again after it had been introduced. It was found that there was a delay in the immersion classes in the learning of English spelling and punctuation, but that as for the other skills, such as reading, writing, aural comprehension and oral expression, they achieved as well as or better than their peers in the English stream. (There appear to be no studies of English language skills or level of achievement in later grades.) Lambert and Tucker's general conclusion was that after only one year of English language teaching, the immersion pupils caught up with their English stream peers. They attributed this phenomenon to transfer.

Chmilar (1984) tested reading strategies in Grade 1 British Columbian French Immersion pupils and found a variety of strategies employed by these pupils, who were
taught to read in French only, in their efforts to decode English. Again, she attributed the skills of the successful readers to their use of transfer of skills and strategies.

This present study did not test the pupils' skills, but rather inquired into the teachers' methods. It raises now the question of the pupils' skills with English Language Arts. Do the pupils currently enrolled in British Columbian French Immersion programmes perform as well as their peers in the English stream after only one year of formal teaching? At what point do their spelling and punctuation, where a slight delay has been noted, catch up with those of their peers? There appear to be no studies of this nature. It would be interesting and helpful to know whether those students who receive teaching with special emphasis on the transfer of skills in English reading achieve as well as or better than those to whom the transfer of learning is left to be purely incidental.

Favourable socio-economic status has been shown (Burns & Olson, 1983) to have a positive effect upon the Immersion pupils' English language achievement. It would be interesting to know whether there is a significant change in the socio-economic status of early French Immersion pupils, and if this change is evidenced in their oratory skills. If the socio-economic status of these pupils, which was originally high, has lowered, has the level of language skills dropped accordingly? How, then, could this issue be addressed? Or is this question of any significance, considering that the goal of bilingual education is not to transform graduates into highly-qualified linguists, but to enable them to live their lives at their individual socio-economic levels in either official language with equal ease?

Yet another change may have occurred in the population of Early French Immersion pupils. Whereas originally they were members of the English linguistic and cultural majority, are they still, or do they now reflect more accurately Canada's multi-lingual and multi-cultural mosaic? Are some of these Early French Immersion Transitional Year English pupils also English as a Second Language pupils?
C. Teaching Strategies

Since reading and writing have already been taught to French Immersion pupils in French before they arrive at the Transitional Year when English Language Arts is taught, the teaching strategies referred to here are concerned with transfer of previously acquired skills and avoidance of interference which could hamper progress.

This section of the questionnaire presented certain skills and concepts and asked if the teachers taught these as pertaining only to English, if they highlighted the similarity to French to promote transfer, or if they made no special provision for the teaching of these skills and concepts.

1. Transfer of Skills.

Reading had already been taught in French, so to what extent was transfer used to facilitate the teaching of reading in English? Generally, half the teachers surveyed taught English reading skills as applying to English only, without reference to French, and half made reference to the similarities between French and English. Thus half emphasized transfer, and half did not. A follow-up study could demonstrate the significance, if any, of teaching for transfer as opposed to allowing it to occur naturally.

Again, about half those surveyed emphasized the differences from and similarities to French writing skills in teaching English writing, and so taught for transfer. The other half taught the skills as pertaining to English only, and so allowed any transfer that took place to occur naturally. "No special provision" was made by nearly a third of the respondents for such skills as penmanship, the development of ideas in a composition, and the development of plot in a story. As suggested above, the significance of teaching for transfer remains to be determined.

The researcher wonders if nearly a third of the respondents who checked the box marked "No special provision" here meant that this area received less attention in the
English component than did Reading and Writing. Otherwise, approximately one third of the respondents taught speaking skills as pertaining to English only, and approximately one third highlighted the similarity to or difference from French in such skills as public speaking, memory work, oral and choral reading and plays.

These results say nothing about the pupils' enunciation, articulation and oratory skills, which could be examined in another study that might determine if teaching for transfer yields higher results. Also, the question raised by the meaning of "No special provision" remains to be answered. Does it mean that the teacher makes no special provision for teaching these skills, or no special provision to facilitate transfer, as was the intent of the question? In future surveys, ambiguous questions need to have the intent clarified.

2. Interference.

There are certain skills and concepts taught in French which are different from rather than similar to their English counterparts, such as capitalization, spelling, the use of quotation marks, and phonics. More teachers highlight the differences between French and English than teach these concepts as pertaining to English only, with no reference to French. However syllabication and the use of the apostrophe were generally taught as pertaining to English only.

Therefore in areas where confusion from interference may pose a difficulty to assimilating new knowledge, the teachers tend to teach to avoid such interference occurring. The benefits of this teaching are yet to be measured.


This study shows that teachers of the Transitional Year English component are indeed aware of the transfer of skills and concepts from one language to another, and that about half of the teachers make use of the transfer by highlighting similarities between
French and English language skills. Likewise, they are aware of interference from one
language to another, and about half of the teachers surveyed teach to avoid this. A follow-
up study comparing the achievement of pupils who are taught with specific reference to
those areas with transferable skills and concepts and who are alerted to interference with the
achievement of those for whom these phenomena are allowed to occur naturally is needed
to determine which method, if either, is more effective.

D. Direction and Support

The intent of the final part of the questionnaire was to determine the degree of
satisfaction teachers of Transitional Year English have with the direction they receive and
their freedom in terms of curriculum guides and materials from their own district and from
the Ministry of Education. It also attempted to discover if the districts surveyed have
prepared materials especially for this programme, if the teachers in question use them, and
if they see a need for them.

1. Curriculum Guides, Materials and Support Services

i. Ministry Guides and Local Support Services.

Whereas in some sections of the questionnaire the response rate was low, as in
section 3, Programme Structure, where there appeared to be some difficulty in
understanding the concept of coordination, in this section the response rate was again high.
Generally dissatisfaction was expressed.

Teachers were satisfied with the suitability of the English books provided for the
pupils' use, however from their comments, it appears that books which are suited specially
to the Transitional Year pupils' needs are desired. Teachers were ambivalent about
opportunities to serve on committees for the further development of the Transitional Year
programme. They were divided about the accessibility of support services and remedial
programmes. They were generally dissatisfied with: a) the Ministry Guidelines for implementing the Transitional Year English; b) opportunities for collaborative planning with the French teacher; c) opportunities for professional development in Transitional Year English Language Arts; d) the availability and the amount of materials developed especially for the Transitional Year programme.

Thus although the teachers of Transitional Year English manage to teach the programme satisfactorily as it is, they see a need for improved, more practical and concise guidelines on how to begin the year, and they feel they would benefit from some collaborative planning time with the French Immersion teacher, and with more professional development in their teaching specialty.

ii. Documents Used in Teaching and Planning.

In this section, the researcher expected to learn the names of Ministry and District prepared documents the teachers found useful in planning for and teaching the Transitional Year English programme. Instead, some teachers named text books they found helpful. Moreover, it was a rare occurrence that the same document was used by more than one teacher. However two teachers named the Ministry Guide, two named the Delta School District Guide, and one named the Coquitlam School District Guide. Thus about a third of the respondents referred to official guides in their planning. Generally the teachers used materials made by themselves or by other English Language Arts teachers.

From these results, one wonders why most teachers did not refer to the official guides: are teachers unaware of the existence of the guides, or do they find these guides not very useful? This question is answered in the final part of the survey, Directions for Further Development.
iii. District Resources.

Here the researcher hoped to learn which districts had prepared documents specially to assist with the planning for and teaching of Transitional Year English. It would appear that Vancouver, Coquitlam and Delta all have documents created by the district to facilitate Transitional Year English, but that not all the teachers in these districts are aware of the existence of such documents. The Delta teachers who referred to their district's work also indicated that they considered the ten-year age of the document to render it out of date.

The recommendation issuing from this part of the survey is twofold: 1) the teachers of the programme need to be made aware of the documents which already exist in the province and could help them in their work, and 2) these documents may need to be updated, thus an assessment of their current applicability should take place.

2. Directions for Further Development

In response to the question posed above, why do the teachers of the Transitional Year English component not refer to the Ministry Guide, it is found to be lacking in detail. The teachers stated what they would like to see in the final part of the questionnaire, where they were asked what sort of document they would like to see produced to facilitate the planning and teaching of the Transitional English Language Arts component. They underlined that they would like it to be "useful" and "specific". They would like a guide that lists resources and strategies. It should respond to the parents' questions regarding their expectations for their children's progress in English. The teachers would like to see a programme that would help them assess the abilities of their pupils as they enter the Transitional Year, and then guide the teachers through the teaching of the various aspects of the programme, such as spelling, grammar and punctuation, in a manner which is current. This means that it should be fun for the pupils, integrated and creative, the teachers
explained. One teacher summed up what was generally requested with the words, "We need to know how to get started."

It appears that once the teachers have the programme under way, they manage to progress without undue difficulty. They find the books available to be satisfactory, however they would like to see more suitable books made available. As discussed above, the wording of the questionnaire leaves a certain ambiguity as to whether it is a greater quantity of books or a greater suitability of books that is desired. This point needs clarification, and is answered in the final section below.

The teachers were unanimous in the final section of the questionnaire in their wish for more professional development in the teaching of Transitional Year English, despite some having indicated a certain ambivalence towards the idea in the preceding section. It needs now to be determined what topics to include, who is to provide the training, the logistics of a professional development programme, and the scope of such a programme. Perhaps those respondents who indicated a satisfaction with the current opportunities for professional development in the preceding section, and so presumably have a well-developed and functioning programme of their own, could be recruited to provide the training for others.

This would, one would suppose, entail these teachers being given time to serve on committees for the further development of this teaching specialty, about which the majority indicated, in section D1, they felt ambivalent. Perhaps these teachers, given the opportunity to share their expertise, might be more enthusiastic about taking time out from their classrooms towards developing the programme.

Respondents were mainly in favour of more opportunities provided for collaborative planning with the French Immersion teacher. Only 2 indicated ambivalence towards the idea. One of those two was also the French teacher. Considering that the Ministry Guide provided to assist with planning is felt to be somewhat lacking in
practicality and usefulness, presumably a better, more comprehensive guide would reduce
the need for greatly increased planning time. The purpose of this survey was to discover
the current practice in teaching the English component in the schools, and so the question
of who ought to teach the English component, the French Immersion teacher or an English
Language Arts specialist, was neither posed nor answered. This could be inquired into.

The area of remedial help and gifted programmes appears to be insufficiently
accessible to Transitional Year English pupils, according to the findings in the survey. Is
this because these pupils are considered sufficiently challenged by being in the French
Immersion programme, or sufficiently capable because they are in the French Immersion
programme that they should not require such services, or is this due to a general lack of
these services in the public school system? These questions were not posed in the
questionnaire, but are now raised as a result of the responses given.

The earlier question which arose out of the questionnaire as to whether teachers
want to see more materials for this programme, or whether they want more suitable
materials for the programme, is answered here: they want both. They want books that are
more suitable to their pupils' needs, they want such books to be made more available to
them, and they want materials that are developed especially for Transitional Year English.
The task to emerge from this is the discovery of exactly what needs to be included or
emphasized in such materials, and then the actual creation of such materials.

Most of the teachers surveyed indicated they need more opportunities to serve on
committees for the further development of Transitional Year English. They are the
practitioners in the field, and as such a valuable resource.

A variable to consider before implementing so many measures for improvement is
the respondents themselves. Not every teacher invited to participate in the survey actually
did so. Did those who participated do so because they were hoping to see some reforms
occur as a result of their input? Did those who chose not to respond refrain because they found the programme functions satisfactorily without any change?

Outside the classroom, directives come from the school principal, the School Board and the Ministry. Unhappily, the loudest complaint heard from the teachers is about the lack of directives. The Ministry Guide is a starting point for the development of a programme for the Transitional Year, but all is left to the teacher to find and assemble materials and to struggle through. Lambert and Tucker (1972) state that the particularity about immersion is that it is a programme which is born of the parents. Now, after thirty years, the programme is proven, and it is time that the Ministry, which represents the general public, seizes responsibility for the programme and assures its implementation and improvement (Burns, 1986).

The teachers await the directives of their superiors, materials from the publishing houses which would be suitable for the programme, and a training which would enable them to profit from the situation presented. They await research that will answer questions such as what is the optimum age to begin the teaching of English in immersion classes. Considering that, these days, registrants in the French Immersion programmes may come from all socio-economic, linguistic and cultural groups, what will be the effects of immersion upon children who come from a disadvantaged environment?

Now that immersion programmes are becoming more universal and drawing in a broader spectrum of students, many from less advantaged academic backgrounds, many wonder what impact they will have on the development of basic English skills. (Motut, 1983.)

At thirty years of age, immersion is still in its youth. We must profit from that juvenescence to make it as effective as possible.
This study examined the current teaching practices in a sample of British Columbian public schools serving relatively small, medium and large-sized populations of French immersion pupils. The object was to determine the composition of the English Language Arts component of the programme with a view to recognizing its strengths and uncovering the areas for further development. Studies have already been conducted to evaluate the pupils' English language skills and to examine the reading strategies they employ in decoding their mother tongue (Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Shapson & Day, 1982; Chmilar, 1984).

E. Conclusion

According to the survey, the teachers of Transitional Year English Language Arts are generally not specialists, as in the St. Lambert Experiment and many American bilingual programmes, but are often the French Immersion teacher. They were mainly anglophones who spoke a second language, usually but not always French. They were all university educated, and most had completed further studies. Very few had any professional development or special training related to Transitional Year English. They were all experienced teachers.

In the schools surveyed, Transitional Year English occurred sometimes in Grade 3 and sometimes in Grade 4, but never in Grade 2, as in many other bilingual programmes.

About half the teachers taught Transitional Year English to their own French Immersion classes in their own classrooms. About a third of the respondents taught the programme to other French Immersion classes, not the one they registered. The others taught the programme in an English Language Arts classroom. The significance of the physical separation of the rooms for teaching different languages in an effort to avoid linguistic confusion was not examined.
Displays of pupils' English work are found in the classrooms where English is taught by the classroom teacher, and in the hallways if English is taught by a different teacher.

The amount of instructional time devoted to English Language Arts is about half that spent in French Language Arts. Some teachers indicated they found the time to be limited for the amount of material they felt needed to be covered. However, others referred to the transfer that takes place from French to English and suggested that the time was sufficient. The request from teachers was to receive directives to assist them in planning that would indicate which concepts needed emphasis in English, so they could make the best use of the time available.

The programme's structure follows that of the typical, wholistic, child-centered teaching approach currently in vogue. The content of the course follows the regular English Language Arts programme for the grade level. Where they can, teachers coordinate English Language Arts with French by using themes, emphasizing transfer, and pointing out areas of interference.

F. Recommendations

This study uncovers that the principal need of Transitional Year English teachers is that of a guide to assist them in getting started. Once begun, they manage satisfactorily. However, they need, as new teachers of this programme, to know how to begin. The teachers' responses show that they develop considerable quantities of their own material for use in their classes, and inherit material from the teachers who preceded them. However they are generally unaware of materials developed especially for their use by their own districts, and by other districts. They would like to have more professional development in their area of expertise. They could provide a valuable resource for the development of curriculum for Transitional Year English.
A number of questions are raised by this inquiry into the paedagogical aspects of Transitional Year English. These questions form the basis for possible future research, and may be summarized as follows:

1. Are there any effects of the teaching of English Language Arts by a bilingual teacher upon the native language achievement of an anglophone in an immersion programme as compared to this same teaching by a unilingual?

2. Does the teacher's knowledge of more than one language have any effect upon the teaching methods employed and subsequently upon the English language achievement of the pupils?

3. What is the optimum time for the Transitional Year English programme to occur?

4. Does having two languages taught in the same setting by the same teacher lead to linguistic confusion in the learners in the classroom setting?

5. Are time constraints an issue in the Transitional Year? Do the teachers feel there is too much material to cover in the time allocated, or is there sufficient transfer that not all skills and concepts need to be dealt with in both Language Arts programmes?

6. When Language Arts are taught by a teaching team of English and French teachers, do they require and would they benefit from extra time for conferences and planning? Would the ensuing coordination of teaching methods and strategies between English and French Language Arts benefit the learners, and if so, in what way?

7. Do pupils whose teachers teach for transfer and to avoid interference achieve better results than those whose teachers do not?

8. Would the development of a standardized set of initial placement tests assist Transitional Year teachers in implementing their programme, or is informal evaluation satisfactory?
9. How do home reading programmes compare between French Immersion, English stream and Transitional Year English teachers?

10. What are the pupil demographics today compared with those of the first classes of French Immersion pupils? Are the pupils still members of a socio-economically-advantaged cultural and linguistic majority group, or do they better represent the Canadian mosaic?

12. Who is best suited to teach the English Language Arts component: the French Immersion teacher, or an English Language Arts specialist?
## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

**Elementary Schools With Early French Immersion in the Six Sample Districts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School District</th>
<th>School Name (Elementary)</th>
<th>EFI Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 Vancouver</td>
<td>Ecole Jules Quesnel Élémentaire</td>
<td>332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hastings Elementary</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L'Ecole Bilingue</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lord Tennyson</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth Annex</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Quilchena Elementary</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir James Douglas Annex</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sir James Douglas Elementary</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trafalgar</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Coquitlam</td>
<td>Alderson Elementary</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glen Elementary</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenayre Elementary</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hillcrest Elementary</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irvine Elementary</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kilmer Elementary</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mary Hill Elementary</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montgomery Elementary</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Panorama Heights Elementary</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Delta</td>
<td>Cliff Drive Elementary</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Name</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devon Gardens Elementary</td>
<td>153</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladner Elementary</td>
<td>186</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson Elementary</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Park Elementary</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunshine Hills Elementary</td>
<td>199</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfred B. Dixon Elementary</td>
<td>195</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Gilmore Elementary</td>
<td>177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Whiteside Elementary</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tomekichi Homha Elementary</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bridge Elementary</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Cook Elementary</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin Road Elementary</td>
<td>116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Heights Elementary</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood Elementary*</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spruceland Elementary</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robb Road Elem.-Jr. Sec.*</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comox Elementary</td>
<td>232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puntledge Park Elementary</td>
<td>156</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These two schools have no Transitional Year English, and therefore were not mailed questionnaires.
Appendix B

Questionnaire for the Teacher of Transitional Year English Language Arts

A. Teacher Background

The first part of the questionnaire is to gather information about who it is who teaches the English component of the programme, what his/her linguistic (and also cultural) background may be, and whether or not he/she has received any special training for this type of work.

Please check or complete the appropriate box.

* Name and Number of School District: ______________________

1. Personal

   i. mother tongue:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>other (please specify):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

   ii. other languages / proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>languages (please specify)</th>
<th>1 (poor)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5 (fluent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Professional: training and education

   i. Years of college/university: 

   ii. degrees held:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>degree</th>
<th>year</th>
<th>university</th>
<th>province</th>
<th>country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iii. Professional development relating to English Language Arts:

- Have you ever participated in a course or workshop relating to English Language Arts in French Immersion?
  - Yes
  - No
  - If "yes," please specify (topic, date, place...)

- Have you ever served on a curriculum committee related to English Language Arts in French Immersion?
  - Yes
  - No
  - If "yes," please specify (topic, date, place...)

iv. Years of teaching experience:

- number of years teaching experience in British Columbia:
- number of years teaching experience in Canada (excluding B.C.):
- number of years teaching experience elsewhere:

3. Comments on this first section:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
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B. The Programme

The purpose of this second section is to discover the physical set-up of the programme in terms of location, duration, programme structure and materials.

Please mark the appropriate boxes to indicate the physical set-up of the programme for your class.

1. Grade

| In which grade does the Transitional Year occur in your district? (The Transitional Year is the year in which English Language Arts is formally introduced to the Early French Immersion classes.) | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Important: These questions refer only to the Transitional Year of English Language arts in Early French Immersion.

2. Physical Set-up

   i. Classroom:

| I teach English Language Arts to my own French Immersion class. | Yes | No |
| If "yes," I teach this in my own classroom. | |

| I teach English Language Arts to a (several) French Immersion class(es). | |
| If "yes," I move to the French Immersion classroom to teach English Language Arts. | |
| If "yes," I have my own English Language Arts classroom. | |
ii. Bulletin Boards for English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are bulletin boards for English in the French classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both French and English are taught there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French only is taught there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bulletin boards for English are in the English classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are bulletin boards for English Language Arts work by French Immersion pupils in the hallways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

iii. Amount of time spent in English instruction in the Transitional Year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>mins./week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of French Language Arts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minutes of English Language Arts:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify the number of minutes of other subjects taught in English in the Transitional Year, eg.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local units: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
iv Programme Coordination

If you are the teacher of English Language Arts to a Transitional Year Early French Immersion Class which you do not register, please answer this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there time set aside in your school for the English Language Arts teacher to meet with the French Immersion teacher for programme planning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;Yes,&quot; does this meeting occur on a regular basis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;Yes,&quot; what is the frequency?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(please specify) - other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Programme structure

Please mark the boxes which correspond to your approach.

i. Reading (English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you pretest at the beginning of the year?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; which test/s is/are used?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;no,&quot; how do you assess?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you divide the class into ability groupings?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If &quot;yes,&quot; how many groups?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Maybe</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you use a basal reader?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please check which one: Ginn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use another approach, such as individualized, emergent, or wholistic?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which genres of literature do you use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- novels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- short stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- poetry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- plays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- non-fiction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- fairy tales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- myths and legends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are English books for independent reading available in the French Immersion classroom?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your class do uninterrupted, sustained silent reading (USSR) in English?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If "yes," is this:

- daily
- weekly

Library use in English is:

- required
- encouraged

Do you read aloud to the class?
If "yes," is this:  - daily
- weekly
- other:

Do you encourage parental involvement through English home reading?
If "yes," is this a formal programme?
If "yes," is it done:  - daily
- weekly
- other:
If English reading is coordinated with French Language Arts, please explain, in general, how it is done:

---

ii. Writing (English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English Language Arts.</th>
<th>Is it coordinated with French?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often does your class practice writing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of writing does your English class do?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>short stories</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expository</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>précis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practice with dialogue (quotations,...)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If English writing is coordinated with French Language Arts, please explain, in general, how it is done:


iii. Spelling (English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Arts.</th>
<th>Is it coordinated with French?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you use an authorised programme?

- Yes Thomas?
- other (please specify):

Do you use a teacher-generated word list?

- with words from pupils' reading
- with words from pupils' writing

Do you use a student-generated word list?
Do you use a joint teacher & student generated word list?

Do you use seasonal themes?

Do you use spelling to teach a pattern or concept? (eg. contractions)

Do you use a pre-test/post-test method?

Do you use some other method? (Please describe briefly.)

Does your programme rely on parental involvement?

If English spelling is coordinated with French Language Arts, please explain, in general, how it is done:
### iv. Grammar (English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Language Arts.</th>
<th>Is it coordinated with French?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Do you use an authorised text?
- Which concepts do you teach in English?
  - sentence structure
  - paragraph structure
  - use of quotation marks (direct speech)
  - punctuation
  - capitalization
  - parallel speech
  - origin of words
  - parts of speech
  - conjugation of verbs
  - other:

- How often do you teach grammar:
  - daily
  - weekly
  - as deemed appropriate
If grammar is coordinated with French Language Arts, please explain, in general, how it is done:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does your class do public speaking?</th>
<th>English Language Arts.</th>
<th>Is it coordinated with French?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your class engage in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- how often:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- daily</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- weekly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- monthly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your class engage in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- choral speech?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- plays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- debates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- speeches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- recitation of memory work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- other (Please describe.):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If English oral language is coordinated with French Language Arts, please explain, in general, how it is done:

4. Comments on this second section:

C. Teaching Strategies

Early French immersion pupils arrive in the Transitional Year English Language Arts class with a knowledge of reading and writing which has been taught in French. Reading and writing skills may or may not have been acquired in English. Certain concepts and skills transfer easily from French to English. However in certain areas there is language-dependent interference.

Please indicate with a check mark where you encounter transfer and interference, and whether or not you give special emphasis in teaching these areas in the transitional year. If an item does not apply to you, please mark N/A (Not applicable).

1. Areas of Observed Transfer from French to English in Reading
The following skills or concepts have probably been taught in French. How do you deal with them in your English class(es)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill/Concept</th>
<th>How do you treat this skill or concept?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alphabet (letter names)</td>
<td>Teach as English only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonics (sounds of letters)</td>
<td>Highlight its similarity to French.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consonant blends and digraphs</td>
<td>No special provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of a sentence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of a paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literary forms (e.g. poem, short story, novel etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making inferences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making predictions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skimming text</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding the main idea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summarizing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (word meaning and origins of words)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Areas of Observed **Transfer** from French to English in Writing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The following skills or concepts have probably been taught in French. How do you deal with them in your English class(es)?</th>
<th>How do you treat this skill or concept?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Penmanship</td>
<td>Teach as English only. Highlight its similarity to/difference from French. No special provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing conventions (e.g. use of capitals, punctuation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammatical constructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions of compositions (e.g. paragraphing, letter-writing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of ideas in a composition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of plot in a story</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Areas of Observed **Transfer** From French to English in Speaking

The following skills or concepts have probably been taught in French. How do you deal with them in your English class(es)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How do you treat this skill or concept?</th>
<th>Teach as English only.</th>
<th>Highlight its similarity to/difference from French.</th>
<th>No special provision.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oratory arts (public speaking)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recitations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choral reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Areas of Observed **Interference** from French to English
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The following skills or concepts have probably been taught in French. How do you deal with them in your English class(es)?</th>
<th>Strategy for teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teach as English only. Highlight its difference from French No special provision made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalization (e.g. days, months)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotation marks (direct speech)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of apostrophe (in contractions and to show possession in English)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word attack skills (French phonics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling (e.g. words spelt almost, but not quite the same, i.e. &quot;adresse&quot; French)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English words of Latin or French origin whose meaning has changed (eg. Fr. &quot;sensible&quot; = En. sensitive; Fr. &quot;phrase&quot; = En. sentence)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other: (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Comments on this third section of the questionnaire:

________________________

________________________

________________________
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D. Direction and Support

The final part of the questionnaire is to determine your degree of satisfaction with the direction you receive and freedom you have in terms of curriculum guides and materials from your district and the Ministry of Education.

It is also intended to discover whether your district has created locally developed materials and opportunities for teachers of Transitional Year English Language Arts in Early French Immersion, if you use them, and if you see a need for such specialty items.

1. Current curriculum guides, materials and support services

i. Please indicate with a check mark how you feel about the materials, guides and support services provided by the Ministry of Education and your local school district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry Guidelines for implementing the transitional year English:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability of English books provided for pupil use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for collaborative planning with the French language teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development in Transitional Year English Language Arts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of support services such as remedial help and gifted programmes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of materials developed especially for Transitional Year English Language Arts:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of materials developed especially for this Transitional Year programme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to serve on committees for the further development of this Transitional Year programme:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Which documents do you use to assist in planning for and teaching Transitional Year English Language Arts? (Please give title, author, source, date... as convenient.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

iii. Are there documents created by your school district to facilitate the Transitional Year English Language Arts programme? (Please give title, author, date etc.)

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
2. Directions for further development

i. Please indicate what you feel to be the needs for further development and how strongly you feel the need to be.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Needs for Development</th>
<th>Not needed</th>
<th>Little need</th>
<th>Ambivalent</th>
<th>Some need</th>
<th>Greatly needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More detailed Ministry Guidelines for implementing the Transitional Year English:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More suitable English books provided for pupil use:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater opportunities for collaborative planning with the French language teacher:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for professional development in this teaching subject:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater accessibility of support services such as remedial help and gifted programmes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater availability of materials developed especially for Transitional Year English:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More materials developed especially for Transitional Year English:

More opportunities to serve on committees for the further development of Transitional Year English:

ii. What sort of document would you like to see produced to facilitate the planning for and teaching of the Transitional Year English Language Arts Programme?


3. Comments on this final section of the questionnaire:


Thank you very much for your time and effort. Please return the completed questionnaire to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Sincerely,

Cynthia K. Brewis
General Delivery
Roberts Creek, B.C.
V0N 2W0
Appendix C

Principals' Approval Form

«DATA Principals Address Data»
«Salutation» «Firstname» «Lastname»
«Title» «School»
«Address» «City/Prov.» «Postal Code»

Bruce P. Clayman, Chair
University Research Ethics Review Committee
Simon Fraser University
Burnaby, British Columbia, V5A 1S6

Re: A Qualitative and Quantitative Analysis of the Transitional Year of the English Language Arts Component of the Early French Immersion Programme in British Columbian Elementary Schools

This document grants ___
denies ___

my permission to conduct the above-mentioned survey amongst the teachers of this component in my school.

I understand that the survey will require about an hour of each teacher's time, and that the results will be published in a thesis under the auspices of Simon Fraser University.

Participation in this study by the teachers is entirely voluntary and the responses will remain confidential.

Sincerely,

«Firstname» «Lastname»
«Title» «School»
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Appendix D
Thank You/Reminder Letter to Principals and Participants

«DATA Principals Address Data»
Cynthia K. Brewis
General Delivery
Roberts Creek, B.C. V0N 2W0

Phone/Fax: 885-4026
e-mail: cbrewis@cln.bc.ca

June 14, 1995

Dear «Salutation» «Lastname»

and The Teacher of Transitional Year English Language Arts:

The month of June is rapidly advancing, and the school year is drawing to a close.
This is my opportunity to thank those of you who so kindly responded to my request for
your time and effort on my questionnaire regarding the English Language Arts Component
in the Transitional Year of the Early French Immersion Programme. My sincere thanks!
Tabulating the results has kept me quite busy! Thank you very much! In one study district, every principal granted permission for the survey to take place, and every teacher involved responded. The detailed responses show much thought and consideration.

Alas, in some districts, the response rate has been disappointingly low. Your input is valuable to my study and to the programme. Despite that it is late in the year, it is not too late to be included in the study. Please dust off your permission form, your questionnaire and the stamped, self-addressed envelope and use them!

If you have misplaced your questionnaire, please feel free to call me (collect) to ask for another copy, which I will gladly expedite.

Once again, thank you for the thought and effort that has been put in by so many busy teachers to help make this project a success. And if you thought it was too late to bother, time is still on your side!

Yours sincerely,

Cynthia Brewis
NOTES


2See Savignon, S. J. (1987). Communicative Language Teaching. Theory into Practice, 26, 235-242. "Central to an understanding of communicative language teaching in an understanding of the term of communicative competence. Coined by a sociolinguist (Hymes, 1971) to include knowledge of sociolinguistic rules, or the appropriateness of an utterance, in addition to knowledge of grammar rules, the term has come to be used in language teaching contexts to refer to the ability to negotiate meaning - to successfully combine a knowledge of linguistic, sociolinguistic and discourse rules in communicative interactions (Savignon, 1972, 1983). The term applies to both oral and written communication, in academic as well as non-academic settings."
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