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Abstract

This study examined a group of English-speaking individuals temporarily residing in the province of Quebec who were studying French. I expected to find that language students who take an active role seeking opportunities to practice French outside of the classroom would demonstrate acquisition of a native speaker (NS) language variant more than those students who take a passive role in seeking out informal French interactions or those who actively sought instead interaction in English. However, no significant correlation between active or passive reactions to the learning environment and the production of the language variant was established. Students who actively sought French interaction were those who were focused on French language study, favored linguistic diversity, and spoke more French at school. For future French language students coming to Quebec to acquire native-like French I suggest developing a strong foundation of French beforehand and, once in Quebec, to live in a Francophone area.

Résumé

Cette étude a examiné un groupe d'anglophones résidant temporairement dans la province du Québec qui étudiaient le français. J'ai compté constater que les étudiants de langue qui saisissent des occasions d'un rôle actif de pratiquer français à l'extérieur de la salle de classe démontreraient l'acquisition d'une variante de langue plus ainsi que les étudiants qui prennent un rôle passif en cherchant des interactions en françaises ou ceux qui activement ont cherché l'interaction orale en anglais. Aucune corrélation significative entre les réactions actives ou passives à l'environnement d'étude et à la production de la variante de langue n'a été établie. Les étudiants qui ont activement cherché l'interaction française étaient également ceux qui ont été concentrés sur l'étude du français, ont favorisé la diversité linguistique, et ont parlé plus français à l'école. Pour de futurs étudiants de français venant au Québec pour acquérir les caractéristiques natives de français je suggère développer une base forte de français à l'avance et, une fois au Québec, pour vivre dans un secteur francophone.
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1 Introduction

This study focuses on the effect of the presence of a learner’s L1 in a study abroad environment. In cases where students intentionally position themselves in a foreign language environment or community the hope is that the increased access to native speakers (NSs) of the second language (L2) will provide the learner with a greater need to use this target language (TL). Much of the research on the experience of study abroad students has assumed that time spent abroad will lead to greater L2 achievement (see Freed, 1995). Nonetheless, although many researchers since the 1960s have examined the study abroad experience, much remains unknown about its specific linguistic benefits and difficulties (Freed, 1995).

The present study is based on the probability that in this age of globalization language learners abroad are more likely than ever to encounter someone who speaks his or her L1. The result of this situation is that some learners will be able to bypass the need to speak the TL during their study abroad. Language learners may find fellow students who come from countries that share their L1. These students may then spend considerable time with one another while living in the TL environment. Other times, students (especially those of widely-spoken languages, e.g. English) are able to communicate in their L1 for their commercial needs (hotel, restaurants, etc.) because many times workers in those industries speak more than one language, especially in touristy areas. Globally, this situation does not apply to any language community as much as it applies to speakers of English as a first language, because English is the most widely studied second language in the world. By extension, this also applies to other study abroad students who speak English as a second language but not as the language of study.

The impetus for my research topic has been fueled by personal observations over the course of one high school and four university study abroad experiences. Three times I have participated as a student and twice as an advisor, each in a different country and to study three different languages in all. In each case students who spoke English have always surrounded me, and in each case I have noticed English-speakers
at some point afforded the luxury of being able to communicate in English. Whether it was used when spending time together away from the company of host country members or even in place of the TL in communication with locals, English seems to always be available for L2 learners in the TL community.

The uses of English in the situations I have witnessed have not always deterred an effective language-learning experience. I do not believe that a language student must utterly abandon his or her L1 during foreign language study. In fact, at least one researcher (Wilkinson, 1998) has claimed that L1 use among students contributes to bonding/commiseration during language studies and dealing with culture shock. During many of my study abroad trips the students talked out their frustrations, discussed the TL culture, and otherwise used time with other students of their cultural background to understand as a group what they were experiencing together. As anyone who has participated in intensive language study can testify, the process can be stressful and exhausting. I believe that time to relax and reflect is necessary for successful L2 acquisition. One purpose of this study, therefore, is to attempt to discover at what point L1 use adversely affects L2 acquisition.

The L2 learning situation I have chosen to examine is that of a study abroad experience. For the purposes of this study, study abroad learning can be defined as any situation in which an individual chooses to learn the language of a community that is not his or her native language while temporarily residing in that community. Normally a study abroad student studies the language both formally in a classroom and informally outside the classroom. This definition is consistent with that used by Freed (1995). The usual duration of such an endeavor may be from two weeks up to a year.

I have chosen the study abroad milieu for the wide range of benefits students are able to derive from such experiences. In the optimal study abroad scenario, a student can be submerged in the TL community for the trip’s duration, living in an environment of rich, authentic language exposure and interaction, which supplements the classroom language study.

On the other hand, students may avoid contact with people outside of the classroom. They may choose instead to remain in their L1 groups, shielding themselves from the struggle of one-on-one communication tasks. Such students could thereby
reduce their language learning experience to little more than what is received in the classroom, which they could have done had they stayed home.

As a study abroad student and advisor, I have witnessed students who fall into both extremes – those who strive to put themselves into contact with the TL, even shunning activities that do not involve using the TL, as well as those who cared little about learning the TL, being more interested merely in the experience of traveling. Beyond that, these latter students seemingly could not have cared less if they returned from that country speaking the TL worse than they had before they left!

In this study I am expecting to find that students who take an active role to seek out opportunities to practice the TL will show greater gains in TL oral proficiency than those who either take a passive role in seeking out TL speaking opportunities or those who tend to avoid TL interaction altogether, preferring the safety of L1 interaction.

2 Literature Review

Over the last forty years a myriad of variables have been tested for having a meaningful relationship to language learning success. Among the most prominent are language aptitude, motivation, language anxiety, and the learner’s attitude towards the learning environment, language, and language teacher. I have chosen to focus on attitude and motivation in this study because numerous researchers have agreed that they are among the critical variables associated with learner success (Gardner & Smythe, 1973; 1977; Gardner, 1985; Clément, Dörnyei, and Noels, 1994; Dörnyei, 1994; Tremblay & Gardner, 1995). “Almost everybody agrees that motivation is important in learning a second language” (Gardner & Smythe, 1973: 219). “[It] has been demonstrated many times that [attitude and motivation] measures predict achievement in a second language” (Gardner, Lalonde, & Moorcroft, 1985: 207).

2.1 Attitude

The study of attitudes in second language education has often included language learners’ attitudes toward the target language community, language learning and bilingualism, and attitudes toward the learning situation.

Various studies have been carried out that examine how individuals who travel to foreign countries adapt to the new environment. Specifically, these studies have focused on how the learners’ attitudinal variables change in relationship to L2
achievement. Masgoret, Bernaus, and Gardner (2000) examined how British and Irish sojourners to Spain adapted to life in there while teaching English. After just four weeks the sojourners exhibited lower evaluation of Spanish people, lower Spanish use anxiety, lower integrative orientation, higher instrumental orientation, higher sociocultural adjustment, and higher self-reported proficiency in speaking and understanding Spanish. These sojourners were not taking Spanish classes at the time of the study; however, these results are similar to older studies where participants were taking classes in a foreign language environment at the time.

Gardner, Smythe, and Brunet (1977), who studied Canadian students of French in Montreal, found results similar to those of Masgoret et al. (2000). The researchers observed an increase in the students’ motivation that promoted rapid improvement in oral and aural skills. Yet, the students tended to be more ethnocentric, less interested in foreign languages, and less integratively motivated after French study. Students also became prejudiced toward outgroups and other languages. The intermediate students in particular held less favorable attitudes toward French Canadians. The authors theorized that “[p]ossibly students at an intermediate stage of second language acquisition are less certain of their future language studies, and as a result are less positive in their attitudes toward the community speaking that language” (p. 251). The authors mention that there may have been an effect of the surrounding French-English environment on the results of the study, but do not offer any suggestions as to what that might have been.

In 1979, Gardner, Smythe, and Clément found an association among attitudes, motivation, and French oral proficiency in Canadian and American students in northern Quebec. The Canadians developed less positive attitudes toward bilingualism but increased ability to think in French. The Americans also exhibited less positive attitudes toward bilingualism; however, they also developed less positive attitudes toward French Canadians, yet were more desirous of learning French. The authors explain that this discrepancy may be caused by age differences and differences in years of previous French study (the Canadian sample was both younger and had much more French training than the American sample). The authors also explain that because French Canadian culture is not a part of American culture to the extent it is in Canada,
Americans were more oriented to European French, thus explaining their decreased integrative motivation to learn French and less positive attitude toward French-Canadians. Also for this reason, Americans exhibited a degree of instrumental motivation not found in the Canadian sample.

As noted by Brecht and Robinson (1995), a language student's attitudes are likely to change over the course of a study abroad experience, and so polling should be done at various points. That is, attitude measurements taken once may be held for a short time, and ultimately may be misleading about a student's overall attitude. Although the current study is not longitudinal, as scheduling made for follow-up testing impossible, changes after time can be assumed though not identified here.

Previous language studies on language attitude indicate a link among positive attitudes students hold regarding bilingualism, the language learning environment and the language itself. Less clear, however, are the language students' attitudes toward members of the target language community, which are not always an indication of their L2 language proficiency development. What these previous studies have also shown, however, is that as L2 proficiency increases, ethnocentrism decreases and attitudes toward the TL group become more positive (Gardner et al., 1977; Gardner et al., 1979). Additionally, none of the studies on attitude mentioned above examined the students' acquisition of native TL characteristics, rather measuring L2 proficiency in terms of comprehension, self-reported proficiency, and using standard language measurements.

2.2 Motivation

Many researchers have attempted to describe the components of motivation in second language learning. Gardner and Smythe (1973) examined the correlation between the dropout rates for high school students in French classes and integrativeness. These authors defined integrative motivation as consisting of four major themes: value of language community, positive attitude toward language learning situation, parental encouragement, and general interest in other languages. Motivation to learn French, according to them, “does not depend simply on working hard, or wanting to learn French” (Gardner & Smythe, 1973: 224). In 1985, Gardner proposed his influential Socio-Educational Model, which linked language-learning motivation “to open and positive regard for other groups and for groups that speak the language...
and attitudes toward the language learning situation” (Tremblay & Gardner, 1995: 506). Ten years later, Gardner and Tremblay modified the model in response to challenges by other researchers (for example, Dörnyei, 1994), who called for more non-linguistic motivational factors. The revised model appears in Figure 1:

Figure 1
Motivational Model, Tremblay and Gardner (1995 p. 510)

Two variables, integrativeness and attitude, were hypothesized to affect motivation in the original Socio-Educational Model (Gardner, 1985). In the revised model above by Tremblay and Gardner, factors such as target language dominance, ability to adapt, self-efficacy (can-do attitude), valence (perceived value attached to activity), and goal salience (how specified a goal is) are affected by a learner’s attitude, which, in turn, affects motivational behavior. The revised Socio-Educational model displays a visual projection of how motivation is interpreted in this study.
Much research on motivation is discussed in terms of integrative and instrumental motivation. Integrative motivation usually refers to actions whose rewards are the actions themselves. Such reasons include learning foreign languages for the pleasure of learning about another culture, or just from the joy of learning. Instrumental motivation, on the other hand, refers to an impetus to perform an action for some other pragmatic end. An example of instrumental motivation in L2 learning would be to learn French to work in a job in which French is required. The integrative/instrumental dyad has come under criticism from Dörnyei (1994) as being a convention in L2 research that is too static. Another model of motivation was proposed by Deci and Ryan in 1985 (cited in Noels, Pelletier, Clément, and Vallerand, 2000) in which integrative and instrumental motivation were placed on a continuum. I refrain from discussing this model because it is beyond the conventions of this study. For this study I will only refer to the conventional integrative/instrumental dyad of motivation.

A number of studies show that American high school and young college students like foreign language study primarily because it is an avenue to greater cultural understanding of other peoples (Finn, 1998; Roberts, 1992). After this, the two most dominant reasons why young people value foreign/second language education are for business and travel. In general, North American Anglophones are integratively motivated to learn foreign/second languages because the working language for most of North America is English. For those who live in Montreal, however, there is an instrumental motivation to acquire French, as it is the working language of Quebec.

At least one study has found that integrative motivation among English-speaking students studying French is not indicative of higher oral L2 proficiency (Gardner & Smythe, 1981). Another study compared European, American, Middle Eastern, African and Asian students who were studying a Scandinavian language (Svanes, 1987). In this study, the author found that, “European and American students were more integratively motivated than [the other] students, who were more instrumentally motivated” (p. 341). The main motivations given by the European and North American students for studying the language were mostly based on cultural interests or heritage language interests. North American and European students, who come from countries and who speak languages that have international recognition, however, did not see this
education as an opportunity to improve their quality of living. Svanes's findings agree with those of other studies in which speakers of internationally recognized languages exhibited low instrumental desire to develop a second language (Pousada, 1996; Brod & Huber, 1997).

The individuals in this current study are studying French for both instrumental and integrative reasons. None of these students, it seems, was taking French to fulfill some type of school requirement, which means that taking French was their own choice. Several subjects mentioned wanting to learn French in order to obtain work in Montreal.

2.3 Willingness to Communicate

One factor that has stood in the way of motivated language students achieving high L2 oral proficiency is language anxiety. North American Anglophones are sometimes fearful of oral communication in foreign language classrooms. There exists a type of paradox between the type of education the students want and what they are actually willing to do. On one hand, university students of foreign languages want communicative practice, yet, on the other hand, are frustrated by oral L2 interaction. This phenomenon has been mentioned in previous studies (Walker, 1973, cited in Tse, 2000; Harlow & Muyskens 1994; Tse, 2000). “Students [did not wish] to engage in public speaking or talk to conversation partners yet at the same time, [wished] to focus on oral communication” (Tse p. 47). Similarly, Bacon and Finnemann (1990) remarked:

[N]o matter what strategies a student elects to employ when dealing with authentic input, the most important obstacle to a sense of comprehension or satisfaction is unwillingness to confront the input…When the instructor is a native speaker of the target language, the frustration appears to be even greater (p. 467).

Perhaps these students would learn more if they were deprived of the chance to use English altogether at least in the classroom. In a study of university students' perceptions of failure in foreign languages conducted by Tse (2000) one student taking an American Sign Language course said that, “we, as students, had no choice but to learn and use Sign Language while we were in class...This was unlike my Spanish classes where we were allowed to speak in English at any time” (Tse, 2000: 76). Whether the sign language students were less anxious than students of Spanish is a
moot question for two reasons. First, sign language courses do not have an oral component like Spanish. Second, because the sign language teacher was deaf the students had no choice but to overcome any anxiety they might have had; it was authentic and necessary communication. Bilingual environments like the Spanish class create an awkward inauthenticity. Students are meant to speak the TL, but everyone in the class (including the teacher) speaks the students’ L1.

Oral language anxiety does not affect all language students. However, how much a student seeks to interact in another language outside the classroom, sometimes with an interlocutor who can speak that student’s L1 very well, relates closely to the bilingual environment in Montreal. Many non-Francophone Montrealers are capable of communication in French, yet are not always willing to do so. Some of this unwillingness, I suspect, is motivated by political reasons, some of it is because English is easier, for others it is anxiety, or some combination of these reasons. MacIntyre et al. (1998) give a more refined breakdown of variables that can affect a learner’s willingness to communicate (see Figure 2, following page). The Willingness to Communicate Model identifies social-psychological and personal factors that can affect oral language interaction.

The Willingness to Communicate Model links L2 communication to attitude and motivation as well as individual learner factors such as self-confidence and non-learner factors such as social situation and intergroup climate. According to the model’s designers, the pyramid shape indicates “the immediacy of some factors and the relatively distal influence of others” (p. 546). This means then, that a language student’s behavioral intention is the most important factor in determining whether informal L2 interaction takes place. It is worth noting that these authors state that in addition to the variables listed in the model, the language of study can have “perhaps the most dramatic effect” on communication setting (p. 546). I would argue, moreover, that the learner’s L1 could also have a dramatic effect on the communication setting. This was the case in a study of Puerto Ricans, which I discuss next.
Figure 2
Heuristic Model of Variables Influencing Willingness to Communicate
(MacIntyre et al. 1998, p. 547)

1. L2 Use

2. Willingness to Communicate
   - 3. Desire to Communicate with a Specific Person
   - 4. State Communicative Self-Confidence

3. Interpersonal Motivation
4. Intergroup Motivation
5. Intergroup Motivation
6. Intergroup Motivation
7. L2 Self-Confidence

8. Intergroup Attitudes
9. Social Situation
10. Communicative Competence
11. Intergroup Climate
12. Personality

Note: Numbers indicate hierarchy of factors that influence L2 use.
Pousada (1996) conducted a study in Puerto Rico that illustrates how the learner's L1 can affect language learning. There, the linguistic situation is very similar to that of Montreal where bilingualism is a coerced issue between two international languages; however, the role English plays is not the same as in Montreal. In Puerto Rico, Spanish has been the language of the island’s people since after the Spanish colonization in the sixteenth century. Yet, in modern times, Puerto Rico has become a territory of the United States, which has imposed a pressure for English there. According to Pousada, many people have not enthusiastically adopted English.

“Because English is not indispensable in their domestic lives and because they already speak a language of world-wide prominence, Puerto Ricans are ambivalent about their L2, and most underestimate their [L2] proficiency” (Pousada, p. 510). Puerto Ricans are aware of the benefits that come with learning English, but many cannot use the L2 effectively. Puerto Ricans, much like Anglophones in Montreal, do not find their second language to be indispensable in their daily lives. Overall, the English-speaker who comes to Montreal does not have to learn a lot of French. English is not essential to living and working in Montreal, yet learning French is a helpful, if not necessary, language to speak in most fields, as will be discussed below.

The reason why the L1 has such impact in the case of the subjects of my study has to do with the role of English in Montreal, in Canada, and on a global level. Central to the current study is this last point, which I shall now discuss.

2.4 The Mixed Blessing of English

English has at times played an intrusive role in L2 classroom communicative activities as well as informal contact with native speakers in language exchange programs. However, no studies to my knowledge have specifically addressed the pervasive nature of English globally in the context of non-English studies abroad as a problem. Yet, the pervasive nature of English may be disadvantageous to Anglophone language students, who, as a language community, have already been identified as susceptible to assuming that “everyone” speaks English. This assumption has been noted by Tsuda (2000), who stated that, “even educated people take the use of English for granted and naively expect everyone in the world to speak English” (p. 37).
Generally, however, the more foreign language study one has, the less ethnocentric that person is liable to be (Gardner & Smythe 1979). This should mean, then, that advanced learners of language, and especially those who have been abroad, should be more sensitive to the assumption that everyone can speak English. Sometimes, however, the language learner abroad does not get around English.

A study by Wilkinson (1998) described American learners of French admitting guilt over speaking English during a study abroad program in France. Another study, conducted by Knight and Schmidt-Rinehart (2002), revealed that American students staying with Mexican host families still have access to English. Among several complaints made by these host families was the difficulty of students’ pervasive use of English. Both of these studies were conducted in the framework of homestays, where language use is typically more monitored than in apartments or dormitories. Rivers (1998) focused on comparing language gains of American students staying with Russian host families to those in dormitories. According to Rivers, some study abroad students actually made greater strides in language acquisition when put in dormitories, where students are presumably less constrained in language use than with families. That study, however, only differentiated students who stayed with host families as opposed to those who stayed in dormitories, not those who had access to English against those who did not.

The disruptive presence of English has also been noted in Canadian study abroad settings. Gardner and Smythe (1977) found that all 62 Anglophone students taking a five-week intensive French course in Montreal admitted to using English at school despite making a promise not to. A more recent study by Lapkin, Hart, and Swain (1995) of English-Canadian high schoolers in Quebec on interprovincial exchange stated that:

[T]he use of English was reported by many students as a problem. The intrusion of English media and attempts by others to talk with them in English often prevented the exchange experience from being one of total submersion. In some cases, the presence of other exchange students in the same school also posed a problem. (p. 71)
Sometimes the competence of TL community members in English is so great that it can deter the language learner’s acculturation into that community. In 2002, Lybeck examined the acculturation (and lack thereof) by American women who had recently moved to Norway. Interviews revealed that some of the women had difficulty to resist speaking in English with many Norwegians who were capable speakers of English. MacIntyre, Clément, Dőrnyei, and Noels (1998) predicted that when two individuals with different L1s tried communicating, it is the person with the higher L2 self-confidence who determines the language of communication. This was often the case for the women in Lybeck’s study. The Norwegians they socialized with often had significantly more English schooling than they had Norwegian language study.

Some authors, such as Phillipson and Skutnabb-Kangas (1996) and Tsuda (2000), have written about the widespread influence of English and how it is not good for our world as a whole. Tsuda (2000) wrote that, “The majority of the speakers of English are unaware of the problems caused by the hegemony of English; and even educated people take the use of English for granted” (p. 37). Foreign language students, of all people, should not be the types of English-speakers whom Tsuda is addressing. If anything, they are the Anglophones who are trying to go against this trend. As mentioned above, however, the English they find in their L2 environment may frustrate these learners.

2.5 Proximity

As previously stated, a number of earlier studies have argued that time spent abroad would increase L2 proficiency. One reason for this is the time a language learner spends in proximity to native speakers of the TL.

Overall, studies that have compared learners who spend time in foreign language communities point to the importance of such an environment. The closer the proximity, the greater the TL improvement tends to be. Regan (1996), in a study of Irish students who spent nine months in France, found that each of the students experienced oral proficiency gains. Among her conclusions was that the language student living in a foreign language environment will try to approximate the L2 of the native speakers.

Acculturation, that is, the rate at which a person closes the social distance between him- or herself and a foreign culture, has also been the subject of several
Outlets for English studies. In Lybeck's (2002) study of the efforts of American women living in Norway to develop a social closeness to Norwegians, their level of self-perceived acculturation was compared to their L2 pronunciation development, as it was posited that a learner living in an L2 environment will approximate characteristics of those who speak that language around them (Regan 1995).

My study also takes this interpretation as its starting point. I hope to show that the subjects of my study who demonstrate some type of behavioral closeness with the target language community will also demonstrate linguistic characteristics of that community's native speakers.

Proximity is not a guarantee of L2 acquisition but it does provide great opportunities for L2 acquisition if the learner is able to take advantage of interaction with NSs. The question becomes, then, whether and how students take advantage of this proximity. In order to answer this question I have developed an original model with which I hoped to measure the reaction of language learners in my study to studying in an environment that native speakers of English and speakers of the TL share.

2.6 Outlets to English Model

The *Outlets to English Model* describes four types of reactions an Anglophone may have for opportunities and desires to speak their L1 and L2 in the study abroad milieu. This model was developed due to the high amount of English found in the learning environment of this study; however, it may be used for other situations where students' L1 is widely used. This model is an original contribution and was created because no other models have been developed to suit the aims of this study. A description for each reaction type is given here:

**Reaction Type**

1. **L1 Identification.** Students realize where English is spoken or what members of community speak L1 (e.g., professor, local restaurant workers, other students).

2. **L1 Engagement.** Students engage, either willingly or otherwise (e.g. out of courtesy, by chance, or unwillingly), in speaking their L1.

3. **L1 Active Engagement.** Students actively seek out opportunities to speak L1.
4. L2 Avoidance. Students not only seek out English but also actively avoid second language speaking situations (e.g., planning to go out with English-speaking friends to escape dinnertime conversation with host family).

Language students abroad often have more than one language community with which they can interact, which is often either the TL community or other students from the L1 community. The four types of reactions in the Outlets to English Model are designed to represent a comprehensive range of how a language student decides to interact between these language communities.

2.7 Language Variants – ne Deletion vs. ne Maintenance

"Language variants" in this study refers to morphological, syntactical, lexical, and phonological variations of speech that do not change semantic meaning (Rehner & Mougeon, 1999). Both L1 and L2 speakers exhibit language variant use (Regan, 1995). Sometimes native speakers will favor a particular linguistic variant that is not widely taught to L2 learners. Studies in second language acquisition have recently been giving increased attention to L2 learners' production of these types of variants. Research in the acquisition of French language variants has been no exception. French interlanguage studies have looked at learner choices between, among others, tu vs. vous (informal and formal second person singular pronouns, respectively), on vs. nous (first person plural pronouns), and the omission of il/elle (il est là vs. Il est là, He is there) in French pronouns. One language variant in particular has received considerable attention, namely the deletion of ne in negative utterances. In L2 studies there is a small yet growing corpus of research on ne deletion in FR interlanguage (Dewaele, 1992; Dewaele & Regan, 2002; Dewaele & Sachdev, 2001; Regan, 1995, 1996; Rehner & Mougeon, 1999, 2003; Sax, 1999; Thomas, 2000; Trévise & Noyau 1984).

As a rule, ne is maintained in written French, yet ne is not always used in the spoken form. In L1 French speakers, Ashby (1981, 1988) reports that in both European and Canadian French ne is disappearing entirely from spoken French. In the French of Montreal, Ashby wrote, ne was almost non-existent in all NS samples (<2%). In oral French, such factors as formality of speech, sex, and age are strong predictors of ne deletion or maintenance in NS French (Rehner & Mougeon, 1999). Regan (1996)
described *ne* deletion as co-occurring with other variables in French such as the use of *tu* or *on* (p. 179). A study conducted by Rehner and Mougeon in 2003, however, revealed that French immersion students in Canada treated use of *on* (as opposed to *nous*) differently from *ne* deletion. As the authors state, both language variants are mildly marked, which means that neither conforms to standard French and are typical of informal register but may be used formally, and are not stigmatized. The students in their study exhibited greater use of *on* than *nous* (though still well below NS levels) but very little use of *ne* deletion. The authors explain this difference through examination of the teachers’ language. These French immersion teachers regularly used *on* in place of *nous* but also displayed a high maintenance of *ne* in negative utterances. This means that *ne* deletion, unlike use of *on*, may be learned primarily through informal NS contact. This possibility is consistent with the findings of other studies on *ne* deletion acquisition (Dewaele, 1992; Regan 1995, 1996; Rehner & Mougeon, 1999, 2003, Sandy 1997, cited in Rehner & Mougeon, 1999). As Regan (1995) suggested, students learn that *ne* deletion is acceptable through contact with native speakers outside the classroom.

Dewaele & Regan (2002) listed constructions of French negation that they did not use in their study. These constructions are omitted because they are either ungrammatical, such as the deletion of the postverbal forclusif “pas”, or have no other semantic alternative, as in the categorical uses of *ne*. I have followed suit, omitting these varieties, given here:

Table 1

*French negation constructions excluded from analysis* (Dewaele & Regan, 2002 p. 135):

The categorical uses of *ne*.

- *N’importe*  
- *N’est-ce pas*

The case where use is impossible

- *PAS du tout.*  
  - *J’irai avec mes amis mais PAS avec mon père.*

The case where the postverbal “forclusif” is omitted

- *Je NE connais ces hommes.*

And likewise, where the participle *ne* or postverbal *pas* is said twice in succession the structure was counted only as one instance.

- *Je ne n’ai pas de stylo.*  
- *Nous n’allons pas pas ce soir.*
Dewaele (1998) and Regan (1995) note that language students who see that *ne* deletion in formulaic phrases such as *c'est pas* and *je sais pas (sepas)* adopt them into their own speech, but as unanalyzed language chunks. These authors hypothesized that such formulaic constructions of *ne* deletion appear prior to other negative constructions in French interlanguage. Because the learners of my study possess varying French-learning histories, I have decided to condense this model into raw frequency of *ne* deletion while noting the distinction of formulaic constructions.

In summary, previous studies have employed use of language variants as a measurement of sociolinguistic competence of L2 learners. *Ne* deletion seems to be a variant that is typically not favored by French language teachers despite its high presence in NS speech; authentic interaction with NS and TL media are related to *ne* deletion acquisition, but length of TL study is not always a reliable predictor. *Ne* deletion is therefore a good variable to use to measure a French learner’s degree of interaction with French NSs.

3 Purpose of Study and Research Questions

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship between the acquisition of a L2 native speaker variant (*ne* deletion) and acculturation in relation to L1 outlets in the learning environment. I consider the environment in which this study takes place a relevant factor because it is one in which both the TL and the learners’ L1 are widely present.

I expected that those students who reported an active resistance to speaking their L1 and who actively pursued chances to maximize opportunities to speak the TL would also demonstrate use of the NS-preferred variant in the TL. I did not expect those students who reported an evasive reaction to TL interactional opportunities with active reaction to L1 interactional opportunities to demonstrate knowledge of NS-preferred variants in the TL.

The questions I seek to answer are the following:

1. Is there a significant correlation between a participant’s particular type of reaction to the learning environment and oral language proficiency?
2. Are the participants who show an outward willingness to engage in the French speaking community more likely to produce native speaker variant word choices than those who do not?

3. Are the participants who show an outward preference for their L1 community also less likely to demonstrate native speaker variant word choices?

4. How do other variables, such as goal salience, language attitude, and language use at school, relate to the other measures? Are these variables related to reaction types to the linguistic environment?

4 Methodology

4.1 Context

For my study I have chosen to focus on native speakers of English who have come to Quebec, Canada to study French. Quebec is officially the only uniquely French-speaking province of Canada. Most areas of Quebec outside of Montreal are almost exclusively French speaking. Montreal is a functionally bilingual French/English city, but French is the official and dominant language overall. In addition, a sizeable percentage of Montrealers speak a third, fourth, or fifth language due to large immigrant populations. In the province, French is the native language of approximately 80 percent of Quebec’s population. Anglophones are second at 15 percent, and speakers of various other languages (Allophones) comprise the remaining 5 percent of Quebec’s population. In areas of Quebec outside of Montreal, the French speaking presence is around 95 percent. Quebec City, for example, is approximately 98% francophone according to the Université Laval website (fl.ulaval.ca).

Students come from around the world to learn French in Quebec, although the majority of learners come from other parts of Canada on a government-sponsored bursary program through which Anglophone Canadian citizens can travel to French Canada (usually to the province of Quebec) and Francophone Canadians can travel to English Canada for several weeks of intensive (and free) language study.

The bilingual nature of the city of Montreal, while in some ways providing for a language learning situation that is arguably dissimilar to most other study abroad locales globally, dramatically raises the number of outlets to English when compared to other Quebec cities. Nevertheless, residents who possess limited English skills inhabit
a significant portion of Montreal. Students who wish to submerge themselves in the French language in Montreal would have little problem finding opportunity to do so. Conversely, however, these same students could find just as readily sections of Montreal where English is widely spoken in the streets, movie theatres, and stores.

4.2 Participants

I solicited participants for this study in two ways. The first was through on-line classified advertisements placed in local Montreal university websites. Interested persons were directed to a web site I created specifically for this study. At that website the potential candidates were asked to take an on-screen test to determine whether they fit the desired criteria for this study. The second way was direct solicitation at language schools throughout Montreal where I approached teachers, administrators, and students to ask if they would be willing and able to take part in the study. Three of the participants came from the direct solicitation method and 13 participants were responders to the on-line ads.

There were 16 students who participated in this study, 14 Anglophones and two Allophones. Nine participants came from English-speaking Canadian provinces, or had spent the majority of their childhood there. Five participants came from the United States. There were also two near-native English speakers, (the Allophones) included in this study attending an English university who had not grow up with English as a first language. The sex ratio was six male and ten female participants. The average age for the participants was 25.6 years.

The population used in this study was diverse overall, taking into consideration each student’s French-learning history. Seven participants were studying French at English universities. Four were taking classes at private language schools. Two were participants in the Canadian bursary exchange program, which meant studying at a French university. One student was learning French in a program designed for refugees (though not a refugee herself), and another in a program for immigrants. One participant was not taking French courses, but had just finished a degree in French and decided to move to Montreal to learn French informally while going to school in English. One of the students had been studying French in Chicoutimi, a small town north of Quebec City. Half of the students had studied French for five years or more.
previous to the classes they were taking at the time I interviewed them. The average
time spent studying French for all 16 participants was 4.9 years.

Seven of the participants (44%) are listed as residents because they have been
living in Montreal for at least one year. This group is largely comprised of students at
English universities in Montreal. Nine subjects had come to Montreal for a short stay,
that is six months or less. Most of these participants had come specifically for
language study but some had not specified this as their primary goal. There were no
subjects who had stayed in Quebec longer than six months but less than a year. A
breakdown of the chief characteristics of all the participants is given in Table 2.

4.3 Model

The instruments created for this study were based on an adaptation of
Schumann's acculturation model from a study conducted by Lybeck (2002), discussed
above, in which Lybeck studied the linguistic acculturation of American women who
had moved to Norway. Lybeck measured L2 pronunciation and compared it to a
participant's own opinion of self-involvement with the Norwegian culture. My
application is similar. I use Lybeck's model to measure the participants' language
variant choices compared to levels of self-evaluated types of reactions to English
outlets, attitudes about language, goal saliency, and language use with other students.
In contrast to Lybeck, who tried measuring involvement with the target culture, this
study focuses on a student's involvement with spending time speaking English.

4.4 Instruments

There were two methods for data collection I used in this study: a questionnaire
and informal interviews. To assess students' self-evaluated relationship to their daily
opportunities and desires to speak their L1 or L2, I designed a questionnaire (see
Appendix A). The questionnaire was developed to include questions about the
students' background such as country of origin and languages learned (Appendix A,
Sections A, B, C). These questions were answerable by fill-in format. The next
section, (Appendix A, Section D) comprised questions that were to be subjected to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learner Characteristics</th>
<th>Residents (N=7)</th>
<th>Sojourners* (N=9)</th>
<th>Total (N=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Languages Spoken at Home</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian Language</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country of Origin</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous Study Abroad Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French-speaking Country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Country</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previous French Study</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-2 months</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-4 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;11 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sojourners are those students who had been staying in Montreal for less than six months. Residents had been in Montreal between 1-5 years. There were no participants who had been in Montreal between six months and one year.*
statistical analysis. These questions could be answered on a scale of one to five (one = really agree; five = really disagree with statement). There was also a space after each question for comments. The questions were adapted from the Attitude and Motivation Test Battery developed by Gardner (1985). I chose questions to address seven categories, as follows.

**Goal** This category consists of two positively worded and one negatively worded items. A high score reflects a high goal orientation.¹ These items asked if coming to Quebec was directly linked to French study, or if there was some other reason for coming to Quebec.

**Language Attitudes** This category consists of one positively worded and two negatively worded items. The items dealt with issues of the subjects’ attitude toward the importance of English and attitudes toward the French Canadian language. A high score reflects a positive attitude toward language diversity.

**Language Use with International Students** This category consists of two items that asked subjects to rate the amount of English and French they used with other international students at their schools. A high score reflects positive use of TL use.

The following variables were created in conjunction with the *Outlets to English Model* that I created for this study.

**Type 1 Reaction: L1 Identification** This category consists of four positively worded items, which refer to the learner’s knowledge of where English is spoken in the community. A low score indicates a subject’s inclination to this type of reaction.

**Type 2 Reaction: L1 Engagement** This measure is composed of three positively worded items, which refer to the learner’s using English minimally and any efforts they have done to speak actively seek and talk in the TL. A low score reflects a subject’s inclination to this type of reaction.

**Type 3 Reaction: L1 Active Engagement** This category consists of four positively worded items that refer to the learner actively seeking opportunities to interact in

---

¹ Note 1. High scores on *Other Variables* were re-adjusted in statistical analysis in Tables 6, 7, and 8 to clearly show consistent positive and negative relationships among variables. This is to say, the negative correlations between high scores for *Other Variables* (positive traits) when correlated with low scores for Reaction Types (indicating high identification) were changed to positive (and vice versa) to keep consistent with correlation reports within Reaction Types.
4.5 Procedure

I decided to conduct the study at two centrally located cafés in Montreal. I chose cafés to emphasize the informality of the study in an effort to increase the likelihood of casual, spontaneous speech in the interview portion of the study.

The study was separated into two parts, each taking about 15 minutes to complete. In the first part, all conducted in English, I greeted the subjects and explained a brief overview of the study. Next, I orally asked the participants several questions about their education and where they had lived in Montreal (English-dominant areas, French-dominant areas, or bilingual areas). Next, the subjects were asked to complete the questionnaire and to get a coffee if they wished.

Afterward the participants were asked to join one of three interviewers in a different area of the café for the language sample portion of the study. Only one interviewer was used per day, as determined by their availability. The interviewers were selected for their past experience in conducting similar interviews in other studies. Two of the interviewers were native speakers of French, one native European, and one Quebecois. The third interviewer was an Anglophone near-native French speaker who had lived in Quebec for several years and who had highly developed sensitivity for the Quebecois manner of speech. The interviewers were all university-educated, bilingual, and in their mid-twenties. I trained each of the interviewers before beginning the study. What was stressed most, however, was that a casual atmosphere be maintained and that, aside from the scripted questions (see Appendix B for complete list), the main goal of
the interviewer was to ask questions that solicited more than one word responses. “Describe for me the types of things you do after class is over” is one sample question.

Although each interviewer in the current study was a fluent speaker of English, the subjects were not informed of this, nor was any English spoken between the interviewers in the presence of the subjects. This was done for two reasons: to test the participants’ willingness to persist in French, thereby maximizing the amount of French they would produce, and secondly, to test the subjects’ assumption as to whether or not the interviewer could speak or understand English. While none of the interviewers pretended not to understand English each persisted as much as possible to conduct the interviews in the target language.

Conversations were audio-taped and I, an advanced speaker of Quebecois French, transcribed them at home. Three transcriptions were selected at random and were evaluated by one of the Francophone interviewers to ensure transcription accuracy. The interviewer listened to the original tapes while reviewing my transcription, noting any disagreement in writing. By this method, a high level of agreement was reached.

Conversations were then rated for level of proficiency using a scale of communication fluency (see Appendix C).

All ethical procedures were maintained throughout the proceedings of this study. See Appendix D for the consent form that was completed by each subject prior to participation, and see Appendix F for a copy of the approved ethical review form.

Subjects were given a small monetary compensation for their participation and interviewers received a stipend for their work as well. All participants were given pseudonyms for this study to protect their identities.

5 Data Analysis

The transcriptions were analyzed to isolate frequency of the variable, *ne* deletion and non-*ne* deletion (see Table 3). Frequency of *ne* deletion constructions that are formulaic appear in parentheses. The means of each subject’s answers to the questions of the four reaction types were calculated. Using the SPSS program for statistics, these means were then correlated with the *ne* deletion/maintenance frequencies. These correlations are presented in Table 4.
Table 3

Frequency of *ne* Deletion by Subject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Frequency of <em>ne</em> deletion*</th>
<th>Frequency of <em>ne</em> maintenance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>24 (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>5 (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>23 (11)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>75 (19)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Number of *ne* deletion constructions that were formulaic given in parentheses.

**Data for Karl was lost due to recorder malfunction.
Table 4

**Correlations of Reaction Types vs. Frequency of Native Speaker Variant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of NS variant*</th>
<th>TYPE 1</th>
<th>TYPE 2</th>
<th>TYPE 3</th>
<th>TYPE 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>L1 High</td>
<td>L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of <em>ne</em> deletion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of <em>ne</em> maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N=15

Transcriptions were examined against a scale (see Appendix C for transcription evaluation guidelines) to sort three groups: low oral proficiency, intermediate proficiency, and high proficiency (see Table 5). It was evident during transcription that there was a clear discrepancy among the participants in their abilities to perform during the conversation segment. The scale reflects this, as it was constructed around fluidity of communication. On the whole, individuals of the group tended to show either no signs of misunderstanding, numerous points of misunderstanding, or heavy reliance on their L1 because of lack of L2 skill.

Reaction types were correlated with one another as well as the other variables (goal salience, attitude, and language use at school, and conversation performance ratings, see Table 6). Analysis produced three significant correlations. There was a significant positive correlation between Type three and Type four reactions (.76, p < .01). There was a significant positive correlation between Goal and reaction Type two (.64, p < .05). Between Language Use and Type four there was a significant negative correlation (-.58, p < .05)
Table 5

*Transcription Ratings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Oral Proficiency Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tammy</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julius</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandar</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominica</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paula</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correlations between reaction types with the other variables were negative except for reaction Type two on Goal (.64), Language Use (.50), and Oral Rating (.21). Type two correlated negatively with Attitude (-.08), but this was lower than that of the other reaction types (Type one -.32; Type three -.30; Type four -.38).

The qualitative analysis involved information that the subjects gave in the interview about their language learning experience. Although the conversation topics tended to vary overall, many subjects took the opportunity to reveal information about their French learning experience in Quebec. Sample excerpts are given in Appendix E and arranged by three topics: (1) Social uses of French/language use among friends; (2) Reasons for learning French; and (3) Other variables explaining why French proficiency has been hampered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction Types</th>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 1: L1 Identification</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2: L1 Engagement (N=16)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 3: L1 High Engagement (N=16)</strong></td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 4: L2 Avoidance (N=16)</strong></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal (N=16)</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.64*</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude (N=16)</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use (N=15)</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Rating (N=15)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < .01 level  
* p < .05 level
6 Results

6.1 The Case of ne Deletion

Table 3 shows that participants as a group omitted ne in 37 percent of all negative statements. Ne maintenance accounted for 63 percent. The overall rate of ne deletion is higher than that found by Rehner and Mougeon (1999, 2002) in Canadian French immersion students (27% and 28% respectively) but lower than that found by Regan (1996) for second language learners (50%) and much lower than that of native Francophone studies in Canada (Ashby 1981, 1988).

Of the 75 ne deletion types, 19 (25%) were of the formulaic construction as in c'est pas, or se pas. These frequencies are listed in parentheses under the column “Frequency of ne deletion”. These results agree with the prediction made by Regan (1995) that formulaic constructions of ne deletion have a higher potential for use among pre-advanced French speakers. For two learners (David, Julius) formulaic ne deletion accounted for all ne deletion constructions but a minority of overall negative constructions (22%).

Two subjects also displayed negative constructions that omitted the postverbal forclusif (e.g. pas, jamais) but not the ne particle. As mentioned in the literature review, this construction has been omitted from analysis.

There is a considerable amount of variation among which learners exhibited ne deletion. Among 15 subjects, two, Angela and Paula, accounted for 63 percent of all examples of ne deletion. An explanation for this is that the participants have little uniformity of experience as a group. It is for this reason that this data cannot be understood without comparisons to other variables.

6.2 Reaction Types vs. Frequency of ne Deletion

When the frequency of ne deletion was compared to each of the four reaction types (shown in Table 4) we see that there is no significant correlation. Despite the lack of significant correlation, the trend in the data appears contrary to expectation. Type two, for which a low score represents an active pursuit of interaction in French, is positively correlated with production of ne deletion, whose frequencies are given a high value. However, the other three reaction types all show a negative correlation.
Examination of correlation between reaction types and maintenance of *ne*, although also not significant, show a trend that goes against expectation as well. Reactions one (identification) and two (pursuit of TL) are negatively correlated with *ne* maintenance, but reactions three (pursuit of L1) and four (avoidance of TL) are not.

**6.3 Interview Ratings**

Transcription ratings produced the following results: five high proficiency ratings, six intermediate, and four low ratings. These ratings were compared with the other variables in Table 6.

**6.4 Correlations with Other Variables**

Reaction types were correlated with each other as well as other variables measured by the questionnaire: attitude toward English and Canadian French, Goal, and Language Use among classmates studying French. Results indicated that there is a high correlation between Type three and Type four reactions (.756). This means that those participants who actively sought interactions in English also avoided interactions in French.

There is also a negative correlation between Type four reactions (TL avoidance) and language use.

The only other correlation in this table is that of Type two reaction (those who actively seek TL interaction) with Goal salience (.640). This indicates that those who have come to Quebec specifically for French studies have also actively sought TL interaction.

Despite Type two having a significant correlation with one other variable, Goal, one other variable, Language Use with a significance of .059 is close. Comparison with the other reaction types’ correlations with Goal, Attitude, Language Use, and Oral Rating show a solid pattern linking Type two more strongly to these variables than the other reaction types.

**6.5 Sojourners Vs. Residents**

Means were calculated for questions presented in the questionnaire of reaction type and the other variables for each participant (minus Karl), shown in Table 7. A t-test was carried out to compare the means of the sojourning group and the residents. Analysis shows that there is a difference between the two groups on type two (-3.05),
goal (3.37), and language use with other language students (3.14). These results indicate that the sojourners identified more with reaction two than residents, were more goal-oriented in their French studies, and tended to use French more at school.

Table 7
Variable Means for Sojourners and Residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language Use</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sojourners</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
*T-test for Equality of Means of Sojourners vs. Residents*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Use</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6 Qualitative Data

*Analysis of four learners*

I have chosen here to elaborate on the qualitative data of four particular subjects. I translated their conversations from French to English, adding important context in brackets where it is necessary to fully understand what they said. The first three of these participants all scored highest in the Type two category, L1 Engagement, which I expected to predict acquisition of *ne* deletion. These subjects are not the only ones to have scored highest in Type two, but I have decided to discuss their relative failure and successes in acquiring characteristics of *Québécois* French. The final subject discussed did not score high on Type two. In fact, it received her lowest score. Yet, she is the individual with the highest display of NS-like speech. I discuss why the score she has given is not an accurate reflection of her real behavior because of comments she made on the questionnaire.

**David (Type two)**

David is a 27 year-old sojourner from Alberta. He arrived in Quebec six months prior to the study. This was his first experience living in a foreign language community. He decided to come to Quebec in part to study French at the local English universities in Montreal. He did not mention why he chose English universities over
French universities. He wants to come into contact with French speakers but lives in an English part of Montreal.

And maybe it’s the cause of my living situation because now I live in Westmount [a highly Anglophone neighborhood]...And two of my friends who come from here who are English unfortunately do not have many French-speaking friends or many Quebeois friends.

The friends that David has speak English as a first language, yet he laments his lack of engagement with the French community in Montreal.

I’ve met a lot of friends in Montreal. I made a lot of new friends, but the problem is the majority are maybe those who speak English first...It’s ok, but I’m missing something and that is the half of the culture with the Quebeckers.

Although he does not specify why it is that he does not have more French-speaking friends, he hints that the problem may be because he is too nervous to make mistakes when talking with them. He says: “I have a great fear of speaking in French when I’ve visited... the bars in Montreal or the Quebeois bars because I want to talk but I have a little fear of making great errors.”

David enjoys studying languages (he has studied six), and his French is very good (high rating). David’s French is, however, characterized by overgeneralizations typical of French language students with little contact with NSs of French. His token *ne* deletion of 15 total negative utterances was a formulaic *sepas*. David also produces one other NS language variant, the use of *on* instead of *nous* a high percent (9/9 utterances). Apart from language variants, David also revealed some knowledge of colloquial lexeme; he produced a swear word used mainly in Quebec, *tabernacle*.

Overall, despite David identifying most with reaction two, his knowledge and use of native speaker characteristics is low, despite high proficiency in oral French.

Luke (Type two)

Luke is a 19 year-old resident who was raised periodically in English Canada and in English Hong Kong. He has been in Montreal for more than two years. Luke took high school French, but two months prior to the study decided to take an intensive French course offered at a local language school. In this program, Luke spends 250 hours in the classroom, the highest total for any subject. Like David, Luke has only
been living in English-dominant areas of Montreal. Luke has a comparable French learning history to David, but is rated as an intermediate speaker.

Luke speaks about his efforts to engage native speakers of French in his summer trips to Montreal and Quebec City.

During the summer we go to Montreal. We went to Quebec City... to practice French, our French. Normally because... most of my friends are Anglophones. We don’t speak French with each other when we’re together. But, in action, in the street, in the cafés we try to speak with the people who we meet in French.

Luke mentions several reasons why he wants to learn French. First, learning French is instrumentally linked with finding a job and his desire to remain in Montreal.

I hope with French, when I learn a lot of the language, I can find a job... And too, I live in Montreal, and I think that I can live here for the rest of my life. I must, because I love the city. I love the atmosphere and I want to speak. I must speak in French.

Luke also lists that it is his duty as a Canadian to learn French. This statement reflects another comment where he says that he likes languages, and that most people in this world speak more than one language.

I also want to learn French because I am Canadian. I think that each Canadian must speak a little bit of French at least... Normally most people of the world speak much more than one language. So now... I would like to learn the other languages... French, it's the first language. After French, I would love to learn Spanish and maybe Cantonese. It's in the future.

Luke was gregarious and energetic during his interview. Yet, in spite of his attitude towards and motivation for learning French, Luke, like David, exhibits speech that is characteristic of formal, classroom-learned French. Luke identified closest to reaction two. He does not, however, display sociolinguistic knowledge of French in his transcription despite his efforts to practice with native speakers.

Pam (Type two)

Pam is a 22 year-old Canadian who has been a resident of Montreal for the past three years. Her experience living in Montreal is her first living in a foreign language
environment. Like David and Luke, Pam most strongly identifies with reaction type two. Unlike David and Luke, however, Pam has lived in French Montreal since her arrival there. Also unlike David and Luke, Pam has several francophone friends with whom she occasionally speaks in French. “I have some friends who are Francophone. And they have the same knowledge of English as I have of French.”

Pam says that she is confident in her French-speaking ability for her everyday needs.

In the city when I’m going to buy something or when I’m going to the bank... I know how to speak. But sometimes people respond in English. I know how to speak French. [I respond back in French].

Pam, who was rated as having intermediate oral French ability, is also fluent in Estonian, her other L1. Because of this language spoken at home, Pam has a positive attitude toward learning other languages, which is also reflected in the answers she gave concerning language attitudes in the questionnaire (avg. 4.3/5).

I think that it’s a good idea to learn other languages. I speak Estonian with my mother. And I think that it’s a good idea to learn other languages.

Among her reasons for learning French, Pam says that it is for working in Montreal.

[It is important to learn French] because I think you live in Montreal. It’s really a good thing to know. Because, if you look for some work, there is much more opportunity with speaking French.

Pam has gone through more schooling overall than either David or Luke (who have both studied French four years in high school) because she had gone through French immersion as a child in addition to four years of high school French. She displays strong knowledge of colloquial French speech and strongly favors ne deletion over ne maintenance (83% vs. 17%).

Angela (non-Type two)

Angela is an example of a case where numerical analysis of questionnaire data alone is misleading. In her questionnaire, Angel gave a lot of comments that qualify her answers. For example, for question 19 “Outside of class people have begun conversations in French with me but I have ‘switched’ the conversation to English” she agreed (2). However her comments indicated that, “Sometimes I have an off French
day and my brain only functions in English”. This comment resounded with those of other participants.

Angela is a 21 year-old from Iowa and a newcomer to Montreal. Although coming to Montreal was not directly linked with French acquisition in mind, for her it was “a perk”. Angela is also the only participant to not have been schooled in Quebec at the point of the study. Instead, she had completed an undergraduate degree in French in the United States just two months earlier. Nevertheless, Angela was inspired to move to Quebec in part to improve her French. She had spent the previous summer abroad studying French in France with a program through her university.

Angela’s interaction in French had been mainly through her Francophone landlady, with whom she spent some time “each day”. However, she says, “most of the students I hang out with don’t speak any French.”

Angela was rated as possessing high oral French ability and her speech was characterized by the highest frequency of *ne* deletion (24/25) as well as a preference for *on* (100%). In addition, her use of *ne* deletion contained only one token formulaic construction.

Angela’s identification with reaction type two was the lowest of all four reaction types. But inspection of Angela’s comments in the questionnaire reveal that to look at the numerical answers alone is misleading, that is, she is the type who tries to engage the French-speaking community up until the point where she is tired. This is an understandable limit. Her example indicates how numerical evaluation of the questionnaire alone is a limited measure.
7 Discussion

1. Is there a significant correlation between a participant’s agreement to a particular type of reaction to the learning environment and oral language proficiency?

2. Are the participants who show an outward willingness to engage in the French speaking community (reaction two) more likely to produce native speaker variant word choices than those of the other three categories?

3. Are the participants who show an outward preference for their L1 community (reactions three and four) also less likely to demonstrate native speaker variant word choices?

To answer the first three research questions, no significant correlation between any of the four reactions to the learning environment and the production of *ne* deletion was established. This unexpected result may have been caused by numerous factors, including a small sample size, not being able to compare learners over the course of time, and by questionnaire analysis not capturing the students’ answers that were qualified.

4. How do the other variables, goal salience, language attitude, and language use at school, relate to the other measures? Are these variables related to reaction types to the linguistic environment?

In response to the fourth question, whether there was a correlation between attitude, goal, and language use with other language students and the four reaction types there is a trend in the statistical data to suggest that those students who actively seek L2 interaction (Type two) are also those who are focused on French language study, and to a lesser extent, exhibit language attitudes that favor linguistic diversity, and are more likely to speak French with other French language students. This trend is most apparent in Table 6, where Type 2 is consistently more strongly correlated to the variables of Goal, Attitude, Language Use, and Oral Proficiency.

The three subjects who had by far the highest frequency of *ne* deletion (Angela, Paula, and Francis) were also the only three to have lived in a French-speaking country previous to the study. Angela participated in a three-month study abroad trip in France, Paula worked for six months in France, and Francis studied French for three months in Switzerland. This finding may raise questions about the benefits of studying French in
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Europe versus Quebec, but given the small number of participants it is difficult to say.

It may be that because Quebec is a veritable French island in a continent of
Anglophones, Quebec provides a milieu more accommodating for Anglophone students
of French than European countries like Belgium, for example.

Levels of *ne* deletion as a group were similar to that of other groups tested for this
variable. Although not included, there was a correlation between years of French
schooling and production of *on* versus *nous*. Every subject with at least ten years of
French study showed at least 70 percent preference for *on* over *nous*, but did not always
exhibit *ne* deletion. This result agrees with studies conducted by Rehner and Mougeon
(1999, 2002), who witnessed a preference for *on* but not *ne* deletion in French
immersion students. Those authors concluded that length of education seems to predict
*on* preference, but not *ne* deletion due to its stigmatization in French classrooms.

One individual, Pam, despite having been educated in a Canadian French
immersion program, did not follow this trend. She favored *ne* deletion and produced
one token *nous*. She had also been living in highly Francophone areas of Montreal for
two years and had made Francophone friends.

In general those who have set out to study French even for short durations of time
(sojourners) are more likely to have higher goals, which is not surprising due to the fact
that more of the sojourners have come to Quebec with learning French specifically in
mind. Sojourners also use French more among other students of French. This finding
is more curious. The explanation for this may be that the sojourners are more
motivated to learn French due to their shorter time frame, and may wish to maximize
learning potential at school. Lastly, sojourners are more likely to exhibit Type two
reactions. This discovery means that those who come to Quebec for short stays and
with the direct purpose of learning French are also more likely to speak French with
classmates and native speakers. I cannot say, however, whether this also leads to
greater linguistic proficiency.

There is a question of how this study may relate to speakers of different L1s,
viz., languages other than English. Since there were only two Allophones who were
incorporated in this study (Bandar and Steve) I will refrain from placing too much
confidence in how differences between them and the others might have been a result of
having different L1s. Nevertheless, what is different about their language samples when compared to the Anglophones is that neither participant relied on English to communicate. Notably Bandar, who was clearly the least advanced speaker of French of all the participants, did not use English once. He suffered through an arduously slow and difficult conversation with the interviewer totally in French without resorting to English. This is unlike even intermediate English speakers (e.g., Dominica, Tammy²), who would casually turn to English to bridge gaps in communication with the interviewer.

Although I have labeled the participants of this study as “study abroad students”, it may strike the reader as odd that a majority of them are from the same country in which the study has been conducted. As I mentioned in the introduction, this definition is consistent with that of others (Freed, 1995) because, in a looser sense of the definition, a person who studies abroad can be one who travels to another region of his or her country in which the majority language is not his or her own. By this interpretation, Swiss students from Geneva are considered “study abroad” students while taking German classes in Zurich. In a more traditional sense of “abroad”, however, they would likely be considered to be “on exchange”.

In summary, the data present a trend that is in agreement with other studies of its kind; there is a trend that ne deletion is linked to interactions in French. Students who had not spent time in a francophone area of Montreal or elsewhere exhibited no ne deletion. Students who were most likely to exhibit characteristics of NS French had studied French more than ten years, spent time previously in another Francophone country, or lived in Francophone parts of Montreal.

Based on the conclusions of this study, suggestions for future Anglophone French language students who come to Quebec and wish to develop native-like speech would be to develop a strong foundation of French beforehand if possible and then to live in a Francophone area. Great strides in oral French are possible, given the high level of oral French exhibited by subjects of this study who had little previous language study.

Note 2. Tammy's oral language rating would have been intermediate, but had used too much English, thus diminishing her rating to low.
Acquisition of NS characteristics, as suggested by previous studies as well, takes place only in advanced speakers of a L2 who have had at least minimal experience living in a Francophone environment.

8 Limitations and Implications for Future Research

One key limitation to this study is the sample size. For the figures to be statistically significant there would have had to have been twice as many individuals. The wide variation in learners’ previous French learning history also made comparison difficult with so few participants.

This study set out to measure the linguistic advancements of French students’ oral proficiency through acquisition of a specific native characteristic trait compared to self-reported attitudes and social activity as relating to language. The result was null, however the results would have been different if I had chosen to use another linguistic device as a tool of measurement. For instance, there seemed to be a number of participants (notably Julius) who were very fluent in French and displayed high vocabulary knowledge, but scored low on the acquisition of ne deletion. However, I chose this particular native speaker characteristic because I wanted to know how much of their French they were learning from native speakers, not just other students or media or teachers.

I had originally desired to monitor the subjects’ attitudinal progression, but as time constraints did not allow this, I can only speculate that the measurements were good indications of the subjects’ attitudes for the whole learning duration. I had also desired to administer a second test one month after the original testing period but I had to cancel this step also due to time restrictions.

Comments that the participants gave to qualify answers given in the questionnaire, although important to the study as a whole, had no statistical effect in terms of calculating the questionnaire scores, thus lowering the effectiveness of statistical analyses. Perhaps better-worded questions would have eliminated the need for comments, improving the accuracy of the statistics. However, the comments were very useful in illuminating numerical responses.

A longer and more comprehensive questionnaire and interview would have given more thorough data for each of the measured variables. While I attempted to get the
most data from the participants I did not want the time spent on each participant to go too long during the test administration. I worried that not enough participants would want to sacrifice longer than a half an hour to do the study. This was a crucial issue especially for sojourning students, some of whom had just days left before leaving Montreal.

Future research should be longitudinal, tracking both the students' shifts in attitudes as well as their linguistic progression. This study reveals a snapshot of the learners' attitudes, achievements, and linguistic ability, which must be evaluated over the course of at least one month. The Outlets to English Model should not be discarded, but needs to be tested against a larger body of subjects to fully test its importance to the field of second language education and research.
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Appendix A

Questionnaire for Anglophone Study Abroad Students

A. Origin

Please write in your country of origin (and state or province) and time you have lived there. If applicable, state what other countries you have lived in and time of residence.

________________________________________

________________________________________

B. Languages

What languages have you studied and for how long? ____________________

________________________________________

Are there other languages you grew up with or that are spoken in your home? Yes No

If so, what are they? ____________________

Have you ever lived in a foreign language environment before? Yes No

If yes, where did you go? ____________________

With whom or what group? ____________________

For how long? ____________________

What did you study? ____________________

C. Personal Information

Are you (circle one): Female Male

Age (in years) ____________________
D. Québec Study Abroad

Directions
Please read the following statements and decide if the statement really applies to you or really does not apply to you. Circle the number that corresponds to your answer. A line is provided at the right for any comment you may wish to make.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY</th>
<th>1=strongly agree; 2=agree; 3=neutral; 4=disagree; 5=strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. I willingly chose to come to Québec to study French.
   <Agree   Disagree>
   1 2 3 4 5
   Comments:

2. Learning French was MY main reason for coming to Quebec.
   <Agree   Disagree>
   1 2 3 4 5
   Comments:

3. I was influenced to participate my current program because I have a friend also doing it.
   <Agree   Disagree>
   1 2 3 4 5
   Comments:

4. I have not really minded seeking things to do that keep me outside of direct contact with French-speakers. Example: Preferring to go shopping with English-speakers instead of spending time at home with host family.
   <Agree   Disagree>
   1 2 3 4 5
   Comments:

5. I have met people here in Québec who cannot speak English enough to converse.
   <Agree   Disagree>
   1 2 3 4 5
   Comments:
6. I have welcomed the opportunity to speak English with either local French-speaking people or other international students.

   <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

   Comments:

7. In general, I feel like everyone can speak at least some English.

   <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

   Comments:

8. There have been times when French-speakers of the community have “switched” to English for me but I have made attempts at “switching” back to French.

   <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

   Comments:

9. I know who at my school can speak English.

   <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

   Comments:

10. I have often made long calls to home so I can have a “good” conversation in English.

    <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

    Comments:

11. I like the way Québécois French sounds.

    <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

    Comments:

12. I know in general what areas are regarded as English-prevalent and which areas are French-dominant in Montreal.

    <Agree  1  2  3  4  Disagree>

    Comments:
13. Since I began my French studies, other English-speaking students (e.g., Americans, English-Canadians) begin conversations with me in English and I respond in English, but only to be polite. I’m here to speak French!

<Agree Disagree>

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

14. When everyone else is speaking in French I speak in English because I know everyone will understand what I mean.

<Agree Disagree>

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

15. There have been times when I feel I just need to be with people who speak English.

<Agree Disagree>

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

16. I have met some international students who do not feel proficient enough yet in French so we communicate in English outside of class. I have been interested in getting to know them, but I cannot help but feel we should be talking more in French.

<Agree Disagree>

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

17. Everyone should speak English.

<Agree Disagree>

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

18. There have been times when I won’t speak French (e.g., at a store, bank, etc. someone begins conversation in French, but I respond in English).

<Agree Disagree>

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:
19. Outside of class people have begun conversations in French with me but I have “switched” the conversation to English.

<Agree 1 2 3 Disagree> 4 5

Comments:

20. Interaction with my host family or other French-speakers has been kept short.

<Agree> 1 2 3 Disagree> 4 5

Comments:

21. Some French-speaking people of the community (e.g., in a restaurant or shop) have “switched” to speaking English with me in mid-conversation.

<Agree 1 2 3 Disagree> 4 5

Comments:

22. When I am with other international students I speak in English.

<Always 1 Sometimes 2 Never> 3 4 5

Comments:

23. When I am with other international students I speak in French.

<Always 1 Sometimes 2 Never> 3 4 5

Comments:

Because this study ideally would track a student from the time he or she began to study French up until his or her program was over, would you be willing/able to repeat this study as a follow-up towards the end of your studies?

___ Yes
___ No
___ N/A (already at end of studies)
Appendix B

French Interview

Guidelines

- Keep to about 15 minutes per person
- No error correction
- CASUAL
- Spontaneous discussion
- Coherent
- If participant is talkative, let him or her talk. It is more important that they give relaxed speech than to answer all the questions
- You may have to reformulate questions if s/he doesn’t understand the first time
- Try to keep conversation all in French
- Try to keep questions open, i.e., avoid yes/no type of questions

Suggested questions-

What did you (will you do) this summer?
What types of things do you do with your friends?
Have you made friends here?
What do you like about Montreal?
What don’t you like about Montreal (or city life)?
What do you like about French? Don’t you like?
What kinds of things do you do with your family (host family, or real family)?
Appendix C

Transcription Rating Scale

Low: frequent miscommunication. Much reliance on L1. Several instances of participant saying they do not understand. Participant is usually not able to respond in more than a sentence. Interviewer repeats or rephrases many questions.

Intermediate: few instances of miscommunication. Little reliance on L1. Participant is capable of extended speech. Speech is marked by false starts. Communication is not always fluid.

High: Zero or one instance of miscommunication. No to little reliance on L1. Participant is able to fluidly elaborate on points.
Appendix D
INFORMED CONSENT FORM TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Title: Effects of Outlets to English in Anglophone Study Abroad Students
Researcher: Nathaniel Takeshi Ward

This project is designed to examine the language use of students who are studying French as a second language on a "study abroad" program. Participants will be given a questionnaire about their use of French and English; this questionnaire should take about 20 minutes to complete. Participants will also be asked to elaborate on their answers orally in a brief interview session after completion of the questionnaire; this portion will be tape-recorded. Subsequently, each participant will be asked to give a target language sample, that is, demonstrate oral proficiency in French; this portion, too, will be tape-recorded.

To protect participant confidentiality, all participants will be assigned alphanumeric codes (e.g. A3) that correspond to their data. The code key will be stored in a separate file, to which only the researcher and his supervisor have access. Pseudonyms will be used in the final paper; no personally identifying information will be included.

The final research paper will be available at the McGill University Library M.A. thesis collection. It is also possible that an article based on this research will be submitted for publication to an appropriate professional journal.

CONTACT INFORMATION
Researcher: Nathaniel Ward, 2787 Rouen, Montreal QC H2K 1N4
takeshiward@hotmail.com (514) 521-2969
Supervisor: Dr. Lise Winer, Associate Professor, Dept. of Integrated Studies in Education, McGill University, 3700 McTavish, Montreal, QC H3A 1Y2
lise.winer@mcgill.ca (514) 398-5946

STATEMENT OF INFORMED CONSENT:
I understand the purpose of this study and know about the risks, benefits and inconveniences that this research project entails.

I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time from the study without any penalty or prejudice.

I understand how confidentiality will be maintained during this research project.

I understand the anticipated uses of data, especially with respect to publication, and dissemination of results.

I have carefully studied the above and understand my participation in this agreement. I freely consent and voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

Name (please print) ____________________________________________________________

Signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________
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Sample Excerpts from Interviews

Note: Transcript originally in French. Words originally in English are italicized. Translation provided by author. Names are pseudonyms.

SOCIAL USES OF FRENCH/LANGUAGE USE AMONG FRIENDS

Beth:
“I have a French friend...He speaks with me sometimes and my boyfriend is good. He speaks French with me a little.”
“I speak in French um, but if someone speaks to me in English after I try speaking in French, I speak in English.”

Jennifer:
“All my friends speak only English...[I speak French] with my professor.”

David:
“I’ve met a lot [of friends in Montreal]. I made a lot of new friends, but the problem is the majority are maybe those who speak English first. Or who are immigrants. It’s ok, but I’m missing something and that is the half [of the culture] with the Quebeckers.”

“And maybe it’s the cause of my living situation because now I live in Westmount [a highly Anglophone neighborhood].”

“And two of my friends who come [from] here who are English unfortunately do not have many French-speaking friends or many Quebeccois friends.”

Angela:
“I spend a lot of time with [the house lady]. She is Francophone. She is from Montreal. She told me an expression. She told me that it’s exclusive to Montreal, to Quebec. And also, I find that the Quebec French is more English..franglais?”

Luke:
“During the summer we go to Montreal. We went to Quebec City...to practice French, our French. Normally because...most of my friends are Anglophones. We don’t speak French with each other when we’re together. But, in action, in the street, in the cafés we try to speak with the people who [we meet] in French.”

Pam:
“Only because all my friends are English. But I have some friends who are Francophone. And they have the same knowledge of English as I have of French.”
“In the city when I’m going to buy [something] or when I’m going to the bank...I know how to speak. A lot in the city. But sometimes people respond in English. I know how to speak French. [I respond back in French].”
Tammy:
"Yeah. It’s a lot of English in Montreal, and I have forgotten a lot of French."

Julius:
“I made a friend from Switzerland, but he’s left now. So, at the school I’ve made some
friends. [They come from] the rest of Canada.”

Bandar:
“I [haven’t] spoken French for two months because the course had finished two months
ago.”

Steve:
 “[My friends] are a mixture [of Francophone and Anglophone]. But because my
friends, many of [them] are Anglophone."
“[My friends and I] speak English more than we speak French…I need to practice
French.”

Sarah:
“I have read in French. Speaking French? That’s difficult…So, you know. I need
practice. I would like to practice [speaking]…So, So sometimes, sometimes I would get
it, sometimes I would not.”

Paula:
“I have only a few [Francophone friends in Montreal]…Only a few. And I try to speak
French with him but not a lot. And I know how to speak French in Montreal…But how
much French do I need when I’m going to cafés, or in a store? I don’t speak a lot of
French.

REASONS FOR LEARNING FRENCH

Jennifer:
“French. Why did I learn French? Um. I don’t know. Because I live in Montreal and
it’s important.”

David:
 “[To learn French] is one reason why I am here. To meet Quebeckers, to understand the
culture. Because in Alberta between British Columbia, we have myths about
Quebec…And I want to discover for myself if they are true or false.”

Angela:
“[I chose Montreal] because I had a professor who did her Master’s here. She did her
PhD in Montreal. At McGill. In linguistics. She found it to be perfect. So she told me I
have to go there. And I looked at the McGill web page.”
Luke:
“I hope with French, when I learn a lot of the language, I can find a job.”
“Because...I can not work without French in Montreal. And I think I...would like to work.”

“Normally [most people of the world] speak much more than one language. So now...I would like to learn the other languages...French, it’s the first language. After French, I would love to learn Spanish and maybe Cantonese. It’s in the future.”

Pam:
“[It is important to learn French] because I think you live in Montreal. It’s really a good thing to know. Because, I [you] look for some work, there is much more opportunity with speaking French.”

Amanda:
“So, I am here, in Montreal to study French because, if you take an exam over the phone in a [foreign] language...If you pass the exam you win extra points...So, I’m here to study, to take the [U.S. foreign service] exam, to pass the exam.”

Tammy:
“[I don’t read much in French] but there, there are some newspapers, some French newspapers. Because I...want to know the dates of festivals.”

Sarah:
“I would like to work. To live in Europe. Switzerland...I don’t know but but you know. That’s my, it’s my...goal.”
“I like to travel...That’s another reason [why I want to learn French].”

ATTITUDES TOWARD QUEBECOIS FRENCH/LANGUAGE LEARNING

Angela:
“I like the French-English culture. I like hearing people speaking French and I like people here. Everyone here is always patient of the language people speak.”
“So, when I go shopping everyone’s always, ‘Bonjour/Hello’.”

Luke:
“I also want to learn French because I am Canadian. I think that each Canadian must speak a little bit of French at least. And too, I live in Montreal, and I think that I can live here for the rest of my life. I must, because I love the city. I love the atmosphere and I want to speak. I must speak in French.”

Pam:
“I think that it’s a good idea to learn other languages. I speak Estonian with my mother. And I think that it’s a good idea to learn other languages.”
Amanda:
“It’s difficult to understand Quebeckers for me. Because I want to understand...but I can’t. The accent is very different for me than traditional French...From France.”
“I visited the Azores in Portugal. I taught myself some Portuguese...I studied a little Italian...I speak a little Spanish, but just vacation Spanish.”

Julius:
 “[I find the people of Gaspé] very kind. And also very interesting because they speak with an accent very different from the accent here [in Montreal]....[Understanding them] was not a problem.”

Steve:
“I used to like [French]. But now, it’s because French, it’s a very difficult language...Very complicated. English is simpler...Much simpler.”

Sarah:
“I’ll try to speak in French ‘cause I can.”

Paula:
“It’s the immigrants who speak Spanish as a first language. Who don’t speak English. A little French. And the accent is not good...[It’s] very hard. And it’s not French. And you have to speak in French with the other people in the class. And when I was speaking...I don’t learn good French...It’s bad for learning the accent, but it’s good for learning grammar.”

“Because I think I could. We should speak French well but I can’t. And I don’t understand why I can’t. I can’t speak and understand French. Because I have studied French for a long time and I’ve been very frustrated. I don’t know. I studied German. I understand everything. For one year. And I can read, speak, and it’s easy. But French, for not all my life, but for a long, long time. I don’t understand...I don’t practice German. But I miss a little of it because I don’t practice it. But if I practice my French one month, I forget everything.”

Francis:
“I think that it’s stupid to speak...in French with another Anglophone. It’s terrible. It’s stupid...If I want to speak in French I speak with people in French at school. I speak with the people at my work. I don’t need to create people who can speak French.”
OTHER VARIABLES EXPLAINING WHY FRENCH PROFICIENCY HAS BEEN HAMPERED

David:
“I have a great fear of speaking [in French] when I’ve visited...the bars in Montreal or the Quebecker bars because I want to talk but I have a small fear of making great errors.”

Pam:
“In elementary school I had been in an immersion program for four years. And so after that, in high school I had some French courses. And now, I hope to better my French. I am at McGill [University] but I haven’t a lot of time because I have other courses.”

Tammy:
“But when I studied at university I stopped [taking French courses]...To speak French now, I forget a lot...And it’s very difficult to speak but I understand when I read a book or a magazine.”

Dominica:
“[My] vocabulary is too small.”

Paula:
“In Saskatchewan...I took the courses in high school...It’s not good. It’s just ‘Salut, ça va’? Or not ‘ça va’. ‘Comment ça va?’...But it’s not good either. And after the course, I took [one] at McGill [University].”

“I lived in France. And when I lived in France my French was very good...After that, I returned to England and I missed my French...I returned to university and I studied other languages.”
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MCGILL UNIVERSITY FACULTY OF EDUCATION
STATEMENT OF ETHICS OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

It is assumed that the responses to the questions below reflect the author’s (or authors’) familiarity with the ethical guidelines for funded and non-funded research with human subjects that have been adopted by the Faculty of Education and that responses conform to and respect the Tri-council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (1998).

1. Informed Consent of Subjects

Explain how you propose to seek informed consent from each of your subjects (or should they be minors, from their parents or guardian). Informed consent includes comprehension of the nature, procedures, purposes, risks, and benefits of the research in which subjects are participating. Please append to this statement a copy of the consent form that you intend to use.

*Please see attached.*

2. Subject Recruitment

2.1 Are the subjects a “captive population” (e.g., residents of a rehabilitation centre, students in a class, inmates in a penal establishment)?

No. *Subjects will be recruited from classrooms but all interaction will take place outside of the classroom and on a voluntary basis.*

2.2 Explain how institutional or social pressures will not be applied to encourage participation. (See attached guidelines).

*This study will solicit subjects from classrooms, but participation or otherwise will have no academic effect on students. This is to say that there will be no benefit grade wise for the students who participate, nor will there be academic repercussions for non-participation.*

2.3 What is the nature of any inducement you intend to present to prospective subjects to persuade them to participate in your study?

*Subjects will be asked to participate strictly on a voluntary basis.*

2.4 How will you help prospective participants understand that they may freely withdraw from the study at their own discretion and for any reason?

*Subjects will be told orally as well as in a written release form I will ask them to sign beforehand that they are free to withdraw from the study at any time if they feel uncomfortable.*
3. Subject Risk and Well-being

What assurance can you provide this committee (as well as the subjects) that the risks, physical and/or psychological, that are inherent to this study are either minimal or fully justifiable given the benefits that these same subjects can reasonably expect to receive?

The manner of my study, which includes filling in a questionnaire and answering questions in an interview, do not physically involve the students. Furthermore, psychological risk is minimal because the nature of the questions I will address will focus on how the students use their first and second language in their interactions with other members of society. I feel with confidence that such a topic will not create psychological damage in the subjects.

4. Deception of Subjects

4.1 Will the research design necessitate any deception to the subjects?

There is neither intent nor need of deception in the design of this study.

4.2 If so, what assurance can you provide this committee that no alternative methodology is adequate?

N/A

4.3 If deception is used, how do you intend to nullify any negative consequences of the deception?

N/A

5. Privacy of Subjects

How will this study respect the subjects’ right to privacy, that is, their right to refuse you access to any information which falls within the private domain?

Students in the interview will be informed that they can refuse responding to any questions they feel uncomfortable answering.

6. Confidentiality/Anonymity

6.1 How will this study ensure that (a) the identity of the subjects will be concealed and (b) the confidentiality of the information, which they will furnish to the researchers or their surrogates will be safeguarded?

The written/recorded data will be coded by an alphanumeric code (e.g. A3) and I will inform the students of this. Later, I plan to give each participant a randomly chosen pseudonym.
One problem of language learning may be found in the amount of opportunity a student has to speak his or her native tongue during periods of intense L2 formation. Today there is no language more widely spoken than English, putting English-speaking learners of another language at particular risk of having English compete with L2 practice time outside the classroom.

Therefore, I plan to examine any link between opportunities to speak English for Anglophones in intensive L2 study and oral language development. For this, I will examine university students using interviews and questionnaires. Specifically, my goal is to answer two questions: 1. Are Anglophone university students studying a foreign language in a study abroad situation less motivated to learn that language if they are exposed to too many outlets to use their L1? 2. Do tendencies to use L1 coupled with avoiding out-of-classroom target language interaction hamper target language formation?

This study, although innovative in focus, is an inversion of numerous other studies that have investigated exposure to L2 (as opposed to L1) in the language learner's environment. This study hopes to investigate the impact of English as a world language and its effect on foreign language study by comparing how Anglophone learners taking advantage to speak English during their study affects actual oral language proficiency.

It is hoped that this study will give language study abroad organizers a more defined idea of how L1 use during a study abroad may or may not be an obstacle to L2 (non-English) development for those who speak English.