

FRENCH IMMERSION AND
REGULAR ENGLISH PROGRAMS
IN THE ELEMENTARY DUAL-TRACK SCHOOL:
A STUDY OF THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

by

Sandra Rideout

B.G.S., Simon Fraser University, 1981

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS (EDUCATION)
in the Faculty
of
Education

© Sandra Rideout 1987

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

October 1987

All rights reserved. This work may not be
reproduced in whole or in part, by photocopy
or other means, without permission of the author.

APPROVAL

Name: Sandra D. Rideout
Degree: Master of Arts (Education)
Title of Thesis: French Immersion and Regular English Programs in the
Elementary Dual-Track School: A Study of the Role
of the Principal
Examining Committee
Chairperson: P. Winne

S. Shapson
Senior Supervisor

L. LaRocque /
Assistant Professor

P. Coleman
Professor
Faculty of Education
Simon Fraser University
External Examiner

Date Approved

Apr 19/87

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Project/Extended Essay

French Immersion and Regular English Programs in the Elementary

Dual-Track School: A Study of the Role of the Principal

Author:

(signature)

Sandra D. Rideout

(name)

19 Oct. 87

(date)

Abstract

The purpose of the current study was to describe what actions principals of elementary dual-track schools (i.e., schools housing both a regular English program and a French immersion program) were taking (a) to integrate French and English stream students during whole-school activities; (b) to nurture a collaborative staff; and (c) to foster positive home-school relations, resulting in cooperation between French and English program parents.

An interview schedule was designed around the three topics (French/English student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations), and principals' responses to questions were recorded. School practices were identified and analysed according to strategies recommended in the literature and deemed appropriate by the researcher, and an overall approach to each of the three areas was developed for each school. Approaches taken by individual schools were examined in the context of their school district's policy regarding French immersion programming. Finally, the relationship between those approaches and three variables which, according to the literature, could affect implementation of effective strategies (i.e., the enrollment in the French immersion program compared to the English program; the principal's fluency in French; and the principal's experience in the dual-track school setting) was

explored.

The study reveals that there exist great discrepancies among principals of dual-track schools in their approaches to student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations. A relatively small majority of principals employed effective strategies in integrating French and English program students, and an even smaller majority took steps to ensure collaboration between French and English program staff members. Fewer than half of the principals, however, were judged to be initiating actions designed to engender positive home-school relations.

Neither student integration nor staff collaboration were found to be significantly affected by enrollment, principal fluency, or principal experience. There was some evidence, however, that schools with higher French program enrollments were less likely to be enjoying positive home-school relations, and further, that principals who were fluent in French appeared to employ more effective strategies in nurturing positive home-school relations in the dual-track school than did principals with little or no French fluency.

The study concludes with recommendations regarding the administration of dual-track schools, among them that school goals reflect those recommended in the literature, that principals employ more of those strategies identified in the

study as effective, and that districts should plan frequent in-service sessions directed specifically at the administration of the dual-track school and its unique considerations.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my appreciation for the help and support I received from the Kamloops School District, Mr. T. Dale, Mr. and Mrs. E. F. Rideout, Surrey School District and its Research and Evaluation Department, the participating principals and their school districts, Dr. S. Shapson, Dr. P. Coleman, and Dr. L. LaRocque.

Table of Contents

	Page
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	ix
1. INTRODUCTION	1
Problem Statement and Background	1
Limitations of the Study	5
Project Outline	6
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	8
Training for Principals of Dual-Track Schools	9
Student Integration	12
Staff Collaboration	16
Home-School Relations	21
Variables Affecting Achievement of Goals	28
Synthesis of Literature	30
3. METHODOLOGY	32
The Sample	32
Data Collecting Instruments	34
The questionnaire	34
The interview	36
Procedures	37
Data Analysis	39
4. RESULTS AND INTERPRETATIONS	45
Student Integration	45
Staff consensus	46
Inter-program activities	47
Language at school functions	48
School profiles and overall approach	48
Purposeful approach	49
Coordinated approach	50
Limited approach	52
Detached approach	53
Staff Collaboration	54
Trust level	55
Staff decisionmaking	58
Shared goals	60

School profiles and overall approach	62
Purposeful approach	62
Coordinated approach	63
Limited approach	63
Detached approach	64
Home-School Relations	64
The parent group	65
Communications with parents	67
Eliciting feedback from parents	68
School profiles and overall approach	69
Purposeful approach	70
Coordinated approach	70
Limited approach	71
Detached approach	72
Chapter Summary	73
5. DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY	81
School Profiles	81
School Profiles in Relation to District Policies	86
Student Integration and Selected Variables	88
Enrollment	88
Principal fluency	89
Principal experience	90
Staff Collaboration and Selected Variables	91
Enrollment	92
Principal fluency	92
Principal experience	93
Home-School Relations and Selected Variables	94
Enrollment	94
Principal fluency	95
Principal experience	96
Summary	97
Conclusions and Recommendations	99
Implications for Further Study	101
APPENDIXES	107
Appendix A	107
Appendix B	109
Appendix C	112
Appendix D	123
REFERENCES	124

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1	
Predominance of French Programs Operating in Sample Schools	43
Table 2	
Principal Profiles re French Language Facility and Experience in the Dual-Track School Setting	44
Table 3	
School Profiles: Practices re French Immersion and Regular English Student Integration . .	75
Table 4	
Summary of Approaches to French Immersion and Regular English Student Integration	76
Table 5	
School Profiles: Practices re Staff Collaboration	77
Table 6	
Summary of Approaches to Staff Collaboration . .	78
Table 7	
School Profiles: Practices re Home-School Relations	79
Table 8	
Summary of Approaches to Home-School Relations	80
Table 9	
School Profiles: A Summary of Approaches . . .	103
Table 10	
Relationships between Approaches to Student Integration and Selected Variables	104
Table 11	
Relationships between Approaches to Staff Collaboration and Selected Variables . . .	105
Table 12	
Relationships between Approaches to Home- School Relations and Selected Variables . .	106

Chapter 1

Introduction to the Study

Problem Statement and Background

The small group of Anglophone parents in St. Lambert, Quebec who, in 1965, pursued and achieved the dream of a French education for their children could hardly have foreseen the long-reaching effects of their actions on elementary education in Canada. In the two decades since that time, the term "French immersion," referring to a model of second-language acquisition wherein students are taught in the second language for all or part of the school day, has become familiar to most Canadian educators. Today, over 10% of Anglophone Kindergarten children are enrolled in French immersion classes in every province and territory of the country (Canadian Parents for French, 1986). From that very first, and well-researched, attempt to provide children with a unique method of learning a second language (see Lambert & Tucker, 1972; Lambert, Tucker, & d'Anglejan, 1974), the phenomenon has grown at such a spectacular rate that one wonders how it is possible that researchers can keep up to it at all. Not unnaturally, the achievement of students has garnered the most attention (see Cummins, 1978; Lapkin, Andrew, Harley, Swain, & Kamin, 1981). But the issues at stake do not all pertain directly to students. Parents, teachers, and administrators are affected in a

variety of ways by the spread of French immersion education. Parents, for example, have been the driving force behind the establishment of immersion programs in many parts of Canada (Burns & Olson, 1981; CPF, 1986), and parents opposed to the introduction of French immersion in their neighbourhood schools have made their views clear as well (Burns & Olson, 1981; Canadian Education Association [CEA], 1983). Teachers in the regular English program may be affected by declining student enrollments leading to loss of teaching positions (Burns & Olson, 1981; CEA, 1983), and by the presence of French immersion teachers in their schools (Day & Shapson, 1983). Administrators may find themselves working longer hours to cope with the new programs, students, parents, and teachers which immersion has brought to their schools (McGillivray, 1978).

Many researchers in the field of French immersion have recommended further study into the role of the principal in immersion schooling (Olson & Burns, 1981; Guttman, 1983), yet such studies have existed only on the periphery of other, larger topics. There is no lack of research, however, devoted to the study of the role of the principal in the more general school setting, and his or her indispensable contribution in providing leadership in almost any area concerning schools or schooling. Several studies have shown that principals can have a positive effect on student achievement by promoting the basic skills in their

schools (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981), and by creating an atmosphere in which students and teachers "work much harder than can ordinarily be expected" (Sergiovanni, 1984, p. 5). Interest in the vital role of the principal in schools housing a French immersion program prompted the current study.

In B.C., the large majority of immersion classes are housed in dual-track schools. As the name implies, these are schools in which two programs (i.e., French immersion and regular English) run parallel to each other. In general, English programs alone existed in these schools until demand for a French program required that immersion classes be installed. At that point, French immersion would be offered as an alternative in Kindergarten and/or Grade 1, and the program expanded year by year as that "lead group" passed through the system. This model is referred to as an "early total immersion" experience for students, because 100% of their instruction for approximately the first three years of school is in French. That percentage drops at varying rates until the end of the program, while the English component increases; generally, Grade 7 early immersion students are receiving approximately one-half of their instruction in English, the other half in French (Modern Languages Services Branch, 1981). At the end of a seven- or eight-year period, the familiar neighbourhood school would have been transformed from an all-English K-7

*what's a
dual-track*

model, to one with a K-7 English program plus a K-7 French program, attended by children from a much larger area than just the immediate neighbourhood.

This transformation carries with it important implications for school administrators. Not only are they required to become familiar with a completely new method of delivering curricula, but also with new teachers (possibly and probably from a different cultural background), new students and their families, and new problems. What is needed is a description of what principals in these schools are doing, and how they perceive their role as leaders in schools housing two parallel educational models.

The current study was undertaken in order to shed light on strategies employed by principals in dual-track schools in three specific areas: French and English student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations. How, for example, do principals of elementary dual-track schools manage two distinct programs in one building? Are the two groups of students treated as one student body, or are they dealt with separately? How much is the French language used outside of classrooms? Do students from the two programs have opportunities to learn together, or is the language difference considered to be a barrier? How do principals deal with the inevitable conflicts between two groups of teachers and parents with shared, but nonetheless separate, goals? What do principals do when French

immersion teachers don't speak English fluently? How well do English and French teachers accept each others' programs, and what do principals do to promote acceptance? What strategies, if any, do they employ to unify their students, teachers, and parents? A questionnaire and interview protocol were developed for the study in which principals were asked to describe their school's handling of strategies in each of the three areas.

Limitations of the Study

The following are considered to be the limitations of the study.

1. There was no attempt to cross-validate principals' perceptions with those of the students, teachers, or parents. The lack of research specific to the role of the principal prompted the decision to focus entirely on the functions of administrators from their point of view.

2. The interview originally included a section on supervision of teachers along with the sections on student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations. Once in-depth analysis of the data had commenced, however, it became evident that the topic of supervision was a subheading of the section on principals and teachers, rather than a suitable fourth area for examination in this study. Supervision was also found to be almost exclusively manipulable by principals themselves, and was therefore not

Questions
5 to know not
about
principals
believe

as subject to influence by outside agents as were the other sections. The supervision section, therefore, was dropped from the study in order to focus on the relationships between principals and the three other groups of people most important in schools: principals and students, principals and staff, and principals and parents.

Project Outline

A review of the literature is contained in Chapter 2, and is divided into five sections. The first section deals with the literature that is pertinent to the role of the principal in the dual-track school, and what qualities are generally considered to be most valuable for those principals. In the second, third, and fourth sections the topics of student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations are dealt with in turn by examining literature from educational models other than the dual-track school, since research specific to that model was not available. The fifth section considers factors which may influence the achievement of goals in the dual-track school.

Chapter 3 details the methodology of the study. The chapter begins with an explanation of the sample selection, and moves on to descriptions of the data collecting instruments: a questionnaire and an interview. A description of procedures is then followed by a detailed account of the data analysis.

In Chapter 4, the results of the data analysis are presented in three sections, entitled Student Integration, Staff Collaboration, and Home-School Relations. An overall approach to each of the three areas, based on the philosophies and activities described by principals, is developed for each school. Pertinent results are interpreted in order to establish the basis for the characteristics of these approaches.

A discussion and examination of results, including their relationship to the literature, is contained in Chapter 5. In a final summary, implications for principals in dual-track schools are explored. Several conclusions resulting from the study are drawn. A list of recommended topics arising from the current study which may be of sufficient interest to other researchers to merit further investigation concludes the chapter.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

French immersion programming for Anglophone students in Canada has grown very quickly since the first "experiment" in St. Lambert, Quebec in 1965. There is an abundance of literature dealing with student achievement (Day & Shapson, 1983; Swain & Lapkin, 1982; Trites, 1981), language development (Baetens Beardsmore, 1982; Bruck, 1978; Cummins, 1984; Day & Shapson, 1987) and comparative studies on the different approaches to teaching and learning a second language (Krashen, 1984; Lapkin, Andrew, Harley, Swain, & Kamin, 1981; Swain, 1978), among others. Very little, however, has been written about the role of the principal working in the French immersion school setting. The underlying assumption of this study is that French immersion is an educational innovation which requires special considerations in its administration.

In British Columbia, French immersion education is still relatively new. The program was first offered in 1971, when only 83 students were enrolled. In the 1985-86 school year, over 15,000 students were registered in French immersion programs throughout the province (Modern Languages Services Branch, 1985). And yet, despite this phenomenal growth, there is no special training available to principals of schools housing French immersion classes. Thus, most

French immersion programs are administered according to the same precepts as their English counterparts.

Training for Principals of Dual-Track Schools

The concern for adequate training for administrators is not new. In a 1981 study, Olson and Burns state unequivocally that "a...neglected area has to do with the leadership of principals. No principals had specialized training for being a principal in a school with an immersion program... principals indicated that they played a 'supportive role' rather than a 'leadership role'" (p. 13).

In their conclusion, Olson and Burns emphasize the importance of the provision of training programs for both administrators and teachers as a means toward "becoming responsible partners in these new demands [which immersion programs will have on the existing system] rather than remaining passive reactors to a change process that is already well under way" (p. 14). In a later article, the authors reiterate their findings, and further state that in French immersion programs, the "leadership role [of the principal] is jeopardized if the principal is unilingual and has only minimal knowledge of the program's special problems" (1983, p. 12). They go on to cite potential problem areas in budget, training, and materials, and add logistical and technical problems to their list. They suggest that "many of these problems could be solved if the

Ministry created clear certification requirements and mandated both the immersion teacher and principal positions as requiring special training" (p. 12).

Clinton and Talmanis, in an address to immersion principals and teachers in 1982, agreed that "long term planning for the implementation of an immersion program is a must. Such planning should ideally include...a bilingual principal" (1982, p. 35).

Mary Alice Julius Guttman supports the contention that "there is a crisis of leadership in French immersion programs" (1983, p. 20). She points out the lack of effort by school boards to establish "a highly trained bilingual administrative staff to plan, support, and evaluate these programs. Instead, most boards have indicated that it is business as usual. Boards of education have placed the traditional school principal, without any French language skills or specialized training, in charge of these programs" (p. 20).

The Canadian Education Association (CEA), in a 1983 cross-Canada survey of school boards, found that of 96 boards, only 19 (or 27%) said the program was "usually administered by a bilingual principal or vice-principal." Eleven other boards stated that "bilingualism was strongly preferred and would probably be required in the future" (p. 26). Considering that French immersion had already been

offered in one form or another in Canada for almost 20 years at that time, one can only ask when "the future" will begin.

In the meantime, then, what qualities should principals of French immersion programs possess? Are there special problems unique to the administration of French immersion programs which ought to be considered in developing a profile for principal effectiveness?

One of Canada's foremost contributors to research on the immersion phenomenon from an administrative perspective, W. R. McGillivray, wrote an article outlining some of the inevitable problems to be faced by a principal of an immersion program (see McGillivray, 1978). Among them are the three main topics to be dealt with in this study: (a) the maintenance of two distinct programs in one school, and the resultant integration or non-integration of the two streams of students; (b) the development of a harmonious working relationship between French immersion and English program teachers; and (c) the recognition of and planning for the special needs of the community served by the two programs. French immersion and English program parents will have different, but no less important, concerns with which the building principal must deal expeditiously and fairly. Literature will be reviewed under headings designed around these three administrative considerations, deemed to be of special concern in the dual-track school setting.

Student Integration

One obvious factor which sets the dual-track model apart from most school settings is the co-existence of the two programs (French immersion and regular English) in the same building. Although the majority of students in each program will be Anglophone, many of the French immersion students will not live in the immediate catchment area of the school (CEA, 1983, p. 21). Since those children are also learning in a different language from their peers, the question of whether or not these two distinct groups of students can be administered as one body must be asked. It may in fact be necessary to employ unique strategies in order to provide experiences in the whole-school setting which reflect the classroom experiences of the two streams. An experienced principal in this setting expresses it this way:

The bilingual designation of our school compels us to engage in activities which reflect this status of our school. The school will strive to have its pupils acknowledge and appreciate the peaceful coexistence of two dominant languages and cultures (French and English) in their school community. However, no one group will be considered over the other. (Lebrun, 1981, p. 7)

The Canadian Education Association acknowledges the same goal when it states that the principal "has a crucial role in establishing a harmonious and supportive atmosphere in the school with an immersion program or in a dual-track school" (1983, p. 27).

One might expect, therefore, to find that principals of dual-track schools would develop some strategies designed to integrate -- that is, promote a feeling of unity -- between the two streams of students in the school.

There is virtually no literature dealing specifically with this topic. Some possible strategies, however, can be developed from statements made in related literature. For example, a major study of student achievement in immersion centers versus dual-track schools showed that immersion centers were more effective in promoting high student achievement in several areas than were the dual-track schools. Several causal factors were isolated, among them being the amount of spoken and written French that the students were exposed to in the school environment.

There is, on average, more French material displayed in immersion classrooms, in the corridors, and in school on parents' night in the immersion centres than there is in the dual-track schools. In addition, a higher proportion of school assemblies, sports days, and announcements are estimated to take place in French in the

immersion centres....there is more exposure to French in the wider school environment of the immersion centres than in the dual-track schools.

(Lapkin et al, 1981, p. 80-81)

Lebrun supports these findings by stating two objectives for his dual-track school in this way: "to provide pupils with school services in both languages" and to ensure that "both languages...be visible and heard in the whole school" (1981, p. 8).

Recent literature on effective principals in any school setting espouses the importance of setting clear goals.

"Effective principals are exceptionally clear about their own short- and long-term goals for students and these goals usually centre on 'the basics'" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982, p. 320). Sergiovanni calls this goal-setting procedure "purposing" and defines it as "inducing clarity, consensus, and commitment regarding the school's basic purpose" (1984, p. 6). And Rallis and Highsmith (1986) state that "leadership means keeping sight of long-term goals and steering in their direction" (p. 300).

An essential goal included in any description of effective principals is that of high expectations for student achievement (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982; Shoemaker & Fraser, 1981). We should expect, therefore, that in order to encourage high student achievement in the French immersion program, effective dual-track school principals

would encourage the use of French throughout the school, and particularly in whole-school activities; and that this would be a stated goal of the school, worked toward by the principal, staff, and students.

For the elementary dual-track school principal operating in an Anglophone community, this goal, which has been labelled "student integration" for the study, carries with it several implications.

First of all, it means that principal and staff must be committed to the operation of the school as a unit, rather than as two smaller schools. There may be differing approaches to acknowledging or nurturing this commitment. Some schools may make a formal policy stating student integration (or some similar term) as a goal of the school. Others may discuss strategies for integrating students without formalized policy but with an understanding on the part of staff that students will function as a single body.

Secondly, the goal of integration means that students in the two programs should be led to understand that it is possible for them to work together both in class and out of class, in the language of their program, without conflict. In other words, they should be shown that although the language may differ, the fundamental goals and content of the two programs do not. When they understand that the expectations for students in each program are essentially the same, they should be drawn to conclude that the students

themselves in each program -- and hence, each culture -- are also the same.

And finally, the principal must seek ways to publicly validate the French program in the eyes (and ears) of all students. No matter what the ratio of French to English students, it is important for both languages and cultures to be highlighted -- if not equally, then to some extent -- at whole-school functions. In this way, the principal and staff are essentially saying to French immersion students, "Your program matters. It is an important part of our school."

*effective
dual-track*

*Ex: Thymine
national*

Effective dual-track school principals, therefore, will promote the goal of French and English student integration in several ways. First, they will try to achieve staff consensus acknowledging the importance of integrating the two streams of students. Second, they will encourage teachers to involve students from both programs in joint intra- and extra-curricular activities. And third, they will conduct whole-school functions in both French and English.

*effective
dual-track*

Ex: Carnaval

Staff Collaboration

Not only will two distinct streams of students be found in a dual-track school; the teachers will also be representative of the two cultures, since many of French immersion teachers in B.C. are Francophones. The relatively

sudden rise in popularity of French immersion has given rise to a number of problems in terms of teacher relations. In B.C., an over 300% rise in French immersion student enrollment between 1982 and 1986 clearly indicates that more and more parents are selecting French immersion for their children. Thus, the French program requires more teachers, while the English program -- which, coincidentally, has been declining steadily due to other factors -- requires fewer teachers. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that "boards face problems with teacher resentment, insecurity and animosity when the Anglophone teachers see their numbers decrease while French teachers are hired" (CEA, 1983, p. 24). There is evidence of French programs "causing redundancies within schools and thus leading to teacher transfers" (Olson & Burns, 1981, p. 11), but little to suggest that English program teachers have actually been released from employment; boards have generally been able to handle the declining demand for English program teachers through attrition. The potential for conflict, however, remains.

from anglophone teachers

A second factor in the question of teacher relations arises from the fact that French immersion teachers being hired are often young, energetic novices, since few experienced teachers are willing to leave secure positions in Francophone school systems. The English program, on the other hand, has seen the average age of its teachers

2

increase rapidly in recent years. Overall, according to a research report prepared by the B. C. Teachers' Federation in 1986, "the teachers in B. C.'s public schools can now be seen as a middle-aged (and aging) work force with over 70% falling into the 35 to 55 age group" (Jacobson & Kuehn, 1986, p. 21).

A third factor which may contribute to conflict between the two groups is the fact that many Francophone immersion teachers may not speak English fluently, a factor that can cause non-French-speakers to become uncomfortable when French is being spoken, or resentful of people they cannot get to know very well because of the language barrier.

Fourthly, because of the newness of the French program, both federal and provincial monies have been made available for start-up costs, new materials, library and media resources, curriculum development, and professional development. It is not difficult to understand the feelings of English program teachers who are still using textbooks, furniture, and equipment which are far from new. As Lebrun points out, "no one group will be considered over the other" (1981, p. 7), and it often falls to the principal to deal with the problems that such budgetary decisions engender.

These are some of the factors existing in the political arena outside of the dual-track school. Turning again to the literature on effective principals, it is evident that "[attending] to the relationship among school

staff...particularly the mutual trust existing among staff" (Leithwood & Montgomery, 1982, p. 325) is an important quality for principals in any setting, but perhaps even more so in the dual-track school, if only because of its potential for conflict. Finn, among others, states that teachers "must function collegially if their schools are to be effective" (1984, p. 522). Among the strategies discovered by Leithwood and Montgomery to be most commonly used by effective principals in building interpersonal relationships among staff members were: a) seeking staff advice on important issues; b) engaging in shared decisionmaking and encouraging participation early in the decisionmaking process; c) establishing structures within which participation can be fostered; d) acquiring personal experience in attempting to implement innovations; and e) encouraging staff to set their own goals. "Effective principals publicly and unambiguously express their support for new practices related to program improvement. They attempt to develop trust among their faculty, frequently using informal, person-to-person methods to do this. And they make themselves available as sounding boards for teachers' problems or new ideas" (1982, p. 326-7). In a book devoted entirely to the topic of principal effectiveness, published four years later, Leithwood and Montgomery explain that "principals...demonstrate their valuing of staff and students through efforts to increase

participation in decisionmaking. More participative organizational processes, less centralized decisionmaking structures, and more formalized rules are associated with teachers' perceptions of increased school effectiveness" (1986, p. 180-81). Lebrun's experience in the field leads him to this statement: "Both staff groups should feel they are equal partners in the school. All duties should be shared and leadership should come from both groups" (1981, p. 8).

The collaborative effort is cited as an appropriate strategy in bicultural programs as well:

The leadership must perceive and work from the instructional team concept....the hierarchical method of downward flow of information, decision power vested in administrative positions, and consensus by decree is dysfunctional in bicultural programs. The instructional team concept, because of its organization, taps many of the program and non-program staff for their thinking power, glues decisions to instructional reasons, and enhances staff support via maximum involvement. (Valverde, 1978, p. 338-9)

An effective principal might also provide opportunities for teachers to engage in shared curricular activities, particularly in view of the fact that, in British Columbia at least, the aims and objectives of the French immersion

*P. napa
should*

and regular English programs are identical insofar as content is concerned. Methodologies and teaching strategies will differ, however, because of the language component.

It is evident that the dual-track school principal has no easy task. Most of the literature on staff collaboration has arisen as a result of problems perceived on culturally matched staffs; the presence of two distinct cultural groups contains even more potential for problems. The effective principal, therefore, will utilize any and all strategies to encourage a collaborative model on his or her staff. As we have seen, development of trust, participatory decisionmaking, and shared goals are key factors in creating the desired results. Clearly, both French- and English-speaking teachers must be equal partners in all decisions. Simply put, "the program needs the most supportive of administrators" (Powell, 1982, p. 14).

Home-School Relations

It is virtually impossible to study the literature on effective schools and effective principals without understanding the importance attached to parents and their role in achieving school goals. Moyer (1982) calls the school and the community "two of the most powerful influences on student achievement" (p. 285), and Leithwood and Montgomery also found that "effective principals view the actions of parents and the wider school community as

*influence
on
student*

potential instruments for fostering goals being pursued by the school and shape their relationships with the community to serve this end" (1982, p. 321). The latter study revealed as well that in studying relationships with the community, effective principals were found to focus on "communicating the goals of the school to parents," while typical principals tended to focus on "establishing friendly but nonsubstantive relations" (p. 325). A recent study by Cattermole and Robinson on parents' preferred methods of communication from schools showed that "close communication between schools and their communities establishes shared goals and thus builds public support for and commitment to the schools and their educational objectives" (1985, p. 48). In a 1983 study, the U. S. Department of Education identified 152 schools across the country as being meritorious, having identified 14 attributes of effectiveness including "community support." Mangieri and Arnn, as a result of that study, found that principals of 111 of those schools ranked "community involvement and support" among the five most important tasks they performed (1985, p. 9). In their summative work, Improving Principal Effectiveness: The Principal Profile, Leithwood and Montgomery state that

effective principals attempt to establish an organizational backdrop to support and reinforce the effects of classroom activity. This involves

creative attempts to bring non-regular material and other resources into the school. It also involves ensuring cooperative working relationships...between the school and the community. These relationships usually involve a real sharing of decision-making responsibility around clearly established school priorities.

(1986, p. 227)

If it is important to nurture the home-school relationship in a single-track school, it is even more critical in the dual-track setting. As we saw in the section dealing with staff collaboration, the establishment of French immersion programs in some communities is not met with immediate acceptance. The impetus for French immersion programming may have come from parents (CEA, 1983; Lapkin, 1984), but that is not to say that all parents are strong supporters. "Parents of non-immersion students must be reassured that their children are still receiving a quality education and the effects the program will have on the school and on their children must be explained to them" (CEA, 1983, p. 32). The notion that the French program is going to "take over" is often a common one, arising from the decision by some boards to establish single-track immersion centres, thereby necessitating the relocation of English students. And immersion parents themselves often require extra reassurances.

Most immersion parents are very supportive of the program and are delighted that their children have this opportunity, but they are also worried. In spite of the positive results reported by various researchers they realize that the program is relatively new and they are still concerned about possible negative effects. Consequently they need more frequent reassurance that their children are progressing normally in immersion. (McGillivray, 1978, p. 72)

Because the dual-track school community has the potential for divisiveness, the principal must take extra steps to ensure that the parents, like the students and staff, can operate as a unified group. He or she "must show sincerity in wanting parent participation and involvement" and make the "establishment of a parent-advisory group...a major responsibility" (Aguilar, 1979, p. 28). Moyer even goes so far as to suggest that "if the public school to survive...a true coalition of school and community is an absolute necessity" (1982, p. 287). Parents, too, are looking for meaningful involvement. One French immersion parent expressed her desire for the school to "maintain effective and open communication with parents regarding the formation of educational policies and curriculum development" (Hawkes, 1982, p. 18). There are a number of different strategies which can be employed by principals to

foster a healthy, open communication between home and school.

The parent advisory group, which might be known by any number of different titles, is a key strategy. It must be representative of the community (Aguilar, 1979; Moyer, 1982) -- that is, it should be made up of both French and English program parents; it should provide opportunities for parents to learn about school goals and how they can contribute to them; it should allow parents to express their views freely; and it should allow parents to work cooperatively with the school in planning activities to complement the school's programs. Most writers agree that it is the principal who is ultimately responsible for the success or failure of the parent group.

A second strategy which is effective in fostering strong home-school relations is the use of frequent and varied communications of the school's activities and goals to parents. Cattermole and Robinson, in 1985, duplicated a 1973 U.S. study in Abbotsford, B.C. They found that "parents like to rely on first-hand sources of information" (p. 49) to learn about what schools are doing, and that, in fact, 78% of the parents surveyed preferred to learn about the school from their children, 67% valued school newsletters, 57% preferred to learn from report cards, 54% from scheduled parent/teacher conferences, and 49% from personal visits to the school. The authors concluded that

"if schools really want to communicate more effectively with parents, they have only to develop the traditional modes of home/school communication that rely on direct, personal contact between educators and parents" (p. 50).

Thirdly, principals will elicit from parents, on a regular and frequent basis, their opinions on how well the school is serving their children and what it might be doing better. In the same study, Cattermole and Robinson found that parents preferred to communicate to the school through phone calls or visits (89%), parent/teacher conferences (84%), volunteering in schools (61%), and messages sent with children (60%) (1985, p. 49). In terms of those methods which are manipulable by schools, and which could be initiated by them, those preferred by parents were parent/teacher conferences (84%), parent groups (47%), surveys from schools (41%), and participation in school activities, such as fund raisers or graduation (41%). Effective principals, therefore, will employ all of these methods at various times throughout the year, ensuring that a full spectrum of parents, including those who do not visit regularly, will be heard from.

Principals of dual-track schools must guard against encouraging any rivalry between French and English stream parents. "Both sets of parents will question why one group is getting something that the other may not be receiving" (Lebrun, 1981, p. 12). Allowing parents to have a

meaningful part in the decision-making process by establishing a parent group with a substantive agenda, giving parents equal opportunity for input, and communicating school goals frequently and in a variety of ways are all essential if the home-school relationship is to flourish.

Effective dual-track principals, then, will take steps to ensure that there is open communication between the school and parents of both the French and the English program. Three strategies which will aid in establishing good home-school relations are (a) the establishment of a parent advisory group, representative of both streams; (b) frequent communications to parents, in the form of newsletters and face-to-face dialogue; and (c) giving parents meaningful opportunities to express their opinions about the school and its programs.

Clearly, the setting of goals, which has appeared in every section dealt with in this review, is fundamental in the profile of the effective principal. Students, teachers and parents must be aware of and committed to the goals of the school, and must also be given opportunities to contribute to their achievement. Principals of dual-track schools should employ strategies designed to encourage high student achievement in the French language, and acceptance and understanding of the two cultures represented in the

school. A spirit of cooperation and equality between the two streams should prevail.

Variables Affecting Achievement of Goals

There are many factors which affect the achievement of goals in schools. When we re-examine the literature to find what factors affect administration in dual-track schools, there are three that come to the forefront.

Firstly, and perhaps most obviously, there is the very existence of the French program itself. The dual-track school is a relatively new phenomenon. The model dictates that principals, teachers, students, and parents will be housed in one building, and the placement of French immersion in a school has initiated both negative and positive reactions, such as those described in the previous section. When the French immersion program begins to overtake the incumbent English program in size, these reactions are further magnified. One important variable affecting the achievement of goals in the dual-track school, therefore, may be the size of the French program.

Factors which reflect personal characteristics of the principal should also be considered to be of importance in the achievement of goals. For example, several researchers (CEA, 1983; Clinton & Talmanis, 1982; Olson & Burns, 1983) stated their concern that most principals administering French immersion programs were not bilingual. If a

principal were able to communicate effectively with both Francophone and Anglophone teachers, then perhaps more substantive goals, such as staff development and participatory decision-making, would be attainable on the staff level. Principal fluency in French, therefore, may be another factor affecting goals.

Thirdly, some researchers criticized the lack of special training for French immersion program administrators (Guttman, 1983; Olson & Burns, 1981, 1983). Failing that, principals new to the program are recommended to establish contact with more experienced administrators of French immersion programs and "find out what it is all about" (Clinton & Talmanis, 1982, p. 39). Experienced principals, therefore, may be better able to effectively achieve the goals of the program, at the same time achieving the less tangible goals of cooperation and unity of purpose among teachers, students, and parents.

The three variables outlined here -- predominance of French immersion programs in schools, principal fluency in French, and experience in administering French immersion programs -- are not a comprehensive representation of factors affecting the achievement of goals in dual-track schools. They are, however, important considerations for a study of French immersion principals such as this one.

Synthesis of Literature

Several strategies which encourage harmony between students, teachers, and parents in the French and English programs can be synthesized from review of the literature.

In the area of student integration, it is suggested that principals attempt to develop the following strategies:

1. staff consensus favouring the goal of French/English student integration;
2. shared intra- and extra-curricular activities involving students from both programs; and
3. the use of both French and English at whole-school functions.

To promote a collaborative staff, it is recommended that principals attempt to:

1. establish acceptance between teachers in the two programs;
2. employ a participatory decisionmaking model, encouraging equal input from teachers in both programs; and
3. provide opportunities for teachers to discuss and develop shared goals for the whole school.

In order to promote positive home-school relations, and to encourage parents of students in both programs to function as a group for the good of the whole school, it is suggested that the dual-track school principal:

could do

1. establish a parent group that is comprised of parents from both the French and the English programs, and encourage their involvement in meaningful activities which complement school programs;

2. communicate frequently and substantively with parents regarding school activities; and

3. elicit feedback from parents on their satisfaction with the school and its programs.

These strategies may be affected by a number of factors present in the dual-track school. Among them are (a) the enrollment in the French immersion program as compared to the enrollment in the English program, (b) the principal's fluency in French, and (c) the experience of the principal in the dual-track setting.

The extent to which these strategies exist in B.C. dual-track schools, their interrelationship, and the factors affecting them are the focus of the present study.

Chapter 3

Methodology

The study was designed to reveal how principals incumbent in dual-track schools in British Columbia deal with specific areas of school administration. Because no documented studies that were current or pertinent to B.C. were available, a questionnaire/interview model was adopted as the most reliable and specific method of obtaining the desired information for the study. A sample of several principals in different districts was also thought to be the best method of acquiring reliable information so that the role of the principal could be examined within the context of different district policies.

The Sample

The following criteria for selection of school districts to participate in the study were developed:

1. that the French immersion program had been operating in the district for a minimum of eight years (thereby allowing time for the program to have become well-established);
2. that the district had, in at least some schools, implemented the early total immersion model in a dual-track setting, because that model is prevalent in B.C.; and

3. that the district expressed interest in the study, and a willingness to have principals participate, thus ensuring that principals viewed the study favourably.

As a result of these criteria, four districts were selected. All four were large districts located in the Lower Mainland area of British Columbia. District operation of the French immersion program ranged from 9 to 19 years, inclusive of the year in which the study was conducted. All four districts implemented the early total immersion model. A sample copy of the letter sent to each district requesting their permission to participate in the study can be found in Appendix A.

Once district permission had been obtained, the schools whose principals were to be interviewed were selected according to the following criteria:

1. that the school be an elementary dual-track school, housing both French and English programs (since that model is the one most commonly implemented in B.C.);

2. that the model adopted for the immersion program in the school be early total immersion (again, because of its prevalence in the B.C. school system); and

3. that the immersion program span at least four grade levels (since it was felt that a program spanning fewer than four grade levels would not yet have had a significant impact on the administration or daily operation of that school).

From preliminary contacts with the principals of schools in the four districts which fell within the confines of the above criteria, it was discovered that only one was fluent in both French and English. Believing that 1 out of 15 bilingual principals would not yield meaningful results for comparative purposes, another principal who was known to be fluently bilingual but whose district was not included in the original sample was contacted, and when he agreed to be interviewed, he was included in the study.

The final sample, therefore, included 16 principals of elementary dual-track schools in five school districts, whose early total immersion program spanned at least four grade levels. In all cases but one, the English program comprised the full K - 7 complement; the one exception offered grades 1 - 7. Eleven of the 16 French programs (68.8%) spanned K - 7. Table 1 summarizes specific information about the French program in the 16 sample schools.

Insert Table 1 about here

Data Collecting Instruments

The questionnaire. A questionnaire, consisting of 13 closed-ended and 6 open-ended questions (see Appendix B),

sought demographic information on the school, such as the numbers of students in each program and the numbers of teachers assigned to classes in each program. French immersion program enrollments were higher than English and other enrollments in 9 out of the 16 schools; 4 of those 9 were by a margin of more than 20%. The numbers of full-time equivalent (FTE) teachers in each program (not including administrators, librarians, or learning assistants) was also requested. These data are summarized in Table 1. Raw data are contained in Appendix B.

*bibliothé-
caire
?*

Principals were asked to rate their ability to speak and understand French on identical 7-point scales, ranging from "not at all" to "fluently". Principals who rated themselves in the "not at all" and "a little" categories were classified as low in language ability. Principals who spoke and understood French "fairly well" or "fluently" were rated as high in language ability. Table 2 shows that the majority of principals (11 out of 16, 68.8%) were classified as low in language ability because they spoke and understood little or no French.

The participants were also asked to describe their experience in any dual-track school setting. Those who were in their first or second year of a principalship in a dual-track school were classified as being low in experience, and those with three or more years experience were classified as high. Table 2 reveals that principals

with three or more years experience in a dual-track school (10 out of 16, 62.5%) outnumbered those with two years or less experience (6 out of 16, 37.5%).

Insert Table 2 about here

It is interesting to note that only 3 out of the 16 principals in this sample had been principal of more than one dual-track school; the other 13 were all in their first placement, although the numbers of years in those schools varied.

The interview. An interview protocol, included in Appendix C, was developed specifically for the study, according to the precepts of interview design contained in recent studies (see Patton, 1980, and Borg & Gall, 1983). The interview consisted solely of open-ended questions. Great care was taken to ensure that no bias could be perceived by the participant: questions were phrased in neutral terms; no assumptions were made regarding strategies employed or beliefs held by principals. Pre-determined probes were used by the interviewer only when more detail was required from principals on certain questions. The interviewer spoke as little as possible during interviews, and followed the pre-set protocol with very little

3 aspects
studied
on how
principals
were doing.
37

deviation. One preliminary interview was completed between the interviewer and a volunteer principal of a dual-track school not included in the sample, and several suggestions from that principal on wording, order, additions, and deletions were accepted by the interviewer. The appropriate revisions were made prior to the first interview. No further changes were made subsequent to the first interview in order to ensure that valid comparisons could be obtained.

The interview sought information from participants on three main topics related to the administration of the dual-track school: student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations. Principals were asked to describe the strategies they used to achieve each of these goals, as well as to outline any problems they had encountered in doing so. A minimum of 10 questions was asked in each section. These questions were developed specifically from the types of strategies identified in the literature and described in the previous chapter.

Procedures

Principals were contacted by telephone after permission to do so was obtained from the school district. An appointment for the interview was set up at a mutually agreed upon time, and a letter confirming the interview date (see Appendix D) was subsequently mailed to the principal along with the preliminary questionnaire. The questionnaire

was retained by the principal until the interview date and returned to the interviewer at that time. All interviews took place at the principals' schools.

Principals were made aware of the three general topics to be discussed at the interview, but did not have access to the actual questions which were to be asked. The prepared questions were asked of all principals, and further probing questions were utilized only when more detail was required (see Appendix C). Because principals were asked to give their opinions and perceptions regarding the issues being studied, care was taken to ensure validity of responses. Responses were closely monitored during interviews, and continually scrutinized for internal consistency. Objectivity on the part of the interviewer was maintained. The nature of the data analysis was such that inconsistencies or contradictions between what principals said and the actions they described would become evident. All interviews were tape-recorded with permission, and notes were taken. Portions of interviews which were applicable to the objectives of the study were later transcribed by the researcher. Anonymity of participants and confidentiality of responses was sought and ensured in all cases. The actual identities of principals, the schools they administered, and the school districts in which the schools were located were known only to the researcher. Interviews

took place between April 9, 1987 and May 8, 1987. The time of each interview varied from 42 minutes to 184 minutes.

Schools were coded by using a portion of the postal code from which the identity of the school could not be discerned, and by a digit representing the district in which it was located. Once all the data had been collected, those codes were dropped, and a simpler numbering system identifying schools by the numbers 1 through 16, in no particular order, was substituted. There was a 100% response rate for each question, though the amount of detail given by each respondent varied greatly. When quotations were used, some minor deletions and/or additions may have been made for purposes of clarity, taking care that the intent or meaning of the comments was not changed. Tapes, their transcriptions, and any other pertinent hard data were destroyed upon completion and approval of the project. An Executive Summary of results was sent to each school district contact person and each participant.

Data Analysis

Frequency distributions of the closed-ended questions contained on the questionnaire were prepared. When the total school enrollment was divided by the French program enrollment, for example, a percentage figure was arrived at which reflected the predominance of the French program in the school. Schools were then divided into two groups:

those with a French immersion program enrollment which was higher than that of the English program (more than 50.0%), and those with a French immersion enrollment lower than the English enrollment (less than 50.0%). The same method was used to analyse the numbers of FTE classroom teachers working in schools. The data from individual schools on the predominance of the French immersion program were then summarized in Table 1. Similarly, data from the questionnaire on principal language ability and experience in the dual-track setting were grouped and summarized in Table 2. These procedures, outlined in the earlier section describing the questionnaire, were undertaken in order to obtain a summative profile of schools and principals. In that way, groups of schools rather than individual schools could be dealt with in subsequent analyses.

Responses to open-ended questions both on the questionnaire and in the interview were content-analysed in terms of strategies employed and attitudes expressed by principals. Because of the enormous amount of subjective data that had resulted from the interviews, only those strategies which were found to be most important in the examination of the literature were selected for further analysis. In the area of student integration, the following strategies were analysed:

1. staff consensus re student integration;
2. joint intra- and extra-curricular activities; and

3. language at whole-school functions.

The area of staff collaboration yielded the following three strategies for analysis:

1. developing trust among staff;
2. participatory decisionmaking; and
3. shared goals.

In the area of home-school relations, these strategies were analysed:

1. the formation of a parent group;
2. frequent communications from school to home; and
3. eliciting feedback from parents.

Based on their approach to each of these major strategies, schools were classified into one of four categories. These categories were labelled purposeful, coordinated, limited, and detached. These same categories emerged in each of the three main areas of investigation, although they comprised different strategies. These categories are defined in detail in the Results chapter.

The final analysis led to comparisons of the overall approaches taken by schools in student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations to the three variables discussed above.

It was anticipated, for example, that schools with higher French enrollment would highlight French in the school more often than other schools, and would therefore take a purposed or coordinated approach to student

integration. Similarly, schools in which the principal had more experience might be more likely to employ more strategies aimed at achieving staff collaboration, resulting in a purposeful or coordinated classification.

The results of those analyses in each section constitute the basis for the interpretation of results, which is presented in the next chapter.

Table 1

Predominance of French Programs Operating in Sample Schools

School	Grades offered	Fr. Imm. enrollment & % of total	Fr. Imm. teachers and % of FTE classroom teachers
1	K - 7	370 (63.1%) *	15.0 (57.7%)
2	K - 7	326 (62.6%) *	12.0 (61.5%)
3	K - 7	162 (39.5%)	7.0 (38.9%)
4	K - 7	353 (65.7%) *	12.0 (63.2%)
5	3 - 7	125 (24.3%)	5.0 (25.0%)
6	1 - 4	184 (44.2%)	8.0 (47.1%)
7	K - 6	200 (47.1%)	9.0 (50.0%)
8	K - 7	241 (47.3%)	11.0 (52.4%)
9	K - 7	252 (54.5%) *	9.0 (50.0%)
10	K - 6	141 (34.4%)	5.0 (34.5%)
11	K - 7	250 (55.6%) *	10.5 (58.3%)
12	K - 7	216 (50.2%) *	9.0 (50.0%)
13	K - 7	256 (68.1%) *	9.0 (56.3%)
14	K - 7	395 (77.5%) *	14.0 (70.0%)
15	K - 7	282 (50.5%) *	11.0 (53.7%)
16	K - 4	145 (28.4%)	5.0 (23.8%)

* Schools with at least 50% of total enrollment in French immersion have been classified as "high French program enrollment schools" in subsequent tables.

Principal Profiles re French Language Facility and
Experience in the Dual-track School Setting

School/Principal	Language * ability	Experience **
1	low	high
2	low	low
3	high	high
4	low	high
5	high	low
6	low	high
7	low	low
8	low	high
9	low	low
10	low	low
11	low	low
12	low	high
13	high	high
14	high	high
15	low	high
16	high	high

* High = self-rating of "fairly well" or "fluently"; Low = self-rating of "not at all" or "a little" (Appendix B).

** High = 3 or more years; Low = 2 or fewer years (in a dual-track setting).

Chapter 4

Results and Interpretations

The chapter is organized around the three main topics of student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations. Results of the data analysis of major interview questions are presented in the following order:

1. For each topic, strategies mentioned most frequently by participants, and whose effectiveness is supported in the literature, are outlined.

2. Principals' comments regarding specific school practices under each topic heading divide schools into four categories: purposeful, coordinated, limited, or detached. The resulting school profiles are further characterized by the inclusion of typical comments from principals whose schools fall into each of the four categories.

Student Integration

During interviews, principals were asked specific questions regarding their philosophies and actions pertinent to student integration. All 16 participants agreed that student integration was an important consideration for planning in the dual-track school. The remainder of discussion on student integration will be in terms of the three strategies discussed in the review of the literature, i.e., existence of staff consensus expressed through formal

or informal policy, encouragement of joint instructional and extra-curricular activities, and use of language at school functions. These findings are summarized in Table 3.

Insert Table 3 about here

Staff consensus.^{a)} Principals were asked if they had any policy in place which made a statement or statements regarding the goal of student integration. A formal policy was defined as one which was discussed and developed at the staff level, and then written into the school philosophy or handbook. An informal policy was defined as one which had been discussed and accepted by the staff, and which was known and understood, but which was not written down. The majority of principals (11 out of 16, 68.8%) stated that their staffs had discussed the goal of student integration to the point of formulating an informal or formal policy. The remaining five principals denied that a policy of any description existed or had been discussed. This did not, however, preclude the existence of some integrative activities, as will be seen in a later section. Schools were therefore divided into two groups: those where staffs had reached consensus on student integration through discussion, and those who had not participated in discussion of the topic.

Inter-program activities. In a series of questions, principals were asked whether or not French and English program students participated in any joint instructional and extra-curricular activities, to describe the extent of their integration if they did so, and to outline the linguistic component of such activities. Joint instructional activities were defined as those wherein students from both programs were engaged in the same sequential learning activities, with or without shared classroom time. In all cases, the principal language of instruction was maintained during instructional activities. During extra-curricular activities, however, the linguistic component was much less consistent, and usually dependent upon available personnel. Principals' comments regarding the status of the two sets of activities were divided into three basic categories.

Fort Langley
FR Ans.

1. Frequent: Principals whose schools fell into this category described joint instructional activities which took place regularly at several grade levels. Extra-curricular activities were offered in both languages while students from both programs were present.

2. Incidental: Joint instructional activities in these schools were limited to one or two teachers' classes, on an irregular basis. Most activities took place over a set time or during a prescribed unit of study. Extra-curricular activities were offered in French on a limited basis to individuals or small groups of French students.

3. Never: Principals were not aware of any joint instructional activities or planning having occurred. Extra-curricular activities were offered only in English, whether or not the teacher in charge was from the English or the French program.

Language at school functions. Finally, principals were asked to outline the use of French at whole-school functions. Again, their comments fell into three distinct categories.

1. Equal use of French and English: All or most of the remarks and presentations would be presented in both languages by teachers and/or students on a regular basis.

2. Some French: Certain components of assemblies, such as the singing of the national anthem, opening and closing remarks, and specific class presentations would be in French on an irregular basis.

3. English only: No French was used at assemblies to which the whole school was invited.

School profiles and overall approach. The status of each of the three strategies in the schools was examined. Schools were rated according to the overall degree to which they pursued the most positive courses of action in integrating students. The findings are summarized in the final column of Table 3, entitled "Approach to Integration". The 16 schools were divided into four categories, according to the following criteria.

Purposeful approach. The first approach comprised those schools which showed evidence that the goal of student integration was being actively supported both philosophically and practically. These schools pursued the most positive course of action in each of the three strategies, and therefore received the highest possible overall rating. They: (a) had reached consensus favouring the goal of student integration; (b) enabled French and English program students to participate in joint instructional and extra-curricular activities, most often preserving the language of the program in which the child was enrolled; and (c) used the French language equally as often as English during whole-school functions. The two schools which fell into this category were classified as purposeful in their approach to the goal of student integration. The following quotations from the principals of these schools typifies this approach, and are included to further characterize the schools for the reader. School identification numbers are bracketed after each quotation.

"There is a strong sense of value in having the two programs in this school...as a result of various activities and projects." (3)

"Assemblies are done in both languages by teams of teachers." (2)

"Students emcee in both languages at assemblies." (3)

"Once a week, all the Grade 1's have P.E. together and some is in French and some in English. It's a highly visual class." (2)

Coordinated approach. ^{e)} The second group of schools included those whose overall approach to student integration was coordinated. Most often, inclusion in this category meant that somewhat positive steps were being taken in all three strategies. These schools were described in the following ways: (a) they had reached consensus on staff concerning student integration; (two schools which had not reached consensus, however, were included in this category because they were pursuing the most positive course of action under the heading of one other strategy); (b) there was at least some integration of French and English students during instructional activities, and occasional extra-curricular offerings were held in French; and (c) at least some French was being used during whole-school functions. This group comprised the majority of schools by a relatively slim margin (9 out of 16, 56.3%). Schools included in the coordinated category were described by principals this way:

"We are in the process of developing a handbook, and expect to make statements regarding the bilingual nature of the school." (8)

"[The staff shares] a willing attitude to try and keep the school as one as much as we can." (11)

"[Integrating students] is built into the philosophy and objectives of the school which are designed for the school as a unit, not as two separate schools." (14)

"Sports [practices] are held in both languages. Occasionally, French is even spoken when English students are present, and they seem to take it in stride." (14)

"The computer club is conducted in English, but French software is used with the French students." (12)

"[Assemblies offer] the one chance that collectively in the school we can demonstrate that there are children in the school who are becoming more fluent in the second language." (11)

"Assemblies are mainly in English, with certain portions in French." (4)

"Track and field practices are primarily in English with some French spoken on an individual level." (10)

"Small groups and individuals may be coached in French." (13)

"English and Math are timetabled together for Grade 5's and 6's whenever possible." (7)

*affiches
bilingues*

"Gr. 6 Outdoor Education is attended by French and English together and both languages are used." (11)

"We try to have activities for both groups because these children [may be] experiencing growing up in the same neighbourhood but never sitting in the same classroom [as their neighbourhood friends]." (13)

*Student
VS
Student*

Limited approach. The third group of schools comprised only those whose strategies toward integrating students were still in their infancy. These schools (a) had reached consensus concerning student integration as a goal for the school, (b) were involving some students to a small degree in joint instructional and extra-curricular activities; and (c) were using only English in whole-school functions. The two schools in this group were employing some positive strategies in two out of three categories. Because they were not yet consistent, however, they were classified as limited in their approach to student integration.

Principals of these two schools made comments such as:

"We don't talk about it, we just do it." (16)

"[Extra-curricular] activities are all in English, but French students must speak French to immersion teachers if they are in charge." (15)

*Teacher's
responsibility*

"The choir, drama clubs, and intra-murals are all in English." (16)

"Grade level teachers are encouraged to plan together, but instruction remains inside classrooms." (15)

Detached approach. The final approach to student integration was made up of the remaining three schools (18.8%), which fit the following description: (a) the goal of student integration had been not been discussed, (b) joint instructional activities and extra-curricular activities in French seldom or never took place, and (c) assemblies were held only in English. These schools were classified as detached, meaning that a commitment to acknowledging the dual nature of the school was not apparent according to the three variables. Typical comments from principals of schools in this classification were:

"The principal articulates his wishes [regarding student integration] and the staff agrees." (1)

"French teachers don't always want to be included [in school activities]." (6)

"Everything is in English." (9)

"Extra-curricular activities are held in English. Some coaching was done in French, and the English students dropped out because they felt the French students were being favoured." (6)

"The outdoor school is a Science experience, not a linguistic experience, and therefore the French

Staff
collaboration

2

a-b-c
↓ ↓ ↓
trust level staff decision making shared goals 54

immersion classes are not permitted to attend without an English class." (1)

"Instructional activities are kept almost rigidly separate because French teachers want to limit the use of English with French students." (6)

"On field trips, French and English classes may travel together for economic reasons, but then split into two groups for the experience." (9)

The numbers of schools in each of the four categories signifying approach to student integration are summarized in Table 4.

In the following chapter, the relationship between the overall approach to student integration and the variables of student enrollment, principal fluency in French, and principal experience in the dual-track setting will be examined and discussed.

Staff Collaboration

Principals' perceptions of the extent to which their staffs worked collaboratively are discussed in the following sections, according to strategies recommended in the literature: (a) the development of trust among staff members, indicating acceptance between French and English program staff members; (b) the encouragement of participatory decision-making; and (c) the provision of

opportunities for teachers to work on shared goals.

Findings are summarized in Table 5.

Insert Table 5 about here

a) Trust level. Two indicators of the degree of acceptance between French and English program teachers were (a) the amount of French spoken in the staffroom and how it was received by English-speaking teachers, and (b) whether principals perceived any differences in the nurturing of staff collaboration between single-track and dual-track schools.

Schools where a high level of trust was evident were those in which (a) Anglophone teachers accepted completely the speaking of French by immersion teachers, and understood their need to do so; and (b) principals acknowledged the potential for divisiveness between French and English stream teachers, and initiated projects that would encourage collaboration between the two groups. A number of schools fell into this category (6 out of 16, 37.5%), and their principals made comments such as these:

"It's very important for French immersion teachers to speak French to adults, not just children all the time." (1)

positive
comment

"The administration must provide opportunities and situations for success [in working collaboratively]." (2)

"French is commonly spoken in the staffroom, and the English teachers feel comfortable about it." (8)

"I have seen English teachers helping French teachers with phrasing and wording on report cards and notices." (8)

"There should be visible equality [in services, supplies, staff time]." (9)

"It is unfair to ask French native speakers to always speak in their second language." (14)

"It is healthy to have both languages with no linguistic restrictions." (16)

The majority of schools (9 out of 16, 56.3%)

illustrated a moderate level of trust. Schools were placed in this category based on the following criteria: (a) French was spoken in the staffroom occasionally, but French teachers usually switched to English if non-French speakers were present; and (b) principals accepted to some extent, or were uncertain of, the necessity to nurture staff collaboration differently on dual-track staff. Principals stated:

"It is probably necessary to handle [collaboration] differently." (3)

positive
Principals
Staff
French

1
2
8
9
14
16

"English is spoken if teachers are mixed. French teachers use their judgement about this." (6)

"There is no one most effective way [to achieve collaboration] but one teacher leader who is completely bilingual and is able to bridge any gap can be especially helpful. It is not so much an administrator initiative." (7)

"French immersion teachers may only speak French when English teachers are not likely to be 'frozen out'." (11)

"I don't know how I'd engender collaboration as an objective." (13)

"French teachers are willing to use English when English teachers are nearby." (15)

Only one of the 16 schools (6.3%) appeared to have a low level of trust between teachers. In this school, French was not spoken in the staffroom if any English-speaking teacher was present, and the principal did not acknowledge that any special consideration was required to nurture staff collaboration in the dual-track school. Comments from this principal included:

"I have asked some French teachers to speak English because English teachers are often uncomfortable." (4)

"I don't go out of my way to make sure the French get along with the English." (4)

Principal who don't care.

"upto teachers"
7
11
15

stupid stupid principal
4

Collaborative
(b)

for effective principals

Staff decisionmaking. Another important characteristic arising from the literature on effective principals is the use of collaborative staff decisionmaking. Principals in this study were asked to outline the way in which most decisions of concern to the staff were made, and further, to describe the involvement of French and English program teachers. All of the principals interviewed described processes using a collaborative staff decisionmaking model. Not all, however, felt that French and English program teachers participated equally in those decisions. Principals comments fell into two categories: equal participation on the part of French and English staff members, and less French participation. None of the principals described more French than English teacher involvement in decisionmaking.

A majority of principals (12 out of 16, 75.0%) described equal involvement on the part of French and English program teachers in staff decisionmaking. Typical comments from these principals were:

"The school coordinating team consists of one primary French [teacher], one primary English [teacher], one intermediate French [teacher], and one intermediate English [teacher]." (1)

"There is representation from throughout the school on committees." (3)

most 12/16

"Although French teachers are greatly outnumbered...they are really perceived as carrying the school ball." (5)

"There are no differences in school activities, professional development, or extra-curricular [involvement]." (9)

"We have a policy in writing that department heads must be from a specific linguistic group from time to time." (12)

"No differences can be identified; each group participates as enthusiastically as the other." (15)

The remaining four principals (25.0%) described less involvement on the part of French immersion teachers in staff decisionmaking. Some of their comments include:

"French teachers do not participate as often during staff meetings; I see a difference because of the Quebec teachers' cultural background -- they are not used to participatory decisionmaking." (7)

"French teachers are not as involved at staff meetings." (10)

"Two or three of the teachers don't comprehend at staff meetings; others might translate for them." (13)

"Francophones speak much less frequently in the large group." (14)

C) Shared goals. The third strategy indicating a high level of staff collaboration is the pursuit of shared goals by teachers. To some extent, this strategy is a composite of the two previous strategies, and for this study, the dimension of mutual planning figured in its calculation also. Principals were asked to comment on how frequently teachers from the two programs planned activities together, as well as what they perceived the relationship between teachers of the two programs to be.

Schools where (a) teachers from both programs were equally involved in decisionmaking, and (b) there was regular and varied cross-program planning were judged to be consistent in their pursuit of shared goals. Principals of schools in this category stated:

"Teachers plan together for a variety of units." (2)

"Teachers plan and work well together. It may look like a dual-track school on the outside, but on the inside it's a single-track." (8)

"English and French teachers work together on reports quite commonly, since in many cases they share the same students." (12)

Schools in which either (a) equal participation in staff decisionmaking, or (b) cross-program planning was not

consistently undertaken were designated intermittent in their pursuit of shared goals. Principals in four schools, for example, acknowledged that there was less French involvement in staff decisions, but mutual planning took place on a semi-regular basis. The reverse was also true: five principals saw no mutual planning taking place among teachers of each program, but at the same time felt that French and English teachers participated equally in decisionmaking.

There were two schools in which shared goals were not evident. These principals described poor staff relations between French and English teachers. Some of the statements included the following.

*Poor
staff
relations*

"There are catalysts for conflict in both the English program and the French program. These people know they are the cause [of conflicts] and transfers have been recommended to them." (6)

"French teachers, for various reasons, are not committed to the school." (10)

"Everyone discusses issues but if consensus cannot be reached, then I [the principal] will probably make the decision." (6)

"The baggage of old attitudes is hard to overcome. The English [teachers] may appear to listen [to suggestions from the French teachers], then say, 'Oh, yes, but...'" (10)

School profiles and overall approach. Table 5 summarizes the preceding information on staff collaboration. The same pattern of analysis that was followed for student integration was used to rate each school's degree of commitment to the goal of staff collaboration, resulting in their assignment to one of four approaches.

Purposeful approach. Those schools which pursued the most positive course of action in each of the three categories (level of trust, staff decisionmaking, and shared goals) were rated as being purposeful in working toward the goal of staff collaboration. According to the criteria, four of the 16 schools studied (25.0%) were purposeful. A selection of typical statements made by principals of these schools follows.

"The teachers work together on every level. We separate only for very [language] specific tasks (like textbook ordering)." (1)

"One of the most important issues...is to provide a good model for students...if students see a cooperative, collaborative staff they, in the end, will model it." (2)

"The staff is encouraged to work together on committees, goals, and student programs." (8)

"There are no animosities based on linguistic lines. These are very cooperative, professional people." (16)

Good
#1
#2
8
16

Coordinated approach. The second group of schools included those whose approach to staff collaboration was coordinated. These schools were pursuing the most positive course of action in at least one, but most often two, categories. In other categories, their actions were moderately positive. Six out of 16 schools (37.5%) were classified as coordinated. Comments made by principals of these schools included:

"It is important to maintain a shared feeling of the unique opportunity of working in a dual-track school." (3)

"The French teachers bring an enthusiasm, an ambiance, an enrichment dimension. They are happy, personable, chattery, open people. It creates a pleasant atmosphere in the school." (5)

"We try to keep colleagues aware of each other, and what they are doing." (12)

"We try for a staff committee with equal representation from both programs, but it's not carved in stone." (15)

Limited approach. The third group of schools comprised those which were making moderate efforts in only two categories of staff collaboration. These schools were designated as being limited in their approach. Five schools (31.3%) were included in this category.

"French teachers tend to be a bit 'clannish'." (4)

"There may be small tensions on 'bad days'." (7)

"French teachers tend to miss the ebullient atmosphere common to Francophone staffrooms." (14)

"We don't give those people who aren't fluently bilingual much of a chance to discuss [issues]." (13)

Detached approach. The fourth approach to staff collaboration comprised schools where very little was being done to promote this goal. Only one school (6.3%) was designated as being detached.

"Attitudes are historically difficult to change." (10)

"There is a lack of understanding between English and French teachers." (10)

Bad School #10
tension between teachers

The 16 schools fell into the four categories of approaches to staff collaboration as shown in Table 6.

In the following chapter, the relationship between the overall approach to staff collaboration and the variables of student enrollment, principal fluency in French, and principal experience in the dual-track setting will be discussed.

Home-School Relations

During interviews, principals were asked specific questions related to their philosophies and actions pertinent to the development of good home-school relations.

The following strategies, recommended in the literature, comprised the basis for the development of questions:

(a) the establishment of a parent advisory group which is representative of both French and English program parents, and which will concern itself with meaningful activities to benefit the whole school; (b) continued and substantive communication with parents, informing them of the school philosophy, goals, and activities in a variety of ways; and (c) providing parents with the opportunity to share their opinions regarding how well the school is serving the needs of their children and themselves. Table 7 summarizes the findings.

Insert Table 7 about here

The parent group. Principals in this study were asked to elaborate on the parent group: its existence, its structure and function, and their role in it. All 16 principals described a parent group with a variety of formalized structures and titles, such as The Home and School Association, The Parent Association, The Parent Council, The Parent-Teacher Group, The Liaison Committee, and The Parents' Consultative Committee.

Schools in which the parent group was equally representative of both French and English stream programs

were rated higher than those where groups depended solely on volunteers. Principals who described their role in the parent group as consultative rather than directive, and participatory rather than disengaged also received a higher rating. The combination of these two factors led to two categories under the strategy of the parent group:

representative (rep) and unstructured (uns).

Comments from principals of representative parent groups included:

"The executive includes a rep from each class." (1)

"There are two chairs: one French and one English." (2)

"The constitution was drawn up to favour equal representation." (3)

"I attend all meetings with the vice-principal; I have more of a consultative role." (8)

"There is an unwritten agreement to have an English president one year and then a French president the next." (13)

"I'm part of the executive committee. I inform them of school policies and act as a liaison with the school." (14)

Unstructured groups, on the other hand, were described like this:

"There is an English chairperson, but most of the rest of the executive is French." (4)

"There are no French immersion parents on the Parent Auxiliary executive." (5)

"French parents do not often serve as table officers, but they have a profound influence on policy because of their recruiting techniques." (12)

"All of the members of the executive but one is French; attendance at meetings is 80% French." (16)

Communications with parents. The literature stated five ways that parents preferred to learn about their schools: first, from their children; second, from report cards; third, from newsletters; fourth, from scheduled conferences; and fifth, from personal visits to the school. Principals in this study were asked to list the ways in which the school communicated with parents, how often newsletters were sent home, and which method or methods they believed were most effective in communicating with parents. None of the principals interviewed mentioned students as a means of communication, and only one named parent-teacher conferences specifically; person-to-person contact, however, was interpreted as also referring to conferencing for the purposes of this section of the study. Newsletters were sent home by every principal, most often on a regular

monthly schedule. And several felt that parent meetings were an effective way of informing parents, a response that was not even in the top 16 preferred methods for parents.

School effectiveness in communications with homes was rated highest (good) in those schools where (a) principals mentioned at least two of the methods preferred by parents; (b) principals sent newsletters home on a regular schedule, at least once per month; and (c) either students or conferences were judged to be the most effective communicators. Five out of the 16 schools (31.3%) were included in this category.

Schools were judged to be fair in communicating with parents if (a) principals valued at least one of the methods preferred by parents; (b) newsletters were sent home at least once per month, regularly or when needed; and (c) newsletters were judged to be the most effective communicators. This group represented the majority of the schools: 10 out of 16 (62.5%).

One school was judged to be poor in its communications with parents. The principal mentioned newsletters as being the only way of communicating with parents, and yet they were sent home only once every two months.

Eliciting feedback from parents. Parents prefer to communicate their opinions and concerns to schools through direct, personal contact: conferences, parent group meetings, and volunteering. Surveys and questionnaires

distributed by the school are only half as effective as their first choice, but are valuable as a means of hearing from those parents who do not come to the school regularly. It is not enough, however, for schools to simply wait until parents make contact. They must do more to encourage parents to be in the school, thus providing greater opportunity for dialogue.

Schools which rated high in providing opportunities for feedback from parents were described by principals as utilizing at least three of the parents' preferred methods. We have already established that all principals at all schools attended regular parent group meetings; 6 out of 16 (37.5%) also stated they had an "open door policy", valued the volunteer services of parents, and periodically distributed surveys or feedback forms on newsletters.

The rest of the schools (10 out of 16, 62.5%) tended to be more passive regarding parents' feedback. These were the schools where principals felt that the numbers of phone calls and visits to the office were reliable indicators of parent satisfaction, and where only one or two of the methods preferred by parents were initiated by the school. In Table 7, these schools were rated low in providing opportunities for feedback.

School profiles and overall approach. The results of the preceding analyses are contained in Table 7. Once school commitment to each of the three strategies was

established, their overall approach to the goal of positive home-school relations was obtained in the following ways:

Purposeful approach. Only one school was found to be pursuing the most positive course in all three categories (parent group, communications with parents, and eliciting feedback). This school was defined as being purposeful in its approach to home-school relations. The following quotation sums up the principal's comments:

"This is the most important thing you [the interviewer] and I have talked about. The key in administration is to be aware of the ways and means of drawing parents into the school so that they can see the benefits of dual-track schools." (3)

Coordinated approach. Six out of 16 schools (37.5%) were classified as coordinated in their approach to home-school relations. These schools were pursuing very positive courses of action in two out of three categories. For example, three of these schools made no effort to ensure that French and English parents were equally represented in the parent group, but were rated highly in both communication with parents and eliciting feedback; two others had a representative parent group and good feedback opportunities, but were making only fair efforts to communicate with parents. Some of these principals' comments included:

"When parents have a concern I react quickly, and I guess word is out, because they don't mind dropping in." (4)

"We sent a survey out last year." (4)

"We try to provide reasons for parents to come to school as much as possible." (5)

"The only ways [to communicate with parents] I know of are newsletters, handbooks, and school literature." (10)

"We send the same newsletter to both French and English stream parents so that each can see what the other is reading. It is an important consideration in the dual-track school to keep everything out in the open." (14)

"Certainly, French immersion parents will let you know if they're not happy." (16)

Limited approach. Five out of the 16 schools (31.3%) were judged to be limited in their approach to home-school relations. These schools were inconsistent in their handling of the three components. Four of these schools had a representative parent group, fair handling of communications with parents, and very little provision for parental feedback. The other school was also highly rated in only one of the three components. Their comments reflected this inconsistency:

"There is a school profile that is available at the office for parents to sign out." (1)

"I really lecture parents that they are not immersion parents, they are _____ School parents." (1)

"That's an interesting question. [How do you ascertain whether or not parents are satisfied with the school and its functions?] Most dissatisfied parents will pick up the phone." (2)

"I will not send a survey this year, because it's my first year in the school, and I don't want any comparisons with the former principal to be made." (2)

Detached approach. The remaining four schools (25.0%) rated unfavourably in all three categories; their best efforts -- which were only fair in three schools and poor in one school -- were made in communications with parents. These schools were classified as being detached in their handling of home-school relations.

"Personal conversations and assemblies do untold good for public relations, but for simply communicating information it's got to be a newsletter." (6)

"We sent a survey out two years ago...we should probably do it more often." (9)

"We sent a Ministry [of Education] survey last year, but we didn't get the feedback we'd like. We thought the questions were not well put together. (11)

"I would like the newsletter to go home monthly but it's not that often. Probably every two months one goes home outlining the happenings." (11)

The numbers of schools in each of the four categories signifying approach to home-school relations are summarized in Table 8.

In Chapter 5, the relationship between the overall approaches to home-school relations and the variables of student enrollment, principal fluency, and principal experience will be examined.

Chapter Summary

During interviews, principals were asked specific questions regarding their philosophies and actions pertinent to the integration of French and English program students, the nurturing of a collaborative staff, and the fostering of positive home-school relations. In each of the three areas under investigation, school practices were examined in relationship to strategies recommended in the literature, and an overall approach developed for each school. The four possible approaches were termed purposeful, coordinated,

limited, and detached. Approaches were further characterized by quotations from principals.

In Chapter 5, approaches to each of the three areas are summarized, and the overall approaches are examined in terms of the following three variables: (a) French and English program student enrollments, (b) principal fluency in French, and (c) principal experience in the dual-track setting. Further, each school's approach is discussed in relationship to its district's policy on French immersion implementation. The chapter concludes with a summary of findings and recommendations for further study.

Table 3

School Profiles: Practices re French Immersion and Regular English Student Integration

Student Integration Strategies				
School	Staff consensus	Inter-prog. activities	Use of lang. in sch. func'ns	APPROACH TO INTEG.
1	no	incidental	English	detached
2	yes	frequent	equal	purposeful
3	yes	frequent	equal	purposeful
4	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
5	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
6	no	never	English	detached
7	no	incidental	equal	coordinated
8	no	frequent	some Fr.	coordinated
9	no	never	English	detached
10	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
11	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
12	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
13	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
14	yes	incidental	some Fr.	coordinated
15	yes	incidental	English	limited
16	yes	incidental	English	limited

Table 4

Summary of Approaches to French Immersion and Regular
English Student Integration

Approach	number	percent
Purposeful	2	12.5%
Coordinated	9	56.3%
Limited	2	12.5%
Detached	3	18.8%

Table 5

School Profiles: Practices re Staff Collaboration

School	Dev. of trust	Staff decision- making	Shared goals among staff	APPROACH TO COLLABOR.
1	high	equal	consistent	purposeful
2	high	equal	consistent	purposeful
3	moderate	equal	consistent	coordinated
4	low	equal	intermittent	limited
5	high	equal	intermittent	coordinated
6	moderate	equal	not evident	limited
7	moderate	less Fr.	intermittent	limited
8	high	equal	consistent	purposeful
9	moderate	equal	intermittent	coordinated
10	moderate	less Fr.	not evident	detached
11	moderate	equal	intermittent	coordinated
12	moderate	equal	consistent	coordinated
13	moderate	less Fr.	intermittent	limited
14	high	less Fr.	intermittent	limited
15	moderate	equal	intermittent	coordinated
16	high	equal	consistent	purposeful

Table 6

Summary of Approaches to Staff Collaboration

Approach	number	percent
Purposeful	4	25.0%
Coordinated	6	37.5%
Limited	5	31.3%
Detached	1	6.3%

Table 7

School Profiles: Practices re Home-School Relations

School	Parent group	Communication with parents	Feedback opportunities	APPROACH TO H-S REL'NS
1	rep	fair	low	limited
2	rep	fair	low	limited
3	rep	good	high	purposeful
4	uns	good	high	coordinated
5	uns	good	high	coordinated
6	uns	fair	low	detached
7	rep	fair	low	limited
8	rep	fair	low	limited
9	uns	fair	low	detached
10	rep	fair	high	coordinated
11	uns	poor	low	detached
12	uns	fair	low	detached
13	rep	good	low	coordinated
14	rep	fair	high	coordinated
15	uns	fair	high	limited
16	uns	good	high	coordinated

Table 8

Summary of Approaches to Home-School Relations

Approach	number	percent
Purposeful	1	6.3%
Coordinated	6	37.5%
Limited	5	31.3%
Detached	4	25.0%

Chapter 5

Discussion, Summary, Conclusions, and Implications for Further Study

The chapter begins with a discussion of school approaches to the three areas under examination. The possible effects of district policy on profiles are also examined. A discussion of the relationships between the approaches to student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations and the variables of French student enrollment, principal fluency in French, and principal experience in the dual-track school setting follows. The significance of the findings in terms of the literature is presented, followed by conclusions and implications for further study.

School Profiles

The schools in this study varied greatly in their approaches to student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations. Table 9 summarizes the approaches in each area for the individual schools. Overall, most principals described purposeful or coordinated efforts in at

Insert Table 9 about here

least one of the three areas (15 out of 16, 93.8%). The integration of French and English program students in whole-school activities was successfully pursued by 11 out of 16 schools (68.8%). A somewhat smaller majority of schools were described by principals as having a collaborative staff (10 out of 16, 62.5%). And fewer than half of the principals studied were utilizing effective strategies to encourage positive and cooperative home-school relations (7 out of 16, 43.8%). How can such inconsistencies be explained? The discussion which follows attempts to shed light on this question.

(1) integration students (11/16)
(2) collaborative staff (10/16)
(3) effective home-s. relations (7/16)

The integration of French immersion and English program students is a factor that may be nurtured as much by the efforts of teachers as by those of principals. The principal can encourage and even help teachers to plan cross-program activities, but ultimately, such activities are dependent upon the willingness of teachers to participate in them. Use of French at whole-school assemblies, particularly in schools where the principal (or the usual emcee) does not speak French well, may also be dependent upon the French teachers' participation in translating and organizing, and initiative. And the practical aspects of holding separate assemblies for both programs probably dictate that integration in assemblies is a must: large meeting spaces may be at a premium; informational assemblies may be open to misunderstandings

(1) mostly up to the teachers

if issues are not presented in precisely the same manner; and disruption of classes because of movement in hallways would increase, to name only a few. It is not surprising, therefore, that more schools were rated purposeful or coordinated in pursuing strategies aimed at integrating French and English program students than any of the three areas studied.

Of the 10 schools rated purposeful or coordinated in staff collaboration, 7 were in schools where the French teachers were equal in numbers to, or outnumbered, English teachers. It may be reasonable to assume that French immersion teachers are very flexible, self-reliant, and adaptable, since they are working in a program that is relatively new, and also considering the fact that many of them have voluntarily uprooted themselves from their home provinces to come and work in the B.C. school system. These teachers may bring those qualities into their relationship with English program teachers, exhibiting a willingness to compromise and a sensitivity to some English teachers' concerns regarding the French immersion program. As a result, principals could quite safely perceive that the English and French program teachers collaborate well. It is interesting to note that of all the principals interviewed, only one (designated as detached in the final analysis) stated that noticeable tensions existed between French and English program teachers; all of the others (5 out of 16,

relation
is good
because
of

a
dwm
principal

31.3%) believed that their staffs were collaborative, although the data showed that they were limited in their approach to collaboration. Principals of the latter schools were seemingly convinced that expecting French teachers to speak English in the staffroom and conducting staff meetings in English when a percentage of teachers might not understand were not unreasonable demands. These findings suggest that among their criteria for a definition of collaboration, these principals appear to value a homogeneous group: everyone being equal means everyone speaking the same language (literally).

Fewer than half of the schools in the study were rated purposeful or coordinated in home-school relations, a rather surprising finding considering that two out of the three criteria used to arrive at the rating (communications with parents, and opportunities for feedback from parents) were in no way specific to the French immersion program. This raises questions about the abilities of principals to successfully nurture positive home-school relations in any setting. It may be possible that principals are not receiving adequate training in dealing with parents and parent groups.

Because a number of the factors which are thought to have contributed to the approach taken by a school in any of the three areas examined were subject to influence by outside agents (such as teachers and district

administration), schools were relatively inconsistent in their individual profiles. For example, three schools received a different rating in all three areas. It was not evident that schools which were rated purposeful or coordinated in one area would receive that same rating in other areas as well.

Only two schools (12.5%) were rated purposeful or coordinated in all three areas. Both schools had French immersion student enrollments which were considerably lower than the English enrollments, and both were administered by principals who spoke French fairly well or fluently. One of these principals, however, had three or more years experience in the dual-track school, while the other had two years or less. If we examine the possibility that a lower French immersion enrollment combined with high principal fluency leads to positive approaches in student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations, we find that only one other school in the study fits those criteria. It was rated positively in two of the three areas, but limited in its approach to student integration. In that particular case, however, the principal had been in the school for less than one year, and had not yet been able to effect changes in the geographic mixing of French and English classrooms (i.e., placing French and English classes near each other). This principal felt that more intermingling of French and English students and teachers would take place when "the

→ relation?

want to integrate 2 programs
Principal (deas) decided
86 of separations

French wing" and "the English wing" (as the former principal had arranged the classrooms) were done away with.

School Profiles in Relation to District Policies

Policies regarding the implementation and/or administration of French immersion in four of the five districts represented in the study were examined to discover whether or not issues specific to French/English student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations in dual-track schools were addressed. One of these four policies was still in its preliminary stages, and was being developed by a Task Force. The other three had been formally printed and issued by the school boards of those districts.

Schools 1, 2, and 3 were located in the district whose policy was being developed; preliminary drafts had been made available to principals and members of the Task Force. Interestingly, of the seven occurrences of a purposeful approach to any of the three areas, five were found in this district's schools (71.4%). One explanation for this high ratio could be that principal input into future policy was very evident: principals served on the Task Force, and the immersion principals' association had also submitted briefs to the Task Force. Conversation with these principals revealed that they felt that the district valued their input and that they were welcome to raise issues at any time. The

report examined in this study made 16 recommendations on a variety of topics which might or might not appear in the final policy statement. Insofar as directly addressing issues in any of three areas, however, only student integration was the subject of a recommendation: "that the District develop objectives and programs to promote cross-program fertilization and cross-cultural awareness and understanding in dual-track schools" [confidential source]. All other recommendations were related to administration of French immersion programs from a district perspective, including transportation policy, enrollment intakes, locations of programs, roles of parents, and implementation models.

None of the other district policies (a) indicated that principals had any more input than any other group, nor that they (b) addressed any school-related administrative concerns, such as French/English student integration, staff relations, or home-school relations. All policy statements were of a strictly district administrative nature. The approaches taken by principals of these districts did not fall into patterns showing positive trends, a result that suggests district policy-makers might consider addressing more of those issues with which school administrators are dealing on a daily basis.


Student Integration and Selected Variables

The schools' overall approaches to student integration and their relationships to the variables of student enrollment, principal fluency, and principal experience were explored in turn. In this way, it was possible to ascertain whether or not any of the three variables had an effect on a school's approach to student integration. This information is summarized in Table 10.

Insert Table 10 about here

In the discussion, the categories of purposeful and coordinated will be considered together, as will the limited and detached categories. This will simply allow for less cumbersome discussion.

It was established in the previous chapter that the majority of schools (11 out of 16, 68.8%) were purposeful or coordinated in their approach to student integration. The remaining five schools (31.2%) were either limited or detached in their approach.

 Enrollment. Overall, a comparison of schools with higher and lower French program enrollments did not reveal any great difference in approach to student integration. Of the 11 schools which were rated purposeful or coordinated, 6

number
students
don't
matter

had higher French enrollments (54.5%), and 5 (45.5%) had lower French enrollments. This indicates, perhaps, that it is not the size of the program, but the mere fact of its presence in the school which encourages many principals to integrate the two streams of students. There still remains, however, the over 30% of schools studied (5 out of 16) which did very little to integrate students while retaining some recognizance of their language of instruction.

★ Principal fluency. On the questionnaire, principals were asked to rate their fluency in French (see Appendix C for raw data). These self-ratings subsequently formed the basis for the categorization of principals' fluency in French.

A majority of schools rated purposeful or coordinated (7 out of 11, 63.6%) were administered by principals whose self-rating suggested that they spoke little or no French. The explanation for this somewhat surprising finding may be found in the comment of one of these principals, who said, "I rely on my French teachers to bring French to the rest of the school. During our Cultural Appreciation Week, for example, Grade 7 [immersion] students set up booths in the gym and explained French culture to visiting classes in both French and English. That was the initiative of one teacher." This is not to say, however, that principals who rated themselves as having higher fluency in French did not effectively integrate students. All but one of the

principals who believed that they spoke French fairly well or fluently (4 out of 5, 80.0%) were purposeful or coordinated in their approach to integration. Nor should it be concluded that all principals whose self-rating suggested that they spoke little or no French relied on their teachers to initiate integrative activities. In fact, of the five schools rated limited or detached, four of them (80.0%) were administered by principals who rated themselves in that category. It appears, then, that the ability of principals to create a climate wherein teachers may feel free to initiate more integrative activities does not depend upon their fluency in French.

Principal experience. Schools rated purposeful and coordinated were fairly evenly divided between those whose principals had three or more years experience (6 out of 11, 54.5%) and those whose principals had two or fewer years experience (5 out of 11, 45.5%). Of the five schools which were limited or detached in their approach to student integration, however, four of the principals (80.0%) had three or more years experience. The conclusion must be, therefore, that experience in the dual-track setting does not appear to ensure the use of effective student integration techniques; nor does the use of such techniques necessarily depend on experience.

None of the variables of student enrollment, principal fluency in French, or principal experience was shown to be a significant predictor of the use of effective student integration strategies in the dual-track schools studied. Very few principals cited educational reasons for their decisions regarding the use of language outside of classrooms, tending rather to leave such decisions to individual teachers.

Although almost 70.0% of the principals studied here were utilizing effective means of integrating the two streams of students, the relatively small size of the sample must limit the conclusions; a larger sample might reveal trends which are more clearly delineated. Based on these findings, however, it would appear that principals would benefit from more in-service and training regarding effective administrative practices in the dual-track school.

Staff Collaboration and Selected Variables

The schools' overall approaches to staff collaboration were examined in relation to the variables of French and English student enrollment, principal fluency in French, and principal experience in the dual-track school setting. Ten of the 16 schools were rated purposeful or coordinated in their approach to staff collaboration (62.5%), and the remaining 6 were rated limited or detached (37.5%). The results of the analysis of the relationship between these

approaches and the three variables are summarized in Table 11.

Insert Table 11 about here

★ Enrollment. Of the 10 schools which were rated purposeful or coordinated in pursuing strategies aimed at nurturing staff collaboration between French and English program teachers, 6 (60.0%) were in schools with higher French program enrollments. Although this is not a large majority, it may indicate that the presence of more French teachers on staff could, in itself, be a factor in promoting collaborative activities. The six schools rated limited or detached were equally split between higher and lower French program enrollment. In all, the factor of enrollment is not a clear indicator of more activities aimed at staff collaboration.

*better for
students
but not
for teacher
collaboration*

Principal fluency. A relatively high majority of purposeful or coordinated schools were administered by principals who admitted to speaking French a little or not at all (7 out of 10, 70.0%). Again, it may be that some principals with lower French fluency are more willing to give teachers a leadership role in developing staff collaboration. One principal stated, "One teacher leader who is completely bilingual and is able to 'bridge the gap'

can be especially helpful. Ideally, this person should be older and experienced, and neither a Quebecker nor a B.C.-ite. We have one on our staff from Manitoba, and she has helped bring people together immeasurably." We must be reminded, however, that four of the six schools rated limited/detached (66.7%) were also administered by principals whose self-ratings indicated that they spoke almost no French. These data suggest that the decisions of individual principals in this study regarding staff collaboration did not appear to be affected by their professed ability to speak French.

Principal experience. A small majority of schools led by principals high in experience (6 out of 10, 60.0%) were rated purposeful or coordinated in pursuing strategies aimed at staff collaboration. At the same time, however, four of the six schools rated limited/detached (66.7%) were also administered by principals high in experience. It would appear that, in this study, a principal's experience in the dual-track school setting was not a reliable predictor of the utilization of successful staff collaboration strategies.

After studying the three variables in terms of school approaches to staff collaboration, it can only be concluded that, similar to the findings regarding student integration, these variables do not appear to be indicators of

effectiveness. The highest percentage of purposeful or coordinated schools occurred in the category of principals who rated themselves low in French fluency (7 out of 10, 70.0%), but this figure also represents less than 50.0% of the total number of schools studied. Again, a larger sample size might have revealed more definitive results.

Home-School Relations and Selected Variables

It was established in Chapter 4 that 7 out of 16 schools (43.8%) were judged to be purposeful or coordinated in their approach to home-school relations. The remaining 9 schools (56.3%) were rated limited or detached. The results of comparisons between these approaches and the three variables are summarized in Table 12.

Insert Table 12 about here

Enrollment. Of the seven schools which were rated purposeful or coordinated in their approach to home-school relations, four of them (57.1%) were in schools where the French program enrollment was lower than the English. Some of these principals felt that the ratio of English to French was not an important factor, and that "one can make the most of any ratio." Principals of schools with higher French program enrollments disagreed, however. Six out of the nine

schools (66.9%) which were rated limited/detached had higher French program enrollments. Several of these principals, by contrast, mentioned negative feelings on the part of English program parents regarding the size of the French program, and principals felt that these feelings created added conflicts in the school. One principal stated, "The English program feel they are the 'underdog.'" These principals, therefore, were dealing with a more divisive set of parents to begin with; since this factor contributes to making the task of creating good home-school relations more difficult, fewer of them were rated highly in this category. This trend, therefore, may lead to the conclusion that schools with higher French program enrollments might be more likely to require extra care from administrators to ensure that positive home-school relations with both groups of parents, and all parents as a group, are fostered.

Principal fluency. A large majority of principals whose schools were rated purposeful or coordinated in home-school relations indicated that they spoke French fairly well or fluently (5 out of 7, 71.4%). And 100% of the schools rated limited/detached were administered by principals who claimed to have little or no French fluency (9 out of 9). This finding is in direct contrast to those in the other sections of student integration and staff collaboration, where principal fluency did not appear to be a factor. It is possible that principals who speak both

French and English well instill confidence in French immersion parents since they are a model of what these parents hope their children will grow up to become -- bilingual. English parents may also feel assured that someone who is planted firmly in both cultures has a better understanding of the route toward cooperation between the two groups. This confidence in the principal could quite easily translate into a cooperative, active group of unified English and French parents.

bilingual principal
reassuring parents

Principal experience. Of the seven schools judged to be purposeful or coordinated in their approach to home-school relations, principals with three or more years experience in that setting were in the majority (5 out of 7, 71.4%); five of the nine principals in schools rated limited/detached, however, were also high in experience (55.6%). This circumstance effectively negates any interpretation of experience as a positive factor in the development of good home-school relations.

Schools with higher French program enrollments were somewhat less likely to be employing strategies aimed at nurturing positive home-school relations. There was evidence, too, that principals who rated their ability to speak French highly were more likely to report positive home-school relations than principals who spoke little or no

French. Principal experience had no apparent effect on relations with parents.

Summary

The purpose of the current study was to describe what actions principals of elementary dual-track schools were taking (a) to integrate French and English stream students during whole-school activities; (b) to nurture a collaborative staff; and (c) to foster positive home-school relations, resulting in cooperation between French and English program parents. Further, the study sought to discover whether any of the following three variables influenced the implementation or non-implementation of effective strategies: (a) the comparative French and English student enrollments in the school; (b) the principal's fluency in French; and (c) the principal's experience in working in the dual-track school setting. In a series of analyses, each school was rated as having a specific approach to each of the three areas under scrutiny, and these approaches were then compared to the above three variables.

Individual school approaches to French/English student integration, staff collaboration, and home-school relations were arrived at by examining strategies and philosophies described by principals during interviews. It was discovered that schools varied, both within themselves and

in comparison with other schools, in their approaches to the three areas. Only 2 of the 16 (12.5%) schools examined rated highly in all three areas.

The majority of district policies did not address issues directly related to school administration, and did not appear to have affected school approaches to student integration, staff collaboration, or home-school relations. Five of the seven schools (71.4%) rated purposeful in any of the three areas, however, were located in a district which invited a high proportion of principal input, and whose preliminary policy did address school-related concerns.

Neither student integration nor staff collaboration were found to be significantly affected by enrollment, principal fluency, or principal experience. There was some evidence, however, that schools with lower French program enrollments were more likely to be utilizing strategies aimed at positive home-school relations, and that principals who spoke French fairly well or fluently also appeared to engender good relations with parents (CEA, 1983; Guttman, 1983). The negative reactions of English program parents toward large French immersion student enrollments in their neighbourhood schools is well documented (Burns & Olson, 1981; CEA, 1983; Nagy & Klaiman, 1986), suggesting that school boards may need to look carefully at their long-range plans for French immersion implementation. Many researchers also state that bilingualism is a desirable quality for

conclusions

principals of dual-track schools (Guttman, 1983; Lapkin, et al, 1981); if, as this study discovered, parents do view bilingual principals more favourably, then it should indeed be an important goal for districts to consider.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Results of this study indicate that principals of dual-track schools must be encouraged to do more to acknowledge the dual nature of their schools. Many of the principals in the study were passive in their administrative style, tending to allow a majority of parents or teachers to decide the direction for school goals. It should become the responsibility of school districts to educate principals regarding the administration of schools housing innovative programs such as French immersion (Guttman, 1981; Olson & Burns, 1981). The assumption that such programs can be administered according to the same principles as regular-program schools is outdated. There is enough evidence in the research to provide topics for meaningful and appropriate in-service.

Secondly, principals should continually be provided with opportunities to improve their facility in French (CEA, 1981; Guttman, 1981; McGillivray, 1978). This is the only one of the three variables over which principals have any measure of control. Principals should be encouraged by school districts to actively pursue ways in which their

fluency can be improved, if only because it may have some bearing on parents' perceptions of principals. This study has shown that parents value the quality of bilingualism in principals. Students and teachers, too, can only benefit from a principal's ability to converse with them in their first language of instruction, rather than forcing discontinuance by speaking English.

Thirdly, principals must take time to thoroughly discuss and define with staff members goals and philosophies pertinent to the dual-nature of the school (Olson & Burns, 1981). Unless the staff is given opportunities to act as one body, to share in the direction for programs and activities, the potential for divisiveness between French and English program teachers will continue to exist.

Fourthly, inter-program planning and whole-school activities at which both languages are highlighted should be pursued by schools (Lapkin, et al, 1981). Only through strategies such as these can the essential goal of understanding between the French and English cultures be achieved in the dual-track school setting.

And finally, more should be done to educate parents of both streams regarding the benefits of having French and English programs housed in one school (CEA, 1981; Olson & Burns, 1981). Distrust and division most often results when a lack of understanding exists between the two groups;

therefore, activities aimed at involving French and English parents for the good of the whole school should be sought.

Implications for Further Study

There are several directions for follow-up to this study. The most logical, perhaps, is to determine how teachers, students, and/or parents describe the role of the principal in the dual-track school. How their perceptions compare with principals' could well provide further suggestions for districts and administrators.

A larger scale in-depth look at district policy and its effect on school practices would also be of interest to both school and district administrators. This study raised some concern that district policies may not address enough of the issues directly affected by school administration, such as those areas under scrutiny here.

Also of interest would be a study exploring the impact of French immersion on the English program. Several studies have looked at this issue in eastern Canada (see Nagy & Klaiman, 1986); a similar study of the B.C. system is needed. Principals, teachers, and parents would benefit from an accurate study of how many students, teachers, and program flexibility are being lost as a direct result of the introduction of French immersion into schools.

Another study could be designed to determine exactly how the integration of French and English stream students

affects (a) French immersion student achievement, (b) French and English student attitudes toward the other group, (c) teacher attitudes, and so on. It may well be that integration does not contribute to any academic goals, but merely to attitudinal goals; or it may not be a desirable goal on any plane.

A more thorough study exploring the effects of comparative enrollments of French and English programs in dual-track schools would also be useful. Are schools with larger French immersion enrollments in danger of creating serious resentments among English program parents? Should a 50/50 ratio be actively pursued by school boards?

This study also raised the question of how well schools are communicating with parents, whether they house French immersion classes or not. An analysis of school practices in this area compared to district policies or directions could quite possibly reveal a lack of awareness on the part of administrators in dealing with this issue.

It is important for the research on French immersion to continue. The model is well-entrenched in British Columbia education, and should be constantly reviewed and changed to meet the needs of students, teachers, and parents. It is incumbent upon school districts and administrators to make it relevant, positive, and successful.

Table 9

School Profiles: A Summary of Approaches

School	Student Integration	Staff Collaboration	Home-School Relations
1	detached	purposeful	limited
2	purposeful	purposeful	limited
3	purposeful	coordinated	purposeful
4	coordinated	limited	coordinated
5	coordinated	coordinated	coordinated
6	detached	limited	detached
7	coordinated	limited	limited
8	coordinated	purposeful	limited
9	detached	coordinated	detached
10	coordinated	detached	coordinated
11	coordinated	coordinated	detached
12	coordinated	coordinated	detached
13	coordinated	limited	coordinated
14	coordinated	limited	coordinated
15	limited	coordinated	limited
16	limited	purposeful	coordinated

Table 10

Relationships between Approaches to Student Integration and
Selected Variables

Variable	Approach			
	Purposeful	Coordinated	Limited	Detached
French prog. enrollment				
-high (9/16)	1	5	1	2
-low (7/16)	1	4	1	1
Principal fluency in French				
-high (5/16)	1	3	1	0
-low (11/16)	1	6	1	3
Principal experience in dual-track				
-high (3 yrs +) (10/16)	1	5	2	2
-low (<2 yrs) (6/16)	1	4	0	1

Table 11

Relationships between Approaches to Staff Collaboration and
Selected Variables

Variable	Approach			
	Purposeful	Coordinated	Limited	Detached
French prog.				
enrollment				
-high (9/16)	2	4	3	0
-low (7/16)	2	2	2	1
Principal fluency				
in French				
-high (5/16)	1	2	2	0
-low (11/16)	3	4	3	1
Principal experience				
in dual-track				
-high (10/16)	3	3	4	0
-low (6/16)	1	3	1	1

Table 12

Relationships between Approaches to Home-School Relations
and Selected Variables

Variable	Approach			
	Purposeful	Coordinated	Limited	Detached
French prog.				
enrollment				
-high (9/16)	0	3	3	3
-low (7/16)	1	3	2	1
Principal fluency				
in French				
-high (5/16)	1	4	0	0
-low (11/16)	0	2	5	4
Principal experience				
in dual-track				
-high (10/16)	1	4	3	2
-low (6/16)	0	2	2	2

Appendix A

March 11, 1987.

Dear _____:

This letter is a follow-up to the conversation you had with Stan Shapson regarding my research project.

As a vice-principal of a dual-track school in Kamloops, I became cognizant of several new areas which were demanding my time. In sharing my concern with principals, I realized that few, if any, of them had been prepared for the unique aspects of administering a dual-track school. This led to my decision to focus on administrative strategies employed by principals of dual-track schools in my Master's project. The project is entitled Leadership in the Dual-Track School: The Role of the Principal, and has the following objectives:

(1) To discover the strategies used by principals of dual-track elementary schools in coping with the following aspects of school administration:

- a. supervision of French class teachers;
- b. school-community relations (with emphasis on these three groups: Canadian Parents for French, English class parents, and French Immersion parents);
- c. integration of French and English students; and
- d. collaborative staff decision-making.

(2) To elicit from principals in the field, through personal interviews, what preparation or special help was required or was perceived by them as being necessary in order to help them successfully meet the needs of the dual-track school in the four areas outlined above (1a-d); and

(3) To explore those strategies that school districts have employed or that are recommended by principals to prepare administrators for the role of dual-track principal in the four areas outlined above (1a-d).

Criteria for selecting schools and principals are: schools must be working on the elementary dual-track model, housing a full regular English program, plus an early French

Immersion program spanning at least 5 years (e.g. K-5, 2-6, etc.). Permission is being sought to interview principals of schools in four school districts: _____, _____, _____, and _____.

According to my information, there are 5 schools in [name of district] which fall within the boundaries of my study, namely: _____, _____, _____, _____ and _____. I would hope to interview some or all of those principals.

The interview schedule is now in the process of being designed, and should be available for your approval by the end of March. I anticipate that interviews will approximate one hour and that follow-up interviews will not be necessary. I hope to begin interviewing in April.

If you require any further information, please don't hesitate to contact me at ____-____, or my senior supervisor, Stan Shapson, Associate Dean of Education, Simon Fraser University, at ____-____.

Thank you for your kind attention to my project. I believe the school districts will find the results of my study useful. I hope to hear from you soon.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra D. Rideout

c.c. Stan Shapson

Appendix B

STUDY OF DUAL-TRACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A Master's Project

Simon Fraser University

by

Sandra D. Rideout

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please complete this brief questionnaire before the scheduled interview. The researcher will pick it up at that time.

School Name _____

Grades offered in French Immersion (see Table 1)

Grades offered in regular English (1 @ 1 - 7; 15 @ K - 7)

Other programs (e.g. special classes) offered: various ESL; two Programme Cadre K - 7; 4 special classes.

Total (French & English) student enrolment (376 - 587)

Total French Immersion student enrolment (125 - 395)

Number of regular English classroom teachers (6 - 16)

Number of French Immersion classroom teachers (5 - 15)

Number of years the French Immersion program has been

offered in this District: (9 - 19 years)

Number of years the French Immersion program been

offered in this school: (5 - 18 years)

Number of years you have been principal of this school:

(2 mos. - 7 years)

Please outline the experience you have had as a principal.

Include regular English program schools and schools offering any alternative language program or programs (such as other dual-track schools, those offering minority language programs, D. N. D. postings, etc.), here in B. C., elsewhere in Canada, or outside the country.

If you had any special training which prepared you specifically for the role of principal (in any setting), please outline it here.

If you have received any special training to prepare you for the role of principal of French Immersion programs, please outline it here.

Indicate your answers to the following statements by putting a check mark in the appropriate space [numbers expressed as words represent responses given in each category].

1. I speak French

five	:	three	:	four	:	two	:	_____	:	_____	:	two
1		2		3		4		5		6		7
not at all		a little		fairly well		fluently						

2. I understand French

four	:	two	:	five	:	_____	:	three	:	_____	:	two
1		2		3		4		5		6		7
not at all		a little		fairly well		fluently						

Please describe any courses or exchange/summer programs in which you have participated, or other strategies you have used to upgrade your French language proficiency.

Appendix C

STUDY OF DUAL-TRACK ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

A Master's Project

Simon Fraser University

by

Sandra D. Rideout

PART I: THE DUAL-TRACK SCHOOL MODEL

- (a) Some researchers have stated that dual-track school principals should be fully bilingual. What are your comments on this statement?
- (b) Some researchers of French Immersion schooling have stated that a 50/50 French/English student enrolment is the ideal ratio for a dual-track school. Can you give me your feelings on that ratio?

PART II: STUDENT INTEGRATION

For the purposes of this study, student activities fall into three categories: during school hours, during instructional time, and extra-curricular.

[Define terms if necessary: during school hours includes those activities which take children out of class -- assemblies, concerts; during instructional time includes those activities in which children participate for a direct instructional purpose -- buddy classes, field trips; and

extra-curricular activities are those which take place before school, at noon, and after school.]

- (a) Do you feel that integration of French and English students in school activities is an important consideration for planning in the dual-track school? Why or why not?
- (b) Have you, either alone or with your staff, developed a policy on French/English student integration? (Could you outline it for me? [Attach a copy if available.])
- (c) Are any attempts made to create a French milieu or environment in the school? ([If yes] Could you outline the strategies used in doing so?)
- (d) To what extent is French used as the language of communication outside of the classroom? (How often do adults use French in speaking to children? do children use French in speaking to other children? do adults use French in speaking to other adults?)
- (e) What activities, if any, do French and English program students participate in jointly during school hours? (About how often would [each activity] be held?) (Are both languages used during [activity]?)

([If yes] Could you tell me more about how the [activity] would be organized, from a linguistic point of view?)

- (f) What activities, if any, do French and English program students participate in jointly during instructional time?

(Who initiates most of these activities?)

(How is the linguistic component handled during these activities?)

- (g) What extra-curricular activities, if any, do French and English program students participate in jointly?

(Are [the activities] offered in both languages?)

(Are [the activities] offered in only French or only English?)

- (h) Which of the activities you have mentioned in answer to the preceding 3 questions are, in your opinion, the most effective in integrating the French and English students?

(How do the students appear to feel about [those activities]?)

(Have you had any comments from parents or students about the use of one or both languages during [the activities]?)

- (i) Are there any other activities designed to integrate the French and English students which you would like to see implemented in your school?

((If yes| What are they?))

((If no| Can you explain why they are not yet being implemented?))

- (j) Are there any other points you would like to raise on the topic of French/English student integration?

PART III: STAFF COLLABORATION

- (a) Have any English program teachers at your school been transferred or laid off as a direct result of French Immersion registration?
- (b) Please comment on the relationship between French Immersion and English program staff members.
(Probe for behaviours.)
(Could you describe how tensions manifest themselves?)
(Have you developed any strategies to alleviate tensions?)
- (c) Is French spoken in the staffroom? How frequently?
What is the reaction of English-speaking teachers?
- (d) Do staff members of both groups show an interest in the others' language?
- (e) Do English-speaking teachers help Francophone teachers with their English? Do Francophone teachers require help with report cards? Who would give them this help, and how would it be given? Do French-speaking teachers help English speakers with their French?

- (f) Could you describe the process by which decisions are made at staff meetings? For example, how would the staff decide upon the focus for Professional Development Days?
- (g) Compare your French Immersion and English program teachers and describe their interest and involvement in a variety of school functions and activities.
- [Probe for whether:]
- a. Teachers participate in discussing staff meeting items.
 - b. Teachers raise issues to be discussed at staff meetings.
 - c. Teachers plan units or student activities with other teachers.
 - d. Teachers voluntarily join committees for planning school events.
 - e. Teachers share units, ideas, and resources with other staff members on their own initiative.
 - f. Teachers ask for ideas or resources from other teachers.
 - g. Teachers attend district-sponsored workshops in a variety of curriculum areas.
 - h. Teachers attend provincial conferences in a variety of curriculum areas.
 - i. Teachers ask for parent helpers in their classrooms.

- j. Teachers make use of district resources for curriculum extension.
 - k. Teachers lead extra-curricular activities with students.
 - l. Other?
- (h) Is it necessary to nurture staff collaboration differently on a dual-track school staff than on a single-track school staff?
- [If yes] Could you tell me some of the unique aspects which must be considered?
- What are the most effective ways of nurturing staff collaboration?
- (i) Are there any other points you would like to raise on the subject of staff collaboration?

PART IV: SUPERVISION OF TEACHERS

For the purposes of this study, supervision will be defined as a non-evaluative procedure aimed at helping teachers to improve their instructional practices.

- (a) Could you describe how the supervision of teachers is handled in the school?

If French Immersion and English program teachers are not supervised in the same way, could you compare the two models used?

Have you, either individually or with the staff, developed a policy or set of procedures with regard to

the supervision of teachers? Could you outline the policy? Attach a copy if available.

- (b) Please comment on your feelings toward the supervision of French Immersion teachers.
- (c) What do you perceive to be the feelings of French Immersion teachers regarding supervision of instruction by principals?
(Is there any unwillingness because of language proficiency or lack of it? Are they different from English teachers?)
- (d) Outline some of the problems, if any, that you have encountered in the supervision of French Immersion teachers.

What solutions can you see to these problems?

- (e) In your experience, what is observable for the purposes of data collection in a French Immersion classroom?
- (f) Do you supervise the linguistic ability of your French Immersion teachers?
[If no] Who does?
- (g) What help, if any, have you received from the district in the area of teacher supervision?
- (h) Are there any other points you would like to raise on the topic of teacher supervision?

PART V: HOME-SCHOOL RELATIONS

- (a) Could you estimate what percentage of the French students live within the catchment area boundaries of your school?

How do those students outside the boundaries get to and from school?

- (b) Approximately what percentage of the regular English students live within the catchment area boundaries of your school?

How do those students outside the boundaries get to and from school?

- (c) Do you perceive any differences in the characteristics of the average French Immersion parent in your school in comparison to the average English class parent?

Describe their level of interest and involvement in a variety of school matters, whether in the classroom, in the school in general, or beyond the school building.

[Some possible areas include:]

curriculum content?

school activities?

helping with homework?

school discipline policies?

serving on parent committees?

progress reports?

pupil placement?

student learning objectives?

evaluation criteria?

volunteering in the classroom?

attending school events?

teacher qualifications?

class size?

other?

- (d) Is there a formalized parents' group attached to the school?

([If yes] Could you describe its function and structure?)

(" " Could you describe your role in the parent group?)

(" " Could you outline activities or events, if any, that the parent group sponsored in the school this year? Does the parent group differentiate in any way between French and English students in planning activities?)

- (e) Is there an active Canadian Parents for French local at work in this community?

([If yes] Could you describe your experiences with this group as principal?)

- (f) How does the school communicate policies, up-coming events and so on to parents?

- (g) Which of those communications methods listed in III(f) are, in your opinion, most effective at keeping parents informed?
- (h) How frequently are communications from the office (e.g. newsletters) sent home?
- (i) Do parents of French and English students receive the same communications? If there are differences, please expand further.
- (j) How do you, as principal, ascertain whether parents are satisfied with the school and its functions?
- (k) Are there any other points you would like to raise on the subject of parent/school relations?

PROBES

Could you outline [] for me?

Could you explain a little more fully what you mean by []?

Could you tell me more about []?

In what way?

Is there anything else?

Are there any other []?

How often?

When would that happen?

Can you explain why []?

Could you describe []?

Can you give me your opinion on that?

Can you give me your feelings on that?

What are your comments on that?

Appendix D

April __, 1987.

Dear [principal's name]

As a follow-up to my phone conversation with your secretary of March __, 1987, I am confirming the interview date of April __ at __ p.m. and enclosing the preliminary questionnaire attached to the study. Please complete it prior to the interview and I will collect it at that time. Thank you for your help in contributing to my study. I look forward to meeting you on April __. If you require any further information, I can be contacted at __-__.

Yours sincerely,

Sandra D. Rideout

References

- Aguilar, J. V. (1979). The building principal's role in a bilingual education program. Journal of Teacher Education, 30(3), 26-28.
- Baetens Beardsmore, H. (1982). Bilingualism: Basic principles. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1983). Educational research: An introduction (4th ed.). New York: Longman Inc.
- Bruck, M. (1978). The suitability of early French immersion programs for the language disabled child. Canadian Modern Language Review, 34(5), 884-887.
- Burns, G., & Olson, P. (1981). Implementation and politics in French immersion. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Press.
- Canadian Education Association. (1983). French immersion and school boards: Issues and effects. Toronto, Ont.: Author.
- Canadian Parents for French. (1986, June). Brief presented to the Standing Joint Committee of the Senate and of the House of Commons on official languages. Ottawa, Ont.: Author.

- Cattermole, J., & Robinson, N. (1985). Effective home/school communication -- From the parents' perspective. Phi Delta Kappan, 67(1), 48-50.
- Clinton, A., & Talmanis, A. (1982). Administration of French immersion programs. Actes du congres nationale, A. C. P. I., 33-39.
- Cummins, J. (1978). The cognitive development of children in immersion programs. Canadian Modern Language Review, 34, 855-883.
- Cummins, J. (1984). Bilingualism and cognitive functioning. In S. Shapson & V. D'Oyley (Eds.), Bilingual and Multicultural Education: Canadian Perspectives (pp. 55-67). Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. (1983). Elementary French Immersion programs in British Columbia: A survey of administrators, teachers, and parents. Part II: Detailed findings. Burnaby, B.C.: B.C. French Study, Faculty of Education, Simon Fraser University.
- Day, E. M., & Shapson, S. M. (1987). Assessment of oral communicative skills in early French Immersion in early French Immersion programs. Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 8, (in press).

- Finn, Jr., C. E. (1984). Nine commandments for school effectiveness. Phi Delta Kappan, 65, 518-524.
- Guttman, M. A. J. (1983). There's more to French immersion than social class. Interchange, 14(1), 17-22.
- Hawkes, S. (1982). French immersion -- A parent's perspective. Contact, 1(1), 18.
- Jacobson, E., & Kuehn, L. (1986). In the wake of restraint: The impact of restraint on education in B. C. Vancouver, B. C.: B. C. Teachers' Federation.
- Krashen, S. D. (1984). Immersion: Why it works and what it has taught us. In Language and Society, 12. Ottawa, Ont.: Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages.
- Lambert, W. E., & Tucker, G. R. (1972). Bilingual education of children: The St. Lambert experiment. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Lambert, W. E., Tucker, G. R., & d'Anglejan, A. (1974). An innovative approach to second language training: The St. Lambert experiment. In Stephen T. Carey (Ed.) Bilingualism, Biculturalism & Education. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, pp. 47-53.

Lapkin, S. (1984). Future perspectives on administrative and pedagogical aspects of French immersion education.

Contact, 3(1), 4-10.

Lapkin, S., Andrew, C., Harley, B., Swain, M., & Kamin, J. (1981). The immersion centre and the dual-track school: A study of the relationship between school environment and achievement in a French immersion program.

Canadian Journal of Education, 6(3), 68-90.

Lebrun, L. A. (1981). Organizing a French immersion school. In Early French immersion: Administrator's resource book. Province of British Columbia, Ministry of Education, Division of Public Instruction, Modern Languages Services Branch.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the elementary school principal in program improvement. Review of Educational Research, 52(3), 309-339.

Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1986). Improving principal effectiveness: The principal profile.

Toronto, Ont.: OISE Press.

Mangieri, J. N., & Arnn, Jr., J. W. (1985). Excellent schools: The leadership functions of principals.

American Education, 21(3), 8-10.

- McGillivray, W. R. (1978). Administrative problems of early immersion. Interchange, 9(4), 70-72.
- Modern Languages Services Branch. (1981). Early French immersion: Administrator's resource book. Province of British Columbia: Ministry of Education.
- Modern Languages Services Branch. (1985). Enrolment in immersion programs in British Columbia. Chart distributed by F. Wilton at Immersion and Programme-cadre de Francais Administrators' Conference, November 28, 1985.
- Moyer, K. L. (1982). Four steps to effective community involvement. Educational Leadership, 39(4), 285-287.
- Nagy, P., & Klaiman, R. (1986, June). Attitudes to and impact of French immersion. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Educational Researchers Association, Winnipeg, Man.
- Olson, P., & Burns, G. (1981). Immersed for change: Politics and planning in French immersion. Orbit, 12, 7-14.
- Olson, P., & Burns, G. (1983). Politics, class and happenstance: French immersion in a Canadian context. Interchange, 14(1), 1-16.

- Patton, M. Q. (1980). Qualitative evaluation methods. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- Powell, B. (1982). Conversion to immersion: The views of a neophyte principal. Contact, 1(1), 14-18.
- Rallis, S. F., & Highsmith, M. C. (1986). The myth of the 'Great Principal': Questions of school management and instructional leadership. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(5), 300-304.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(7), 4-13.
- Shoemaker, J., & Fraser, H. W. (1981). What principals can do: Some implication from studies of effective schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, 63(3), 178-182.
- Swain, M. (1978). French immersion: Early, late or partial? The Canadian Modern Language Review, 34(3), 577-585.
- Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Trites, R. L. (1981). Primary French immersion: Disabilities and predictions of success. Review and Evaluation Bulletins, 2(5). Toronto, Ont.: The Minister of Education.

Valverde, L. A. (1978). Instructional leadership for bicultural programs: Role responsibilities and relationships. Education and Urban Society, 10(3), 337-346.