

Pedagogical Implications of Cross-Linguistic Awareness-Raising:

An Exploratory Study

Monique Mainella

A Thesis

In

The Department of Education

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree of Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics)

Concordia University

Montreal, Quebec, Canada

August 31, 2012

© Monique Mainella 2012

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

School of Graduate Studies

This is to certify that the thesis prepared

By: Monique Mainella

Entitled: Pedagogical Implications of Cross-Linguistic Awareness-Raising:
An Exploratory Study

and submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts (Applied Linguistics)

Complies with the regulations of the University and meets the accepted standards with respect to originality and quality.

Signed by the final Examining Committee:

____ Dr. Walcir Cardoso _____ Chair

____ Dr. Sarita Kennedy _____ Examiner

____ Dr. Marlise Horst _____ Examiner

____ Dr. Joanna White _____ Supervisor

Approved by _____ Dr. Pavel Trofimovich _____

Chair of Department or Graduate Program Director

_December 10, 2012

____ Dean Brian Lewis _____

Dean of Faculty

ABSTRACT

Pedagogical Implications of Cross-Linguistic Awareness-Raising: An Exploratory Study

Monique Mainella

Second language teachers are typically not aware of the syllabus their first language counterpart is following. Reasons for this include lack of meta-linguistic knowledge, negative attitudes towards the notion of cross-linguistic comparisons, resistance to change, lack of planning time, and scheduling issues. Students are caught in the middle and may not recognize cross-curricular similarities, even when such similarities exist. The present study looks at a ten-month collaborative study involving two language teachers in a Quebec secondary school. One taught an enriched English as a second language (EESL) course, and the other taught a French mother tongue (FMT) language arts course to some of the same students. The teachers met every week to identify the areas of similarity between their two language programs that could inform their teaching, with particular attention paid to the development of the students' ability to write in their first and second languages. Students completed weekly questionnaires with journal prompts in which they were asked to note any similarities and differences between the grammar and writing conventions that their teachers highlighted in class. Samples of their writing, in English and French, were collected at the beginning and end of the year. Analysis of the meeting notes and journals showed the development of cross-curricular awareness by the teachers and cross-linguistic awareness by their students. The

findings from this research have implications for language teachers and language teacher pedagogy in Quebec.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my supervisor, Dr. Joanna White, for her tremendous support. I started my Applied Linguistics degree at a very significant time in my life. When I started my degree I had just gotten married, soon after I had two children all while teaching ESL at the same time. Joanna was very understanding of the challenges I faced with a young family and balancing life with work. During one of her courses she planted a seed in my head about language awareness. In a small class project I explored the language awareness of students and EESL and French Mother Tongue (FMT) teachers in Quebec. I was inspired and I needed to know more. With Joanna's enthusiastic encouragement, I did find out so much more in what became my thesis. Thank you, Joanna!

I also thank my thesis committee members Dr. Sarita Kennedy and Dr. Marlise Horst for taking an interest in my work. I thank them for their valuable contribution and support. I thank the Concordia APLI professors for their dedication to the field. I have a long history at Concordia University. This is where I studied to be an ESL teacher so many years ago, to then pursue an MA in Educational Technology to conclude with an MA in Education. I thank Concordia's Faculty of Education for a fantastic education.

I truly appreciate my colleagues, school administrators and students who took part in this project; their passion for teaching, learning and education is inspiring. Thank you to my family and friends, your support and concern is what carried me through! Thank you, dad, I know you were cheering me on.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this thesis to my husband Vince, my son Giordano and daughter Sabrina. You were there for me every step of the way. I just couldn't have done it without you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	xii
CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 – LITERATURE REVIEW	4
Language Awareness Defined	4
Language Awareness as Methodology	5
Language Awareness of Teachers.....	8
Cross-Linguistic Awareness Pedagogy.....	10
Challenges Facing CLA Pedagogy and In-Service Teacher Training	12
1. Meta-linguistic Knowledge.....	12
2. Teaching Beliefs about CLA.....	13
3. Practical Constraints	14
Language Awareness Pedagogy as Policy	15
Cross-Linguistic Awareness Collaboration and Cultural Issues.....	15
Cross-Linguistic Awareness and the Collaboration of Teachers in the Quebec Context	17
Conclusion of Literature Review	20
Motivations for the Proposed Research	20
Research Questions.....	22
CHAPTER 3 – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	24
Context.....	24
Participants.....	24
Instruments.....	26
Procedure	29
CHAPTER 4 - DATA ANALYSIS, FEASIBILITY and FINDINGS	35

Research Question #1	35
Feasibility Issue 1: Administrative Support.....	36
Feasibility Issue 2: Willingness of Teachers.....	37
Feasibility Issue 3: Time Factor.....	37
Feasibility: Post Project Interview with Miranda and Judith	38
Summary of Interview Findings Regarding Feasibility	41
Research Question #2	42
Research Question #3	42
The Process of Planning CLR: The First Meeting.....	42
Identifying a Focus for CLR	44
Grammatical and Text Features Identified for the Planned CLR	47
The Process of Planning CLR Step-by-Step	49
Teachers’ On-The-Fly Reference Journals	56
Analyzing the On-The-Fly Reference Frequency	63
Creating a Reference Document	64
Phases of Planning CLR a Summary	64
Research Question #4	66
Student Journals.....	66
Analysis April 10 Journal	68
Do the Students Notice?.....	69
Interviews with Comparison Group Teachers	70
What the Students Noticed.....	72
Summary	74
Analysis April 23 Journal	76
Analysis Français Plus Journal	77

Analysis May 17 Journal	78
Analysis May 30/31 Journal	80
Research Question #5	83
Final Writing Test Results	83
Research Questions: a Conclusion.....	84
CHAPTER 5 - DISCUSSION	85
Introduction.....	85
The Teachers' Perspective: Feasibility	85
Two Language Programs: Similarities and Differences	86
The Planning Process.....	86
The Students' Perspective.....	86
Plan of Action, Recommendations, and Guidelines	87
Limitations of the Study.....	88
Future Studies	89
Pedagogical Implications.....	91
Implications for Language Teacher Training.....	92
Conclusion	93
REFERENCES	94
APPENDIX A.....	97
APPENDIX B	99
APPENDIX C	102
APPENDIX D.....	104
APPENDIX E	106
APPENDIX F	108
APPENDIX G.....	110

APPENDIX H.....	112
APPENDIX I	113
APPENDIX J	116

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Programs of Study FMT and EESL: The Similarities	19
Table 2	Grammatical Features Isolated in Students' English Writing Sample	45
Table 3	Grammatical Features Isolated in Students' English Writing Sample	46
Table 4	Summary of Grammatical and Text Features Identified for the Planned CLR.....	48
Table 5	Calendar of Meetings and Content Addressed	50
Table 6	Transcriptions of On-the-Fly References	57
Table 7	Summary of On-the-Fly References made by FMT and EESL Teachers	63
Table 8	Reported References Made by Miranda	73
Table 9	Reported References Made by Judith	73
Table 10	Reported References Made by Kevin	74
Table 11	Reported References Made by Beatrice	74

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A	97
Appendix B	99
Appendix C	102
Appendix D	104
Appendix E	106
Appendix F	108
Appendix G	107
Appendix H	110
Appendix I	113
Appendix J	116

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 2000, the Ministry of Education (MELS) in the province of Quebec introduced a new, competency-based curriculum across all subjects, beginning in grade 1. The programs were implemented one year at a time and have now reached Secondary 5; the curriculum reform is thus complete. The implementation of a competency-based curriculum required students and teachers to adapt to a new way of learning and teaching. The previous objective-based program focused on students reaching curriculum objectives in a very systematic manner with a focus on the product. The teaching was mostly teacher-fronted with little interaction on the part of the students. In contrast, the new program focuses on the development of competencies, on the process of learning and not the product, and students are often asked to work in collaboration. Moreover, with this competency-based program, it is not only the students who are expected to work together, but also the teachers. With the addition of cross-curricular competencies, teachers are expected to work collaboratively across the curriculum in order to help students succeed across all subjects.

The core English Second Language (ESL) program is geared to the majority of students learning English as a second language in Quebec. However, when the competency-based curriculum was created, the MELS took the opportunity to create a parallel program, Enriched English as a Second Language (EESL). The EESL program, offered at the secondary level, was meant to address the needs of students who are more proficient in English, many of whom have completed the Intensive program at the

elementary level. The EESL program carries an official ministry code and was meant to replace the 'home-made' enriched or language arts programs that had been created in isolated French high schools but were not recognized by the Ministry of Education.

In comparison with the core ESL program, the EESL program puts much more emphasis on writing in a variety of styles and on reading a variety of text types and analyzing the particularities associated with each genre. EESL teachers focus on teaching a range of writing genres, and their students read several classic novels within a school year. EESL teachers still tend to use their personally-made materials because publishers have not yet created textbooks for this particular market.

From my personal teaching experience and from observations of EESL classes in and around the Montreal area, I have become aware that a lot of the content, especially the focus on reading and writing, taught in both the EESL classes and the French mother tongue classes is quite similar. It would seem advantageous, then, for teachers of EESL and French mother tongue (FMT) classes to become aware of what they both teach and to explore how they can work together for the benefit of the students. Though the ESL and French mother tongue teachers teach two different languages, they are both languages nonetheless. It would be an advantage if the teachers could collaborate and teach some elements that are the same in both programs in similar ways, such as dictionary skills and the writing process, or, alternatively, help students to notice where there are differences in the two languages. Such a collaboration, whereby teachers can compare, contrast, and reinforce what they teach in the classroom, would seem beneficial when we consider that a common complaint amongst teachers is the lack of time to address content thoroughly.

The idea of high school English and French teachers collaborating may puzzle some educators for two reasons. The first is the longstanding and widely held belief that if teachers know they can use the students' L1 in the L2 classroom sometimes, they will use it too often and spend time translating as opposed to using effective language teaching and learning strategies. A longstanding yet debatable principle is that language learning is best achieved when using the target language exclusively (Turnbull & Dailey-O'Cain, 2009). Therefore, those who hold to this principle may believe that if teachers are not provided with pedagogical guidance, simply telling them that they can make reference to the L1 can lead to misuse or overuse of the L1 in second language classrooms. The second reason is logistical. French and English teachers are already limited in terms of the amount of time they have to work with colleagues teaching their own subjects; it would seem difficult to find the time to meet with their counterparts in the other language. There are many questions to consider and explore. Do the teachers of the two subject areas like the idea of collaborating? Is it feasible? How does it affect the students and the school? Are there measurable learning gains when first and second language teachers collaborate with a common goal of helping their students improve their ability to read and write in both languages? Despite the potential setbacks and challenges, the possibilities are worthy of investigation.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study is concerned with the cross-linguistic language awareness (CLA) raising of first and second language teachers and the pedagogical implications of raising their own and their learners' CLA. In the first section, after defining language awareness (LA), I will look at the different facets of CLA with regard to methodology and pedagogy. As well, I will look at research on the usage of cross-linguistic referencing (CLR) in the classroom and the challenges faced. The chapter ends with the research questions for the study.

Language Awareness Defined

The Association for Language Awareness defines language awareness on its web site as “explicit knowledge about language and conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use”. The web site further states that LA “...issues include exploring the benefits that can be derived from developing a good knowledge about language, a conscious understanding of how languages work, of how people learn them and use them (Association for Language Awareness, 2012, “About”).

Some of the first work concerning LA and teachers was done by Eric Hawkins. Hawkins believed that both learners and educators should engage in explicit reflection on language both for native and foreign languages taught and learned. The LA movement was British in origin, otherwise known as the British Language Awareness Movement. There was much dissatisfaction in the UK with mother tongue teaching, and this dissatisfaction was also expressed with respect to foreign language courses and with

students' poor literacy skills in general. In a paper entitled *Foreign Language Study and Language Awareness* (Hawkins, 1999), Hawkins takes a look back at the beginnings of language awareness. It was he who proposed a new subject "language" to be taught as a bridging subject linking English and the foreign languages in the curriculum. He was concerned that teachers of English and those of foreign languages seemed to be sealed off from one another.

Hawkins was not the only linguist to express concern about foreign languages being taught in isolation from the mother tongue; it is still an issue today in what Cummins (2007) calls the "two solitudes". As he explains, there are three inter-related and dominant, and in his view misguided, assumptions regarding best practice in learning a second or foreign language. These assumptions are that a) the target language should be used exclusively for instructional purposes, that b) there is no room for translation in the language class, and that c) within bilingual programs the two languages should be kept separate. Although research shows very little support for such assumptions, these existing beliefs have strong roots.

Language Awareness as Methodology

LA begins with linguistic awareness on the part of teachers, but it also involves their knowing how to help their students become language aware. The work of Wright and Bolitho (1993) emphasizes the importance of language awareness as a part of teaching methodology in that language awareness requires teachers to be proficient in language use, knowledge about language and knowledge of language teaching methods. They feel that LA is a critical component of teacher education because, as Andrews & McNeil (2005) suggest, engagement with language is a crucial variable when determining

just how effective an L2 teacher is. Wright (2002) offers valid reasons why LA should be part of teacher training both at the pre-service and in-service levels. He believes that language teachers are involved in language teaching rather than language learning and that LA offers ways in which language learning can be the focus in the classroom. Expanding on the ideas of Wright & Bolitho, Borg (1993) lays out the criteria of LA as methodology. Some of the main features he addresses are learning how to talk about language and using LA to engage learners both affectively and cognitively. He also lists the demands on a teacher when implementing LA as methodology. A teacher, at a very basic level, needs to be linguistically aware by having linguistic knowledge: this ranges from encouraging teachers to work together to activating learners both mentally and emotionally and placing more emphasis on a discovery-oriented approach. He says that LA pedagogy needs to be broken down into three parts: 1) awareness of language - understanding how language functions; 2) awareness of learning - understanding how learners perceive language; 3) awareness of teaching - understanding how teachers can present language and adapt lessons.

According to Wright (2002), a teacher who is language aware has, or is developing, sensitivity to language in order to understand students' struggles and interlanguage features. Wright feels that a linguistically aware teacher and one who applies LA techniques can generate discussions and explorations of language, encourage noticing, and consequently offer pertinent and appropriate language learning activities. This sensitivity to language enables first and second language teachers to work together in order to fill what is sometimes referred to as "the space between". The "space between" is what Hawkins (1991) describes as the gap between English teachers, for

example, and teachers of modern languages that may be bridged by having them work together to present 'language' to their students.

While some may wonder what specific techniques educators could use to promote LA, Simard & Wong (2004) propose a number of LA techniques. These range from input enhancement to metalinguistic reflection. They demonstrate how simple techniques can help learners notice features of a language, thus reinforcing language learning skills and facilitating transfer of those skills to more than one language. One technique for promoting metalinguistic reflection is guided reflection. With guided reflection, the learner is asked questions about a target form while comparing samples of language containing the form. Another technique involves textual enhancement, such as underlining a grammatical feature, to help the learner to notice and to process the form more easily.

Bilash and Tulasiewicz (1995) explain that students and educators can put LA into practice with the goal of discussing the nature of language, improving language skills, providing attitudinal education, and enhancing awareness of the language learning process. These four facets of language awareness could be explored with a range of activities. Such activities could include exploring word origins, thereby allowing learners to explore how languages can influence how words are formed. Another activity could be to look at word order. Such an activity would help learners to see how the structure of a sentence can help them to guess the meaning. A pedagogical approach including language awareness activities allows teachers to develop their own sensitivity to language

use, which can be beneficial for their students because they might more quickly learn and apply important aspects relating to the learning of language.

Language Awareness of Teachers

Hawkins (1999) reported that not much had changed since the need for LA became apparent 25 years earlier, as expressed in the Bullock Report, a UK government document in response to concerns about literacy in schools, Hawkins pointed out, however, that despite the lack of change and collaboration in educational settings, there were some promising examples and some openness with regard to the talk about language amongst teachers. He noted that the collaboration of teachers with regard to LA is what can maximize its effective use and integration.

During the same time period, Pomphrey and Moger (1999) made a very strong case for language teachers in England to work together. In essence, they felt that students' perceptions of language are not likely to make much sense if the language teachers they have hold different attitudes and perceptions and do not collaborate to fill any gaps or discuss differences and similarities. Their study looked at a group of student teachers' attitudes and perceptions in the area of knowledge about language. The goal of the study was to examine and influence cross-subject dialogue about language between student teachers of English and those of Modern Languages with the aim of providing greater consistency and communication in the school system. The participants' open-ended responses revealed that teachers of Modern Languages and English felt that it would be beneficial to work together, and they felt very positive about the prospect of collaborating.

An example of successful pre-service language awareness work of first and second language teachers is illustrated in the research by Burley & Pomphrey (2003). This qualitative study looked at the development of student teachers' understanding of their role as language teachers from the beginning to the end of their language teacher education program. The researchers define this understanding, which they call *intercomprehension*, as an approach that aims to develop in teachers, the knowledge and understanding of what language is and how it works. The study revealed that participants thought it was important for English teachers and teachers of Modern Languages to work together. The researchers felt that, according to their definition of intercomprehension, the two groups of teachers had developed and increased their understanding of each other's subject through the course of the program. They stated that one critical outcome of this dialogue was the change in students' views of their subject. There seemed to be an understanding of what language was and that there were commonalities across languages when they are viewed as a means of communication.

In the Canadian context, Bilash and Tulasiewicz (1995) explored the impact of an LA curriculum in Alberta. They created activities that were reflective of the four main aims of LA, namely discussions about the nature of language, improvement of language skills, attitudinal education and awareness of the language learning process. The activities were conducted with students, and their respective, in-service, teachers were the observers. The activities were well received, and they brought about a language awakening amongst the students. The teachers also viewed the LA activities and experiences as positive, reporting that they provided a systematic means of gaining the knowledge to adequately implement and convey the principles of LA.

Cross-Linguistic Awareness Pedagogy

While the aforementioned studies illustrate how teachers can come to appreciate and understand the purpose of collaboration with regard to language awareness and methodology, the following studies illustrate the outcomes of the application of pedagogy in which learners' attention is drawn to similarities and differences across languages. Rather recently, some promising and innovative studies particular to the context of cross-linguistic awareness (CLA) pedagogy in Quebec have been conducted. These studies not only show that teachers have an enthusiasm and openness to LA applications in the classroom, but also show positive outcomes with regard to teachers and learners becoming more language aware. The studies also document the potential for LA and CLA to promote language learning in both the first and the second languages. In one such study, Horst, White and Bell (2010) documented the opportunities taken and missed for cross-linguistics awareness-raising by two primary school teachers who taught the same students. One was the students' French mother tongue teacher, the other their ESL teacher. After observing the content that was addressed in French and English, the researchers developed a set of CLA activities which the ESL teacher implemented. The researchers continued to observe the teachers and examined the opportunities each took to make references to the other language, both during the CLA activities given to the ESL teacher and during other pedagogical activities during the school day. The researchers concluded that while the French teacher was open to a CLA approach, the ESL teacher embraced it more whole-heartedly by trying out the LA tasks provided by the researchers and by making more on- the- fly CLA references than the French teacher. In fact, the French L1 teacher had made only one explicit connection to English, even though there

was no shortage of opportunities for her to make CLA references; in contrast, the ESL teacher made twenty connections to French.

In a continuation of their CLA study, White and Horst (2012) focused on raising teachers' and learners' cognate awareness in order to encourage cross-linguistic comparisons. The researchers assessed the learners' performance with regard to French-English cognate recognition, examined responses written by the students that probed cognate awareness, and interviewed the teachers to shed light on their experiences with using the cognate activities. They found that learners benefitted from the activities in class, showing gains in cognate recognition, and that the teachers liked to make cross-linguistic comparisons.

In another study, Lyster, Collins, and Ballinger (2009) explored the extent to which a bilingual read-aloud project could (1) raise teachers' awareness of the bilingual resources of their French immersion students, (2) encourage students' cross-linguistic collaboration, and (3) promote teachers' cross-curricular and cross-linguistic collaboration. The French and English teachers of each class read aloud to their students from the same storybooks over four months, alternating the reading of one chapter in the French class with the next in the English class. The study showed that cross-linguistic references were made by the teachers and the students and that the students found these references helpful. Also, the teachers came to realize that teacher collaboration was possible and appeared to be beneficial. Though the consultations between the English and French teachers were brief and did not lead to jointly elaborated strategies in order to help their students, they consulted more than they otherwise would have.

Challenges Facing CLA Pedagogy and In-Service Teacher Training

While studies show that there is no shortage of opportunities to make CLA references, there are many reasons teachers may shy away from collaborating across languages. These reasons include lack of meta-linguistic knowledge, negative attitudes towards the notion of CLA, and resistance to change. Other important reasons are the lack of planning time and scheduling issues teachers face if they do want to work together. All of the aforementioned challenges are explored in detail in the next sections.

1. Meta-linguistic Knowledge

One concern is that teacher(s) may not feel linguistically capable of making comparisons between two languages because they have minimal knowledge of the other language or they may even have limited meta-linguistic knowledge of the language that they teach. According to Pomphrey and Moger (1999), the main source of reluctance or apprehension with regard to collaboration was based on the anxiety new teachers faced with meta-language and transferring knowledge. One of the problems with regard to teachers' lack of collaboration or being reticent about the idea of working together to plan CLA pedagogy may simply be that they are not linguistically aware, in either the L1 or L2. Meta-linguistic knowledge is rather fundamental to CLA, and Van Lier (1991) points out that language awareness plays a central role in both language learning and in teaching. He believes that if we ask our learners to be linguistically aware, then as teachers we need to be aware of how languages are used as well. This may mean that teachers need to increase their meta-linguistic knowledge.

Another factor may simply be that teachers are not aware of what the other language teacher is teaching and what cross-linguistic references could be made. Some

teachers may question whether there are any similarities in two language programs. For example, Lyster et al. (2009) report that the English and French teachers who taught in the same school were surprised that they taught some of the same things. In their read-aloud project, the researchers were able to show that it is beneficial from a language awareness perspective for teachers to collaborate, but that once again the lack of linguistic awareness on the part of the teachers limits them from seeking out CLA opportunities and planning of their own free will. The teachers in the Lyster et al. study commented that those without strong skills in the learners' L2 would have benefited from some additional preparation in order to better deal with CLA references. As Horst, White, & Bell (2010) point out, one challenge of the French mother tongue and ESL teacher(s) working together may simply be the lack of knowledge of the other language concerned.

2. Teaching Beliefs about CLA

Another reason collaboration does not occur pertains to teachers' beliefs.

Teachers enter the profession with a wide array of belief systems that will greatly impact how they teach and what they teach. First and second language teachers may have differing views with regard to language teaching and learning, and these differences may also be a factor in the teachers' willingness to collaborate. Harris and Grenfell (2004) report that English teachers did not believe that explicit knowledge about language could positively impact learners' language proficiency. Mother tongue teachers, on the other hand, embraced the school of thought that there was a strong connection between competence and knowledge about grammar. Therefore, FMT, ESL and EESL teachers will likely have differing opinions on the importance of explicit knowledge of language features. These varying belief systems may make some teachers feel that they will not be

able to find a middle ground or agree on how they can address LA in a way that is suitable for all.

3. Practical Constraints

A third reason teachers may be reticent about using CLA pertains to practical constraints such as time. Teachers always struggle with insufficient time regardless of the subject they teach. With all of their daily tasks and duties, finding time to meet with their language counterpart for regular discussions may not be feasible, as seen in Lyster et al. (2009) and Horst, White & Bell (2010). However, it may be argued that since teachers of both languages do actually teach a lot of the same content, working together, though it may take additional time initially, may save some time in the end. Horst, White & Bell (2010) point out that simply providing teachers with fully developed CLA learning activities does not ensure that they will be used. Therefore, the CLA activities need to also be generated by the teachers and fill their specific needs because as Fullan (2001) argues, for pedagogical innovation to be well received in general, educators' have to take ownership of their teaching ideas. If CLA learning activities are to really be adopted then they need to be compatible with educators teaching practices and beliefs. Furthermore, though all partners in a CLA project may be on board, Fullan says that we must assume that educational change, more generally, will take time, that it is a process of "development in use". Significant change in the form of implementing specific innovations, when change is self-imposed, can take a minimum of three years. Change that is imposed by administrators or institutional reforms can take five to ten years to occur. Furthermore, Kruse, Louis & Bryk (1994) outline several conditions that need to be met in order for a professional learning community, such as a group made up of

teachers and administrators, to develop and grow within a school. Such conditions include time to meet and talk, which is a formal process that allows for substantial and regularly scheduled blocks of time for teachers to conduct on-going pedagogical self-reflection and self-renewal. The time must not simply be added to the teaching day, but rather the additional structured period of time must be built into the school's schedule and calendar so that teachers have the opportunity to consider critical issues in a reflective manner. Creating recurring formal situations for teachers to work together or team teach and to develop integrated lesson design is what Kruse, Louis & Bryk call Interdependent Teaching Roles. Such working teams provide lasting substantial structures for sustained communication based on shared goals, which would result in effective collaboration and a greater willingness to change. Therefore, change takes time. The adoption of CLA practices will also take time, time that needs to be allocated.

Language Awareness Pedagogy as Policy

One way of addressing some of the aforementioned challenges has been to propose system wide raising of LA. For instance, Van Lier (1991) makes convincing arguments for a systematic educational language policy for language awareness. Such a policy would help make language teachers linguistically aware and perhaps more open to the uses and benefits of cross-linguistic referencing. However, our political situation here in Quebec would probably limit the extent of changes that can be made with language policies that do not include the French language.

Cross-Linguistic Awareness Collaboration and Cultural Issues

While some may be eager to work with teachers of other languages, we must be sensitive to political and linguistic issues, thus ensuring collaboration based on mutual

respect. It is important for students and teachers to understand the benefits CLA can have for both parties. The work by Young and Helot (2002) illustrates the potential for teachers and the entire school community (students, parents, administrators) to become aware of the cultural resources already present in their environment. These researchers implemented a project where from an early age, students were introduced to various languages and cultures represented in their school. The project illustrated how language awareness can actually be complementary to language learning. In this particular project the students' parents came to class, talked about culture, introduced the students to culturally diverse foods, and taught songs in their child's L1. The project illustrated how different languages can be introduced harmoniously and be beneficial to students, teachers and even parents. Other work by Helot & Young (2003) illustrated the fact that when teachers gain knowledge and understanding of multilingual and multicultural issues, students, parents and teachers can complement their understanding of languages and even be sensitized with regard to racism. Being culturally aware and sensitive is just another quality of a good teacher; as James (1999) notes, good language teachers frequently make use of comparison and contrast, especially when talking about foreign culture. In Quebec, Armand and colleagues have carried out projects in multi-ethnic elementary schools aimed at enhancing children's language and cultural awareness which have had a positive influence on both teachers and students.

To conclude, there is always room for teachers to expand their knowledge of different cultures and languages in the multicultural province of Quebec. As Burley & Pophrey (2003) show, teachers and students who teach and learn different languages

can benefit from working together and can create a sensitivity and appreciation towards other cultures.

Cross-Linguistic Awareness and the Collaboration of Teachers in the Quebec Context

In difficult economic times, educators and the public are well aware that curriculum reform would be very expensive (Bilash and Tulasiewicz, 1995). Regardless, in 2000, Quebec was faced with a major curriculum reform that was indeed costly, both financially and with respect to the time it took to plan and create. The new curriculum required educators to make some key changes to their teaching. Teachers had to aim at developing competencies and not target objectives, move from teacher-focused instruction to student-centered learning, and put the emphasis on the process of learning and not on the final product. The new program adopted the idea of developing cross-curricular competencies and referred to broad areas of learning as a means for teachers of varying subjects to work together to develop competencies particular to every subject and also to develop competencies that are cross-curricular. When the curriculum was written, it would have been the opportune time to integrate the idea of language awareness and cross-linguistic referencing, but this did not occur. However, teachers and administrators should consider that the MELS (2001) did make explicit mention in both the FMT and EESL programs of how pedagogical cross-curricular connections could be made across these languages. The FMT program states the following:

À l'intérieur des disciplines du domaine des langues, les élèves se constituent graduellement une représentation de ce qu'est une réalité linguistique et culturelle. Ils sont amenés à réfléchir aux liens qui existent entre la langue française et la langue seconde ou les autres langues qu'ils étudient ou parlent. Ils sont invités à dégager des aspects par lesquels elles s'apparentent ou se distinguent et à s'intéresser à l'origine des mots ainsi qu'aux emprunts linguistiques. Ils sont sensibilisés à la façon dont la société considère la langue et les aspects de la culture qui s'y rattachent et ils apprennent à tenir compte du rôle des repères culturels dans la compréhension et l'interprétation des textes écrits et oraux, courants et littéraires. (Programme de formation de l'école Québécoise, enseignement secondaire, premier cycle, 2001, p.26).

Similarly, the MELS EESL program (2001) states the following:

The EESL program can also be linked to the other subjects in the PFEQ. Learning English allows students to construct knowledge and develop strategies that can be reinvested in other fields of study and areas of interest, both inside and outside the classroom. There are clear connections between EESL and the other language programs: Français, langue d'enseignement and Spanish as a Third Language. In all these programs, students develop communicative competence and respect for other cultures; use processes, strategies and resources; and explore a variety of texts. They can reinvest their use of communication and learning strategies, and various resources when developing the Spanish as a Third Language competencies. (Programme de formation de l'école Québécoise, enseignement secondaire, premier cycle, 2001, p.3).

While the MELS notes the global links that the two language subjects can make, a closer inspection of each program reveals that the general goals they address are parallel with regard to reading and writing texts. The information Table 1 comes from synthesizing the descriptions of competencies found in the respective EESL and FMT programs.

Table 1

Programs of Study FMT and EESL: The Similarities

Programs of Study: The Similarities	
French Mother Tongue	EESL
Focus on literature and exploration of literary texts, classic literature and “textes courantes”	Read and view a variety of texts
Teach reading strategies	Teach reading strategies
Emphasis put on discussions with peers (concerning texts)	Use writing as a means to interact with peers
Write a variety of texts	Write a variety of texts
Interact with peers	Interact with others, use of different speaking strategies, talk about text
Study genres of explanation, reporting, argument, persuasion with emphasis on social functions	
Communicate with different audiences	

As we can see, the competencies related to reading and writing are similar. In 2011, an additional, more detailed document entitled *The Progression of Learning at the Secondary Level* was created by the MELS. This document lays out the specific content that should be taught from one year to the next for all subjects. While the program of study is vague, the Progression of Learning guidelines allow teachers to identify more similarities and differences in the two respective programs. The programs of study do not specify when the criteria of every competency need to be taught at a particular time in a school year, therefore the teaching situations will differ from one school to another. Also, some schools might have remedial programs, some classes are condensed in time, and therefore teachers have control of deciding the content they will teach and at what point in the school year.

Conclusion of Literature Review

The literature has shown that there are benefits for both the mother tongue language teachers and the English Second Language teachers to work together with regard to LA and CLA. Studies show that learners are able to notice CL comparisons and use them to learn language. We know that despite the fact that there is openness for teachers to work together, they may not always know how to do it, or why. As Horst, White and Bell (2010) noted, teachers often work in isolation, and time is a serious factor to consider in addition to the teacher's meta-linguistic awareness of the L1 and L2. As well, we need to consider the attitude of language teachers and the often repeated message that references to the other language would not be of service to the students for fear that translation would become a frequent pedagogical practice. Finally, and quite simply, teachers probably do not know how to begin working together when considering CLA activities and practices.

To conclude, the literature reveals that, despite many challenges, collaboration between language teachers is possible and beneficial and would improve learning language outcomes.

Motivations for the Proposed Research

In 2009, as part of a Language Awareness course, I conducted a pilot study in which I investigated how much teachers of enriched ESL and FMT classes knew about each other's language programs. I was interested in this topic because I realized that the programs were similar, but I wanted to see if the teachers of both subjects were aware of

it. I also wanted to see if they thought it would be beneficial and even feasible to work together. Also, I was curious to see whether students in both classes, FMT and EESL, felt that there were similarities in the two classes that they took. What my project revealed was that teachers of both subjects were open to working together and were aware to some degree that there were similarities, but they simply did not know how to go about working together. The languages seemed different to them, and they questioned the feasibility of collaborating. The students felt there were many similarities with regard to reading and writing. The results were very exciting and promising.

The goal of this thesis research is to build on the pilot study by documenting the collaboration of a secondary English teacher and a secondary French teacher over one school year. I wanted to examine their collaboration to find out whether students would notice the teachers' cross-linguistic references, and to see what impact, if any, these references would have on their first and second language writing. Finally, I wanted to observe what pedagogical tools the teachers of both subjects could create for the purpose of raising their students' cross-linguistic awareness.

This study is pertinent because the official Ministry programs explicitly mention that the first and second language programs can be interconnected to develop cross-curricular (cross-linguistic) competencies although they do not say how this might be accomplished. As well, in 2011, the Ministry of Education officially announced that Intensive English was to become mandatory in all elementary schools in the next five years. If implemented, this change will have implications at the secondary level because many of the post-intensive students will be in EESL classes in secondary school. With

more EESL students and more EESL classes in the near future, the collaboration of the French and EESL teachers will be highly desirable.

Research Questions

The literature review has led me to ask the following five research questions.

1. Is it feasible for L1 and L2 teachers to work together and plan cross-linguistic awareness pedagogy and activities? (Feasibility in the case of this research project refers to the challenges, difficulties and shared opportunities and how teachers address them.)
2. What similarities and differences do teachers of French mother tongue and English L2 (EESL) find in their respective programs that would allow them to plan for cross-linguistic awareness-raising?
3. What process do teachers go through to plan cross-linguistic referencing? How will the teachers learn about the linguistic features of the other language, what methods will they use and what tools/instruments can they create to help their students notice the CLR?

Although some recent studies have investigated elementary school students' noticing of cross-linguistic comparisons made by their L1 or L2 teachers (e.g. Horst, White & Bell, 2010; White & Horst, 2012), there is a gap in the literature when it comes to studies that involve participants at the secondary level. Therefore, another research question to answer is this:

4. Do EESL students notice the cross-linguistic references made by their L1 and L2 teachers? If so, what do they notice?

Finally, if cross-linguistic comparisons are made and noticed by the students, it would be important to investigate whether the noticing helps students improve their writing; therefore the final research question is:

5. Is there a measureable effect on student writing when cross-linguistic awareness (CLA) pedagogy and activities are used?

The operationalization of each question will be described in the *Instruments* section of the thesis.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, I will present the methodology that was carried out to answer the five research questions. After describing the context and participants, I will explain the instruments and procedure used in this case study.

Context

The study was conducted in a private French co-ed secondary school situated in a suburb of Montreal. The students are bussed in from neighbouring municipalities. These municipalities vary: some are primarily unilingual French while in other more multiethnic municipalities, the students' first language is neither French nor English, and their L1s include Vietnamese and Chinese for example. Each student in this school is enrolled in an English class (regular ESL, EESL or English mother tongue), and a French class (regular, enriched, or Français Plus for students who need remedial work).

Participants

The teacher and student participants in this study are described in the following paragraphs. Note that the groups are numbered according to the system used in the school.

Two CLA teachers participated in this study. The first is the teacher of the Secondary 5 EESL class (Miranda).¹ She has three years of teaching experience. She is currently completing her Master's degree in Second Language Education. Her L1 is English but, she is also fluent in French and Mauritian Creole. The second is the teacher of the Secondary 5 French Mother Tongue (FMT) class (Judith). She has twenty years of

teaching experience. Judith has a Bachelor's of Education. Her L1 is French. She understands English but is limited with regard to fluency. These two teachers were chosen for the study because they expressed an interest in collaborating on CLA activities and pedagogy.

The groups in the study were organized in the following way. The FMT teacher teaches group 57. While she teaches this entire intact group, the EESL teacher has a class composed of half the students from group 57 along with half the students from group 58. A total of 12 students are in both classes with Julie and Miranda. These 12 students constitute the *Experimental Group* as they are receiving CLA instruction in both English (EESL) and French (FMT). The students that the EESL teacher does not teach are in the *Comparison Group* as their ESL teacher is not involved in the project. The total number of student participants is 32. The students are in the fifth year of their respective English and French programs. The students' L1 is either French, English and in a few cases Chinese and Vietnamese. There is no group in the study that does not have either Miranda or Judith as a teacher. Other than the 12 students of group 57 who are the experimental group, all other groups either have Judith for French and an EESL or ESL teacher other than Miranda or the students have Miranda for EESL or ESL but have a French teacher other than Judith.

Another participant is Nancy, the director of pedagogical services (DSP) who works at the school where the study is conducted. She was a teacher for 15 years before becoming the Secondary Cycle One director; for the past three years she has been the director of pedagogical services. She was interviewed regarding her professional views

on the feasibility of teachers working together. Her mandate is to help teachers implement their specific programs of study. Because she expressed an interest in arranging for the participating teachers to have the necessary time to work together, her particular interest and role in this project is discussed.

Instruments

A number of instruments were used during the ten months of the study to address the research questions outlined on pages 22 and 23. Each instrument is described below, as well as its link to one or more specific research questions.

To address the first research question about feasibility, the following instruments were used:

- Researcher's journal in which the researcher documented the process and progress of the weekly meetings between the English and French teachers. The researcher attended all meetings and took notes in a notebook.
- Interviews with the teachers and DSP determined the feasibility issue from the teachers' and DSP's perspectives. The interviews also informed the researcher about the teachers' L1 and their perceived ability in both the L1 and L2. This provided information about their knowledge about language and their respective teaching programs. The interview was conducted with Miranda in English and in French with Julie. Notes from the interviews were hand-written. (see Appendix A)

- Post Project Interviews at the end of the school year inquired about the teachers' (Miranda and Judith) experience and recommendations with regard to the use of CLA pedagogy and its feasibility.

The second research question asked about the similarities and differences teachers of French mother tongue and English L2 (EESL) found in their respective programs that allowed them to plan for cross-linguistic awareness-raising. More specifically, to find out what language features L1 and L2 teachers identified as being similar or different in the two programs of study, the following instruments were used:

- Essays written by student participants in both the English and French classes at the beginning of the school year. They were used by the English and French teachers to diagnose language errors the students made, and they determined what aspects of writing the teachers focused on together. They served as pre-tests.
- Correction grids created by the teachers based on the initial essay. The correction grids were used to identify the errors that the English and French teachers felt posed a problem because of their differences and also that may have been influenced by the L1. (see Appendices B and C)

To address the third research question regarding the process teachers go through to plan cross-linguistic referencing and the tools/instruments they could create to help their students notice the CLR, the following instruments were used:

- Teachers' journals in which the teachers recorded instances when they made on-the-fly and planned references to the other language (English or French). The

references were to be noted on a daily basis or whenever the references were made.

- Pedagogical tools created by the English and French teachers for them to use to teach or illustrate similarities and differences with regard to grammatical notions and the writing process for both languages. (see Appendix I)
- Researcher journal also served to document and examine the process the two teachers went through with regard to planning CLR.

To address the fourth research question about whether students noticed cross-linguistic references (CLRs) made by their L1 and L2 teachers, the following instruments were used:

- Students' questionnaires with journal prompts in which they recorded instances of CLRs made by the teachers; as well, students were occasionally prompted with specific questions to investigate whether they felt that the teacher's CLA interventions enhanced noticing and/or learning of the L1 or the L2. An example of such a prompt given is the following: *Do you think it is helpful if your French and English teachers make reference to the other language in your class? For example, if your French teacher makes reference to English and vice-versa.* The students completed seven questionnaires over the course of three months (see Appendices D through G for the questionnaires with journal prompts). The students also kept track of daily occurrences of CLA interventions in a table provided by the researcher (see Appendix H for the table). The questionnaires and journal prompts were given in either English or French. The students were

allowed to complete the questionnaires in either English or French, whichever language they felt most comfortable.

- Teachers' journals in which the teachers recorded instances when they made on-the-fly and planned references to the other language (English or French). The journals would be used to compare the students' examples of noticing with the references that the teachers made and noted.

Finally, to address the fifth research question about the effect of CLA pedagogy on students' writing, the following instrument was used:

- Students' essays, written in English and French, at the end of the ten-month study. The final written products were evaluated by the teachers for evidence that the students' accuracy had improved on specific features that were targeted through the planned and unplanned use of CLA.

Procedure

The first step in the study was to interview the teachers and the DSP. The interview responses were recorded on paper. (See Appendix A for the interview questions) The purpose of the interviews was to determine how feasible it was for a school to arrange for English and French teachers to work together at a scheduled time each week. As well, the interviews with the teachers were to determine their initial perceptions about CLA and why they decided to work together on a cross-linguistic project that addresses language awareness and looks at the similarities and differences in the content that they teach. The purpose of the interviews was also to see if they felt that collaborating to plan CLA was potentially beneficial for both the students and

themselves. Furthermore, I asked about their perceived language skills in the L2 as this may shed light on their perceptions of using CLA and their metalinguistic awareness. Both the DSP and the teachers were open to the study, but as they did not already have a common free period in their schedule, the DSP had to free up the teachers in order for them to meet on a regular basis.

At the beginning of the school year, the English and French teachers each assigned an in-class essay. In addition to serving as a pre-test, the essay enabled the teachers to identify the language structures that they wished to work on with their students and, through their discussion of the learners' performance, to become aware of the similarities and differences in the English and French programs with respect to the writing competency. The topic of the English essay assigned by Miranda was titled *C2 and C3 Feature Article*; the topic of the French essay assigned by Judith was *Appréciation d'une oeuvre théâtrale*. The teachers then drew up a list of the errors and problem areas that they felt needed to be worked on. These errors were either particular to the L1 or influenced by the L2; influence back from L2 English to L1 French or vice-versa. The errors were used as a means to use CLA during the ten-month study. This initial written production was then compared to the students' end-of-year written production, and was used to determine the extent to which accuracy improved in the language features and specific writing genre that was targeted during the ten-month study.

The interventions that the teachers made during class to raise awareness of an error or writing specification they wanted to address are referred to as the *treatment*.

These interventions were made either because the error had become a source of concern or because a particular distinction had to be made in either language in order to avoid potential errors in writing for example the use of quotation marks in direct speech. The treatment could also be a particular CLA tool like a reference sheet that the teacher(s) wished to create in order to bring attention to a particular language issue.

The performance of the comparison group shed light on the effectiveness of the CLA treatment. Readers, you will recall that due to the composition of the groups in the study, not all students had Miranda as the EESL teacher and not all students had Judith as the French teacher, those not taught by both teachers in the study are the comparison group.

Throughout the study, the researcher observed and documented the process the teachers went through in order to plan the CLA interventions and activities. The interviews were conducted in the teachers' respective L1s and the planning sessions were conducted in both English and French with both teachers switching back in forth between the two languages. The researcher sat in on all weekly meetings and took hand-written notes to document what the teachers were discussing, how they planned their CLA and to observe their progress as they explored the metalinguistic nuances of both the L1 and L2. Furthermore, the teachers had the opportunity to create LA-raising reference documents that they could use in their classes. These tools were to address aspects of language, structures and text features related to specific grammar notions, text type and writing process. Such references were important because they could serve as documents that

other teachers in the school could use and that Miranda and Judith might want to use, modify and adapt in a subsequent school year.

While the teachers had the opportunity to plan their CLA pedagogy and activities, they were also asked to note their ‘on- the- fly’ CLA interventions in a journal that the researcher collected at the end of the school year. The teachers’ journals were analyzed for frequency and type of references made; for example, how often did the teacher refer to a linguistic feature or writing structure? As well, the teachers noted any particular errors that they felt might no longer be occurring in their students’ writing. The teachers also noted grammar questions based on the L2 that came up in class. For the most part, the L2 refers to English. These questions were then discussed during the weekly meetings with the other teacher who could explain the grammar rule. In addition, the teachers noted specific moments of success whereby the CLA intervention was of particular interest or particularly helpful or problematic. Finally, the teachers were invited to note any teaching material or practices they would like to change for the following school year.

As well, the students completed weekly questionnaires that included journal prompts. The questionnaires and prompts were at times given in English and other times in French. The first two questions on the questionnaire were the same for each document and the third was a prompt that varied depending on what was planned in the two language classes, for example:

1. Did your French or English teacher make references to the grammar/ vocabulary/ writing conventions of the other language? Yes or No. If yes, what did she/he say?
2. Do you feel that the references made were helpful to you? Yes or No. Explain your answer. (See Appendices D through G for the questionnaires and journal prompts)

Using the student questionnaires/journals and the on-the-fly and planned moments of CLA identified by Miranda and Judith in their journals, the researcher was able to observe whether or not the students noticed the CLA in the class. The students' journal responses for the experimental instructional interventions were rated for evidence of CLA by comparing the examples the students provided with the instances the teachers noted in their journals.

The purpose of the final written product was to determine whether the students' writing improved with respect to the linguistic features and aspects of writing that both the English and French teacher had targeted.

The documented process the teachers went through in order to plan the CLA was analyzed in order to identify the main steps which the teachers used to plan the CLA referencing and interventions. Such a plan will help other EESL and FMT teachers with their own planning of CLA.

The post-study interviews with the teachers and DSP were analyzed to see how the teachers felt about the process and planning of CLA pedagogy. The interviews

allowed the teachers to reflect on the process and identify changes and adjustments they would like to make in subsequent years when using CLA pedagogy and activities. The information will be shared with other teachers as an example of a pedagogical innovation.

CHAPTER 4

DATA ANALYSIS, FEASIBILITY and FINDINGS

In this chapter, I will describe the analysis procedure used with the instruments in the study and the results as they relate to the research questions asked. Since this study is exploratory in nature, the data provided by the instruments is qualitative. Some of the instruments were created as the study unfolded and the need for them arose.

Research Question #1

Is it feasible for L1 and L2 teachers to work together and plan cross-linguistic awareness pedagogy and activities? *Feasibility factors in the case of this research project refer to the challenges, difficulties and shared opportunities and how teachers address these.*

To address the first research question about the feasibility of planning cross-linguistic referencing, the following data were collected. In order to answer the feasibility question, I first needed to obtain the permission of the school to conduct this study. Then, I had to find two teachers, one EESL and one FMT, who were willing to devote time to the project. Accordingly, I conducted separate interviews with the DSP, the FMT teacher and the EESL teacher and found that they were all willing to participate. Summaries of the interviews appear below; the interview questions can be found in Appendix A. In order to analyze the interview responses I wrote down the interviewees responses and then asked those interviewed to verify the responses I noted to make sure that I understood their responses and had interpreted them accurately.

Feasibility Issue 1: Administrative Support

As the school's director of pedagogical services (DSP), Nancy is responsible for the proper implementation of teaching and evaluation methods and practices that conform to the Ministry of Education (MELS) program (PFÉQ) in all subject areas. She was a key player in deciding whether or not the EESL and FMT teachers would be freed up one hour per week in order to work on this research project. She has a good understanding of the school subjects and their programs and particularities. She also has a good sense of how subjects are similar or different. I interviewed Nancy to get a better understanding as to why she believed collaboration between the English and French departments was important and also to establish whether she believed it was feasible or not.

When I asked her why she was interested in allowing the two teachers to work on this project with me, she stated that her primary goal was to help the students. She felt that it was important to collaborate so that students would move away from thinking and learning in what she called different compartments in their brains. She felt that the collaboration would help the teachers put a greater emphasis on learning and on how students learn. As a DSP, she has often heard the French and English teachers complain about the same pedagogical issues and concerns. She naturally saw links in the two programs of study. She believes that collaboration would allow teachers to understand their language learners better and ultimately be better language teachers.

She believes that such collaboration is feasible at her school and that it can also be feasible in other schools if the teachers are open to the idea of working together with the goal of helping their students. However, she said that only teachers who want to understand the language learning issues that the students are facing and how they can be

helped should undertake such a project or commitment. She noted that it is fundamental for the teachers to be given adequate time to meet, plan and discuss. She commented that if other schools expressed an interest in working on such a project, those school administrators need to make sure that the teachers' main goal is to help the students and that the teachers are open to questioning their pedagogy.

Feasibility Issue 2: Willingness of Teachers

When I asked Miranda why she was interested in working on this project, her answer was simple: why not? She expressed the view that her main goal was to help her students the best way she could, and in turn she felt that it would make her teaching job easier and more effective.

Judith was interested in working on this project because of the colleagues that she would be working with and because she believed in the basic principles and ideas of the project. She was very interested in the subject of cross-linguistic referencing and language awareness, and she believed that there could be considerable pedagogical gain. In short, the project reflected her pedagogical views and beliefs.

Feasibility Issue 3: Time Factor

Other than their willingness to participate, the teachers needed time to meet. At the school in question, teachers can be allotted approximately one hour per eight-day school cycle to work on special projects although due to budget constraints, only a limited number of teachers can be given this time each year. The one hour per cycle counts towards a teacher's teaching assignment hours. For example a full-time teacher's assignment is 32 hours, which includes teaching time and extra-curricular school

activities or pedagogical projects. Thus it was possible for the two teachers to be given approximately one hour per eight day cycle to meet and plan their CLR. They agreed to meet in the morning of every “day 8” at 8:30 before the teaching day started. The teachers met 14 times over the course of 10 months.

As can be seen in Table 5, at times there were gaps between the meetings because of the school calendar (e.g. holidays, school breaks, pedagogical days). These breaks slowed down the momentum of trying to plan CLR. As well, the teachers cancelled several meetings for personal reasons. In these instances, the teachers tried to make up for the time during lunch or by starting their weekly meetings a little earlier although this was not always possible. However, the teachers found even the regular cycle meetings too far apart and too short for what they wanted to accomplish, so midway through the school year they requested, and got permission from the DSP, to use one of their pedagogical days in order to have a three-hour meeting to accelerate the process of planning.

Feasibility: Post Project Interview with Miranda and Judith

In June I interviewed the teachers a second time to get a better understanding of how they felt while working on this project and to find out if they had any recommendations for other teachers who would like to plan CLR. After the post project interviews I realized that the data informed the research question of feasibility. When looking back, 10 months after the start of the project, the teachers’ comments shed light on the limitations and successes of the feasibility question. I will begin by summarizing Miranda’s experience.

Miranda said that although she had not been sure what to expect when the project started, an understanding emerged through the weekly meetings with her colleague and the researcher. She learned a lot about herself as a professional, about herself personally, and about the teaching profession. She learned about the students and how and what they learn. Her experience with the project made her want to review what she learned in her ESL training and review concepts about how language is processed and how students learn best. The experience taught her to be more patient, to find alternate ways to teach, and / or to be more pedagogically reflective. The experience also helped her to have a better relationship with her students as she took the time to find out and explore the source of their errors.

Miranda felt that the major obstacle in implementing the project had to do with time. She felt that there wasn't enough time to repeat or review grammatical concepts that she had planned with the French teacher. She strongly felt that the lack of recycling, as well as the gaps in time between the teaching and evaluation of the concepts found in their post writing might have explained some of their persistent errors. She found it interesting that students were often unable to explain FMT grammar rules when she asked about them, which suggests that they lacked metalinguistic awareness and terminology. Overall, though she enjoyed the weekly meetings and learned a lot, she felt that the opportunities to meet with Judith and to make references in the classroom had been interrupted by events in the school schedule and her personal life.

In essence, Miranda feels that a project requiring collaboration could only work if the teachers had the support of the administrators. In her opinion, the administrators

would have to believe that learning English is as important as learning French and demonstrate equal respect for both language programs. She feels that the students' teachers need to agree with the principles underlying cross-linguistic referencing and be willing to collaborate. However, for collaboration to be possible, the teachers would always need time built into their schedules. As for the future, Miranda recommends that the "blue" reference sheet (Appendix H) be given at the beginning of the school year and that it be used as a reference tool along with a dictionary. She also suggests that teachers and students keep track of their errors with a chart or grid.

The following is a summary of the interview with the French teacher. Judith had no expectations of how the project would unfold; she let herself be guided by the researcher, but more importantly by the discussions that she had with Miranda. Through working on the project, Judith realized that her students have a good knowledge of English although she noticed that there is a lot of confusion with grammar and punctuation. She thinks that adolescents have to sense that something is important before they are willing and open to learn about it, for example they have to feel that learning about the differences in argumentative writing in French and English is important because it will impact their final exam mark.

Judith considered the lack of time as a major factor in the CLR project, in her opinion they lacked the time they needed to plan. As well, she feels it is important for teachers to have the same pedagogical belief system in order to work together. She also noted the importance for teachers to realize that their teaching is not being judged, but rather that they are working together in order to help students.

Judith believes that such collaboration could work for other teachers and schools if they start with a list of errors that they would like to address or use to plan the CLR. She thinks time needs to be set aside for the teachers to plan and work together. The teachers need to have a schedule, and the problems to work on need to come from the teachers as opposed to proposed by someone not teaching the content or levels in question.

As for recommendations, she suggests starting the referencing early, giving the “blue” observation sheet (Appendix H) in September, and having the students use it as a reference tool very much like a dictionary. She suggests explaining the CLR project to other teachers in the school in small increments at the start of an academic year.

Summary of Interview Findings Regarding Feasibility

The results presented above show that it is feasible for EESL and FMT teachers to collaborate. The teachers need to be given some additional planning time the first year they want to implement CLR. Once the plan has been made, each subsequent year would require less time for meetings. Saving time is even more possible if teachers document their references and perhaps create a reference guide/document to use during the school year. This is especially helpful for teachers who may struggle with the “other” language. As well, the teachers’ journals and the students’ journals show that the two teachers were able to identify many similarities that don’t need to be addressed, and many differences that do need to be addressed, in the two programs. The EESL and FMT teachers can find many instances where references to each other’s languages both grammatically and with regard to writing texts and writing conventions can be made.

The findings from this exploratory research suggest that in order for teachers to get started with the CLR process with writing, teachers should collect a writing sample first and then isolate the problem areas. The teachers need to be aware of the problems/differences they would like the students to notice and keep the goals of their language programs in mind.

The following section addresses research questions 2 and 3. It is important to discuss the next two research questions together because, although they address different key issues, they cannot be separated in that the analysis of the similarities and differences the teachers found in their programs is also part of the process that I documented.

Research Question #2

What similarities and differences do teachers of French mother tongue and English L2 (EESL) find in their respective programs that would allow them to plan for cross-linguistic awareness-raising?

Research Question #3

What process do teachers go through to plan cross-linguistic referencing and how will the teachers learn about the linguistic features of the other language? What tools/instruments can they create to help their students notice the CLR?

The Process of Planning CLR: The First Meeting

Since this was an exploratory study and I did not have much previous research to use as a model, I was not quite sure how to start the CLR planning process. All I knew

for certain was that I had the school's support and two teachers who were really interested in working together. During the first meeting, I explained to the two teachers the idea of Language Awareness and Cross-Linguistic Referencing. I told them about some research in this area that showed the potential benefits of making cross-linguistic comparisons. I explained the goal of my research, which was to investigate the feasibility of FMT and EESL teachers planning cross-linguistic referencing and consequently, to find out whether or not the students noticed the referencing when the teacher made it, and finally, to find out the extent to which noticing improved the students' language skills.

I asked the teachers what language issues concerned them the most as secondary 5 teachers. Secondary 5 is an important year because of the provincial leaving exams and because the outcomes of these exams in large part determine whether or not students obtain their high school diploma. The two teachers talked about their teaching programs, the particular challenges for the students, and the similarities and differences in the contents of the two language programs. They came to realize that the two programs had a lot of similarities, in particular for writing. They noted the importance of pointing out and teaching about the differences with regard to grammar and writing conventions so that the students could avoid being heavily penalized for making particular errors when writing in either English or in French. One such examples would include not paying attention to the thesis statement and how it differs in English and French writing.

It is important to note that I did not want to tell the teachers what to focus on or what to plan. According to Fullan (2001), the needs to be met must be identified by the teachers if change is to occur. I also wanted the process to be realistic in the event that it

is used as a model by other schools. Moreover, anything that was not realistic would not be transferable to other teachers in the school in question. This was confirmed by the two teachers who told me during the first meeting that if I had provided them with tools to use for the referencing or if I had imposed a plan and referred to it, they would have been less inclined to participate because this might not have met their needs adequately. By the end of the meeting, the teachers had decided that they were going to focus on writing. The question now was what writing features or what grammar to focus on for the CLR.

Identifying a Focus for CLR

The French teacher suggested that they could start with an initial writing sample that would be collected from the students. From that writing sample the teachers would code the errors to determine what types were made as well as to see what errors seemed to be influenced by English and/or French. The writing samples were used by the English and French teachers to diagnose the language errors that were of biggest concern and to determine what aspects and features of writing to focus on for the CLR. The samples were meant to serve as pre-tests because the teachers would then collect writing samples in June, nine months later, to determine whether the errors they chose to focus on for the CLR were reduced, eliminated or stayed unchanged.

Once the French teacher had examined her students' writing samples, she isolated the errors and error types shown in Table 2. The students were then given the error categories in a grid format which would be used as a reference throughout the year in order to facilitate corrective feedback. See Appendix B for this grid.

Table 2

Grammatical Features Isolated in Students' French Writing Sample

É – Er	Leur – leurs
Écriture des chiffres en lettres	Dont
A – à	Héros
Écriture des titres	D'autre(s)
CP,	Ce – se
Accord verbe + sujet (BASE!)	Accord part. passé aux. Avoir
Certain(s)	Favori(s)
Écriture des accents	Pronom de reprise le, la, les, l', lui, leur
<i>Ou – où</i>	Quoique – quoi que
<i>Conjugaison – terminaison «eux» / «i» / eus»</i>	De + nom(s)
<i>Mot français et anglais exemple, défaut, ...)</i>	Plupart
<i>, mais – car – or – donc</i>	, et ce,
Accord verbe → qui sujet	Oublier – obliger
Écriture de la date	Développer – appeler
Sont – son	Tout le – tous les
Faire partie de	
Trait d'union → inversion verbe et complément / verbe et sujet	

The English teacher also analyzed her students' initial writing sample and isolated the errors which are shown in Table 3.

Table 3

Grammatical Features Isolated in Students' English Writing Sample

Headline and secondary h. structure	General subjects
Lead/Close	Subject-verb agreement
Angle	Present perfect
Paragraph structure	Noun clauses
Referring to text	Prepositions
Proper support	Transitions
Vocabulary (ww, wc, and wform)	Question formation
Tailoring to audience	Double negative
Naming the source	Contractions
Definitions	If - conditional
Quotation structure and explanation	Modals
Commas – FANBOYS	Count vs non-count
Verb tense consistent	More /most -er/-est
Etc	This/That These/Those
Get	Sp – Cannot
Processus	Sp- proof/prove
Scientific	Sp- which
False Cognates	Sp- Future
Noun vs verb	But/Because
A vs An	Sp – Another
The vs A	

Based on the two correction grids of isolated grammatical errors, the English and French teachers decided what to focus on in order to plan their CLR. They not only decided to look at the grammatical features that were problematic, but they also chose to focus on the argumentative/persuasive writing genre when addressing writing and stylistic features. This writing genre is of particular importance because it is the focus of the MELS exam in both English and French. While the English and French writing tasks are similar to some degree, they are also very different. For example, in the opinion piece of writing, it is important for students to use “Je” to take a position while in English the students are asked to use the third person instead of ‘I’. It is such differences that may pose problems and result in a grade deduction should a student not be aware of them. The details of the differences and similarities the two teachers chose to focus on for the CLR they planned are described below.

Grammatical and Text Features Identified for the Planned CLR

Working from the individual lists they had drawn up, the teachers decided which issues and errors to target as they were particularly problematic in both English and in French. Following are the grammatical points and writing features that they agreed to reference in class. Note that this list is in its original form as it was compiled by Miranda and Judith (Table 4).

Table 4

Summary of Grammatical and Text Features Identified for the Planned CLR

Cher... NON! ... Pas en français!		
Dear... to ... or nothing! NOT THE SAME!!! Dear, commun use		
Coordonnant et subordonnant		
P1, mais, car, donc P2.		
,car → n'égale pas because! Because→ subordonnant par coordonnant !		
Ex. : Nous sommes partis plus tôt parce que nous devons prendre l'autobus. We left earlier because we had to catch the bus.		
Répétition des prépositions à- de- en		
Not in English because it's goes with the verb.		
Titre en anglais→ la première lettre de chaque mot sauf les articles et prépositions-conjonctions		
Italique (souligné) le titre de l'œuvre		
«» un partie de ...		
Choix du pronom personnel complément→ le-les...lui-leur Ex. : Je les parle... Je leur parle		
Liste des mots français-anglais		
Exercice, suspense	Dernièrement – lastly	Fun- funny sportif – athlétique
Library – bibliothèque	Langage, langage	Example-exemple
Default-défaut	Futur – avenir	Hero-héros fameux - celebre
Versatile – polyvalent	sympathique –gentil	actually - maintenant
Écriture de la date		
Le mardi 14 février 2012		
Tuesday, March 15, 2012		
Avoir-être		
Abréviation		
Symbole = anglais et français→ pas de point !		
Abr. Français dernière lettre pas de point, sinon point anglais tjrs un point		

Feature article = article analytique

Structure

Headline

Secondary headline

Byline

(élève fait la correspondance) Hook (chapeau) – lead = Scénario, anecdote, questionne le lecteur

Body → Les éléments d'influence qui causent cet élément

To conclude, the errors that the teachers chose to focus on for their CLR were errors that would pose a greater problem during their end of year exams. As well they were areas that students had to pay particular attention to such as the organization of a text because though the organization is basically the same, it is the small differences that would result in the biggest penalty during a high stakes evaluation. Lastly, the teachers chose these areas to work on because they were errors that should be corrected by secondary 5 and also because they would negatively influence the quality of the students' writing.

The Process of Planning CLR Step-by-Step

At this point the teachers had already met a few times to isolate the grammatical and writing features that they wanted the students to notice with regard to the similarities and differences between English and French. Miranda and Judith decided that they would spend time during the meetings explaining and teaching the grammatical rules and differences to each other and examining the differences in the text types. They also decided that they would discuss any on- the-fly references they made and any issues and successes that came up during class. By success they meant that a student was able to

make reference to a similarity or difference in the other language and that therefore noticing had occurred. We will now look closely at the process Judith and Miranda went through to plan CLR over the course of 10 months. Table 5 summarizes the meetings by date. Following the table is a description of the weekly meetings.

Table 5

Calendar of Meetings and Content Addressed

September 2011	October 2011 October 20 – first meeting - teachers discussed their concerns and what they felt was important to them with regard to helping their students write	November 2011 November 4 – writing sample analysis November 13 - writing sample analysis	December 2011 December 1 – looked at specific language features to address; co-teaching December 22 – work on reference document December 23 – the two teachers taught grammar lessons to each other	January 2012 January 19 – looked at more language features and, 1 at the argumentative/ feature article text types January 31 – looked at language features and discussed brainstorming as part of the writing process
February 2012 February 16 – two meetings in one; co-teaching, elaboration of reference document	March 2012 March 19 – talked about journals students would receive, looked at structure of text types March 29 – examined differences and similarities of argumentative text	April 2012 April 24 – discussed particular language features posing a problem in the writing of text	May 2012 May 25 - shared their experience with DSP and other FMT and ESL secondary 5 teachers	June 2012 June 13 – looked back at the year they had and the pros and cons of the whole CLR experience

Summary of Meetings

The following is a summary of the meetings as recorded in the researcher's journal.

October 20, 2011 Process of Planning CLR: The first meeting

During this first meeting, the teachers and I decided together how we were going to approach the referencing to be made in the two classes. For further details, see *The Process of Planning CLR: The First Meeting* page 42.

November 4, 2011 meeting

The two teachers talked about their correction grids and discussed the next step with regard to CLR which was to identify the major errors.

November 13, 2011 meeting

Judith and Miranda talked about the plan of action; they discussed the list of errors they had identified and the organization of the text types they needed to address.

December 1, 2011 meeting

The teachers identified the errors they felt were based on cross-linguistic influence (either English or French) and looked at particular writing issues that were common in both English and French writing, such as students forgetting to separate paragraphs and the importance of going through the phases of the writing process. They looked at and taught each other about sentence structure S + V + ROS (rest of sentence). They had a discussion about teachers being able to work together. Judith said that she thought such

collaboration would work if teachers felt that they were not being evaluated or critiqued. Rather they should discuss how they could work together with the goal of helping the students. Both teachers expressed the view that a teacher needs to be linguistically aware and fairly bilingual.

December 22, 2011 meeting

The goal of this meeting was to continue adding to the reference document. A specific teaching moment had occurred during the meeting; i.e. Miranda and Judith taught each other the rules of direct and indirect quote usage and how they differ in English and in French. The reference document was adjusted in relation to this grammar point.

It was clear from my observation of Miranda and Judith teaching each other that teachers need to be meta-linguistically aware in their L1 and open to asking and questioning how the L2 functions. The teachers felt that being able to share their own cross-linguistic knowledge empowered students and helped them to activate prior knowledge.

December 23, 2011 meeting

The teachers discussed their reference document and talked about count and non-count nouns that posed a problem, such as *homeworks, informations, researches, moneys, furniture and analysis*. They also talked about the articles *the/ la, a / une*

January 19, 2012 meeting

The teachers continued talking about syntax and language features. They looked at the argumentative and persuasive texts and the criteria that make them similar and/or

different. The teachers also discussed the *Progression of Learning* (see page 19) and how this particular reference document differs for both subjects English and French.

January 31, 2012 meeting

The teachers talked at great length about particular linguistic features and particular student cases and examples. The teachers also talked about brainstorming and the process students go through in order to brainstorm.

February 16, 2012 (First extended meeting)

After several weekly meetings, the teachers expressed their frustration at always having to stop in the heat of their discussions because of time constraints. We then asked the DSP if we could be given a few hours during a pedagogical day in order to hammer out some documents and notes based on the work that had been done thus far with regard to CLR. These documents would be used as a reference this school year and the next. The meeting lasted from 9:30-12:30.

The two teachers looked at linguistic features. They also compared how to address the reader when writing a letter: the difference between the “appel” in French and the salutation in English.

The teachers gave each other lessons about conjunctions such as “car”, “mais”, “or”, “donc”.

The teachers talked about the difference in comma usage. For example, no comma is used before “because” (*He ate the apple because he was hungry*); however, in an equivalent

French sentence, “car” and “parce que” can be preceded by a comma (*Il a mangé la pomme, car il avait faim*).

The teachers talked about the rules for capitalization in titles; in English, the first and other key words are capitalized but articles, prepositions, and conjunctions are not.

They looked at the writing of numbers; is it the same in the two languages?

They looked at problematic vocabulary such as “sympathy”, “actually”, “sportive”, “dernièrement-lastly”, “example” and “language”.

They discussed how the date is written in English versus in French.

March 19, 2012

Judith was absent. Miranda and I met anyway. We discussed the specific CLA interventions to be noted and dates; the journal would be started the following week. We looked over the structure of the reference document.

March 29, 2012

The teachers talked about the persuasive/argumentative text, how it is taught within the FMT program, and how it differs in English. They discussed the procedure for the exam; it seems to be the same.

April 24, 2012

Judith spoke about capital letters and titles, and they adjusted the chart. These matters needed to be addressed as they seem to be problematic in the students’ writing.

Because we noticed that students forgot what specific cross-linguistic references the teachers made each week, though they noticed that some had been made, we decided to provide an “aide memoire” sheet to help students along the way. (See appendix H)

May 25 Meeting with Secondary 5 EESL, FMT Teachers and School DSP

During the last pedagogical day of the school year, the DSP wanted to have a meeting with Miranda, Judith, and me to explain the work we had done during the school year with the other English and FMT secondary 5 teachers. We each shared our experiences and what we had learned as teachers about CLR. The other teachers had many questions as they were very curious about how they could help their students the following year. The French teachers were particularly interested in how students could improve their French writing skills. Beatrice, the other FMT teacher, even said that during her French class she noticed a student pull out the blue “aide memoire” sheet, appendix H, to note a reference she made to English poetry. She concluded that students who really care about improving their French and English skills will notice references made by the teachers.

Last Meeting June 13, 2012

During this last meeting, the two teachers and I shared some final thoughts and reflections on the past year.

I asked them the following: How do you know that the cross-linguistic referencing works and helps students with the writing?

Judith stated that it was the students’ reactions that let her know that the students had noticed the CLR. In particular, she noted that the students who have difficulty with

French seem to show awareness or “light up” when they can address and verbalize the problem or the CLR. Judith suggested that the blue sheet, appendix H, be used as a reference tool, very much like a dictionary. Judith felt that it helped students to remember the grammar rules and conventions.

Miranda stated that some students could answer the questions she asked with regards to the CLR. Students showed understanding by stating “you told us about the difference/similarity, that’s how we know about it.” She feels that for students who care and want to learn, it makes a difference and is very helpful.

With regard to continuing the project next year, the school’s DSP could not guarantee that the teachers would be freed one hour per week to meet. This matter was discussed during the last meeting. The teachers decided that even if they were not officially given time next year, they would still want to meet on a regular basis to plan and discuss CLR. They feel that it is an important and a valuable part of their teaching.

Teachers’ On-The-Fly Reference Journals

The following analysis still about informing research questions 2 and 3. Initially it was going to take a while for the teachers to plan their cross-linguistic referencing and also to teach each other some of the grammatical features. However, the teachers were making references anyway. Therefore, to keep track of the ones they made, they kept a journal. In it they documented references they made from September to June. The references were noted on a daily basis or whenever they were made. After ten months I compared the references noted by the teachers to analyze the following:

- a) if the two teachers made the same references at a given time
- b) if the references the teachers noted were the same as the ones the students noted in their journals (Research Question #4)
- c) with what frequency the references were made.

The following is the transcribed journals of both teachers. (Table 6)

Table 6

Transcription of On-the-Fly References

Judith’s on-the-fly referencing

Miranda’s on-the-fly referencing

September 2011

made reference to date: the order and capitalization Date: jour/mois – minuscule - no ;	None
How to write a letter: Do not use “cher” error from “dear”	None
Novel titles: Souligne (manuscript) Italique (ordinateur)	None
Vocabulary: dans l’avenir	None

The following references are for October to December. It is important to note that Judith had a student teacher from October 24 to December 23 and this is reflected in the number of references made, which are few, for that period of time.

Judith: October – December 2011

Sentence structure: C'est à cause de – du a (due to)
Vocabulary: Polyvalent – versatile
Pronoun error : Je lui (not -le) parle ---pron. pers. CD –le la les l' --- pron. pers. CI – lui leur
Punctuation : “ “English quotation marks should be <<>> in French guillemets français seulement à l'intérieur <<.....>>

Miranda: October 2011

Sentence structure: Because – parce que / car
Verb tenses : Verb tenses not the same as French – perfect tenses I had gone before – 2 French verb tenses

Miranda: November 2011

Compositions: Openings In this composition Today I will talk about I / you -> moi/nous
Noun clause Reported speech – difference in French Direct speech – difference in French Punctuation “sample sentence here.”
Feature article Chapeau = Q words Students express that there must be a chapeau in French, more like newspaper in English

Miranda: December 2011

Quotation marks difference between English and French
Conditional “ if “ noun clauses Si – complicated in both French and English -> remember only 1 situation

January 2012

Judith

Miranda

<p>Vocabulary :</p> <p>ex<u>e</u>mple, exerc<u>i</u>ce, ad<u>r</u>esse</p> <p>derni<u>è</u>rement - finalement</p> <p>reminder of the following words – versatile = polyvalent – du a = a cause de</p>	<p>Vocabulary and Spelling:</p> <p>Cheque – British</p> <p>Colour – more like French possessives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The works of Shakespeare (not as common in English – more classical) <p>Date!!!</p> <p>Month day, year</p> <p>Students always writing day month (missing comma) year</p>
---	---

February 2012

Judith

Miranda

<p>provided reminders of previous on-the-fly references</p>	<p>To do – to make</p> <p>Similar situation</p> <p>To savoir</p> <p>connaître</p> <p>comma rules</p> <p>enumeration</p> <p>capitals – title</p>
---	---

March 2012

Judith

Miranda

<p>Writing conventions:</p> <p>Difference in the writing structure between English and French for the argumentative text/texte argumentatif *intro + * conclusion</p> <p>Content of paragraphs for argumentative text in comparison to the feature article</p>	<p>Writing stylistic features:</p> <p>Explanation of “Dear”, student asks why we are using Dear if we don’t know the person -> different from French</p> <p>Punctuation: no comma before ‘because’ – like ‘parce que’ in French</p>
--	--

The March references were made in relation to the MELS secondary V provincial exam.

The goal of the exam is similar for both subjects.

April 2012

Judith

Miranda

<p>Punctuation:</p> <p>Capitalization differences between English and French</p> <p>Reminder of argumentative text writing conventions similarities and differences between the two languages</p>	<p>Vocabulary:</p> <p>research, information, furniture, technology -> French plural (reminded students)</p> <p>articles: a/an -> French vowel includes ‘y’</p>
---	--

May 2012 Judith and Miranda

No references were made by either teacher as the students were writing their MELS exams. These exams take up to two weeks to complete. As well, Miranda was away.

June 2012 Miranda

\$ before number in English, after in French

Vocabulary: research (singular word)

Articles: a/an – students still making this mistake, maybe an attention issue?

For Judith, no particular references were noted in June. The focus in May and June was on the French MELS exam. Table 7 provides a summary of the references made in terms of their frequency and type.

From the CLR items listed by both teachers, we see that there is a combination of both ‘on the fly’ references and planned references. Both teachers made references that reflected the areas they spoke about during their weekly meetings and they also reflected some of the items they had planned for CLR back in September. The March references were in preparation for their students’ respective MELS exams and they both tackled this aspect with regard to CLR.

Table 7 *Summary of On-The Fly References Made by FMT and EESL Teacher*

	Judith French Teacher	Miranda English Teacher
Punctuation	3	8
Vocabulary	6	7
Grammar	2	9
Writing Convention	5	3
Total	16	27

Analyzing the On-The-Fly Reference Frequency

From Table 7, we can see that Miranda recorded more references in her journal overall than Judith did, and noted more references to French grammar than Judith. Perhaps this was the case because Miranda is more proficient in her L2 than Judith. On the other hand, Judith made two more references to writing conventions than Miranda. This is consistent with what was observed in the weekly meetings when Miranda asked Judith if she could make references to writing features that differed in the argumentative versus feature article text types. The students also observed in their questionnaires that Judith made many references to these text types. (See Appendices D to G for the student questionnaires)

From the analysis of the teachers' on-the-fly journal entries, I concluded that Miranda, the EESL teacher, was more thorough and diligent about noting the references, both those that were planned as well as the true on-the-fly references. She also used the journal to take notes from the weekly meetings, which she then referred to when she was

teaching. As for the French teacher, Judith noted a few on-the-fly references but noted more planned references. The teachers did make the same types of references, often at the same period of time. One example is their reference to sentence structure in October. As well, as I will discuss in greater detail under Research Question #4, the students noticed the same types of references that Miranda and Judith reported in their on-the-fly journals.

Creating a Reference Document

In the preceding pages, I have described the process teachers went through to plan CLR. The second part of Research Question #3 asks what tools/instruments teachers can create to help their students notice the CLR. During the project, it quickly became apparent that the teachers wanted to focus on documenting the references they had made. They felt that a reference document would be an important tool and a starting point for CLR when they began the next school year. Their intention is to build on the document as they proceed with the CLR process in years to come. Moreover, they want the document to be used by other English and French teachers in the school. The initial document they created can be found in Appendix I.

Phases of Planning CLR a Summary

The following is a summary of the phases Miranda and Judith went through in order to plan CLR.

- The teachers spent the first few months explaining to each other the grammatical features they had planned to focus on.

- Mid-way through the project, at approximately month 5, the teachers gave their students the first journal to complete. From that point on, the students received a journal prompt once every week and a half. The journals allowed the students to make a note of any referencing that they had noticed. In addition, the prompts asked them specific questions about the references made. The journal prompts and what students noticed are described below under Research Question #4.
- At every meeting, the two teachers shared any on-the-fly reference(s) they had made in class. They discussed all questions or clarified issues that came up during the class. It was very common to see Judith and Miranda at the board teaching each other grammar from their respective L1s.
- By February, the teachers' main focus was the persuasive text type and its stylistic features.
- After February, it became important for the teachers to document the grammatical features and the particularities of the text type they were focusing on. The teachers wanted to create a reference document that they could give to their students the following year and also to the other EESL and FMT teachers in secondary 5. The teachers felt that it was very important the next school year to start the referencing very early on and to get the students to use the reference documents right away.

- After the initial journal entry, the teachers felt it was important for students to record on a reference sheet, daily instances of CLR that they noticed as opposed to waiting until the end of a week.

Research Question #4

Do EESL students notice the cross-linguistic references made by their L1 and L2 teachers? If so, what do they notice?

To answer this question about whether or not students noticed the references made by their teachers, the students completed several questionnaires in their journals and with each questionnaire a journal prompt was included (see Appendices D to G). The questionnaires were meant to provide data about whether the students noticed any referencing made by their teachers, and the journal prompts were included to get a better understanding of how the students felt about the CLR being used. The initial questionnaires also elicited information about the students' self-rated proficiency in French and English and the language(s) they speak at home. The following is a description of the data from the questionnaires, the journal prompts and the particulars of each.

Student Journals

The students completed seven questionnaires. I chose to analyze five different sets of questionnaires because they included a journal prompt and because of the particular qualitative data they provide. (The four questionnaires with the journal prompts can be found in Appendices D through G). The questionnaires were sometimes distributed by the French teacher and other times by the English teacher, depending on the students' and

teachers' schedules. As well, the students had the option to answer the journal questions and prompts in either English or French. However if the students asked for English and/or French examples they provided them in the required language. It is important to note that not all students completed all of the journals for logistical reasons (e.g. the composition of the groups, absences). In the discussion of each journal entry, I indicate the number of students who completed the entry. Please note that student comments are documented exactly as they were written by the students. The following is the breakdown of the dates for the five questionnaire and journal sets and the motivation for each prompt.

April 10 Journal (Appendix D)

This first questionnaire was meant to examine the students' initial noticing of the references made by their teachers by asking them to list as many references as they could remember their English and French teachers making up until that point in the year. The teachers had been making references since September, but this was the first time the students were asked about what they noticed. In addition, the journal prompt examined the students' attitudes toward the referencing by asking if they thought it was helpful or not and why. This is the prompt that was given.

Do you think it is helpful if your French and English teachers make reference to the other language in your class? For example, if your French teacher makes reference to English and vice-versa.

Yes No Maybe

Justify (explain) your answer

Analysis April 10 Journal

With regard to whether they thought references would be helpful, 16 students replied *yes*, 6 replied *no* and 12 responded *maybe*. Transcribed below are some comments from the students, starting with the positive and ending with the negative.

Positive Comments:

- *I think that it is sometimes helpful and sometimes it is confusing to know both sides.*
- *Ainsi, on peut d'avantage comprendre et savoir ces differences entre les deux langues*
- *Parce que ceci peut te permettre d'ainsi mieux comprendre la matière enseignée*
- *Parce que cela aide à faire une distinction entre la matière exemple: , car , because (jamais)*
- *We can understand better how things work by giving examples from a language we understand better*
- *Cela facilite parfois la compréhension de certaines notions*
- *Je juge que le procédé de référence à l'autre langue peut aider dans le cas ou mon professeur d'anglais réfère au francais ainsi je me base sur ma langue première pour perfectionner ma maîtrise de ma language seconde*
- *Sometimes there are some details we are used to in French that are not the same in English and it can get confusing when the teacher doesn't specify said differences*
- *Helps to avoid making mistakes*
- *Helpful, we sometimes think things are the same in English and French*

Maybe Comments:

- *I think that sometimes it can be useful because it can help a student to make links from a language's rule to another but on the other hand the rules are not all the same, so it can be confusing*
- *Sometimes it can help me to not make mistakes, but other times it is only mixing me up even more*

Negative Comments :

- *Je pense que ce n'est pas nécessaire de combiner les 2 langues car cela pourrait nous mélanger puisque nous pourrions mélanger de ce fait l'orthographe des mots*
- *C'est très mélangent puisqu'il y a certaines choses qui sont identiques dans les 2 langues alors que d'autres non et il devient difficile de les différencier*

What stands out of the first journal is that the reaction of students with regard to CLR is more positive than not. When students thought that the CLR might hinder learning it was usually supported by comments that expressed a concern about being more confused because of the referencing done with both languages. Those who expressed positive comments felt that CLR would actually help them to not be confused with regard to the grammar rules and writing conventions of English and French.

Do the Students Notice?

Out of the 12 students both Miranda and Judith teach who have been exposed to CLR from the beginning of the year in both classes, 11 out of 12 (91.6%) students noticed Miranda's referencing and 7 out of 12 (58%) noticed Judith's referencing. Of the

other 20 students in the study, all 10 of Miranda's students noticed her referencing and 7 out of 10 students from Judith's class noticed her referencing. The reason the number of students who noticed may seem low is that these are mixed classes in which the students may have a different English or French teacher. Of this group of 20, 4 students claimed their English teacher makes references (comparison group) and 7 claimed he does not. Of this group, 5 students claim their French teacher (comparison group) does not make references and 5 other students claim that this same French teacher does make references.

After realizing that some students who did not have Miranda and/or Judith as teachers said that their ESL or French teacher was making references to the other language in class, I decided to interview these other (comparison group) teachers to see if they were, in fact, making references and if so, what type and in what instances. In the next section, I summarize these interviews because they are relevant to the findings for the April 10 questionnaire/journal.

Interviews with Comparison Group Teachers

The teachers I interviewed were the French teachers, Yvon and Beatrice, and the ESL teachers, Alexandra and Kevin. The following are their interview responses with regard to the references they make in class.

Yvon has been a FMT teacher for 35 years. French is his mother tongue. He feels his ability to speak and comprehend text in English to be limited. He claims that he cannot write in English but that he can understand English conversations. He thinks that it is very important for the EESL and FMT teachers to work together because he has noticed an increase in the number of students who speak English, which he attributes to

Intensive English offered in the primary school. He feels that there is much more English exposure and that the students' French has become Anglicized. Yvon feels that the students tend to think in English when they write in French more than they did in the past. The references he claims to make in class are based on grammar and syntax, prepositions and "anglicismes" like "fund raiser". Though he considers his skills in English to be far from fluent, he still thinks it is important for the English and French teachers to work together so that they can help improve the French students learn.

Beatrice has been an FMT teacher for 3 years. She considers herself to be perfectly bilingual, having been raised in a bilingual home. She believes that it is very important that FMT and EESL teachers work together to plan CLR in order for teachers to stop asking themselves why their students always make the same mistakes. Beatrice says that she does make references to English because she can. She understands where the students' errors may be coming from because of her knowledge of English and French. She feels that it is important to help her students. The references she claims to make concern titles, capitalization, vocabulary words such as cognates, prepositions and "anglicismes" such as "bloc appartement".

Alexandra has been teaching English for three years although she was not trained to teach ESL. She considers herself to be fluent with regard to French comprehension. She says that when she speaks French, she sometimes needs to revert to using English words. She considers her French writing skills to be average. She believes that there are only advantages to making references to French in the ESL class, especially with regard to teaching and explaining prepositions. She feels that if teachers do not address the

problems that students have in their writing, the students cannot improve. Alexandra thinks that the collaboration between French and English teachers will always be a lot of work, but if teachers are willing then it is worth pursuing. She believes that a lot of discussion would have to take place between the teachers. Alexandra says that she does make references to French with regard to prepositions and sentence structure.

Kevin has been teaching English, his mother tongue, for 23 years. He considers his French speaking and comprehension skills to be functional. His writing skills are adequate. He does not have a firm opinion as to whether teachers of two different languages can work together, and it is not an important matter to him. Based on what his students tell him, he feels that they already know how the two languages differ, so there is no need make cross-linguistic comparisons. He claims that he does not make any specific references to French. Rather, he simply answers the students' questions and confirms their observations about the differences and similarities in English and French.

What the Students Noticed

Still looking at research question 4 about what students notice, the following four tables (Tables 8-11) list the references the students noted in their April 10 journal. The references are listed separately for the teachers of the experimental group (Miranda and Judith) and two teachers of the control group (Kevin and Beatrice). Each row shows that the item noticed was reported by one student and therefore the item may be repeated more than once but expressed with different terminology.

Table 8

Reported References Made by Miranda

Made reference about “lettre ouverte” that we are supposed to write in French and that we shouldn’t do in English, certain words and grammatical information
Pronunciation of words
Explains that grammar rules are different
Talked about comma rules in written production
Comma rule, but/and/because
“Texte argumentative”, the feature article, how to use a citation
Punctuation, sentence structure
Citations
Feature article
Grammar rules
Difference in words from French to English
Rules on commas
Comma usage as opposed to the French
Structure such as reported speech
Punctuation, pronunciation
Reference to grammar differences
Talk about differences what to do and not to do
Grammar rules/errors
Grammar rules, words and expressions
Examples of pronunciation and spelling differences; compares differences between two languages
Direct quotes
Quotation and citation rules, capital letters, dates, paragraph structure
Verbs, titles, commas
Quotation marks

Table 9

Reported References Made by Judith

The argumentative text
Talking about “ <i>anglicisms</i> ”
Can’t remember
“ <i>Anglicisms</i> ”
Can’t remember
Open letter
Grammar rules
“ <i>Anglicisms</i> ”
Corrects “ <i>anglicisms</i> ”

Writing structures and differences
French/English expressions (equivalents) reference to the structure of a text
If we need to know a French word better
Makes a comparison between punctuation in French in relation to English
Mention of errors made in French that are not errors in English
Argumentative text « personnel » je

Table 10

Reported References Made by Kevin

What words mean in French, when words are not clear in English they are explained in French, when a word needs to be understood better
Examples of sentences where you can use commas (car)
Explain the structure of a text compared to the text type in French

Table 11

Reported References Made by Beatrice

Talks about differences what to do and not to do
Words that come from English, expressions
Examples of pronunciation and spelling differences
“Anglicismes”
Titles, capitals, quotes

Summary

As the tables show, Miranda’s and Judith’s students mentioned very specific references that their English and French teachers made. The examples they provided closely matched what Judith and Miranda noted in their journals. In particular for the month of April, when the students had to start journaling, specific examples noted by the students such as *the argumentative text, writing structures and differences, makes a comparison between punctuation in French in relation to English, argumentative text*

“personel” je and difference in words from French and English matched what Judith and Miranda noted in their journals and what they had planned to reference as documented during their weekly meetings.

Kevin’s students mentioned that he made references to French such as *examples of sentences where you can use commas (car)*, the examples the students provided were very few and vague and related mostly to vocabulary, compatible with the ESL program. Though Kevin said that he didn’t do any referencing, the students’ noticing may reflect instances when Kevin answers the students’ questions and confirms their observations about the differences and similarities in English and French.

Beatrice’s students mentioned that she made references to English; again, examples seem to be vague and to correspond with what she claimed to refer to in class. These students are at the same level of French as Judith’s students.

So, taken together, we can see that Miranda and Judith’s students were able to notice very specific references made by both Judith and Miranda. The references noted by the students matched the CLR planning and journaling made by the aforementioned teachers. When students in the comparison group noticed references made by their teachers, they were very few and vague thus suggesting that since Miranda and Judith made it very apparent that they would be both making references throughout the year that it reflected the students’ ability to notice in a concrete manner.

April 23 Journal (Appendix E)

This questionnaire that simply asked students to note and references made by their teachers came at the time when I knew the teachers were putting a lot of emphasis on the upcoming MELS French and English writing exams and the particulars of these text types in both English and French. The questionnaire asked whether or not their English or French teachers had made any references, to note what the references were and whether they thought they were helpful or not. I wanted to see if the students noticed the references made by the teachers at this critical time.

Analysis April 23 Journal

This questionnaire was completed just a week after the first. This journal is of particular interest because 6 of the 15 students had stated in the first journal that their French teacher, Judith, made no or few references to English. However, in the second journal, the students were able to report that the French teacher had made reference to the argumentative text in comparison to the feature article, a requirement of the English MELS exam. This is quite important to note because between April 10 and April 23, Miranda asked Judith to focus on this particular aspect of writing when making references to English. Miranda felt that the students were rather confused about the similarities and differences in these two text types. In the April 23rd journal, out of the 11 students questioned, 7 said that their French teacher made specific reference to the argumentative/feature article text type, while 4 students said that no referencing was made. Of the students who had the other French teacher, 12 in all, no student made

mention of any referencing having been made. This suggests that Judith was successful in helping the students notice the particular aspects of the text type in question.

May 15 Journal (Appendix D)

This questionnaire was given to the Français plus group. The students in this group get additional help with French. It is a small group of 16 students; Judith teaches the whole group French, and Miranda teaches 5 of them English while other English teachers teach the rest. I wanted to see if they had noticed any particular references made by their teachers. The prompt was the same as for April 23rd which asked students to list any specific examples of when the English and/or French teachers made any references to the other language.

Analysis Français Plus Journal

Of the 16 students, 11 said that no referencing had been made, which is accurate considering that the students wrote the journal during the MELS exam period, a fact which the students mentioned in their journals. As well, during that time, Miranda was away so no references could have been made in English class. However, 5 students did note that references were made in French class. Of these, 2 students whose L1s are Chinese and Vietnamese are of particular interest. Because they were struggling in French, Judith sometimes talked about them during the weekly meetings. Indeed, she felt that the referencing seemed to be helping them notice particular grammar rules that they found problematic. Moreover, Judith's observation is reflected in these students' journals. The following is what these two students wrote when asked about the references made in class:

Student A: For most of the time, when you use a preposition in French the preposition in English will be different, for example, in French, we say we are walking in the road (dans la rue) But in English, we write we are walking on the road.

Student B: (The teachers made reference to) the punctuation in English and French (quotation marks)

I am less confused when I need to decide what punctuation to insert.

May 17 Journal (Appendix F)

This questionnaire was the same as the others in that it asked if the students noticed any referencing made by their teachers; however, an additional journal question asked the following:

If your French teacher explains to you that in general in French writing you DO NOT capitalize all major words in a title like it is done in English, how is this helpful to you?

English: The White Horse

French: Le cheval blanc

Analysis May 17 Journal

This questionnaire was given mid-May, when the students were engaged in their MELS exams. Therefore it is not surprising that almost all the students said that no referencing had been made by their English or French teacher. In the few cases where students did notice referencing, these examples were provided:

- *Some noticing*
- *Yes, mainly correcting “anglicismes”*

The student then went on to say:

- *The references help us be conscious of when we use English words in French*

Two other examples of noticing include:

- *differences in poetry*
- *comma placed before “and”*

The following are some of the comments from students regarding the usefulness of information about capitalization in titles:

- *I make less mistakes in my writing evaluation so I get to have better marks.*
- *I won't make any of these errors in my written production in English and in French when I go to use capitals*
- *helps us not to get mixed up*
- *I won't use capitals in French but I will use them in English*
- *Allows me not to get mixed up when I write titles and I switch from one language to the other*
- *The reference helped me because I had the tendency to mix the two up*
- *I will remember for next time*
- *Very helpful because in this way we are not penalized for the error in our work*
- *When it is time to write a composition, most of the time you will I assume remember what the teacher said and avoid the error*
- *It helps to not mix the English and French rules for the capitalization when I write titles, I can avoid assuming that the rules are the same in both languages.*
- *When I ask myself in which language I'm supposed to capitalize all the title, I remember my teacher saying it in class.*

Only a handful of students did not think that such an explanation would be helpful. Of those students, this is what some had to say:

- *It isn't actually (helpful) because you mix the two rules and personally I made mistakes in English because of it*
- *She already knows the capital rule so the referencing would not be helpful*
- *She already knows the rule*

It is interesting to note that of the 6 students who said that the explanation would not be helpful, 4 of those students have Kevin as the English teacher. Perhaps openness to referencing of the other language is increased if the respective teacher explains to students why it is being done in class.

May 30/31 Journal (Appendix G)

These journals asked students to reflect on whether or not they felt the references made by the teachers were helpful in preparing for and taking their English and French MELS exams. The journal prompt was the following:

Did the references your French or English teacher made with regard to the other language (French teacher making English references and the English teacher making French references) in the last couple of weeks help prepare you for your MELS English and French exams? Please explain your answer.

Analysis May 30/31 Journal

At the end of the research project, the students were asked one last time whether or not they felt the references made by the teachers had been helpful or not. The majority of the students stated that no references had been made. Again, this is not surprising as the

students were writing exams, and the teachers claimed not to have made any references during that period of time. However, 8 references were noted. These 8 references were identified as having been made by either Judith or Miranda, not the other English or French teachers.

Regardless of the limited number of references noted in the journals, I wanted to know if the students thought that the references made up until that time had been helpful to them in writing their French and English MELS exams. In responding to the May 30/31 prompt, 12 students said the references had helped and 15 said they had not. From those who responded positively, here are some of their explanations:

- *Helps me to not make the mistake, understand the difference*
- *Helped us differentiate for structure and difference of expression*
- *To help with the differences for the two MELS evaluations*
- *All the references the teachers make are helpful that could be used during an evaluation*
- *Use of quotes in English and French helps to write properly in each language*
- *I remember the examples in English in French for the written production*
- *We know that some of the things we can do in French is not possible in English or vice versa for example capitalizing the title*
- *For the exam (MELS) it was very helpful to know the differences of the two texts (English and French) in French the text needs to be au "je" unlike in English*

- *References linked to written productions structure like how a feature article was different from the “texte argumentatif” which helped to avoid mistakes.*
- *The texts are kind of similar in some parts. It helped with not being mixed up when reading texts.*

The following two comments were made by students who did not feel that the references were helpful:

- *References are not helpful, I know the two languages well enough*
- *I think that to preserve the French language, we shouldn't talk in English*

A Summary of Comments:

From the comments related to this journal, the positive comments increased and were more specific and salient as they related more to the MELS exam. The findings show that the students do notice the planned and on-the-fly referencing made by their teachers. While most students found the referencing helped them avoid making needless errors in the L1 and L2, some were undecided and fewer thought the references were not helpful at all. Though students claimed that their ESL/EESL and FMT teachers in the comparison group also made references, it was obvious that because the teachers did not make it an explicit part of the teaching and because students were not aware of the teachers' intent to have them notice, their references tended to be vague and random.

Research Question #5

Is there a measureable effect on student writing when cross-linguistic awareness (CLA) pedagogy and activities are used?

Final Writing Test Results

To answer this research question, the teachers gave their students a final writing assignment to collect as a post-test sample. Though it would have been ideal to examine the Ministry exams, we did not have access to those results. The teachers corrected their students' final papers, focusing on the errors they had addressed cross-linguistically and referring to the first writing sample

When Miranda, the English teacher analyzed her students' final writing samples, she chose to note errors that she felt were still occurring as opposed to errors that were no longer present. Miranda found that the mistakes the students made in June were the following:

- 10 students made mistakes in capitals for titles
- Several students made article errors (e.g. *an habit*)
- 10 students made past tense passive voice errors (e.g. *They were gave the tools...*)
- Several students were still not capitalizing the days of the week/months/names in general
- More than a dozen students made the following errors: *information(s)* and *research(es)*

Judith's post-test sample revealed a more detailed analysis of the errors that were not present from the initial pre-test writing sample, as well as errors that were still recurrent; the following is some of her sampling. (see Appendix J for a complete table). Miranda's

analysis was much less detailed, but some comparisons can still be made. For example, Miranda found that fewer students were making mistakes when capitalizing titles and the date; Judith reported no such error in the post writing sample in French. Miranda reported that errors were still being made with words such as information(s) and research(es) whereas Judith reported that these errors were absent in her final observation. Judith's examples of recurrent errors include:

- Error with the use of "son" and "sont"
- Error with "tout le" and "tous le"
- Accord du verbe + sujet

Final Writing Summary

The final writing sample did not provide conclusive evidence with regard to the effectiveness of the CLR because some errors that the teachers chose to focus on were still present in either French or English. However, both teachers reported that some were not present in either language or that the frequency of errors had decreased when compared to the first written production/sample.

Research Questions: a Conclusion

To summarize, from data collected I can conclude that it is feasible for teachers to meet and plan CLR. As well, the students can plan and find similarities and differences to address in their CLR. The students do notice the teachers' CLR when it is made apparent from the beginning of the school year. Finally, some modest improvements are made with regard to writing but the post-test was not conclusive.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

Introduction

This thesis study examined cross-linguistic referencing (CLR) from the perspective of teachers and students. After reviewing these perspectives, I will offer some final thoughts on the use of CLR in the classroom.

The Teachers' Perspective: Feasibility

It would seem that teachers are enthusiastic about implementing CLR with the aim of helping their students notice and be more accountable for the written work they produce. Judith and Miranda were often frustrated when their students said they had not noticed the teachers' references when they in fact knew referencing had been done. The teachers took the project very seriously, and they took great pride in the isolated moments of success when they saw certain students "get it" or notice. It seems that a teacher's lower proficiency in the cross-referenced language, which was the case for Judith, does not necessarily inhibit or limit the use of CLR. In fact, if teachers of differing languages are comfortable about asking for help, then the prospect of implementing CLR is very promising. As Judith mentioned, CLR is not about judging how a teacher teaches but rather, it's about being conscious of students' academic needs. Of course, being meta-linguistically aware is very helpful. In the case of Miranda, it is very possible that because she is comfortable with the grammar of both English and French, she was able to make more references to French grammar than Judith. This study has informed us that it is feasible for French and English teachers to work together to plan CLR. Time must be

provided for the teachers to meet and plan with more time attributed at the start of the planning process.

Two Language Programs: Similarities and Differences

This study has revealed that the French and EESL programs have a lot in common with regard to the grammar that is required to be taught and the writing conventions that need to be addressed. The fact that there are similarities in the programs illustrates the need for teachers to plan CLR in order to address what is the same in the two subjects. In doing so, students will be able to prevent errors of transfer from one language to the other and it will help students to develop their metalinguistic awareness in their L1 and also to grasp their L2 with greater confidence.

The Planning Process

It is possible for the teachers to plan CLR but like it was mentioned before, the appropriate time needs to be given to the teachers in order to meet. As well, the planning process may be slow initially, but the more the English and French teachers are familiar with their programs, are meta-linguistically aware of their L1s and have identified the language issues that need to be taught efficiency will increase.

The Students' Perspective

It would seem that using CLR in the classroom is something that needs to be part of students' language learning reality. I say this because the students seemed puzzled at first with the idea of the French or English teacher making reference to the other language in class. I would predict that making students aware of the benefits of CLR would help them notice the instances of CLR that occur in the English and French

classes. A positive attitude on the teacher's part from the start of a school year would perhaps help students understand that CLR is another tool that will help them to achieve success in their school work. It would seem beneficial for students to be exposed earlier on, such as first cycle secondary or even primary, to CLR and the differences between English and French. The students do notice CLR when they are made aware of its potential use.

Plan of Action, Recommendations, and Guidelines

From my personal experience as the researcher and from talking to Miranda and Judith, I suggest the following plan of action to other teachers or schools who would like to use this project as a model.

- Find English and French teachers who would like to work together in order to plan CLR
- Start planning a year ahead
- Ask for a scheduled meeting time from a school administrator if possible, or find a partner with the same "free period" in order to plan
- Collect a writing sample from your students at the beginning of the year or semester, which you will use to plan the CLR
- Explain to the students that referencing will be occurring and why

- Give the students a reference sheet, such as Appendix H so that they will get into the habit of taking note of the references made; allow students to use it as a reference tool much like a dictionary
- Repeat key concepts and explain their importance especially if there are differences in the two languages that may lead to high-stake errors during an evaluation

Limitations of the Study

The major limitation of this study is its small scale. The fact that it was conducted in one school with one English teacher, one French teacher, and their 32 students potentially limits its generalizability. However, the school administration was supportive of the language-teacher collaboration and provided release time to the participating teachers and myself. Thus it was a unique opportunity to conduct an exploratory case study into the feasibility and effectiveness of cross-curricular collaboration between first and second language teachers.

There were a number of obstacles during the study. These included interruptions to the regular school schedule which affected the momentum of the project, such as Christmas holidays, spring break, the English teacher getting married, and provincial exams that prevent the teacher(s) from doing any teaching for several consecutive classes. As well, the French teacher had a student teacher from October to December. This fact limited the number of references Judith made during this period. Finally, though the weekly meetings were very enriching and motivating, the teachers needed quite some time initially to find their way, and this was a slow process. Miranda and Judith spent

much time sharing classroom anecdotes related to CLR, and this may have also contributed to slowing down the momentum.

As well, writing samples revealed that the pretest to post-test changes in student writing were small or may not be attributable to the CLA pedagogical approach that was piloted. If this study were to be replicated, I would recommend that a different pre-test and post-test be administered that would target the features covered in the CLR treatment. Since the process was new for the teachers, the first few months of the project were dedicated to identifying the linguistic features to be addressed. Data from the case study is limited, but it will allow teachers to adjust their CLA procedure for the following school year. It was clear that the students and teachers thought that the referencing and noticing were relevant and important. Also, in many individual cases, learners reported that they learned a lot about the L1 and L2. The student journals were distributed too late in the school year at a point in the study when the CLA referencing was less frequent. Finally, on many occasions the students responded that they remembered the teacher making a reference but they could not remember any details. Giving a reference sheet such as Appendix H for them to record the references as they noticed them would have been useful right from the start.

Future Studies

This study shows much promise for the potential collaboration of EESL and FMT teachers. A preliminary project conducted in the same school two years ago revealed that most teachers were open to the idea of working together. It would not be difficult to

interest other English and French teachers in collaborating if they follow the suggestions outlined in this document.

An examination of the French and EESL ministerial programs shows that there are many similarities between the two. The Ministry of Education also officially mentions in its programs the possible connections that can be made to bridge the two language programs. Thus, it would appear that the Ministry could encourage first and second language teachers in Quebec to start working together. The next step would be for in-service training to be offered to the teachers of both subjects during a pedagogical day so that a larger number of teachers could work within a cross-linguistic referencing (CLR) paradigm. A trainer could show ways in which language awareness techniques can be applied to help sensitize both teachers and students to language. The training could also be given at the annual ESL teachers' convention.

As well, findings from the study could help FMT teachers to share their experience in the Quebec milieu and show that teachers of both subjects can collaborate to help the learners. The French language teachers could discuss the possibilities at their annual convention.

With regard to published materials, adjustments might be made to textbooks, or a supplemental insert might be added to the teacher's guide to illustrate how CLR pedagogy may be treated.

The next step would be to implement CLR tools from the beginning of a school year, to clearly measure the outcomes at the end of the year, and look at the final ministerial exam scores.

It is hoped that this study has established a procedure that other teachers can follow, even if their proficiency in the 'other' language is limited. This is an opportunity for teachers to embrace working together and sharing what they teach in two different languages. Many will be hesitant about the idea. However, as shown in the work by Helot and Young (2002) and this study, when the English and French teachers work together, both teachers and students across languages become more concerned about language and how it is taught and learned.

This research was exploratory in nature. It would be interesting to repeat the study with a true comparison group and pre- and post-test measures to see whether or not CLR leads to improvement in students' L1 and L2 skills. As well, while the CLR pedagogy was developed as this study went along, it would be interesting to see the impact of CLR when used from the beginning of the school year, with teachers already informed about the planning. Finally, while this study used high school students at the secondary 5 level, it would certainly be interesting to see how students of younger grades can benefit. To conclude, this project focused on writing but it would certainly be interesting to investigate CLR with reading as there are many similarities with how reading texts are treated in both the EESL and FMT classes.

Pedagogical Implications

I anticipate that using CLR would be very beneficial at the elementary level, specifically in the third cycle. With the implementation of Intensive English in grade 6, many FMT teachers have expressed concern that they will not have enough time to cover their program in the 5-month model. However, as we know from teaching two languages,

many notions and ideas are repeated in English and French. It would seem an ideal opportunity for CLR to be used with teachers of Intensive English and FMT of the same grade level to maximize teaching time, but more importantly to help the students develop their language skills and for teachers to understand the challenges the students are faced with.

Implications for Language Teacher Training

While no specific course on CLR is offered at the pre-service level for teachers, it would seem very beneficial to bring teachers' attention to the topic. This awareness on the part of the teachers would help them deal with the challenges of teaching students who may not understand why they are making certain errors and also enable students to use their L1 to recognize what they do understand about other languages. A teacher who has some awareness of CLR may provide language learners with strategies to cope while learning to read and write in both the L1 and L2 and allow a teacher to draw on useful similarities between the languages that they might not have noticed.

Quebec's language policies and realities may perhaps make French and English teachers shy away from working together, especially since it is not uncommon for ESL teachers to be reprimanded for speaking English in a school staff room. When that reality is combined with the longstanding warning for ESL and EFL teachers to avoid using the L1 in the class for fear that a little use may lead to too much use (Gillis, 2007), the idea of English and French teachers working together may take some convincing. So while the British government proposed that CLA become educational policy, Van Lier's suggestion would be hard to implement in the Quebec context; however, CLA pedagogy could be

addressed in both pre-service and in-service training, and materials made by publishers could put an emphasis on CLA.

Conclusion

In this thesis study, I found that not only was it feasible for EESL and FMT teachers to work together and plan CLR, but that they saw the pedagogical benefits for their students to improve their writing skills in both the L1 and L2. As CLR pedagogy becomes more mainstream, it will not be uncommon to find ESL/EESL teachers and their FMT colleagues sitting side by side doing some of their lesson planning together.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, S. & McNeill, A. (2005). Knowledge about language and the 'good language teacher'. In Bartels (ed.), *Applied linguistics and language teacher education* (pp. 159-178). New York: Springer.
- Association for Language Awareness. (2012). *About*. Retrieved from <http://www.languageawareness.org/web.ala/web/about/tout.php>
- Dagenais, D., Walsh, N., Armand, F., & Maraillet, E. (2008). Collaboration and co-construction of knowledge during language awareness activities in Canadian elementary school. *Language Awareness*, 17 (2), 139-155.
- Bilash, O., & Tulasiewicz, W. (1995). Language awareness and its place in the Canadian curriculum. In K. McLeod & Z. De Konick (Eds.), *Multicultural education: the state of the art. A national study*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers. 49-54.
- Borg, S. (1994). Language awareness as a methodology: Implications for teachers and teacher training. *Language Awareness*, 3(2), 61-71.
- Burley, S., & Pomphrey, C. (2003). Intercomprehension in language teacher education: A dialogue between English and modern languages. *Language Awareness*, 12 (3/4), 247-255.
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms. *The Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10, 221-240.
- Fullan, M. (2001). *The new meaning of educational change*, 3rd edition. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gillis, L. (2007). Using the learners' first language in the second language classroom: Beliefs and practices of Quebec secondary-level ESL teachers. Unpublished MA thesis, Concordia University, Montreal.

- Harris, V., & Grenfell, M. (2004). Language-learning strategies: A case for cross-curricular collaboration. *Language Awareness*, 13(2), 116-130.
- Hawkins, E. W. (1999). Foreign language study and language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 8 (3/4), 124-142.
- Helot, C. & A.S. Young (2002). Bilingualism and language education in French primary schools: why and how should migrant languages be valued? *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 5 (2), 96-112.
- Horst, M., White, J., & Bell, P. (2010). First and second language knowledge in the language classroom. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 14(3), 331-349.
- James, C. (1999). Language Awareness: Implications for the Language Curriculum. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 12(1), 94-115.
- Kruse, S. Louis, K.S., & Bryk, A.S. (1994). *Building professional learning communities*. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools.
- Lyster, R., Collins, L., & Ballinger, S. (2009). Linking languages through a bilingual read-aloud project, *Language Awareness*, 18(3-4), 366-383.
- Ministere de l'Éducation du Québec (2001). *Programme de formation de l'école Québécoise, enseignement secondaire, premier cycle*. Québec: Ministère de l'Éducation.
- Pomphrey, C., & Moger, R. (1999). Cross-subject dialogue about language: Attitudes and perceptions of PGCE students and modern languages. *Language Awareness*, 8 (3&4), 223-236.
- Simard, D., & Wong, W. (2004). Language awareness and its multiple possibilities for the L2 classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37, 96-110.
- Turnbull, M., & Dailey-O'Cain, J. (Eds.). (2009). *First language use in second and foreign language learning*. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Van Lier, L. (1991). Language awareness: The common ground between linguist and language teacher. *Georgetown University round table on languages and linguistics, volume 528-546.*

White, J., & Horst, M. (2012). Cognate awareness-raising in late childhood: Teachable and useful. *Language Awareness, 21(1-2), 181-196.*

Wright, T. (2002). Language in Language Teacher Education. John Benjamins Publishing Co., 107-130.

Wright, T. and R. Bolitho (1993). Language awareness: a missing link in teacher education? *ELT journal 47(4).*

Young, A. & C. Helot (2003). Language awareness and/or language learning in French primary schools today. *Language Awareness 12(3/4), 236-246.*

Note:

¹ All names are pseudonyms.

APPENDIX A

Interview with Teachers and DSP

Pre-project Interview Questions for DSP

1. How long have you been the DSP?
2. What is your perceived knowledge of French and English?
3. Why were you interested in working on this project?
4. Did you have any expectations of how it would go?
5. Do you think such collaboration would be feasible for other teachers or schools?
What would have to be in place for it to work well?
6. What recommendations do you have for other teachers or school who wish to collaborate on such a project?

Post-project Interview Questions with Beatrice & Yvon

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. What is your perceived knowledge of French and English?
3. Do you think such collaboration would be feasible for other teachers or schools?
What would have to be in place for it to work well?
4. How do you make references to English?

Post-project Interview Questions with Alexandra & Kevin

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. What is your perceived knowledge of French and English?
3. Do you think such collaboration would be feasible for other teachers or schools?
What would have to be in place for it to work well?
4. How do you make references to French?

Pre-project Interview Questions Miranda & Judith

1. How long have you been teaching?
2. What is your perceived knowledge of French and English?
3. Why were you interested in working on this project?
4. Did you have any expectations of how it would go?
5. What have you learned so far? What did this project help you to do?
6. What were the setbacks/limitations for you?
7. Do you think such a collaboration would be feasible for other teachers or schools? What would have to be in place for it to work well?
8. What recommendations do you have for next year or other teachers who wish to collaborate?

APPENDIX B

Nom _____
 JDLM – français 5^e secondaire

Groupe 57
 Année 2011 – 2012

Feuillet d'accompagnement : appréciation d'une œuvre théâtrale

Après une première évaluation et un peu plus d'un mois de vie en classe et d'observation de ton travail, voici ce à quoi ressemblera le prochain segment se déroulant du 3 au 14 octobre 2011.

➤ INTENTION PÉDAGOGIQUE

Amener l'élève à réfléchir sur sa pratique de scripteur en mettant à profit et en acquérant des connaissances sur la langue, les textes et la culture.

Il y aura une sortie au théâtre, suivie d'une discussion et d'une rédaction. Un feuillet d'accompagnement devra être complété dans son entièreté. Ce travail pourrait permettre un ajustement des résultats obtenus lors de la première évaluation.

Pour ce faire, tu devras effectuer une série d'observations sur ton travail afin de favoriser ta réflexion sur tes pratiques de scripteur et de lecteur. Ce premier constat orchestrera la suite ton travail.

1. Indique le nombre d'erreurs par catégorie que tu as faites dans le tableau de suivi d'écriture.
2. Surligne sur tes deux textes d'observation (cahier de création et texte sur *Nikolski*) et sur la liste ci-dessous les erreurs faisant partie de la liste des erreurs recensées (portrait initial).
3. Prends connaissance des observations qualitatives indiquées sur tes deux rédactions afin d'établir un plan de travail pour l'écriture de ton prochain texte.

Selon le constat établi, un parcours adapté te sera fourni.

1. TABLEAU DE SUIVI D'ÉCRITURE

	U	G			⊖	S		⊖	P		L E X
		G N	G V	H		C T	[]		O		
CAHIER DE CRÉATION											
RÉDACTION <i>NIKOLSKI</i>											
TOTAL											

LISTE DES ERREURS RECENSÉES

É – Er
Écriture chiffres en lettres
A – à
Écriture des titres
CP,
Accord verbe + sujet (BASE!)
Certain(s)
Écriture des accents
Ou – où
Conjugaison «eux» / «i» / «eus»
Mot français et anglais
, mais – car – or – donc
Accord verbe → qui sujet
Écriture de la date
Sont – son
Faire partie de
Trait d'union → inversion V-S ou complément-V
Tout le – tous les
Leur – leurs
Dont
Héros
D'autre(s)
Ce – se
Accord part. passé aux. Avoir
Favori(s)
Pronom de reprise le, la, les, l', lui, leur
Quoique – quoi que
De + nom(s)
Plupart
, et ce,
Oublier – obliger
Développer – appeler

PLAN DE TRAVAIL

FONCTIONNEMENT DE LA LANGUE ET LEXIQUE
OBSERVATIONS QUALITATIVES
ORGANISATION DU TRAVAIL

➤ *Appréciation d'une œuvre théâtrale*

ÉTAPES DE RÉALISATION

- a) Prends connaissance de ton feuillet *Grille d'évaluation d'une œuvre théâtrale* ;
- b) Lis le cahier d'accompagnement *Il Campiello* en tenant compte des quatre questions de discussion à la fin du feuillet;
- c) Remplis les parties du feuillet qui peuvent l'être avant la représentation;
- d) En devoir, après la représentation, remplis les parties du feuillet qui peuvent l'être;
- e) Le cours suivant la représentation, tu discuteras des quatre questions;
- f) Le cours suivant la discussion, tu auras à rédiger un texte.

- **Sortie au théâtre : le 11 octobre 2011**
- **Discussion : le 12 octobre 2011**
- **Rédaction : le 14 octobre 2011**

APPENDIX C

Name _____
 JDLM – EESL secondary 5

Group
 2011 – 2012

Feedback Sheet : C2 and C3 Feature Article

➤ Pedagogical Objective

To help students reflect on their writing and apply what they have learnt from the feedback sheet.

4. In the follow-up writing chart, indicate the number of mistakes you made in each category.
5. In the list below, underline the mistakes you made.
6. Understand and evaluate the markings on your composition and come up with a plan to help the next composition.

2. FOLLOW-UP WRITING CHART

	U	SENTENCE			SYNTAX			PUNCT.		LEX
		S	P	H	AWK	?	F/RO	⊙	O	
ROUGH										
C3 - FEATURE ARTICLE										

3. MOST COMMON MISTAKES

Headline and secondary h. structure
Lead/Close
Angle
Paragraph structure
Referring to text
Proper support
Vocabulary (ww, wc, and wform)
Tailoring to audience
Naming the source
Definitions
Quotation structure and explanation
Commas – FANBOYS
Verb tense consistent
General subjects

Subject-verb agreement
Present perfect
Noun clauses
Prepositions
Transitions
Question formation
Double negative
Contractions
If - conditional
Modals
Count vs non-count
More /most -er/-est
This/That
These/Those
etc
get

Processus
Scientific
False Cognates
Noun vs verb
A vs An
The vs A
But/Because
Sp - Another
Sp - Cannot
Sp- proof/prove
Sp- which
Sp- Future

5.PLAN

LANGUAGE AND GRAMMAR

YOUR OBSERVATIONS

OUTLINE AND ROUGH DRAFT - ORGANIZATION OF TEXT

APPENDIX D

Questionnaire #1

Name : _____ Date : _____

1. What language(s) do you speak and understand? _____

2. What is your perceived speaking level of French? (circle your answer)

excellent very good good poor

3. What is your perceived speaking level of English? (circle your answer)

excellent very good good poor

4. Do you think it is helpful if your French and English teachers make reference to the other language in your class? For example, if your French teacher makes reference to English and vice-versa.

Yes No Maybe

5. Justify (explain) your answer in question 4.

6. Does your French teacher ever make reference to English during class?

Yes No

7. Does your English teacher ever make reference to English during class?

Yes No

8. List specific examples of when your French teacher made references to English :

9. Were the references helpful? Why or why not?

10. List specific examples of when your English teacher made references to English :

11. Were the references helpful? Why or why not?

APPENDIX E
Questionnaire #2

Name: _____ Date: _____

1. Has your English teacher made a reference in the other language this week?

Yes No

2. What was/were the reference(s)?

3. Was/were the reference(s) helpful?

Yes No

4. Please explain your answer to question 3.

5. Has your French teacher made a reference in the other language this week?

Yes No

6. What was/were the reference(s)?

7. Was/were the reference(s) helpful?

Yes

No

8. Please explain your answer to question 7.

APPENDIX F
Questionnaire #3

Name : _____ Date : _____

1. Has your English teacher made a reference in the other language this week?

Yes No

2. What was/were the reference(s)?

3. Was/were the reference(s) helpful?

Yes No

4. Please explain your answer to question 3.

5. Has your French teacher made a reference in the other language this week?

Yes No

6. What was/were the reference(s)?

7. Was/were the reference(s) helpful?

Yes

No

8. Please explain your answer to question 7.

9. If your French teacher explains to you that in general in French writing you DO NOT capitalize all major words in a title like it is done in English, how is this helpful to you?

English: *The White Horse*

French: *Le cheval blanc*

APPENDIX G
Questionnaire #4

Name : _____ Date : _____
Group # _____

What would you say is your first language or the language you speak most often at home?

1. Has your **English** teacher made a reference in the other language this week? (circle one)
YES NO

Who is your English teacher? _____

2. What was/were the reference(s)?

3. Was/were the reference(s) helpful? (circle one) YES NO

4. Please explain your answer for number 3

5. Has your **French** teacher made a reference in the other language this week? (circle one)
YES NO

6. What was/were the reference(s)?

7. Was/were the reference(s) helpful? (circle one) YES NO

8. Please explain your answer for number 7

9. Did the references your French or English teacher made with regard to the other language (French teacher making English references and the English teacher making French references) in the last couple of weeks help prepare you for your MELS English and French exams?

YES NO

10. Please explain your answer for number 9

APPENDIX H

Reference Sheet

Note the cross-linguistic references made during your French and English classes

Name: _____ Group: # _____

Date:	References made by: (English or French teacher)	What was the reference?

APPENDIX I

De l'utilisation de la ponctuation / Punctuation

En français	In English
<p><u>Style direct :</u></p> <p>Pierre conclut : « Je partirai demain même si cela te rend triste.»</p> <p>«Je partirai demain, conclut Pierre, même si cela te rend triste.»</p> <p>«Je partirai demain même si cela te rend triste», conclut Pierre.</p> <p>Elle dit d'un ton moqueur: « Je trouve votre manteau "magnifique".»</p> <p><u>Dialogue :</u></p> <p>« Je suis prêt pour le départ, dit Henri</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pas moi, cria Luc, je n'ai pas fini mes bagages.• Dépêche-toi, sinon nous allons manquer notre avion!• J'arrive...» <p>OU</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Je suis prêt pour le départ, dit Henri.• Pas moi, cria Luc, je n'ai pas fini mes bagages.• Dépêche-toi, sinon nous allons manquer notre avion!	<p><u>Direct Speech :</u></p> <p>Steve uttered, "I am leaving tomorrow even if it saddens you. "</p> <p>"I am leaving tomorrow, " uttered Steve, "even if it saddens you."</p> <p>"I am leaving tomorrow even if it saddens you, " uttered Steve.</p> <p><u>Dialogue :</u></p> <p>"I am ready to leave", uttered Steve.</p> <p>"Not me, " cried Phil. "I haven't finished packing. "</p> <p>"Hurry or we will miss our flight! "</p> <p>"I'm coming!"</p>

<u>Emploi de la majuscule et de la minuscule</u>	<u>Capitalization Rules</u>
<p><u>Notion de temps</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Écriture de la date : jour et mois en minuscules • Jour fériés : en majuscules • Saisons : en minuscules 	<p><u>Calendar Names</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Date : days and months are capitalized • Holidays : Capitalized • Seasons : Lower case
<p><u>Identification des lieux</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Le générique en minuscules, le spécifique en majuscules 	<p><u>Location</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Names are always capitalized
<p><u>Identification des personnes</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationalité • Race • Religion • Profession • Titre honorifique 	<p><u>Identifying People</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationality • Race • Religion All capitalized • Profession • Titles
<p><u>L'écriture des titres</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Écriture du titre : en majuscule, la première lettre du premier mot seulement et les noms propres 	<p><u>Writing Titles of</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Writing titles : capitalize the first letter of every word except articles, coordinating conjunctions, and prepositions.

Vocabulaire – Vocabulary	
devoir	homework- duty
recherche	research
information	information (news - consignes)
furniture	
money	

Writing a Feature Article

En français	In English
<p><u>But :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Faire valoir une position avec cohérence en exprimant ses idées auprès de visiteurs du site Web du Mels (<i>Pouvoir des mots</i>) sur un sujet comportant des enjeux en recourant à des arguments traités en profondeur. <p><u>Structure (éléments obligatoires):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Titre• Introduction:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ sujet amené (mise en contexte du sujet)○ sujet posé (formulation de la thèse)• Développement<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Organismes textuels marquant la progression du texte○ Arguments étayés amenant à une conclusion partielle établissant un lien avec la thèse défendue• Conclusion<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Reformulation de la thèse○ Ouverture	<p><u>Objective :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To analyse and inform readers on a particular subject <p><u>Structure :</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Headline• Secondary Headline• By-line• Lead (includes a hook)• Several body paragraphs• Close (return to idea in the lead) <p><u>Additional Components:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pull quotes• Side bars• pictures

Liste des erreurs recensées dans la dernière observation d'écriture - Groupe 57

- ❖ LISTE DES ERREURS RECENSÉES LORS DE LA PREMIÈRE OBSERVATION D'ÉCRITURE SANS DISTINCTION QUANT À LA FRÉQUENCE D'APPARITION.

Erreurs absentes dans la dernière observation

É – Er
Écriture des chiffres en lettres
A – à
Écriture des titres
CP,
Accord verbe + sujet (BASE!)
Certain(s)
Écriture des accents
Ou – où
Conjugaison – terminaison «eux» / «i» / «eus»
Mot français et anglais exemple, défaut, ...)

, mais – car – or – donc
Accord verbe → qui sujet
Écriture de la date
Sont – son
Faire partie de
Trait d'union → inversion verbe et complément / verbe et sujet
Tout le – tous les
Leur – leurs
Dont
Héros
D'autre(s)
Ce – se

Accord part. passé aux. avoir
Favori(s)
Pronom de reprise le, la, les, l', lui, leur
Quoique – quoi que
De + nom(s)
Plupart
, et ce,
Oublier – obliger
Développer – appeler

- ❖ LISTE DES ERREURS RECENSÉES LORS DE LA DERNIÈRE OBSERVATION D'ÉCRITURE SANS DISTINCTION QUANT À LA FRÉQUENCE D'APPARITION

ERREURS RÉCURRENTES

É – Er
Son – Sont
Ce – Se
Ces – Ses
A – À
Tout le – Tous les
Accents oubliés (é-è)
Presque (élision du e)

Accord du verbe + sujet inversé
Accord du verbe + sujet
Terminaison verbe finale « i » / « u »
Adverbe (- ment / - emment / - amment)
Accord pp seul
Pronom de reprise le, la, les, l', lui, leur

Erreur du choix du pronom relatif que/dont
Confusion nom/ verbe (vol-vole)
Dû à (anglicisme)
À cause que (erreur)
Leur – leurs
