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ABSTRACT

This study examines the effects of integration on intermediate level students in dual track schools. The research hypotheses were that integrated French immersion and regular program students would have more positive attitudes towards learning French and towards other program students than did segregated students in dual track schools. The study considered data gathered from 303 intermediate level students by means of a researcher-developed questionnaire. Twenty students were selected to participate in post-questionnaire interviews. Statistical analyses were computed with the aid of the SPSS computer software program. The investigation determined that although integrated students demonstrated more positive attitudes orally than regular program students, there were no significant differences between the two groups in attitude towards learning French or towards other program students revealed and thus, the research hypotheses were not supported. These findings and suggestions for future research are discussed.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

1.1 Rationale

Immersion, the alternative to traditional programs of second language instruction, has existed in Canada since 1965 (Cummins & Swain, 1986). Students in such programs may be immersed in French, the target language, as early as kindergarten, receiving, in many cases, 100% of their daily instruction in this second language. Immersion teachers are usually bilingual, and students are permitted to respond in their native tongue until they feel comfortable expressing themselves in the second language.

French immersion students are usually anglophone children residing in an English majority milieu whose parents have chosen this alternative to second language learning. In Ontario, French immersion differs from traditional methods of second language teaching in program delivery, program content and in the number of hours of French instruction that students accumulate during their school career. French immersion students in Lambton county, for example, could accumulate 5553 hours of French instruction while at elementary school, and regular (traditional English) program students who receive Core French instruction accumulate 720 hours in the same period of time.

The county in which this study took place, and by which I am employed has 42 elementary schools, and of these, seven currently offer the French immersion experience. The program was introduced in 1984 in four schools. Two of these schools are suburban, one has a rural location and the fourth is in a small town. The decision was made to provide the French immersion program in schools where the regular program was already in place, as opposed to developing French-only centres. The term used for such an arrangement, where two programs are offered within the same building, is "dual track".

1
Within each of the four dual track schools, French immersion and regular programs are offered simultaneously. In two of these schools, French immersion and regular program intermediate level students are integrated for 50% of their instructional day. At the other two schools, students remain in French immersion or regular program classes and are not integrated. All regular program students, regardless of whether or not they are integrated with French immersion students, receive 40 minutes daily of Core French instruction.

In 1988, three more schools were selected to accommodate French immersion, reflecting the program's increased success and popularity. Since 1988, then, there have been seven dual track schools in our county.

In Canada, enrolment in the French immersion program was and is a parental choice at the time of registration. For French immersion students enrolled in our county's dual track schools, French instruction begins at the kindergarten level. This is known as an Early Total French immersion (EFI) program. Students in Lambton county's EFI program receive 100% of their instruction in the target language, from entrance into kindergarten until grades 3 and 4, at which time 25% of the program is allotted to the development of English language skills. The allocation of time to English skill development increases to 50% for grades 5 through 8. Other Boards of Education offer Middle or Late French immersion programs. A Middle French immersion program usually begins in grade 5 and Late French immersion programs begin in grade 7.

Within the dual track schools in Lambton County, students are divided according to the program selected by their parents at kindergarten registration. Thus, in the same school there are likely to be one or more regular program classes and one French immersion class for each grade level. Students in the same grade but in different programs may share interests and be the same age but may not meet or develop friendships because of this segregation. Educators in Lambton County have observed that students of different programs in dual track schools
perceive themselves to be competing adversaries. This may be due to mutual ignorance, since French immersion and regular program students usually have more in common than they realize. Both groups consist of anglophone children who live and play in communities near their school. Due to the unique nature of the French immersion program, there are often few changes in class composition once it is established at kindergarten, with the exception of occasional students transferring from one immersion school to another. It is possible for the same group of French immersion students who started out together in kindergarten to graduate from elementary school together. French immersion students who have been together for a number of years develop a relationship similar to that of a family of many children. Even though French immersion students begin receiving English Language Arts instruction in grade 3, they remain segregated from regular program students who are also receiving English Language Arts instruction. Each group has its own teachers implementing the same curriculum. Within the regular program there is sometimes more room for change in class composition because of greater enrolment in that program and larger class sizes.

Attitudes of superiority among Lambton County students seem to be more common in dual track schools than they are in single track schools. This is understandable given the scenario that has often occurred since Boards of Education began implementing French immersion programs. New classes require space, materials and equipment. Much of this is acquired by means of government subsidies, but this extra attention and distribution of new resources can lead to a negative perception among regular program students and the public who see this as favouritism toward French immersion students.

Administrators, principals and educators in our county have sought to respond to the many issues affecting the success of dual track systems. Foremost is the necessity to encourage attitudes of tolerance and acceptance between regular program and French immersion students, thereby establishing a compatible
environment that is conducive to successful learning in both languages.

1.2 Integrating To Develop Attitudes of Mutual Tolerance.

In attempts to encourage more favourable attitudes in regular program and French immersion students, one Lambton county principal implemented a change to the French immersion program. In September 1991, the French immersion program in this county extended to grade 7 in its four original schools. Since immersion students at this grade level receive 50% of their daily instruction in English, it was decided that the immersion students would be dispersed among regular program students for half of their school day, during which all intermediate students would receive English subjects together. This took place in the morning so that all students would identify with a “homeroom” teacher. The “homeroom” morning class composition, then, consisted of both regular program and French immersion students. The morning program subjects were those not taught to immersion students in French: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Guidance and Music. For the remainder of the day immersion students regrouped to receive their other subjects in French while the regular program students received instruction as usual for the other curriculum areas. Subjects taught in the afternoon were: French Language Arts for immersion students and Core French for regular program students, History, Geography, Art, Health and Physical Education.

Until September 1991, French immersion and regular program students had been in segregated classrooms except for occasional cross-grouping activities or school-wide theme sharing events. The new integrated system of class organization was explained to the intermediate level teachers and other staff involved in this revolutionary plan. At the end of June 1991, the students were introduced to their teachers and classmates for the following school year. There was nervous excitement evident throughout the intermediate division as staff and
students anticipated reactions. Not surprisingly, the feedback was overwhelmingly positive. Students of both programs enjoyed the idea of making new friends and as one French immersion student stated: "It would be nice to get some new blood in our class." Letters were sent home with students explaining the new system to parents. Again the response was positive. In November 1991, a questionnaire polling parental feelings towards the integration of students was sent home with first term report cards. The parents were asked to answer the following question:

Do you feel that the integration of intermediate students this year is working well for your son / daughter?

Parents of students in both programs answered positively, in favour of the changes. Many endorsed the objectives referred to in section 1.1, which anticipated many benefits for both regular program and French immersion students. The main goal was to develop a cohesive school spirit and sense of school family in the students who were accustomed to demonstrating competitive attitudes toward each other.

Attitudes of superiority appeared to dissipate as integrated students were able to recognize each other as equals with common interests and abilities and not adversaries. The integration also improved public perceptions of the French immersion program and enhanced public relations, as the integrated students carried their enthusiasm for the new system home with them and perceptions of favouritism declined.

Although the integration of students who already attend the same school would appear to be a simple task, many administrative factors needed to be considered. Firstly, all intermediate level students would spend the morning with an assigned teacher. In the afternoon, French immersion students would regroup to receive the required 50% of their instruction in French. This would leave the numbers unbalanced in some afternoon classes. It was decided that as many regular program students as possible would also change classrooms for the
afternoon. Since each student would be reporting to two teachers for equal parts of the day, a great deal of communication and planning between teachers was required to balance and coordinate assignment deadlines, report card writing and student well-being.

The second issue was the contractual problem of teacher preparation time. Scheduling of preparation time was made more difficult because subjects taught in French as well as in English had to be considered, and not all staff members are bilingual. Also, intermediate level students receive Industrial Arts and Family Studies instruction at a neighboring school every second week for a half day period. These subjects are part of the English curriculum and must therefore be taught in the morning so that they would not interfere with the immersion students' French instruction time. The teachers themselves were responsible for communicating with more parents since they would be working with a minimum of 45 students per day.

1.3 Integrating To Improve Attitudes Towards Second Language Learning

Equally important to developing positive attitudes towards other program students is the development of positive attitudes towards learning French. If there is animosity or competing attitudes between regular program and French immersion students within the dual track school then students may not put forth their best efforts to work towards becoming proficient in their second language.

As a French immersion teacher I have made regular observations about the attitudes of my students and other students in our school. During my years of experience I have noticed that attitudes toward learning a second language change during adolescence. My former primary students were eager to participate in French activities and strove to imitate the teacher thereby refining their second language skills. I witnessed an erosion of this enthusiasm towards many subject areas and toward learning French when students reach grade 6, and attitudes
continue to become more ambivalent through the progression to grade 8.

Clare Burstall (1974) in her reporting of target language attitudes in children in England confirms my observations. In a cross-national, longitudinal study Burstall found that favourable attitudes towards learning French reach their peak at about the age of ten and decline during the early years of adolescence. She cites a variety of elements that may contribute to this decline, such as maturational factors, peer pressure and ambivalence due to a lack of knowledge of the French community.

Dealing with the changing attitudes of adolescent students is important to administrators and teachers who wish to make French immersion and Core French programs more effective. Perhaps this attitude toward learning French could be attributed to familiarity with the program and its routines, the familiarity of fellow French immersion students, puberty or peer pressure; however, the factors responsible for dwindling enthusiasm are not the issue of this thesis. The issue for me as a teacher is the challenge of encouraging more positive attitudes towards second language learning.

After a few months of integration I noticed a change in attitude among the grade 7 French immersion students. Since they were separated from one another each morning, they were eager to be regrouped together for the afternoon and demonstrated more diligent work habits within the classroom. I observed a marked difference in student preparations for both written and oral French assignments. The same students who seemed to be losing their desire to speak French and were over-anglicising their accents one year before, were now striving to achieve a more native-like pronunciation and fluency. Test results improved and students demonstrated more pride in their ability to communicate in French.

Integration was as new to me as it was to the students. I had always worked well with regular program teachers but I knew very few of the students. In September 1991, I too was integrated with the students and my teaching
assignment changed from Grade 7 French immersion teacher to Grade 7 teacher. In the morning, I would teach the English curriculum to a mixed group of regular program and French immersion students. Regular program students who received Core French instruction began to seek my help with their French assignments, something that had not occurred in the past. Regular program students also began to seek out the assistance of their French immersion peers when they were unsure of a French concept. This improved relations and attitudes as friendships developed between students of both programs.

1.4 Objectives

My short term objectives, by means of this thesis, are to discuss attitudes of intermediate level students in our county's dual track schools. In particular, I will deal with attitudes of regular program and French immersion students towards each other as groups and towards learning French. It is not my intention to make direct comparisons between this county's dual track schools and their programs. Rather, this is a comparison of models and I hope to elaborate on a recently implemented alternative that may serve as an option for those in a position to foster positive feelings, mutual tolerance and enhanced attitudes towards second language learning.

It is my opinion, as a result of the first hand observations previously described, that when the integration of regular program and French immersion students is possible (given school timetables, scheduling of programs and teacher preparation time complications) students will benefit by becoming more mutually tolerant of each other. An attitude of compatibility enhances the learning environment by making it more pleasant for students and staff. I also believe that when French immersion students are regularly separated from each other and are mixed with other students at their school for part of their daily program they become more motivated to increase their efforts towards improving their second
language.

1.5 Overview

This thesis is an empirical, quantitative study of the effects of integration on intermediate level students in dual track schools. The methodology to be implemented in this study will include an historical survey, a review of relevant literature and a descriptive approach, by means of observation, questionnaire and interview. The large sample of participants and the resulting quantitative statistics will prove useful in generalizing survey results.

In Chapter Two, I discuss the issues in this thesis by first providing a literature review that includes an historical perspective, statistics and definitions relating specifically to the study at hand. Particularly noted will be the work of H.H. Stern, Robert Gardner and William Lambert who have made significant contributions to the field of second language learning. Their research encompasses theories of attitudinal factors influencing language acquisition and perspectives on minority/majority group relationships which are applicable to this study. An examination of studies by Clare Burstall, Nancy Halsall, Sharon Lapkin, Merrill Swain and others provides information in the areas of attitudes and second language learning, French immersion and the dual track school setting.

Chapter Three, entitled Methodology, includes a rationale for the chosen study and its design, a detailed account of the survey development, of the questionnaires' and interview questions, and the actual process of collecting data. A complete analysis of the data yielded from the questionnaires and interviews is provided in Chapter Four. A specific emphasis is placed upon significant variances in responses between integrated and segregated students.

Chapter Five concludes this study with a look towards the future and some recommendations.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

There is a wealth of literature about second language acquisition. Most of this body of knowledge relates second language learning to a variety of variables such as the learners’ aptitude, the learners’ attitude and motivation, the classroom environment, and the amount of exposure to the target language. Access to publications on this particular aspect was afforded by descriptors such as “learning French and attitudes” or “French immersion and attitudes”. Each source led to new ones and an abundance of information about student attitudes in general and in second language students in particular emerged. The search for documentation supportive of this study was much more difficult when it became apparent that very little has been written about the attitudes of French immersion students and even less concerning students in dual track schools.

It is the intent of this chapter to share findings from other related studies that are relevant to the study at hand. It will also provide a historical perspective on second language learning and student attitudes.

2.2 The Dual Track School

Sources of information dealing specifically with dual track school settings are very limited. In 1981, Lapkin, Swain, Andrew, Harley and Kamin compared dual track to immersion (French only) centres in order to test their hypothesis that the latter would be more conducive to achievement in French. Their sample consisted of six immersion classes in five immersion centres at the Carlton Board of Education, four immersion classes from two dual track schools and five regular
program classes from the same board. The study also included the opinions of 66 staff members collected by means of a questionnaire. Analyses of variance were conducted on student tests to identify differences in scores between dual track staff and students and immersion centre staff and students. What is relevant to the matter at hand are attitudes related by teachers and principals. Teachers of early French immersion programs in dual track schools unanimously chose the immersion centre over the dual track school as a better place to teach. This would suggest that immersion teachers in dual track schools are not as satisfied as are their immersion centre colleagues. This attitude in staff may be attributable to another factor. When asked to describe the atmosphere in their schools, 44% of staff in the immersion centres indicated that there was a compatible mix whereas only 30% of dual track staff made the same choice. In addition, 17% of dual track school teachers indicated that they felt that the atmosphere was segregated in their schools when only 5% of the immersion centre staff responded in that way. The teachers at non-integrated schools were less positive towards their environment than the immersion centre teachers were. This implies that integration and mixing of groups enhances the compatibility of staff and students and the atmosphere of the learning environment. In an ideal situation, students admire the French culture and language and are eager to improve their skills. In practice, teachers have to be aware of their students’ reservations and prejudices.

In a discussion of issues affecting French immersion programs, Burns (1986) commented that while many boards have adopted immersion programs, few appear to be coping with factors affecting the efficiency of these programs. As a result, immersion frequently has the effect of dividing individual school populations of both staff and students. Burns suggests that more attention be given to factors influencing the effectiveness of French immersion programs such as the in-school atmosphere and staff attitudes.

Although she does not deal with dual track schools as they exist in Canada,
Lindholm (1990) re-emphasizes the findings of Lapkin et al. Lindholm presented (as she entitled them) critical features of successful language education programs. She cites findings of other researchers indicating that successful language programs are found in schools that promote positive interdependence. The work of Kagan (1986), for example, supports the hypothesis of this thesis. Although Lindholm's report lacks methodological details, Kagan's studies suggest that when minority and majority students work interdependently on school tasks, students' expectations and attitudes about each other become more positive and their academic achievement improves. Kagan's work provided an interesting perspective with regards to inter-group relationships in California schools. His research is based on minority (Hispanic) and majority (Anglophone) groups in dual track schools. It differs from the dual track school setting where all students share English as their first language. Similarities may be drawn between Kagan's research and the study at hand. If the French immersion students represent the minority group and the majority group consists of regular program students then his findings as previously described, are applicable to the dual track school situation. Kagan's and Lindholm's research indicated that cooperative learning and group interactions within a school facilitate the development of positive attitudes towards school tasks and towards the other group.

In 1991, The Manitoba Education and Training Centre published results of a provincial study of French immersion graduates. A total of 225 graduates completed a questionnaire on their perceptions of several factors related to their experience with the French immersion program and later in post-secondary school situations. When graduates were asked what they had gained by being in the French immersion program rather than the English program, the most common response was that they had learned a second language and would have an edge on employment opportunities. When asked what they had lost by being in French immersion rather than the English program, most responded that they had lost
nothing. Those who did perceive that something had been lost identified a sense of being segregated from students in the English program. Also identified was the perception that the French immersion program is close-knit but students are actually isolated from other program students from kindergarten on.

Halsall (1989), a project officer with the Research and Development Department of the Carleton Board of Education, researched the impacts of partitioning the student population for program delivery. Partitioning, or separating, of French immersion, English as a Second Language and Special Needs students in Halsall's study does not apply solely to immersion students; however, they are the only group relating to this thesis. Information was collected from trustees, staff, parents and students. Based on analyses of this information, it was found that the effects of partitioning French immersion students included a loss of a sense of belonging to a neighbourhood and a division into two streams of students. Information gathered from trustees included briefs that had been previously presented to the Board by parents. One particular community objected to a proposal to convert the local school from dual track to an immersion centre. Their arguments were based on concerns about losing a community oriented school.

In the same vein, is evidence revealed by analysis of the perception questionnaire responses. The results of four survey questions are particularly appropriate. In responding to the statement, "The sense of being part of a neighbourhood is lessened by having students divided for program delivery," 39.7% of participants strongly agreed while only 7.1% strongly disagreed. Similarly, to the statement "Students in Core French have a poor attitude toward learning the French language," 32.7% agreed and only 12.8% disagreed. The results were consistently towards the agreement end of the five point rating scale. To the statement "The partitioning of the schools into various programs creates negative competition with and among schools," 36.5% agreed. When asked to
select a school organization that best served the needs of elementary students 62.2% of the respondents selected dual and triple track schools. Nineteen percent chose English or French only centres and 16% were undecided.

Halsall stated that dividing the student population into groups lowers the numbers of students who are available for each program and it is the division into a variety of programs that is responsible for difficulties that are encountered (personal communication, July, 1993). As a result of the findings of this exhaustive study, the Carleton Board of Education established that its preferred organization is dual and triple track schools in which French immersion, the regular program and special education programs can be offered at the same location.

2.3 Related French Immersion Literature

Foremost in immersion research is Lambert and Tucker’s 1972 study of anglophone children enrolled in Canada’s first French immersion program located at St. Lambert, Quebec. Their study is pertinent because it was the first of only a few longitudinal studies involving immersion students. Lambert was approached by a group of concerned parents who wished to provide their children with opportunities for becoming proficient in French. They wanted him to assess the effectiveness of the newly introduced French immersion program. Lambert and Tucker examined the linguistic and cognitive impact of the program and then investigated the childrens’ attitudes toward the people whose language they were learning. It was believed that students with positive attitudes toward the other group were more likely than those with negative attitudes to progress in language learning regardless of aptitude. Using a questionnaire, they asked grade 4 and 5 French immersion and regular program students (who received Core French instruction) to express their feelings about learning French. Forty-five percent of the grade 4 and 52% of the grade 5 immersion students answered that they enjoyed
it very much. Only 18% of the grade 4 and 16% of the grade 5 Core French students answered in a similarly positive fashion. The students were also asked if they would prefer to attend an all English school. Three percent of the grade 4 and 4% of the grade 5 immersion students answered that they would prefer this option, whereas 31% of the grade 4 and 46% of the grade 5 students chose the same answer. Lambert and Tucker also found that the French immersion students had more positive attitudes toward francophones than did English speaking students in regular English programs. They attributed this positive attitude, in large part, to parental enthusiasm (Lambert & Tucker, 1972). It is also likely that parents of immersion students at that time were of a higher overall socio-economic status than today. Parents of today's French immersion students seem to have similar socio-economic backgrounds to parents of regular program students.

A further constraint of these findings in their generalizability to the current study is the differences between today's immersion setting in Ontario and that of the setting of the 1972 St. Lambert study. The anglophone children in the French immersion program there were learning the language of the majority and were in a French speaking environment. French immersion in the Ontario context offers programs to anglophone children in an English speaking environment. Children in the St. Lambert French immersion program would have had opportunities to meet French speakers and to practise their second language on a regular basis if they chose to do so. Most of today's French immersion students in Ontario do not receive regular exposure to the French language outside of their school. Other researchers have criticized the generalizability of Lambert and Tucker's findings, revealing that the experimental sample dwindled to 30 children in grade 4 and 20 children in grade 5, and findings based on such limited samples must be interpreted with caution. Nonetheless, the St. Lambert study is important for its historical influence on second language, specifically French immersion, research. It is also important with regard to information concerning the influence of the learning
environment and the detrimental effects that prejudice can have on acquiring a second language.

Lapkin and Swain (1982) describe two social and psychological aspects specific to immersion education. First, there is the adjustment that young children in early immersion programs undergo. Anglophone parents are fearful that their children will not be allowed to express themselves in English and, being unable to communicate in French in the early grades, they will suffer from undue stress. Immersion teachers are usually bilingual and young students are encouraged to speak in their mother tongue until they are equipped with vocabulary in French. Second, and more importantly from the point of view of this study, is a question of the impact of immersion programs on students' feelings towards themselves and French language speakers, and their environment. Some of Genesee's and Hamayan's research (1980) is closely linked to that of Lapkin and Swain. This study examined the attitudes of early immersion program students towards French Canadians employing techniques similar to those used by Lambert and Tucker. Results showed that in the early years, immersion students had more positive attitudes towards French language speakers than did regular program students. It was found, however, that in later years there was no significant difference between immersion and regular program students' attitudes. The attitudes of the immersion students were never less positive than those identified for regular stream students. Lapkin's (1984) research indicates a need for educators to find ways to motivate students to attain native-like fluency in French. She states that once immersion children reach a point in their language development where they can make themselves understood to their teacher and classmates there is no strong social incentive to develop further towards native speaker norms. The hypotheses of this study imply that the integration of dual track students may foster positive attitudes and motivate both immersion and core students to improve their language skills. Lapkin and Swain's (1982) comparison
of regular program student attitudes to French immersion student attitudes did not involve integration within dual track schools but it is applicable in its discussion of problems existing between these groups.

Genesee (1987) suggests that the attitudes of immersion students may become less positive because in most French immersion settings there is an absence of real social contact with native French speakers (other than classroom teachers) and therefore the students have no empirical basis for developing positive attitudes. Lapkin and Swain (1982) agree that the erosion of positive attitudes and failure to make significant progress beyond a certain level of speaking French may be ascribed to this lack of contact. Cummins and Swain (1986) and Parkin, Morrison and Walkin (1987) re-emphasize these views by suggesting that the social and psychological impact of French immersion programs has in no way negatively affected the immersion students' views of their own ethnolinguistic group, and that they have contributed to closing the social gap between English speaking and French speaking Canadians.

Also found in Lapkin and Swain's (1982) report on bilingual education in Canada is a description of a study implemented by Blake, Lambert, Sidoti and Wolfe (1981) which was appropriate in its significance and similarity to this study's integration theme. Blake's research team asked bilingual anglophone and francophone students and unilingual anglophone and francophone students to write about problems between English speaking and French speaking Canadians. Both bilingual groups cited segregation of the two groups, stubbornness and resistance to getting along as problems much more frequently than did the unilingual groups.

Observations made by Colletta, Clements and Edwards (1983) and Genesee (1987) indicate that favourable attitudes in French immersion students towards the second language culture and the learning situation are most likely to lead to success with that language.

Colletta et al. considered parental influence as another variable when
assessing learner attitudes. Colletta and her partners found that the literature suggested, but little empirical corroboration existed, that parental influences could be a determining factor in student attitudes. Data were obtained from 68 students ranging from grades 7 to 10 and their parents. Their results were consistent with the findings of other studies of attitudinal and motivational factors in second language learning. A relationship between attitudinal variables and measures of motivation was observed suggesting that high levels of motivation in second language study were related to the attitudinal characteristics of the students. Students having a high level of drive to learn a foreign language held favourable attitudes and were better able to interact with and to understand the people of the second language culture. Outcomes significant to this study were the causal relationships supported by Colletta’s research group. Specifically, a relationship was found to exist between student attitudes and motivation and student self-confidence in French. Successful language students were also found to have favourable attitudes toward learning foreign languages in general, toward various aspects of the learning situation, and to have perceived considerable parental encouragement to succeed in their language study.

Subsequent to Colletta’s examination of parental influences affecting student attitudes is that of Bienvenue (1986). Bienvenue’s study compared attitudes of regular program parents and parents of students in early total immersion programs. Her sample consisted of 531 parents selected from four Winnipeg school divisions. Questions asked included parental views regarding the idea of segregated classes or schools, the development of elitism and the persistence of community conflict. Statistical analyses indicated that regular program parents differed significantly from their counterparts in the immersion program. Regular program parents were more negative in their views than were immersion parents. Regarding segregation, 52% of immersion parents queried indicated a strong agreement that French immersion programs create a divided school system. Seventy-seven
percent of regular program parents were of the same opinion. In Bienvenue’s study, the regular program parents who responded did not live in the area of a French immersion centre and their negativity towards French immersion reinforces the notion that integration influences perceptions of other groups. If these regular program parents had been exposed to or involved with French immersion students or a French immersion centre, perhaps their attitudes would have been more positive. When generalizing Colletta’s and Bienvenue’s findings, it would be fair to suggest that parental attitudes may be responsible for negative opinions in dual track schools and that integration gives both groups evidence that the other group is worthy of friendship, interest and tolerance.

2.4 Student Attitudes and Second Language Acquisition

Researchers have been interested in investigating the affective factors of language learning, such as student attitudes and motivation, since the middle of the twentieth century. This may, in part, be due to prejudices and new social attitudes that developed after two world wars (Stern, 1983).

Consistent research from the late sixties to eighties has been conducted in Canada by Gardner and Lambert at McGill University and the University of Western Ontario (Stern, 1983). Most of these studies focus on learners’ attitudes, values and motivation in relation to other factors. Their contributions to second language learning consist mainly of studies implemented to measure the abilities of learners who excel at language acquisition. Gardner and Lambert (1972) identified two crucial factors in developing the attitudes of second language learners towards the target language, leading to a distinction between "instrumental" and "integrative" motivation. Students demonstrating an instrumental attitude are those who see learning the target language as having practical advantages for their future, such as increasing employment opportunities. Students with an integrative attitude are those who possess a sincere personal interest in the people, their
culture, and language, and a desire to assimilate. It was Gardner's and Lambert's belief that integrative orientation would sustain the long-term motivation needed for the demanding task of second language learning.

Integrative and instrumental orientations have implications for the groups being studied in this thesis. Gardner and Lambert believed that for second language instruction to be effective, student needs must be met by considering both motivations. In the French immersion dual track school then, immersion and Core French teachers should be aware of the varying motives that drive their students to achieve in the second language. The dual track school can respond to student needs by providing instrumentally oriented learners with the advantages of meaningful, practical experiences with the second language that will improve their language usage. The integratively oriented learner will benefit from a French immersion dual track setting by being able to mix and meet people representing the other group, for instance, francophone teachers.

Most authors interested in the effects of attitudes on second language learning study Gardner and Lambert's integrative and instrumental orientations and over the years have come to a variety of conclusions. The findings of Burstall (1975), on behalf of the National Foundation of Educational Research in Britain, are contrary to those of Gardner and Lambert. Burstall's NFER study showed that students' attitudes and achievement were closely associated but that motivational characteristics of individual students appeared to be neither exclusively integrative nor wholly instrumental. This is probably due to the children's young ages and their inability to look ahead to future needs.

In addition to examining student attitudes towards French culture and the speakers of French, Burstall and the NFER team investigated the attitudes of teachers and principals to language learning and the longitudinal development of these attitudes. Pertinent information is found in Burstall's report of the development of attitudes in students, in which she also disagrees with earlier
studies by Riestra and Johnson (1964). Riestra and Johnson investigated the attitudes of grade 5 students in the United States towards Spanish speaking people and concluded that teaching a foreign language to elementary school children is a potent force in creating more positive attitudes towards the target language speakers. A constraint of this particular study is that the sample was 63 children and because of its size of limited validity. Burstall claims that receiving foreign language instruction is not sufficient to promote positive attitudes towards the foreign culture and considers that personal contact with the other culture may be a more effective factor in developing both positive attitudes towards learning the second language and achievement in linguistic competence.

More recently, Cook (1991) expands upon Gardner and Lambert's attitudinal-motivational orientations by stating that students will find it difficult to learn a second language in the classroom if they have neither instrumental nor integrative motivation, as is probably the case in school language teaching. Like Burstall, Cook states that in Britain school children have no particular contact with the foreign culture and no particular interest in it, nor do their job prospects depend on learning a foreign language. Only 36% of students in England thought learning French would be useful to them according to the Assessment of Performance Unit after an investigation conducted in 1986 (Cook, 1991). Cook's discussion is based on traditional foreign language instruction similar to Ontario's Core French and alternatives like French immersion are not discussed. Cook suggests that teachers should "smooth over" problems by stressing the career benefits that knowledge of a second language may bring and by building interest in the foreign culture through exchanges with French schools.

2.5 The Social Psychological Perspective

Based on their research, Gardner and Lambert proposed that second language acquisition is easily understood within a social psychological framework. Cook
provides a simplified version of Gardner's Socio-educational model of second language learning. According to Cook, success in second language learning depends on motivation and aptitude. Motivation depends in turn on integrativeness and attitudes towards second language learning. From a social psychologist perspective, mastering a foreign language depends on intellectual capacity, aptitude and the learner's attitudes towards other ethnolinguistic groups (Edwards, 1979; Gardner, 1985). According to this model success in second language acquisition is based on motivation and aptitude. The learner's motivation is dependent upon learner attitudes and integrativeness. Each causes the other.

Integrativeness and learner attitudes are a product of the social milieu of the learner. Society may foster particular stereotyped views of foreigners and as a result society sees the classroom learning environment in a particular way. What the learner thinks of the speakers of the second language and this environment is a crucial determinant of success (Cook, 1991).

On integrativeness and instrumentality, Krashen (1981) and Chastain (1988) affirm Gardner's theories that students bring a variety of attitudes with them to their language class. Whether these attitudes are instrumental or integrative may not always be measurable; however it is important for the classroom teacher to provide positive classroom experiences that diminish hostilities.

Gardner and Smythe (1981) revealed further evidence of the relationship between attitudes and success in second language acquisition in a comparison of anglophones studying French in monolingual and bilingual settings. Significant correlations were obtained between each attitude measure and motivation as well as between attitudes, motivation and second language achievement. Of the correlations with the achievement criteria, those involving motivation were the largest, indicating that motivation is the most potent predictor of success. Gardner and Lambert contrasted the results of anglophone students studying French in unilingual versus bilingual settings. With respect to motivation, it was found that,
in both settings, a significant relationship existed between attitudes and second language achievement.

2.6 Conclusions

From the studies reviewed it is evident that acquiring a second language can be facilitated if learners possess positive attitudes towards the target language, its community and/or its culture. None, however, discuss integration of dual track school students as a possible causal variable motivating the development of these crucial positive attitudes. Consistently mentioned in French immersion literature is the need for further investigation into the changing attitudes and motivation of students in immersion programs, particularly at the upper elementary and high school levels, and for identifying programs which are effective in promoting positive attitudes. The changing attitudes of students in immersion programs are important to administrators and teachers who wish to make French immersion programs more effective. The students' attitudes are reflected in their development of proficiency in the use of the French language and on a more global level, may ultimately help to improve communication between the two official language groups in Canada increasing understanding by each group of the other's cultural heritage (Parkin et al., 1987).

As related in Chapter One, it was the post-integration attitude and effort changes observed in French immersion students at our school that prompted my curiosity in this area. Could it be that integration with regular program peers was responsible for a more compatible mix of students within the school and/or a visible difference in students' attitudes towards learning French? This question led to my hypotheses that:

1) Integrated French immersion and regular program students in dual track schools possess more positive attitudes towards learning French than do segregated French immersion and
regular program students in dual track schools and,
2) Integrated French immersion and regular program students
in dual track schools show more tolerance and understanding
towards each other than do segregated French immersion and
regular program students in dual track schools.
CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

3.1 The Questionnaire

I decided to develop a tool that would measure attitudes and efforts of all intermediate level students in dual track schools in our county. My ideal sample would consist of 435 students since this is the number of intermediate level dual track students in Lambton County. Of this sample, 256 students would be from integrated dual track schools and 179 students would be from segregated dual track schools for the 1992-1993 school year. Within the four schools there was a possibility of 143 French immersion students and 292 regular program students who could be involved. Because of school locations, representation from urban, rural and small town schools was incorporated in the study.

The research design is a 2 (type of program) X 2 (integration or segregation) X 2 (sex). Value labels for independent variables are Sex (male, female), Integration ('yes' indicates that the student attends an integrated dual track school and 'no' indicates a segregated dual track situation) and Program (French immersion and regular program).

As previously stated, there are four schools offering French immersion programs from kindergarten through to grade 8 in the county of this study. To varying degrees all have participated in cross-grouping activities between French immersion and regular program students over the years but at the time of my research, two schools provided fully integrated programs each morning for intermediate students. The students of the other two schools usually remained with their designated classes and were not integrated. Once it was clear what I wanted to know and who I wanted to involve in my research, I turned to the task of
developing a tool for collecting data.

In order to develop a valid tool that would collect data representing intermediate level students' attitudes and that would test my hypotheses, I had to consider two dimensions: type of program (French immersion or regular program) and type of interaction (integrated or segregated). Figure 1 illustrates these dimensions.

I developed one questionnaire of forty statements (see Appendix A), each to be rated by students on a five point Likert type scale, with "1" indicating a strong agreement with a statement and "5" reflecting disagreement. The questionnaire's statements were developed from a combination of personal reflections influenced by my own observations, input from university advisors and peers and a literature review on the subject of assessing attitudes in second language learners (Burstall, 1974; Savignon, 1975; Oller, 1979; Hanna, Smith, McLean & Stern, 1980; Lapkin et al., 1981; Colletta et al., 1983; Carey & Cummins, 1984; Bienvenue, 1986; Stern, 1983; Parkin et al., 1987; Halsall, 1989; Manitoba Education and Training, 1991; OISE, 1993). The publications by Savignon, Oller, Hanna et al., OISE and Carey and Cummins provided surveys and samples of statements that would measure attitudes towards learning French and towards other program students. The questionnaire administered to French immersion students differs only in the naming of other program students but would be consistent in meaning to that for the regular program students. The first 23 survey statements relate specifically to student attitudes towards improving French language skills and the remaining 17 statements measure tolerance and understanding towards the other group (see Appendices A and B). Similar methods of investigation were used by Burstall, and Gardner and Lambert in their studies discussed in Chapter Two. Their instruments consisted of statements measuring attitudes towards learning French, such as, "I like learning French " to which respondents expressed their agreement or disagreement (Gardner & Lambert, 1972; Burstall, 1975; Stern,
Figure 1: Sample Sub-groups
1983). During a telephone interview (January 1993), Lapki shared contents of a draft copy of an attrition study to be implemented in Northern Ontario. She and her research team also used a five point rating scale with the numbers one to four representing levels of agreement or disagreement and "5" being "Can't say". I adapted these formats for my own study by adding statements reflecting student attitudes towards other groups in dual track schools such as "I am happy to be a student at a dual track school".

3.2 The Interviews

I chose questionnaires and follow-up interviews as methods of research because they seemed best suited to indicate differences in attitude between French immersion and regular program students in integrated and non-integrated settings. Post-questionnaire interviews seemed advantageous because they provided direct student input in student language and allowed the students to be active participants in the research process. The interview questions themselves, were not created until after the questionnaire had been administered and collected. After perusing all questionnaires I examined more closely those signed by students who had indicated an interest in participating in follow-up interviews. Before selecting interviewees and developing interview questions, I ensured that would-be candidates met the following criteria:

a) students must have indicated an interest in the interview by signing the questionnaire;
b) written parental consent must have been received;
c) the number of survey respondents to be interviewed must equally reflect both French immersion and regular program students in both integrated and segregated programs.

These requirements helped in the selection of interviewees as many students volunteered to participate.
Questions asked at the interviews were similar for all students in that they were asked to explain their rating selections for questionnaire statements of particular interest (see Appendix C).

The following section will elaborate on the research process and specific steps taken in administering both the questionnaire and the interviews.

3.3 The Research Process

After consulting with and receiving permission from appropriate personnel (e.g., Superintendent) at the Board level, the principals of dual track schools were contacted. Information shared with the Superintendent and principals included a pilot questionnaire and sample consent form (see Appendix D). Each principal was asked whether he/she was willing to allow his/her school to be a part of the study. All were very supportive and receptive to my objectives.

After clearance from the University’s Ethics Committee, I arranged to have the questionnaire pilot-tested at a neighboring Board of Education for clarity and length. Consent forms were sent home with students and the questionnaire was administered by a French immersion teacher who had been previously consulted. The pilot classes were from a segregated dual track school. A total of 42 students from grade 7 and 8 French immersion and one regular program grade 8 classes participated. The pilot questionnaire offered to students the opportunity to comment on specific statements or concepts that were confusing or unfamiliar to them. Most students stated that they were unaware of the significance of some terms such as “regular” and “dual track”. The teacher responsible for administering the pilot questionnaire stated that students were unsure of one question in the General Information section. I had asked students to indicate how much time they spend with students from the other program. Many students wanted clarification as they were inclined to include out of school time spent with other students (e.g., time at soccer practice on Saturday afternoon).
Since I required an estimate of in-school time spent with other program students, the teacher involved suggested that the word "class" be included in the question. Some pilot participants suggested that some statements be reworded to be more reflective of student language. When it came to administering the questionnaire in our county, I chose to orally clarify two terms and the question described above. No statistical analyses were run on the pilot questionnaires since I was testing for student interpretation and comprehension of my statements.

Once modifications were taken into account, each of the four schools participating in my study was visited. Teachers were approached and asked to distribute consent forms to intermediate level students (see Appendix E). Deadlines were assigned for the remittance of signed parental consent forms and dates were selected for completion of the questionnaires. Of the ideal sample of 435 participants, 303 students actually completed the survey. Some students returned parental consent forms declining the invitation to participate while other students failed to return consent forms altogether. Three parents indicated an interest in the study and requested copies of the published thesis.

The questionnaires were colour-coded when printed to facilitate identification of questionnaires from dual track schools offering integrated or segregated programs. I visited each of the four schools within a two day period and provided oral instructions in addition to those already printed on the top of the questionnaires. Once students were comfortable with the terms "regular", "dual track" and with the intent of questions in the general information section, they proceeded to complete the questionnaire. It took approximately 20 minutes for students to complete the questionnaire and many students made positive comments about their participation. The next step to the research process was to conduct interviews.

A total of 20 students were interviewed. Five of the interviewees were French immersion students and five were regular program students from integrated dual
track schools. Five interviewees were also selected from each of these programs at segregated dual track schools.

As previously described, interview participants were selected according to pre-established criteria. In addition, selected students were given consent forms to be completed by parents granting permission for the interview to be tape recorded (see Appendix F). Interview questions were read by other teachers to ensure that they would be meaningful to intermediate level students. The interviews themselves took place in classrooms with the researcher and student present. They lasted about five minutes and were transcribed.

3.4 Statistical Analysis

The hypotheses of the study are that integrated intermediate level students in dual track schools possess more positive attitudes towards a) other program students and b) learning French than do intermediate level students in segregated dual track schools. The statistical analyses were conducted using the SPSS computer software. Tests computed include 1) factor analysis of the questionnaire to determine patterns in student responses and 2) analyses of variance (ANOVAS) on factors obtained and additional specific questions. Also frequencies were calculated to show percentages of responses selected by all students (Appendix G).
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

4.1 Factor Analysis

The total number of registered intermediate level students in dual track schools was 435. The actual sample responding to the questionnaire was 303 students. This translates to a return of 73%. Of these students 120 were from integrated schools and 183 were from segregated schools. There were 102 respondents from the French immersion program and 201 from the regular program. One hundred and forty-nine males and 154 females completed the questionnaire. Figure 2 illustrates this break-down of participants. No participants were omitted due to incomplete data.

A principal components factor analysis was conducted on all of the 36 positively worded statements on the questionnaire. This analysis generated eight factors rotated to the varimax criterion. For a statement to be included in a factor a loading of .5 was set and at least two statements were required to include a factor. Using these criteria, four factors emerged. They were termed:

1) General Attitude Towards French Experience which accounted for 29.8% of the variance
2) Social Perceptions Related to the Other Group which accounted for 11.6% of the variance
3) Extra-curricular Use of French, accounting for 5.1% of the variance, and
4) Peer Group Relations which accounted for 3.5% of the variance.

To examine these factors, three-way ANOVAS were completed on the Factor Scores (which represented an average score from questions included) with Sex (male, female), Program (French immersion, regular) and Integration (yes, no) as
Figure 2: Characteristics of Participating Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FRENCH IMMERSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REGULAR PROGRAM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRATION STATUS</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>INTEGRATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEGREGATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRADE LEVEL</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADE 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX</th>
<th># OF PARTICIPANTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
independent variables.

**General Attitude Towards French Experience**

Factor 1 included statements 1, 2, 8, 10, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 28 and 37. The ANOVA revealed a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 259) = 23.08, p < .001$, due to lower scores for females (mean = 2.22) compared to males (mean = 2.73), and a main effect for Program, $F(1, 259) = 49.79, p < .001$, due to lower scores for French immersion students (French immersion mean = 2.00, regular program mean = 2.76). Low scores indicate positive responses, thus females showed a more positive attitude than males and French immersion students showed a more positive attitude than regular program students towards their French experience. There were no two-way or three-way interactions.

**Social Perceptions Related to the Other Group**

Factor 2 is based on statements 24, 26, 27, 38, 39 and 40. A similar three-way ANOVA computed on Factor 2 resulted in a main effect for Program, $F(1, 259) = 16.17, p < .001$, due to lower scores for French immersion students (mean = 1.77) compared to regular program students (mean = 2.16). This indicates that French immersion students showed more positive perceptions of the other group than regular program students. There were no two-way or three way interactions.

**Extracurricular Use of French**

Factor 3 included statements 4, 9, 11 and 13. A three-way ANOVA conducted on Factor 3 also revealed a main effect for Program, $F(1, 259) = 33.59, p < .001$, due to lower scores for French immersion students (mean = 3.46) compared to regular program students (mean = 4.09). This indicates a more positive attitude towards their extracurricular use of French by French immersion students compared to regular program students. There were no two-way or three-way interactions on this factor.

**Peer Group Relations**

Factor 4 included statements 33, 34, 35 and 36. The three-way ANOVA on
Factor 4 revealed a main effect for Program $F(1, 259) = 16.11$, $p < .001$, due to lower scores for French immersion students (mean = 2.15) compared to regular program students (mean = 2.61). This indicates that the French immersion students had more positive perceptions of peer group relations than regular program students. Consistent with the three-way ANOVAS conducted on the other factors, there were no two-way or three-way interactions.

The hypothesis that integrated students would show a more positive attitude than segregated students towards other program students was addressed in the analyses of Factor 2 ("Social Perceptions Related to Other Group") and Factor 4 ("Peer Group Relations"). The means for these factors are provided in Table 1. The absence of main effects and/or interaction effects for the Integration variable indicates that this hypothesis was not supported.

The hypothesis that integrated students would show a more positive attitude than segregated students to "Learning French" was addressed in the analyses of Factor 1 ("General Attitude Towards French Experience") and Factor 3 ("Extracurricular Use of French"). The means for these factors are provided in Table 1. Again, the absence of main effects and/or interaction effects for the Integration variable indicates that this hypothesis was not supported.

4.2 A Closer Look

Additional three-way ANOVAS were computed on specifically selected questions that were of theoretical interest. As previously stated, only the key statements related to this study's hypotheses will be discussed. Those selected as best reflecting student attitudes towards learning French are statements 1, 10, 18, and 21. Statements measuring student attitudes towards the other group (be it French immersion or regular program) are 24, 28, 34 and 37 (see Appendices A and B).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>INTEGRATED</th>
<th></th>
<th>SEGREGATED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.I.</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>F.I.</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
<td>M  F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>2.47 1.95</td>
<td>3.12 2.54</td>
<td>2.02 1.67</td>
<td>2.80 2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>1.80 1.59</td>
<td>2.16 2.04</td>
<td>1.83 1.85</td>
<td>2.32 2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>3.71 3.49</td>
<td>4.28 3.88</td>
<td>3.35 3.31</td>
<td>4.07 4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td>2.24 1.87</td>
<td>2.67 2.40</td>
<td>2.29 2.24</td>
<td>2.83 2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Attitudes Towards Learning French

I try to improve my French

A three-way ANOVA was completed on statement 1 with Sex (male, female), Integration (yes, no) and Program (French immersion, regular) as the independent variables. There was a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 280) = 16.20, p < .001$, due to lower scores for females (male mean = 2.40, female mean = 1.94). This indicates that females showed a more positive attitude towards improving their French than males did. There were no two-way or three-way interactions for this statement.

Learning French is good for me

The three-way ANOVA run on statement 10 showed that there was a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 292) = 12.20, p < .001$, due to higher scores for males (male mean = 2.42, female mean = 1.87), and a main effect for Program, $F(1, 292) = 44.10, p < .001$, due to lower scores for French immersion students (French immersion mean = 1.53, regular program mean = 2.52). The main effect for Sex indicates that females are more positive than males in reporting that “Learning French is good for me.” The main effect for Program indicates that French immersion students are more positive than regular program students in reporting that “Learning French is good for me”. There were no two-way or three-way interactions.

I am happy to meet people outside school who speak French

The three-way ANOVA completed on statement 18 revealed that there was a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 292) = 25.99, p < .001$, due to higher scores for males (male mean = 3.30, female mean = 2.42), a main effect for Integration, $F(1, 292) = 27.15, p < .001$ and a main effect for Program, $F(1, 292) = 29.57, p < .001$. The main effect for Program was due to students in the French immersion program receiving lower scores than the regular program students (French immersion mean = 2.16, regular program mean = 2.94). These results indicate that females were more positive than males towards meeting French speaking people outside of
school and that French immersion students were more positive than regular program students towards meeting French-speaking people outside of school. In addition, the main effects for Sex and Integration were qualified by a two-way Sex X Integration interaction, $F(1, 292) = 4.126, p < .05$. Simple effects tests indicated that males in the segregated schools scored lower (mean = 2.63) than males in the integrated schools (mean = 3.30), $t(146) = 3.77, p < .001$. This indicates that males who are segregated have a more positive attitude towards meeting people who speak French. There was no difference between females in the segregated and integrated schools, $t(152) = 1.49, p > .05$. In addition, males scored higher than females regardless of Program ($p < .025$) confirming the main effect for Sex (See Figure 3). These results indicate that the best scores were obtained by females regardless of their program whereas males in segregated schools had a more positive attitude compared to males in integrated schools.

I like to speak French.

The three-way ANOVA conducted on Statement 21 generated three main effects. There was a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 284) = 40.24, p < .001$, due to lower scores for females (female mean = 2.22, male mean = 3.21) indicating a more positive attitude for females towards speaking French compared to males. The main effect for Integration, $F(1, 284) = 8.98, p < .05$, was due to lower scores for segregated students (Integrated mean = 2.94, segregated mean = 2.45) indicating a more positive attitude for segregated students towards speaking French compared to integrated students. There was a main effect for Program, $F(1, 284) = 36.65, p < .001$, due to lower scores for French immersion students (French immersion mean = 2.07, regular program mean = 3.11) indicating more positive attitudes in French immersion students towards speaking French compared to regular program students. There were no two-way or three-way interactions. The means for ANOVAs computed on statements 1, 10, 18 and 21 are illustrated in Table 2.
Figure 3: Statement 18

STATEMENT 18
MEETING PEOPLE WHO SPEAK FRENCH

Mean Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integrated</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregated</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INTEGRATED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.I.</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 1</td>
<td>M 2.35 F 2.03</td>
<td>M 2.62 F 1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 2</td>
<td>M 2.12 F 1.61</td>
<td>M 2.98 F 2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 3</td>
<td>M 2.81 F 2.13</td>
<td>M 3.55 F 2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 4</td>
<td>M 2.96 F 2.07</td>
<td>M 3.69 F 2.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 2
Mean Scores for Statements Measuring Attitudes Towards Learning French
Attitudes Towards the Other Group
I am happy to be a student at a dual track school

For statement 28 there were main effects for Sex, Integration and Program. There was a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 292) = 10.33, p < .001$, due to lower scores for females (male mean = 2.19, female mean = 1.75) indicating that females were happier than males being at a dual track school. There was a main effect for Integration, $F(1, 292) = 4.49, p < .05$, due to lower scores for segregated students (integrated mean = 2.10, segregated mean = 1.80) indicating that segregated students were happier than integrated students being at a dual track school. The main effect for Program, $F(1, 292) = 17.50, p < .001$, was due to lower scores for French immersion students (French immersion mean = 1.60, regular program mean = 2.19) indicating that French immersion students were happier than regular program students being at a dual track school. There were no interactions.

In my school there is a good mix of students

A three-way ANOVA computed on this statement showed a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 292) = 6.41, p < .05$, due to lower scores for females (male mean = 1.95, female mean = 1.66) indicating more positive perceptions by females compared to males. There was a main effect for Integration, $F(1, 292) = 8.43, p < .05$, due to lower scores for segregated students (integrated mean = 1.96, segregated mean = 1.62) indicating that segregated students showed more positive perceptions compared to integrated students. There were no interactions revealed.

I feel comfortable asking other program students for help

For statement 34 the three-way ANOVA test resulted in three main effects. There was a main effect for Sex, $F(1, 290) = 6.46, p < .05$, due to higher scores for males (male mean = 2.52, female mean = 2.13) indicating that females feel more comfortable asking other program students for help than do males, and a main effect for Integration, $F(1, 290) = 8.05, p < .05$, due to lower scores for integrated students (integrated mean = 2.16, segregated mean = 2.51) indicating that
integrated students are more comfortable seeking help from other program students compared to segregated students. The main effect for Program, F(1, 290) = p < .001, was due to lower scores for French immersion students (French immersion mean = 2.03, regular program mean = 2.50). However, the main effects were qualified by a three-way interaction for Sex, Program and Integration, F(1, 290) = 4.55, p < .05. Simple effects tests conducted on this interaction indicated that females in the integrated French immersion program received lower scores (mean = 1.48) than males in the integrated French immersion program (mean = 2.31), t(55) = 3.34, p < .01. Females in the integrated French immersion program scored lower (mean = 1.48) than did females in the segregated French immersion program (mean = 2.26), t(64) = 3.60, p < .001. Females in the integrated French immersion program scored lower (mean = 1.48) than females in the integrated regular program (mean = 2.19), t(82) = 3.43, p < .001. These results indicate that the most positive attitudes were revealed by integrated French immersion females. Males in the segregated French immersion program scored lower/better (mean = 2.09) than segregated regular program males (mean = 2.93), t(67) = 2.71, p < .01. There was no statistically significant difference but there was a trend for males in the integrated regular program to feel more positively towards seeking other program students' help (mean = 2.45) than males in the segregated regular program (mean = 2.93), t(96) = 1.88, p = .06. 

Having both programs at my school makes it a more interesting place.

The three-way ANOVA run on statement 37 revealed three main effects. There was a main effect for Sex, F(1, 288) = 13.45, p < .001, due to lower scores for females (male mean = 2.35, female mean = 1.84) indicating that females had more positive attitudes than males in reporting "having both programs makes my school a more interesting place." There was a main effect for Program, F(1, 288) = 18.48, p < .001, due to lower scores for French immersion program students (French immersion mean = 1.71, regular program mean = 2.32) indicating that
French immersion students were more positive than regular program students in reporting “having both programs makes my school a more interesting place.” The main effect for Integration, $F(1, 288) = 5.57$, $p < .05$, due to lower scores for segregated students (integrated mean = 2.24, segregated mean = 1.91) indicating that segregated students were more positive compared to integrated students in reporting “having both programs makes my school a more interesting place.” There were no interactions. The means for ANOVAS computed on statements 28, 30, 34 and 37 are illustrated in Table 3.

The hypothesis that integrated students would show a more positive attitude towards learning French was addressed in the analyses of statements 1 (“I try to improve my French”), 10 (“Learning French is good for me”), 18 (“I am happy to meet people outside school who speak French”) and 21 (“I like to speak French”). The analyses of statements 1 and 10 revealed no main effects and no interaction effects for the Integration variable. Analyses of statements 18 and 21 revealed main effects and an interaction effect for Integration in favour of segregated students and therefore, this hypothesis is not supported.

The hypothesis that integrated students would show a more positive attitude towards other program students was addressed in the analyses of statements 28 (“I am happy to be a student at a dual track school”), 30 (“In my school there is a good mix of regular and French immersion program students”), 34 (“I feel comfortable asking regular/French immersion students for help”) and 37 (“Having both programs at my school makes it a more interesting place to be”). Analyses of statements 28, 30 and 37 revealed main effects and an interaction effect in favour of segregated students. Only statement 34 provided a main effect and a three-way interaction effect in favour of integrated students. French immersion females responded more positively to this statement. Thus, this hypothesis was partly supported.
### TABLE 3
Mean Scores for Statements Measuring Attitudes Towards Other Program Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>INTEGRATED</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SEGREGATED</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F.I.</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td>F.I.</td>
<td>Regular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 28</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 30</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 34</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement 37</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 The Interviews

All of the interviews commenced in the same way. Students were asked to explain some of their answer selections. Students were also asked to reflect on relationships with other program students that existed within their own school. Those who were from integrated settings were asked to describe their feelings towards the integration process and its effects. Those who were from segregated settings were asked to describe their perceptions of the other group and how they felt about the notion of integration (see Appendix C).

Evident during the interviews were more positive attitudes expressed by integrated students than by segregated students. This marked difference in responses was not as evident in the questionnaire results. In their oral responses, many students referred to friends who were or were not in the same program. Students’ answers indicated that they based their responses on their feelings for friends and acquaintances in the other program. One integrated French immersion student said:

“My reaction to it (integration) was funny, but I liked it. I think we (French immersion students) needed a change. When kids are together a long time, they start to dislike people in other classes. I think we were disliked too. We (regular program and French immersion students) even fought when the integration was first announced.”

Another integrated French immersion student said:

“Integration scared me because we were leaving a group of kids we’d been with since kindergarten. We never talked to them (regular program students) before and they always called us French fries.”

Integrated regular program students’ answers reflected the same perceptions.

“We were always the English muffins and they were the French frogs. We used to have fights but since we’ve been mixed up we got to know them (French immersion students). They’re like us and we do the same things.”
Equally positive answers came from other integrated regular program students.

"I didn't like the idea (of integration) last year when it was announced but this year I really do ... A lot of the French immersion and English kids are starting to get together because we have one class together in the morning."

The French immersion and regular program students from segregated dual track situations were not completely negative but definitely reflected a general ignorance with regards to the other program within their school and some prejudices were apparent. Most of these students indicated that although there is some competition and animosity between the two groups, they would like to work more often with the other program students in order "to make more friends" and "to get to know them more and then do more things together." One segregated French immersion student commented that:

"French immersion (students) don't bother to mix and we (regular program and French immersion students) don't get along but it would be better if we did."

An observation that was repeated several times by segregated students was that:

"they (French immersion student) stay together because they've always been together" and "they (French immersion students) usually stick to their own guys and it doesn't appeal to them to mix and the English feel the same way."

At this point it is evident that my hypotheses and interview results are not always consistent with the questionnaire findings. A discussion of these results will be the focus of Chapter Five.
CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

5.1 Integration and Attitudes Towards Learning French

The first hypothesis that integration would lead to positive attitudes towards learning French was not supported. The analyses of the two factors which addressed the learning of French ("General Attitude Towards French Experience" and "Extracurricular Use of French") revealed that integration had no influence on these areas. What was relevant was the French immersion experience. French immersion students had more positive attitudes. This is not an unreasonable expectation in view of the level of mastery that would exist for the French immersion students compared to that of regular program students. French immersion students in Lambton County receive approximately 4800 hours more French instructional time than the French Core students do by the time they reach the end of grade 8. Other research has reported similar differences between attitudes of French immersion and French Core students (Lapkin & Swain, 1982). In addition, there was a Sex effect in the "General Attitude Towards the French Experience". It was found in this study, as in those of other researchers, that females possessed a more positive attitude towards learning French than males (Burstall, 1974). This could be due to the fact that females generally have greater facility with language (Gardner, 1985).

Further exploration of the first hypothesis was conducted by examining statements 1, 10, 18 and 21. These statements were selected as being representative of statements 1 to 23 which measured attitudes towards learning French. There was no Integration effect on statement 1 ("I try to improve my French"). Statement 18 ("I am happy to meet people outside of school who speak French")
French’)) however, showed an Integration effect for males, but in a direction contrary to expectations. In essence, segregated males showed the more positive attitude on meeting French speaking people outside of school. This inconsistency may be an artifact or it may indicate that integration has some negative influence on males. Why this might be the case is not clear. Perhaps the integrated males responded negatively to statement 18 because of their daily, routine-like relationship with French speaking staff members and outside of school they prefer to be relieved of pressures to communicate in French. The segregated males may not view French speaking staff members in the same way that integrated students do since segregated students’ exposure to them is limited and may occur during more uplifting activities such as sporting events. Not having the same type of relationship with in-school French speakers may influence segregated students’ feelings, in a positive direction, towards French speakers outside of school.

Similarly, on item 21 there was an Integration effect, but it also was contrary to predictions. The segregated students had a more positive attitude in reporting “I like to speak French”. Perhaps the segregated students did not have sufficient opportunity to speak French and thus were more welcoming of occasions to do so. Possibly, and similar to speculations given in discussing the findings of statement 18, the integrated students may have been experiencing some frustration with continual pressures to speak French and were attempting to communicate by means of the questionnaire that they were feeling saturated.

Of course, the bottom line here is that the integrated setting did not appear to influence, in a positive way, the learning of French.

5.2 Integration and Attitudes Towards the Other Group

The second hypothesis, that integration would lead to more positive attitudes towards other program students, was not supported in the analyses of the two
factors which addressed this attitude ("Social Perceptions Related to the Other Group" and "Peer Group Relations"). Again, what was relevant was the French immersion experience. Students in French immersion had more positive attitudes towards regular program students than was reciprocated. It is not clear why this would be the case. Perhaps some students in French immersion come from different cultural backgrounds. Also possible and more likely for Lambton County students, is that French immersion students are influenced by different parental views as was found in research by Colletta et al. (1983). Perhaps French immersion is a more inclusionary experience which fosters more positive attitudes. Regular program students may be more inclined to develop stereotypes of those not "in the group". Success and survival of French immersion programs may partly depend on positive attitudes, effective interaction and acceptance by regular program students, teachers and parents. French immersion students may adopt expectations that teachers and parents have for the program to be successful.

Further exploration of the relationship between integration and attitudes towards other program students was conducted on statements 28, 30, 34 and 37. These statements were selected as being representative of statements 24 to 40 which measured attitudes towards other program students. The findings here offer mixed support for the research hypothesis that integration will have a positive effect on attitudes towards other program students. On statement 34 ("I feel comfortable asking other program students for help") it is integrated French immersion females who show a more positive attitude. Why this would be the case is not immediately evident. Perhaps females in the French immersion program are more amenable to benefiting, at least in terms of social interaction, from the integrated setting. Indeed, females consistently showed the more positive attitudes (statements 28, 30, 34 and 37). This finding reinforces those from section 5.1. Females may be the most comfortable seeking help of other program students or admitting that they need help because of their own self-confidence and perceptions
of their own abilities. Perhaps males were less positive because they do not possess the same mastery of French nor the self-confidence that females do.

Negative effects related to integration were evident on statements 28, 30 and 37. Surprisingly, segregated students scored lower for statement 28 ("I am happy to be a student at a dual track school"). One would expect integrated students to be more positive since they are the ones undergoing the experience and stated in interviews that they were enjoying it. On statement 30 ("In my school there is a good mix of regular and French immersion program students") the segregated students showed more positive views. They also showed a more positive attitude on statement 37 ("Having both programs at my school makes it a more interesting place"). Why the segregated students would manifest the more positive attitudes here is not clear. Overall, segregated students may have been more positive towards other program students than expected as a result of positive perceptions they may have developed from exposure received to other program students at community events, during theme studies or sporting events at school. This does not however, clarify reasons for which integrated students would not also possess such positive perceptions of other program students.

5.3 Interview Results

With few exceptions, analyses computed to test both hypotheses provided more favourable results for segregated students than they did for integrated students. Interviews were conducted not to generate information so much as to confirm or question survey results. Contrary to the questionnaire findings, the interviews revealed more positive attitudes in favour of integrated students.

With regard to their attitudes towards learning French, integrated students indicated during the interviews that French immersion and regular program students do help each other with French work but none would attribute their efforts to the fact that they were integrated. Evident in integrated regular program
students' responses was the feeling that their level of fluency was well below that of their French immersion peers. Regardless of integration or program status, students stated that the other program students had little effect on their efforts towards improving in French and they compared their own abilities to those of their French class peers. This perception that integration does not affect students' efforts to learn French is substantiated by the questionnaires findings.

With regard to their attitudes towards students in the other program, students who had previously been segregated until grade 6 but who were recently integrated at the intermediate level stated that integration helped them to overcome negative attitudes based on mutual ignorance (this includes 88 students of whom 10 were interviewed). Contrary to questionnaire results, students in segregated schools did not respond as positively toward other program students as the integrated students did. Perhaps segregated students are so accustomed to their own dual track situation that their negativity stems from a lack of integration experience upon which to base comparisons. It is likely, as Stern (1983) explained, that the students' responses were a reflection of their immediate situation and in order for them to be positive about other program students they must first experience integration. The integrated students indicated that they were apprehensive before spending time in their new class arrangements because of hostilities that had existed prior to the implementation of integration. All of the integrated students queried stated that they no longer harboured negative feelings after integration actually took place. More segregated students said that they would like to work more often with other program students than integrated students did. This reinforces the integrated students' comments that they were satisfied with the amount of time that the French immersion and regular program students are mixed. If segregated French immersion and regular program students were given the opportunity to be classmates on a regular basis then they too would likely be satisfied with the amount of time spent with other program students.
Other researchers have related the same discrepancy between questionnaire and interview responses (Stern, 1983). Participants showed a change of attitude in favour of the hypothesis that integrated students possess more tolerance and understanding towards other program students during the interviews which was not evident in their written responses on the questionnaire. Possible reasons for this discrepancy in results are numerous. Perhaps students misinterpreted or were confused by questionnaire statements and the rating system. The difference in questionnaire and interview answers may be due to the difference in the questionnaire and interview situations. The questionnaire was distributed to classes of students whereas the interview was held casually, on a one-to-one basis. It is possible that the written questionnaire encouraged a more task-oriented approach to responding. Students may have offered answers on the questionnaire that they perceived to be the more correct or desired ones. The one-on-one interviews may have made students feel more at ease by allowing them to choose their own vocabulary and to determine the pace of the discussion. Again, perhaps segregated students must first experience integration before they can evaluate their feelings towards it.

5.4 Limitations of the Present Study

Interpretation of the present findings must also consider limitations of this study. It is possible that more than one interpretation of the data exists. The questionnaire results are based on a large sample and represent students from rural and urban communities. In comparison, the interview sample of 20 students is small and responses may not be generalizable to the entire dual track school body. As noted in the review of literature, adolescent attitudes are changing and some findings may be influenced by this commonality among participants. Since the students personalized responses to suit their own experience, perhaps some answer selections were based on the number of friends students have from other
programs and were not based on potential positive experiences and new friends that could be made.

Additional variables affecting results may be parental influences and the influence of students' previous history. For instance, students who have experienced failure at school or who may be new to the dual track situation, may have negative attitudes.

Ideally future studies should involve a larger sample of students participating in the interviews. It would also be interesting to examine reasons for which 132 students did not participate. This may suggest other attitudes existing in dual track schools.

5.5. Implications and Suggestions for Future Research

When studies fail to demonstrate relationships, it is not always clear whether the lack of the relationship is due to a true null relationship in the population or a lack of reliability in the attitude measurement (Gardner & Smythe, 1981). Future studies might include a different assessment tool than that which was implemented in this study to delve further into differences of attitudes in dual track students. Other quantitative research methods might include the semantic differential or the social distance rating scales as opposed to the Likert style scale administered for this study. It is also recommended that pilot testing take place to ensure comprehension and a smooth administration of the measurement tool.

The interview results indicate a need for a more qualitative approach with this age group. The original hypotheses may have been sustained by case studies, more extensive interviews, detailed in-class observations, larger interviewee samples and examining journal entries.

Other researchers may explore the effects of school settings on students' attitudes. Perhaps it is necessary for students to be completely segregated before negativity surfaces. In some schools, there are sections for French immersion
students and sections for regular program students. All of the dual track schools in this study are organized internally by division (primary, junior or intermediate) and not by program of enrolment. A relationship may exist between a dual track school’s location, socio-economic status and students’ attitudes. This would then lead to an investigation of the community’s influence upon French immersion and regular students’ attitudes. A longitudinal study comparing attitudes towards learning French in students at varying grade levels would also be interesting and may shed some light on the changing attitudes of adolescents.

5.6 Summary of Findings

The focus of this study was on the effects of integration on students in dual track schools. In Burstall’s (1975) NFER study, it was found repeatedly that students who had been to France and integrated with French speakers differed significantly in attitude and achievement from those who had not had this opportunity. Those who had been to France expressed more positive attitudes towards France and the French, as well as towards learning French, than did those who had not been to France. Subsequent to my own observations it was expected that integrated students would consistently express more positive attitudes towards other program students and towards learning French than those who are segregated but this was not the case as was indicated by the questionnaire’s findings. Some interesting findings did surface however, and perhaps an emphasis on a more comprehensive collection of data would have sustained the original hypotheses.

French immersion responses were consistently more positive than were those of regular program students. Integrated students were more positive than segregated students towards asking for help from other program students (see section 4.2). The most positive group of respondents for statement 34 was integrated French immersion females.

The interviews produced responses favourable to the hypotheses that
integrated students show more tolerance and understanding towards other program students. In their own words students described their feelings about integration. The already integrated students were very positive and preferred integration to segregation. The segregated students revealed a desire to be integrated.

It may also be that the process of administering questionnaires may influence results. It would have been preferable to discuss a few sample questions with the students or to pilot test a similar measurement scale before actually completing the study’s questionnaire. Other researchers should consider the modalities of administering surveys.

Important educational advantages to integration are a positive ambiance in the learning environment, tolerance and understanding exhibited by students and staff, improved public perceptions of French immersion programs (which are often considered to be elitist and favoured) and decreased negativity between groups within the same school. These are important justifications for this model of integration.

5.7 Recommendations and Conclusions

Ideally, the dual track school setting would be one where all students demonstrated attitudes of tolerance. Since this is not the case, it is the role of educators and administrators to foster these attitudes. In September 1993, one of the four schools in this study is attempting to do just that by integrating all French immersion students whose daily program consists of 50% instruction in French and 50% instruction in English. This integration will incorporate grades 5 through 8. Students themselves recognized that integration would “bring them together” and that “since we’re all at the same school, we should mix well”.

The Common Curriculum (1993) provides principles of education in Ontario. One principle underlying learning emphasizes the responsibility that schools have to address the values implicit for participation in Canadian society. All students
need to develop a positive sense of self and respect and concern for others. A principle underlying curriculum states that students' perceptions of and attitudes towards others are affected by what and how curriculum is taught. What is taught in schools must reflect an authentic picture of reality.

If one agrees that positive attitudes towards other groups enhance compatibility and co-existence in Canadian society then the benefits of integration, rather than segregation, are obvious. Personal observations and literature support intergrouping of students to promote mutual understanding and tolerance. The questionnaire findings of this particular study should not discourage attempts by educators to provide every possible opportunity to prepare students for participation in our society.

While this study has not demonstrated in any dramatic way the advantages of integration, it has shown in a modest way that the intergrouping of students to enhance the learning environment's atmosphere and to foster mutual tolerance has been intuitively and anecdotally confirmed by administrators, educators and students: "Integration has helped us to be friends and to understand each other better. They are really the same as us."
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Appendix A
Regular Program Questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of a research project which is investigating how mixing intermediate level French immersion students with English program students can affect your attitudes towards learning French. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability and ask for help if you do not understand. Completed questionnaires will be kept confidential. No one will see your completed questionnaire except the researcher, Mrs. D. Kirkland.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Section 1 - General Information
What grade are you in? __________
Are you male or female? __________
How much of your school day do you spend with grade 7 and 8 students from the French immersion program? __________
Did you ever take French at another school? __________
In which grade did you enroll at this school? __________
Does anyone in your family speak French? __________

Section 2 - Questionnaire
For each of the following statements circle the number which best represents your answer.

1 = I strongly agree
2 = I agree
3 = I don't know
4 = I disagree
5 = I strongly disagree
Regular Program Questionnaire

1. I try to improve my French.  
2. I usually speak French with my French teacher.  
3. I try to pronounce words in French as French people pronounce them.  
4. I often speak French between classes.  
5. When I can't think of a word in French, I try to explain it using other words.  
6. I read French materials displayed in our hallways.  
7. I rarely try to speak French in my classroom.  
8. During French lessons, I get totally involved in the subject.  
9. I spend a lot of time thinking about my French lessons.  
10. Learning French is good for me.  
11. I sometimes watch French television shows at home.  
12. I try to speak only French during French lessons.  
13. I like to borrow French books from our school library.  
14. I do not feel comfortable when I speak French.  
15. I am proud to be learning French.  
16. Learning French is not important to me.  
17. I am uneasy when I have to speak French.  
18. I am happy to meet people outside of school who speak French.  
19. I think that studying French is interesting.  
20. The more I get to know French, the more I want to learn.  
21. I like to speak French.  
22. I am always willing to speak French in class.
23. During French lessons, I have to force myself to keep involved.
24. I get along well with French immersion students.
25. I am curious about French immersion students.
26. I have many school friends who are not in the Regular program.
27. I enjoy working with French immersion students.
28. I am happy to be a student at a dual track school.
29. I do not have a good relationship with French immersion students.
30. In my school there is a good mix of French immersion students and Regular program students.
31. Keeping the French immersion students and Regular program students in separate classes makes them have negative feelings about each other.
32. I prefer not to work with French immersion students.
33. Working with the French immersion students at my school makes me feel like we are all a part of one school family.
34. I feel comfortable asking French immersion students for help.
35. I would like to work more often with French immersion students.
36. I can learn a lot from French immersion students.
37. Having both the French immersion and Regular programs at my school makes it a more interesting place.
38. Most French immersion students have the same interests that I do.
39. At recess, many students from the Regular program and the French immersion program like to spend time together.

40. French immersion students enjoy mixing with Regular program students.

Section 3
Please print your name on the line below if you would like to participate in a follow-up interview (your parents must have already given their consent to do so).

THANK YOU FOR HELPING ME WITH THIS PROJECT
Appendix B
French Immersion Questionnaire

This questionnaire is part of a research project which is investigating how mixing intermediate level French immersion students with English program students can affect your attitudes towards learning French. Please answer all questions to the best of your ability and ask for help if you do not understand. Completed questionnaires will be kept confidential. No one will see your completed questionnaire except the researcher, Mrs. D. Kirkland.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Section 1 - General Information
What grade are you in? _________
Are you male or female? _________
How much of your school day do you spend with grade 7 and 8 students from the French immersion program? ____________
Did you ever take French at another school? _________
In which grade did you enroll at this school? _________
Does anyone in your family speak French? _________

Section 2 - Questionnaire
For each of the following statements circle the number which best represents your answer.

1 = I strongly agree
2 = I agree
3 = I don’t know
4 = I disagree
5 = I strongly disagree
French Immersion Questionnaire

1. I try to improve my French.  1 2 3 4 5
2. I usually speak French with my French teacher.  1 2 3 4 5
3. I try to pronounce words in French as French people pronounce them.  1 2 3 4 5
4. I often speak French between classes.  1 2 3 4 5
5. When I can’t think of a word in French, I try to explain it using other words.  1 2 3 4 5
6. I read French materials displayed in our hallways.  1 2 3 4 5
7. I rarely try to speak French in my classroom.  1 2 3 4 5
8. During French lessons, I get totally involved in the subject.  1 2 3 4 5
9. I spend a lot of time thinking about my French lessons.  1 2 3 4 5
10. Learning French is good for me.  1 2 3 4 5
11. I sometimes watch French television shows at home.  1 2 3 4 5
12. I try to speak only French during French lessons.  1 2 3 4 5
13. I like to borrow French books from our school library.  1 2 3 4 5
14. I do not feel comfortable when I speak French.  1 2 3 4 5
15. I am proud to be learning French.  1 2 3 4 5
16. Learning French is not important to me.  1 2 3 4 5
17. I am uneasy when I have to speak French.  1 2 3 4 5
18. I am happy to meet people outside of school who speak French.  1 2 3 4 5
19. I think that studying French is interesting.  1 2 3 4 5
20. The more I get to know French, the more I want to learn.  1 2 3 4 5
21. I like to speak French.  1 2 3 4 5
22. I am always willing to speak French in class.  1 2 3 4 5
23. During French lessons, I have to force myself to keep involved. 1 2 3 4 5
24. I get along well with Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
25. I consider myself to be a member of my school first, and a French immersion student second. 1 2 3 4 5
26. I have many school friends who are not in the French immersion program. 1 2 3 4 5
27. I enjoy working with Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
28. I am happy to be a student at a dual track school. 1 2 3 4 5
29. I do not have a good relationship with Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
30. In my school there is a good mix of French immersion students and Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
31. Keeping the French immersion students and Regular program students in separate classes makes them have negative feelings about each other. 1 2 3 4 5
32. I prefer not to work with Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
33. Working with the Regular program students at my school makes me feel like we are all a part of one school family. 1 2 3 4 5
34. I feel comfortable asking Regular program students for help. 1 2 3 4 5
35. I would like to work more often with Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
36. I can learn a lot from Regular program students. 1 2 3 4 5
37. Having both the French immersion and Regular programs at my school makes it a more interesting place. 1 2 3 4 5
38. Most Regular program students have the same interests that I do. 1 2 3 4 5
39. At recess, many students from the Regular and French immersion programs like to spend time together. 1 2 3 4 5
40. Regular program students enjoy mixing with French immersion students. 1 2 3 4 5

Section 3

Please print your name on the line below if you would like to participate in a follow-up interview (your parents must have already given their consent to do so).

THANK YOU FOR HELPING ME WITH THIS PROJECT
Appendix C
Interview Questions

1. Please tell me why you circled "___" for this statement.

2. Can you explain why you chose "___" for this statement.

3. Why did you disagree / agree with this statement.

4. What have you discovered about French immersion / regular program students since you have been integrated? (Answered by integrated students only)

5. How do you think that you would feel if you were in an integrated / segregated program?

6. Do you feel that French immersion should be offered at schools for French immersion students?

7. Are you curious about the students in the French immersion / regular program? Are you curious about what goes on in their classroom?

8. Describe the relationship between French immersion and regular program students in your school.
Appendix D
Pilot Questionnaire Consent Form

1847 Westgrove Drive
Brights Grove, ON
N0N 1C0
(519) 869-6673

Dear Sir / Madam;

I am a teacher with the Lambton County Board of Education and a graduate student with the University of Windsor. I am currently preparing to research the effects of integration on intermediate students who attend schools where both French immersion and Regular programs are offered.

I am seeking your permission to involve your son / daughter in my study by having your child pilot-test a questionnaire that will be distributed to all Grade 7 and 8 students in dual track schools in Lambton County at a later date. Students will be asked to rate their feelings about learning French on a scale of 1 to 5. This questionnaire should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. Participation is voluntary and all answers will be strictly confidential. No one will see the completed questionnaires except myself. No results will be reported for groups or for individuals which would allow specific students or schools to be identified.

The findings of this study will be published and made available to any interested parties by contacting me at the address above.

Please fill out the attached form and return it to your child’s classroom teacher. Do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions. In accordance with the University of Windsor policy in any research involving human participation, Ethics committee approval has been received. For concerns about ethical issues, contact Dr. Larry Morton at the University of Windsor (519) 253-4232.

Thank you for your assistance,

Deborah Kirkland
My child________________________ may / may not participate in the pilot-test
(child's name)
described above.

____________________________________
(signature of parent or guardian)
Appendix E
Questionnaire Consent Form

1847 Westgrove Drive
Brights Grove, ON
N0N 1C0
(519) 869-6673

Dear Sir / Madam;

I am a teacher with the Lambton County Board of Education and a graduate student with the University of Windsor. I am currently preparing to research the effects of integration on intermediate students who attend schools where both French immersion and regular English programs are offered.

I am seeking your permission to involve your son / daughter in my study by having your child complete a questionnaire that will be distributed to all Grade 7 and 8 students in dual track schools in Lambton County at a later date. Students will be asked to rate their feelings about learning French on a scale of 1 to 5. This questionnaire should take no more than 20 minutes to complete. Participation is voluntary and all answers will be strictly confidential. No one will see the completed questionnaires except myself. No results will be reported for groups or for individuals which would allow specific students or schools to be identified.

The findings of this study will be published and made available to any interested parties by contacting me at the address above.

Please fill out the attached form and return it to your child's classroom teacher. Do not hesitate to contact me should you have any questions. In accordance with the University of Windsor policy in any research involving human participation, Ethics committee approval has been received. For concerns about ethical issues, contact Dr. Larry Morton at the University of Windsor (519) 253-4232.

Thank you for your assistance,

Deborah Kirkland
My child ________________________ may / may not participate in the survey described above.

My child may / may not participate in a follow-up interview with the researcher.

______________________________

/signature of parent or guardian/
Appendix F
Consent Form for Recording Interviews

1847 Westgrove Drive
Bright's Grove, ON
N0N 1C0
(519) 869-6673

Dear __________________;

You and your child, __________________, have agreed that he/she may participate in a follow-up interview about some of the statements on my research questionnaire. Please sign below if I may use a tape recorder while the interview is being conducted. Your child’s name will not be published in any form nor will school names be referred to in the thesis. Students are guaranteed anonymity.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you have any concerns or questions about the interview and accept my sincerest sentiment of gratitude for your support in this project.

Deborah Kirkland

__________________________________________

A tape recorder may be used during the interview between my child and Mrs D. Kirkland.

__________________________________________

(signature of parent or guardian)
Appendix G
Percentages of Answers Selected by All Participants

1. I try to improve my French.
   1 2 3 4 5
   21.4% 53% 14.1% 7.6% 3.6%

2. I usually speak French with my French teacher.
   1 2 3 4 5
   16.1% 34.9% 14.5% 22.4% 11.2%

3. I try to pronounce words in French as French people pronounce them.
   1 2 3 4 5
   18.1% 36.2% 23% 15.8% 5.9%

4. I often speak French between classes.
   1 2 3 4 5
   3.6% 2.6% 10.5% 26.3% 53.9%

5. When I can't think of a word in French, I try to explain it using other words.
   1 2 3 4 5
   10.9% 31.6% 22.7% 19.4% 14.5%

6. I read French materials displayed in our hallways.
   1 2 3 4 5
   15.5% 33.2% 15.5% 15.8% 19.7%

7. I rarely try to speak French in my classroom.
   1 2 3 4 5
   11.5% 20.1% 19.4% 28.6% 19.4%

8. During French lessons, I get totally involved in the subject.
   1 2 3 4 5
   8.2% 31.3% 30.3% 19.1% 10.2%
9. I spend a lot of time thinking about my French lessons.
   
   1. 2  3  4  5
   1.6% 17.8% 27% 28.6% 23.4%

10. Learning French is good for me.
    
    1 2 3 4 5
    42.1% 24.7% 16.4% 7.9% 8.2%

11. I sometimes watch French television shows at home.
    
    1 2 3 4 5  
    7.6% 21.7% 10.5% 18.4% 40.1%

12. I try to speak only French during French lessons.
    
    1 2 3 4 5  
    18.8% 33.9% 21.1% 19.1% 6.3%

13. I like to borrow French books from our school library.
    
    1 2 3 4 5
    4.6% 10.5% 12.2% 25.3% 46.1%

14. I do not feel comfortable when I speak French.
    
    1 2 3 4 5
    12.2% 10.9% 20.1% 29.9% .7%

15. I am proud to be learning French.
    
    1 2 3 4 5
    29.6% 24.7% 24% 11.5% 9.5%

16. Learning French is not important to me.
    
    1 2 3 4 5
    10.9% 9.5% 14.5% 23.7% 41.1%

17. I am uneasy when I have to speak French.
    
    1 2 3 4 5
    7.2% 20.7% 25% 29.9% 16.4%
18. I am happy to meet people outside of school who speak French.


22% 20.4% 37.5% 11.5% 8.2%

19. I think that studying French is interesting.


22% 31.9% 18.4% 14.8% 12.5%

20. The more I get to know French, the more I want to learn.


13.2% 28.3% 28.3% 17.8% 11.8%

21. I like to speak French.


22.7% 28.6% 15.1% 15.8% 16.4%

22. I am always willing to speak French in class.


13.8% 32.2% 25.3% 17.4% 10.2%

23. During French lessons, I have to force myself to keep involved.


13.8% 22.4% 20.4% 29.6% 12.8%

24. I get along well with French immersion / regular program students.


50.3% 28.6% 11.5% 5.6% 3.3%

25. I am curious about French immersion / regular program students.


14.8% 17.8% 33.2% 17.1% 15.8%

26. I have many school friends who are not in the French immersion / regular program.


39.8% 26.6% 12.5% 12.2% 8.2%
27. I enjoy working with French immersion / regular program students.
   1 2 3 4 5
   37.5% 29.6% 22.4% 7.6% 2.6%

28. I am happy to be a student at a dual track school.
   1 2 3 4 5
   45.4% 25.7% 19.1% 4.9% 4.3%

29. I do not have a good relationship with French immersion / regular program students.
   1 2 3 4 5
   5.9% 7.2% 9.2% 28.9% 48%

30. In my school there is a good mix of French immersion students and Regular program students.
   1 2 3 4 5
   47.7% 34.2% 9.9% 4.6% 3%

31. Keeping the French immersion students and regular program students in separate classes makes them have negative feelings about each other.
   1 2 3 4 5
   17.8% 19.7% 26.3% 12.2% 23%

32. I prefer not to work with French immersion / regular program students.
   1 2 3 4 5
   4.9% 4.9% 13.8% 27.6% 47.7%

33. Working with the French immersion / regular program students at my school makes me feel like we are all a part of one school family.
   1 2 3 4 5
   21.1% 30.6% 8.6% 8.6% .3%
34. I feel comfortable asking French immersion / regular program students for help.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. I would like to work more often with French immersion / regular program students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. I can learn a lot from French immersion / regular program students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Having both the French immersion and regular programs at my school makes it a more interesting place.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. Most French immersion / Regular program students have the same interests that I do.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. At recess, many students from the regular program and the French immersion program like to spend time together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. French immersion / regular program students enjoy mixing with regular program / French immersion students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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