

## Korean Immigrant Youth's Individual Trilingualism within the English-French Bilingual Framework of Canada

Seong Man Park · Sanghee Bae\*

### 초록

박성만 · 배상희. 2013. 6. 30. 영어-불어 이중언어 구조내의 캐나다 한인 이민자녀들의 개별적 삼중언어 발달. *이중언어학* 52, 149-179. 본 논문은 질적 연구방법을 통해 캐나다의 영어-불어 이중언어 구조 내에 있음에도 불구하고 한인이민자녀들의 한국어 발달이 다른 두 언어와 동시에 이루어지는 삼중언어 발달에 대해 논의하고자 한다. 본 연구를 위하여 캐나다 퀘벡주 몬트리올시에 살고 있는 한인이민 자녀 19명, 한인이민 성인 18명이 인터뷰에 참가하였다. 인터뷰에 참여한 응답자들의 자녀들이 캐나다의 영어-불어 이중언어 구조에도 불구하고 모국어를 포함한 삼중언어 화자가 되는 환경적인 요인에 대하여 조사하였다. 조사결과에 따르면 다음과 같은 세 가지 요인이 삼중언어 발달에 영향을 준 것으로 나타났다. 첫째, 캐나다 주류사회와 지역사회 내에서 영어, 불어와 더불어 이민자들의 모국어가 공존할 뿐만 아니라 실제 사용되고 있다, 둘째, 한인이민 성인들은 불어 표현 능력이 매우 낮다, 셋째, 공식언어가 불어인 캐나다 몬트리올 한인이민 사회에서 영어가 차지하는 비중이 높다. 이와 같은 인터뷰 결과를 바탕으로 본 연구의 논의 및 결론에서는 몬트리올시의 이중언어 구조와 다국어 환경이 한인이민자녀들의 모국어 유지 및 더 나아가 그들의 삼중언어 발달에 영향을 주었다는 점을 논증하고자 한다.(단국대학교)

[핵심어] 재캐나다교포사회 (Korean Community in Canada),  
삼중언어 발달 (Trilingual development),  
모국어유지 (Heritage language maintenance)

---

\* First author: Seong Man Park, Corresponding author: Sanghee Bae

## 1. Introduction

This article focuses on the environmental factors that influence Korean youth's tendency to be trilingual in Montreal, whereas in other parts of Canada, the tendency is towards bilingualism<sup>1)</sup>. This is the more predictable outcome, given the English-French bilingual framework of Canada. What is it about Montreal that seems to lead to trilingualism rather than bilingualism among Korean immigrant youth? This article explores and describes the impact of Canada's two official languages on Korean youth's individual multilingualism within the "institutional French monolingual context of Montreal" (Weber & Horner, 2012, p. 96) with ecological perspectives, where French is the official language in the province of Quebec, while English has social and economic power as one of the two official languages of Canada.

## 2. Linguistic diversity and heritage language education

### 2.1. Linguistic diversity

There are two official languages in Canada, English and French. However, there are different language policies at the level of the provinces. For example, French is the only official language in the province of Quebec. This is where 86% (Statistics Canada, 2008a) of

---

1) This article draws on data from a larger investigation of Korean immigrant youth's heritage language maintenance in the multilingual Montreal context. The study had 37 participants (i.e., 19 Korean immigrant teenage students between 13 and 19 years old and 18 Korean adult immigrants).

Francophones, or those who have French as a mother tongue, live and only 8% of Anglophones, or those who have English as a mother tongue, live (Statistics Canada, 2008a). In this situation, linguistic equality has been a main political issue between the two official language groups in Canada and particularly in Quebec. Canada has tried to attain language equity between English and French languages “through bilingualism laws and constitutional provisions” (Bourhis & Marshall, 1999, p. 246).

However, Quebec has tried to retain its distinctiveness as a French-majority province. A number of language laws, including Bill 101 (the Charter of the French Language), which is regarded as the most important language law, have been implemented by the Quebec government since 1969 (Bourhis, 2001). In fact, Bill 101, which was passed in 1977, made French the only official language in Quebec. This led to significant changes in the domains of education, work, and public life in favor of the French language compared to the English language in Quebec (Bourhis, 2001). Though Bill 101 was designed to protect and promote the French language, one unintended consequence of the language law was that it has led to an increase in multilingualism among Allophones, those whose mother tongue is neither English nor French. Furthermore, the second generation Allophones in Quebec are much more likely to maintain their heritage languages as their home languages, leading in many cases to trilingualism, compared to Allophones in other parts of Canada. This is described by Bourhis (2001) as “a cultural integration strategy for dealing with the presence of two rival host communities in their country of adoption” (p. 122).

The 2011 Census of Canada shows that more than 200 languages were reported as a home language or mother tongue in Canada. These include

immigrant languages, Aboriginal languages, and the two official languages of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2012b). According to Statistics Canada, 20.6% of Canadians speak a language other than English or French at home either exclusively or regularly. Over 80% of this population reside in the six major metropolitan areas of Canada (i.e., Toronto, Montreal, Vancouver, Calgary, Edmonton, and Ottawa-Gatineau) (Statistics Canada, 2012a).

Of those who speak a language other than English or French, 96% of them speak immigrant languages. The rest speak Aboriginal languages and sign languages (Statistics Canada, 2012a). In addition, the proportion of Canadians who speak more than one language at home increased from 14.2% in 2006 to 17.5% in 2011 (Statistics Canada, 2012a). On the other hand, the proportion of Canadians who speak either only English or only French at home decreased both in the province of Quebec and in the rest of Canada. According to the 2011 census, the proportion of the population that used only French as a home language in the province Quebec dropped from 75.1% in 2006 to 72.8% in 2011 and the proportion of the population that used only English as a home language decreased from 77.1% in 2006 to 74.1% in 2011 in the rest of Canada (Statistics Canada, 2012a). Interestingly, 14.4% out of the 20.6% of Canadians who speak a language other than English and French at home also use either English or French in addition to their home language (Statistics Canada, 2012a). Overall, this seems to indicate that more people in Canada are multilingual, not necessarily that fewer people speak English or French at home (Statistics Canada, 2012a).

## 2.2. Heritage language education

Due to Bill 101, the French school system in Quebec has seen an almost overnight increase in cultural pluralism. The response to this has come in 3 types of programs: Compensatory programs including welcoming classes, Language maintenance programs including the PELO (Programme d'enseignement des langues d'origine: Curriculum of heritage languages), and Intercultural Education Programs (D'Anglejan & Koninck, 1992). Among these three, Quebec's response to heritage language education has been the initiation of the PELO classes. The PELO, which is supported by Quebec educational policy, is welcomed by the cultural communities for the maintenance of children's heritage languages. However, many non-PELO teachers argue that this program will lead to immigrant children's incomplete mastery of French (D'Anglejan and Koninck, 1992). Cummins and Danesi (1990) also mention that governmental support for the teaching of heritage languages through provincial programs, such as PELO, has made gradual progress, while there are still ambivalent attitudes toward governmental support for the promotion of the teaching of heritage languages, especially as a part of the regular school system, among many Canadians.

Aside from the PELO, newcomers to Quebec are left pretty much to their community's resources for heritage language maintenance. As a result, heritage language education in Canada relies heavily on ethnic community-sponsored heritage language programs. The focus on language support in Quebec is on the French language. With respect to language education provisions for new immigrants to Quebec, the province provides an integration program with respect to French language and culture

(Ghosh & Abdi, 2004). Programs, such as welcoming classes for new immigrant students in French schools, which keep these students in separate classes where they learn intensive French, have been used as a way of encouraging immigrant students' swift transition from their HLs to the French language. For adults, French language classes are offered for free. Nevertheless, "many Francophones still feel threatened demographically as a minority in North America" (Bourhis, 2001, p. 133), even though language laws, such as Bill 101, have brought big changes and huge gains in favour of the French language in Quebec. Because of this, the influx of immigrants to Quebec is seen by some "as a threat to the survival of the French language" (Ghosh & Abdi, 2004, p. 118). As a result, immigrants' needs for heritage language support have been overlooked in Quebec.

### 2.3. Koreans in Montreal and in the Province of Quebec

The 2006 census indicates that there are only 5,555 Koreans living in the province of Quebec, with 4,850 (87%) living in the Montreal area (Statistics Canada, 2008a). Korean immigration to the province of Quebec started in the 1970s (Yoo, 1999). However, in the early 1990s, a large number of Koreans left Quebec, mainly for Toronto and Vancouver, because of "the political instability" (Yoo, 1999, p. 885).

In Canada, the Korean language ranks 4<sup>th</sup> place among the top five immigrant language groups (i.e., Punjabi, Tamil, Urdu, Korean, and Mandarin) that have the highest rate of retention, which is "the proportion of the population with a given mother tongue that speaks that language at home, either most often or on a regular basis" (Statistics Canada 2012b, p.

5). Based on this, it seems predictable that Koreans in Canada will become bilingual, in Korean and English. The situation in Montreal, however, is different. In Montreal, according to the 2011 Census of Canada, the proportion of the population that used only French as a home language dropped from 59.8% in 2006 to 56.5% in 2011 and the proportion of the population that used only English as a home language also decreased from 10.8% in 2006 to 9.9% in 2011, while the proportion of the population that used a language other than English or French as a sole home language underwent no change at 7% between 2006 and 2011(Statistics Canada, 2012a). Overall, the 2011 Census of Canada indicates that the sole use of one of Canada's two official languages as a home language in the major metropolitan areas has decreased since 2011 (e.g., the decrease of the use of French at home in Montreal and the decrease of the use of English at home in the metropolitan areas of Toronto and Vancouver) (Statistics Canada, 2012a).

### **3. The study**

#### **3.1. Methodology**

This study was conducted in an ethnographic and qualitative approach through semi-structured interviews (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994) and questionnaires with 37 participants. It focuses, in particular, on the Korean youth's individual trilingualism within the English-French bilingual framework of Canada. All the participants were asked to fill out a questionnaire seeking demographic information before they participated in interviews (see Appendix A for the questionnaire and the interview

questions). Data on a number of issues including all the student participants' proficiency levels in Korean, French, and English, their experience learning Korean, all the adult participants' language practices and experiences teaching Korean to their youth, and their proficiency levels in French and English, and frequency in use of them were gathered through the individual interview which was mostly composed of open-ended questions. The interviews were mostly conducted in Korean except for one student who asked for an interview in English. But an interview in French was not asked by any participants.

### 3.2. Participants

Nineteen Korean immigrant teenage students were selected based on the following criteria: (1) Canadian born or immigrants to Canada who live in Montreal; (2) Between 13 to 19 years old (teenagers); and (3) Enrolled in secondary school or in CEGEP<sup>2)</sup>. Concerning the adult participants, eighteen Korean immigrant adult participants (i.e., 10 parents, 4 HL and Bible study teachers of the Korean ethnic church, and 4 pastors of Korean ethnic churches in Montreal) participated in this study.

The rationale for including Korean ethnic church-related personnel is

---

2) CEGEP (Collège d'enseignement général et professionnel): The postsecondary system in Quebec is unique in that the colleges (CEGEPs) provide a program that is a requirement for entry to university. Students who complete high school (normally after 11 years of schooling) must complete two years of the "general program" of the colleges (as opposed to the "vocational" programs) and they then proceed to university for completion of their program, which normally takes three years for a pass bachelor's degree in arts or science (Statistics Canada, 2008b).

that more than half of the Korean ethnic churches in Montreal run Korean language schools (i.e., 7 out of 13) and they hold important roles within the Montreal Korean community based on the fact that more than half of the Korean immigrant population regularly attends Korean ethnic churches according to the weekly reports obtained from all the Korean ethnic churches in Montreal.

### 3.3. Findings

The results show that student participants all seem to speak and comprehend all 3 languages well, but with English as the strongest, French as the second strongest, and Korean as the least proficient (see Appendix B for student participants' proficiency levels in Korean, French, and English<sup>3</sup>). Overall, all the student participants can be considered trilingual adolescents who seem to be capable of appropriate communication in Korean, French, and English.

#### 3.3.1. Co-existence of the three languages at home, in the community, and in the host society

At home: Results indicate that most of the Korean immigrant youth participants (i.e., 18 out of 19) speak to their parents in Korean (see Appendix C for student participants' language use at home including their language use with their parents and siblings). Most of them (i.e., 15 out of 19) also responded that they fully understood their parents when their parents spoke to them in Korean except for some cases where they could

---

3) Statistical data are used only for supplementary purposes in this study, since the data were elicited from all the participants' self-reported responses.

not understand difficult words or expressions. The two main reasons identified from the responses of the students who could fully understand their parents when they spoke to them in Korean are their parents' use of easy words in Korean and exclusive use of Korean with them.

I think I can fully understand my mom and dad when they speak to me in Korean, because I think they know my level of Korean language proficiency. So they seem to speak to me in Korean at the level of my Korean language proficiency. (Y9, February 15, 2008)

One student (i.e., Y19) responded that he could fully understand his parents when they spoke Korean to him, even though he seemed to have difficulty understanding my Korean when I interviewed him. This suggests that his parents might use quite basic Korean to him when they speak to him in Korean. With regard to the student participants' language use with their siblings, only 5 students spoke only Korean with their siblings, while 10 students used all three languages (i.e., Korean, French, and English) and the other 4 students used either only English or French when they spoke with their siblings (see Appendix C). Overall, the results regarding students language use at home indicate that parents' efforts to use only Korean to their children by using basic Korean to them whenever necessary and student participants' use of all three languages with their siblings may lead to Korean immigrant youth's development of multilingual skills at the multilingual home environment in the multilingual Montreal context. This result may also be supported by Bourhis' (2001) claim that allophone immigrants in Quebec are more likely to choose their heritage language as their home language instead of

adopting one of the two Canada's official languages as their home language compared to other allophone immigrants who live in other English-speaking parts of Canada.

In the ethnic community and in the host society: Concerning the student participants' language use outside of the home, the results show that they use all three languages depending on a given situation and whom they talk with. First of all, they have learned and used French through the French school system as a result of Bill 101, which made French the obligatory language of instruction up until the completion of secondary school for all immigrant students in Quebec. Second, they mostly use Korean in the Korean community with Korean adults and Korean international students who are staying on a temporary basis. Third, they mostly use English or French with each other and with their non-Korean ethnic friends (see Appendix D for student participants' use of the Korean language outside the home). Overall, most of the student participants except two students who barely used Korean outside the home mostly due to their inability to speak Korean use Korean in the Korean community outside the home.

With regard to the student participants' experiences learning Korean (literacy learning in particular), three places were identified as possible contexts where they learned the language: home, ethnic church sponsored HL school, and community sponsored HL school outside the church (see Appendix C). In Montreal, there are seven ethnic church sponsored HL schools and two community sponsored HL schools as of 2012. The HL schools run by Korean ethnic churches are held on Sunday, while the HL schools outside the church are held on Saturday morning. The results show that only 7 of the 19 students responded that they had experiences

learning how to read and write Korean from their parents at home. The other 12 students responded that they had no experiences learning to read and write Korean at home. They said that this was mainly because they experienced some of their schooling in Korea before they immigrated to Canada (i.e., six students) or because their parents chose to send their children either to ethnic church sponsored HL schools or to community sponsored HL schools (i.e., six students). No students had experiences learning Korean in the regular school system supported by the Canadian or Quebec government. Overall, 3 students had no experiences learning Korean and 16 students had HL learning experiences either at home (i.e., seven students) or in HL schools (i.e., ten students in both church HL schools and the HL school outside the church, four only in church HL schools, and one only in the HL school outside the church). These results seem to indicate that most of the Korean immigrant parents in this study are eager to help their children to maintain the Korean language within the multilingual Montreal context.

### 3.3.2. Korean immigrant adults' inability to speak French

In this section, Korean immigrant adult participants' language practices in and outside the home and proficiency levels in all three languages are presented in order to explore how their language interactions with their children at home and their use of different languages in diverse contexts and how their inability to speak French compared to Korean and English exert an influence on Korean immigrant youth's trilingualism (see Appendix E for adult participants' reported proficiency levels in French and English and frequency of use of French and English).

First, the results show that parents' reported proficiency levels in

English are higher than their proficiency levels in French in both speaking and comprehension. Overall, the frequency in use of English in their daily lives is almost the same as their frequency of use of French, regardless of their different proficiency levels in the two languages. Parents responded that they used English or French mostly in their workplace. Some parents who did not work responded that they never used either English or French except for a few places where they had to use English or French such as in a hospital or in a government office. Concerning the ten parent participants' language use with their children, nine parents responded that they spoke Korean with their children for the most part, while one parent spoke half Korean and half English with his children for educational purposes. No parents spoke French with their children at home.

Second, teachers' reported proficiency levels in English and frequency of use of English are higher than for French. The higher frequency of use of English can be attributed to the fact that three teachers are college students in universities in Montreal with instruction in English. The other teacher responded that he spoke English for the most part in his workplace. Concerning the four teachers' language use with their students, they all responded that they spoke Korean with their students for the most part, but they sometimes spoke English in a few cases where students or members could not understand difficult words or expressions in Korean. However, they never used French with their students.

Third, pastors' reported proficiency levels in English and frequency of use of English are higher than their proficiency levels in French in both fields and in use of French in their daily lives. They responded that they often spoke English outside the church and that they rarely spoke French inside or outside the church. Concerning the four pastors' language use

with their young members in the church, three responded that they used Korean with them for the most part. The other pastor responded that he used English as well as Korean with second generation children who were not fluent in Korean in order to teach them the Bible.

With regard to Korean immigrant adult participants' inability to use French, the results show that Korean youth rarely use French with adult members in the church and with their parents at home. The fact that the student participants rarely use French in the Korean ethnic church may be explained by the adult members' inability to communicate with them in French. The interviews with all the 11 students also reveal that they solely used Korean in the church with adult church members. They mentioned that they rarely spoke French with Korean adult church members, even though they sometimes spoke French with each other or with younger members in the church. The students also mentioned that they seldom used French with their parents at home either.

That is the special characteristic of the second generation. Generally when I see Asian children, especially Chinese and Korean second generation children, they use English even though they go to a French school. My daughter goes to a French school. Everyone uses French. But during the break, everyone speaks English with friends. Even at home, my daughter uses English with siblings. So I asked once, "Why don't you speak to me in French? I can speak French pretty well." Then, she replied by saying, "You don't know French." My daughters don't use French with me. When they come home, they never use French. Only amongst themselves, they use French if it's urgent. When parents are there, they never use French with their parents. Even when

they come to church, they don't use French. It's because they know the adults can't speak French. (A4<sup>4</sup>), February 13, 2008)

The above excerpt clearly shows that the younger generations of Korean immigrant families in Montreal do not seem to use French with their parents at home either. This indicates that the French-speaking environment in Montreal makes the students speak the HL with their parents, whose French is not sufficient for communication in French. This is also true for the parents whose English is not up to par in Montreal, where fewer opportunities exist for exposure to English, since the majority language is French, as compared with parents who live in Ontario or in the United States, where more opportunities exist for exposure to English as the majority language.

In fact, one parent participant viewed the French-speaking environment in Montreal as another reason for his children's Korean language maintenance. He responded that parents' inability to speak French made parents speak only Korean with their French-speaking children at home. In this regard, he mentioned that children had to learn Korean in order to communicate with their parents at home, even though the children were not eager to learn the Korean language by themselves.

I have tried speaking in French with my children but it was hardly a success. This led us to communicate in Korean instead at home not only for my sake but also for the benefit of my children. I believe those second generation teenagers who are fairly fluent in Korean in Montreal are probably urged to only speak it at home by parents whose French or

---

4) Unique codes are used for the adult participants

English is not up to par and whose French skills are not sufficient to communicate with their children in French. (A10, March 22, 2008)

### 3.3.3. Perceived power of English among Korean immigrants in Montreal

The perceived power of English among Korean immigrants in Montreal: One of the adult participants mentions that approximately 95% of students who have completed their secondary education in French wind up attending English CEGEPs. He also asserts that Korean immigrant youth in Montreal are more likely to be exposed to English due to the English-French bilingual framework of Canada; for example, there are far more channels in English in TV programs due to the influence of other provinces as well as the U.S. In this situation, Korean immigrant parents strongly believe that the importance of English cannot be ignored in the future job market for their younger generations in the Canadian society, where English has more socio-economic power in general both in the U.S. as well as in Canada (e.g., Han, 2012; Yoon & Kim, 2012).

This result can be supported by the fact that the rate of English-French bilingualism in Canada increased very slightly from 17.4% in 2006 to 17.5% in 2011, which was due mainly to the increase of English-French bilingualism in Quebec from 40.6% in 2006 to 42.6% in 2011 (Statistics Canada, 2012a). This increase in Quebec suggests that English is becoming more important for Francophones as they prepare for future careers, for example, with the federal government or outside of Quebec. In a similar vein, Ricento and Cervatiuc (2010) also reported that “Francophones are far more likely to speak English than Anglophones are to speak French, although Canada is an officially bilingual country” (p.

25). Furthermore, English has become a valuable socio-economic asset to immigrant population characterized by their fluent trilingual skills in all three languages (i.e., French, English, and their heritage language) in an increasingly globalized Montreal environment which has “the highest percentage of trilinguals in Canada, and quite possibly in North America” (Lamarre and Rossel Paredes, 2003, p. 64). Accordingly, Statistics Canada decided to use different terms such as mother tongue, the language people speak at home, and people’s knowledge of French and English instead of using the terms such as Francophones, Anglophones, and Allophones in the 2011 Census considering Canada’s increasingly complex linguistic landscape (Scott, 2012).

This tendency may also seem to apply to Korean immigrants in Montreal due to the perceived power of English within the English-French bilingual framework of Canada, which appears to lead to Korean immigrant youth’s trilingualism rather than bilingualism.

#### **4. Discussion**

Overall, all the adult members’ self-reported proficiency levels in English are higher than their proficiency levels in French in both speaking and comprehension. The frequency in use of English in their daily lives is also higher than their frequency of use of French (see Appendix E). They used English or French only in their workplace or places outside the home or the Korean community (e.g., hospitals or governmental offices). They responded that they used neither English nor French at home. In line with this result, Curdt-Christiansen’s (2007) ethnographic study in the Chinese language school located in Montreal also reveals that Chinese immigrant

youth mostly used Chinese and English with Chinese adults. The result shows that Chinese immigrant youth rarely used French when talking to their teachers in the Chinese language school “primarily because they were aware of the fact that their teachers generally have little or no knowledge of French” (Curdt-Christiansen, 2007, p. 81).

Concerning the student participants’ trilingual skills, the results reveal that all the student participants can be considered trilingual adolescents who seem to be capable of appropriate communication in Korean, French, and English due to the multilingual environment of Montreal. The results also indicate that the Korean immigrant youth are likely to use Korean and English more outside of the school even though they must go to French schools up until secondary schools as a result of Bill 101. Overall, the results are supported by Park and Sarkar’s (2007) claim that two majority languages (i.e., French and English) in Montreal may help the Korean immigrant youth realize the importance of trilingual skills for their academic and social success in a multilingual society compared to other provinces in Canada where there is only one majority language (i.e., English). Based on their case study which was conducted with Korean immigrant parents in Montreal, Park and Sarkar (2007) argue that the Korean immigrant youth in Montreal are more likely to accept the usefulness and importance of trilingualism than other Korean immigrant youth who tend to be bilingual (i.e., English and Korean) or monolingual (i.e., English).

In addition, the Korean immigrant parents are less likely to adopt French as their home language since French seems to be perceived as less powerful than English among Korean immigrants in North America except in Montreal and in the province of Quebec. This leads to Korean

immigrant youth's tri-lingualism in the place where three languages co-exist (i.e., French as an educational language in Montreal; English as a socio-economic language in North America; and Korean as a home language in the multilingual host society). This finding finds support in Weber and Horner (2012), who claim that immigrant youth's individual multilingualism can be achieved in a French monolingual environment of Quebec "because of the all-powerful position of English in Canada as a whole" (p. 98). In this regard, Maguire (2010) and Lamarre and Rossel Paredes (2003) argue that the increase in immigrant youth's individual trilingualism in Montreal is "one of the ironies of Bill 101" (Maguire, 2010, p. 38) and "a relatively unnoticed phenomenon" (Lamarre & Rossel Paredes, 2003, p. 64) within a societal French monolingual environment in Montreal.

The results of the study also confirm that Korean as a heritage language education in Montreal solely depends on ethnic community-sponsored heritage language programs without any governmental financial support, since no students had experiences learning Korean in the regular school system and no Korean language education programs were supported by the Canadian or Quebec government. In regard to Canada's approach to multilingualism, Weber and Horner (2012) also claim that "individual multilingualism is frequently valued in a positive way, while societal or institutional multilingualism is more likely to be negatively valued" (p. 102). In this regard, several scholars (e.g., Jang, 2011; Ricento & Cervatiuc, 2010) point out that an ideal multilingual society could be possible only when a variety of languages and cultures would be valued and promoted by the government.

## 5. Conclusion

Results indicate that the multilingual environment of Montreal within the English-French bilingual framework of Canada seems to play a positive role in the Korean youth's heritage language maintenance, which leads to their eventual development of trilingualism within the multilingual Montreal context.

Overall, the results of the study suggest that the two majority languages should be regarded as an advantage instead of a burden in the multilingual Montreal context where there are two majority languages along with heritage languages, since immigrant youth can easily recognize the importance of multilingualism and immigrant parents also recognize the significance of the Korean language as a linguistic integration strategy to survive in a multicultural and multilingual society at an early age. This implies that immigrant youth in Montreal are more likely to realize the importance of multilingualism with ease, since they have to deal with two majority languages along with their heritage languages at the same time in order to survive academically and socially in this multilingual context compared to other immigrant youth who can survive with one majority language, English, in the other provinces outside of Quebec in Canada. For this reason, immigrant youth in Montreal are more likely to accept the importance of their HL skills and realize the benefits from multilingual abilities at their early age in order to be prepared for their future in a multilingual society. Furthermore, this article also implies that linguistic diversity in Canada should be supported and encouraged by the government and educational system for the multilingualism which may increase the likelihood of Korean immigrant youth's eventual

socio-economic integration into the Quebec and Canadian society.

## References

- Bourhis, R. Y., & Marshall, D. E. (1999). The United States and Canada. In Fishman, A. J. (Eds), *Handbook of Language & Ethnic Identity* (244-266), Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourhis, R. Y. (2001). Reversing language shift in Quebec. In A. J. Fishman (Ed.), *Can threatened languages be saved?: Reversing language shift, revisited, a 21<sup>st</sup> century perspective* (101-141). Clevedon, U.K.: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Cummins, J., & Danesi, M. (1990). *HLS: The development and denial of Canada's linguistic resources*, Montreal: Our Selves Education Foundation.
- Curdt-Christiansen, X. L. (2007). Exploring trilingual Chinese children's language use. *Sociolinguistic Studies*, 1(1), 67-85.
- D'Anglejan, A., & De Koninck, Z. (1992). Educational policy for a culturally plural Quebec: An update. In B. Burnaby & A. Cumming (Eds), *Socio-political aspects of ESL* (97-109). Toronto: OISE Press.
- Ghosh, R., & Abdi, A. (2004). *Education and the politics of difference: Canadian perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.
- Han, H. K. (2012). Early bilingual development in a Korean-American community: Ideals and Realities. *Bilingual Research*, 50, 269-294.
- Jang, E. Y. (2011). "Should I learn Korean?" A multiple case study of learning Korean as heritage language. *Bilingual Research*, 47, 139-164.
- Lamarre, P., & Rossell Paredes, J. (2003). Growing up trilinguals in Montreal: Perceptions of young college students. In Robert Bayley & Sandra Schecter (Eds.), *Language socialization in bilingual and multilingual context*, 62-80. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Maguire, M. H. (2010). Lessons in understanding Montreal heritage language context: Whose literacies and voices are privileged? *OLBI working papers 1(1)*, 25-50.
- Maykut, P., & Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning qualitative research: A philosophic and practical guide*. New York: The Falmer Press.
- Park, S. M., & Sarkar, M. (2007). Parents' attitudes toward heritage language maintenance for their children and their efforts to help their children maintain the heritage language: A case study of Korean-Canadian

- immigrants. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 20(3), 223-235.
- Ricento, T., & Cervatiuc, A. (2010). Language minority rights and educational policy in Canada. In J. Petrovic (Ed.), *International perspectives on bilingual education: Policy, practice, and controversy* (21-42). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Scott, M. (2012). Census 2011: StatsCan does away with 'francophone,' 'anglophone' and 'allophone'. *The Gazette*, 26 October, 2012. Retrieved December 15, 2012, from <http://www.montrealgazette.com/news/sensus%2B2011%2BStatsCan%2Bdoes%2Baway%2Bwith%2Bfranco%2Bphone/7439307/story.html>.
- Statistics Canada (2008a). *Ethnic origin for the population of Canada, Provinces, Territories, 2006 census*. Retrieved October 06, 2008, from <http://www.statcan.ca>.
- Statistics Canada (2008b). *CÉGEP*. Retrieved April 5, 2013, from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-004-x/def/4068720-eng.html>.
- Statistics Canada (October 2012a). Linguistic characteristic of Canadians: Language, 2011 Census of population. 24 pages. Retrieved December 14, 2012, from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2-011001-eng.cfm>.
- Statistics Canada (October 2012b). *Immigrant languages in Canada*. 9 pages. Retrieved December 16, 2012, from [http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011003\\_2-eng.cfm](http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/98-314-x/98-314-x2011003_2-eng.cfm).
- Weber, J. J., & Horner, K. (2012). *Introducing multilingualism: A social approach*. UK: Routledge.
- Yoo, Y. S. (1999). Koreans. In P. R. Magocsi (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Canada's peoples* (pp. 882-890). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Yoon, I. J., & Kim, E. B. (2012). Language use of the multicultural family and social identity of their children. *Bilingual Research*, 48, 273-307.

## Appendix A

### *Questionnaire for student participants*

1. How old are you?
2. In what country and city were you born?
3. How long have you been in Montreal?
4. What grade are you in?
5. What is the language of instruction in your school?
6. How many brothers and sisters do you have in your family?
7. How old are they? What grades are they in?
8. What language does your mother speak to you? What language do you speak to your mother?
9. What language does your father speak to you? What language do you speak to your father?
10. What language do you use with your brothers and sisters?
11. What language do you speak to your grandparents?
12. What language do you speak with your relatives?
13. What language do you speak outside the home?

### *Summarized interview protocol for student participants*

1. Do you speak French? How well do you speak French? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *very poor* and 7 as *very fluent*, how would you characterize your ability in French?
2. Do you understand French? How well do you understand French? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *cannot understand at all* and 7 as *understand everything*, how would you characterize your ability in French?

3. Do you speak English? How well do you speak English? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *very poor* and 7 as *very fluent*, how would you characterize your ability in English?
4. Do you understand English? How well do you understand English? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *cannot understand at all* and 7 as *understand everything*, how would you characterize your ability in English?
5. Do you speak Korean? How well do you speak Korean? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *very poor* and 7 as *very fluent*, how would you characterize your ability in Korean?
6. Do you understand Korean? How well do you understand Korean? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *cannot understand at all* and 7 as *understand everything*, how would you characterize your ability in Korean?
7. Do you understand your mother or father when they speak to you in Korean? How much do you understand?
8. Can you tell me about your experiences learning Korean in and outside the home?
9. When you grow up and get married, would you like your children to learn Korean?
10. Have you ever participated in Korean cultural activities in Montreal? If so, can you tell me about your experiences participating in Korean cultural activities? Does your participation help you improve your Korean language skills?
11. Do you go to the Korean ethnic church in Montreal? If so, can you tell me about your experiences participating in Korean ethnic church-related activities? Does your participation help you improve

your Korean language skills?

*Questionnaire for adult participants*

1. How old are you?
2. In what country and city were you born?
3. How long have you been in Montreal?
4. When did you immigrate to Canada?
5. What is your native language?
6. What is your occupation?
7. How many children do you have?
8. What language do you speak to your spouse?
9. What language do you speak to your children, to your students, or to your church members?
10. What language do you speak outside the home?
11. Have you been involved in the Korean ethnic community (e.g., Korean ethnic churches)?
12. Were you involved in church activities before you immigrated to Canada?

*Summarized interview protocol for adult participants*

1. Do you speak French? How well do you speak French? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *very poor* and 7 as *very fluent*, how would you characterize your ability in French?
2. Do you understand French? How well do you understand French? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *cannot understand at all* and 7 as *understand everything*, how would you characterize your ability in

French?

3. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 as *never* and 7 as *almost always*, can you tell me how often do you use French in your daily life?
4. Do you speak English? How well do you speak English? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *very poor* and 7 as *very fluent*, how would you characterize your ability in English?
5. Do you understand English? How well do you understand English? From a scale of 1-7 with 1 as *cannot understand at all* and 7 as *understand everything*, how would you characterize your ability in English?
6. On a scale of 1-7, with 1 as *never* and 7 as *almost always*, can you tell me how often do you use English in your daily life?
7. Can you tell me about your personal experiences in teaching Korean to your children (or to students) in and outside the home?
8. What language do you use with your children (students or members) at home and in the church?
9. Do you think that young Korean children of today are eager to learn and preserve the Korean language?
10. What do you think about Montreal's multilingual environment for your children's (students' or church members') Korean language maintenance?

## Appendix B

All the students (N=19) were asked to evaluate their speaking and understanding ability in Korean, French, and English on a scale of 1 to 7, with 7 as *very fluent* and as *understand everything*.

### *Students' Proficiency Levels in Korean, French, and English*

	Korean		French		English	
	S	C	S	C	S	C
M	4.53	5.03	5.05	5.58	5.58	6.00
SD	1.87	1.59	1.18	1.32	1.26	0.96

Note: S=Speaking; C=Comprehension

This result shows that student participants' proficiency levels in English are similar to their proficiency levels in French, while their proficiency levels in Korean are lower than their proficiency levels in both French and English. The relatively high standard deviations in their proficiency levels in Korean (1.87 and 1.59 for speaking and comprehension, respectively) show greater variation in their proficiency levels in Korean than in French and English. In this study, statistical data are used only for supplementary purposes.

## Appendix C

### *Students' Language Use at Home*

Name	With parents		With siblings
	Language	Understanding	Language: Mostly (Sometimes)
Y1	Korean	Fully	Korean
Y2	Korean	Fully	Korean
Y3	Korean	Fully	Korean (French/English)
Y4	Korean	Fully	Korean

Y5	Korean	Mostly	French (Korean)
Y6	Korean	Mostly	English (French/Korean)
Y7	Korean	Fully	English (Korean)
Y8	Korean	Fully	English
Y9	Korean	Fully	English
Y10	Korean	Fully	English (Korean)
Y11	Korean	Fully	English (Korean)
Y12	Korean	85%	75% English (20% French/ 5% Korean)
Y13	Korean	Fully	English (Korean)
Y14	Korean	Fully	French (English/Korean)
Y15	Korean	Fully	French (Korean)
Y16	Korean	Fully	Korean
Y17	English/ Korean	Mostly	English (French)
Y18	Korean	Fully	Korean
Y19	Korean	Fully	French

*Note.* Unique codes are used for student participants. The average age of the student participants' immigration to Canada is 6 years old.

*Student Participants' Experiences Learning Korean*

Experiences	HL learning contexts			
	Home	Ethnic community sponsored HL school		Regular school
		Church sponsored HL school	Community sponsored HL school	
Yes	7	14	11	0
No	12	5	8	19
Total	19	19	19	19

Appendix D

*Students' Korean language use outside the home*

Name	Korean language use outside the home	
	With whom	Where: Mostly (Sometimes)
Y1	Korean friends and adults	Church
Y2	Korean friends and adults	Church
Y3	Korean friends and adults	Church

Y4	Korean friends and adults	Church
Y5	Korean friends and adults	Church (School)
Y6	Korean friends and adults	Church (School)
Y7	Korean friends and adults	Church (School)
Y8	Korean friends and adults	Church (Korean restaurants, Korean PC Bang, School)
Y9	Korean friends and adults	Church (School)
Y10	Korean friends and adults	Church
Y11	Korean friends and adults	Church
Y12	Korean friends and adults	Church (School)
Y13	Korean adults	Church
Y14	Korean adults (Rarely use)	(Church)
Y15	Korean adults	Church
Y16	Korean friends and Taekwondo instructors	(School/Taekwondo gym)
Y17	No use	No use
Y18	Korean friends	School
Y19	No use	No use

Note. Unique codes are used for student participants

## Appendix E

At the beginning of the interviews, all the adult participants were asked to characterize their speaking and understanding ability in French and English on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 as *very fluent* and as *understand everything*. In addition, they were also asked to rate their use of both languages in their daily life on a scale of 1 to 7 with 7 as *almost always*. They were not asked to comment on their proficiency levels in Korean, since they immigrated to Canada as adults. The results are shown below.

### *Parents' Reported Proficiency Levels in French and English and Frequency of Use of French and English*

<b>French</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Mean	2.80	3.40	3.20
SD	1.75	1.58	2.15

<b>English</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Mean	4.20	4.30	3.30
SD	1.62	1.49	1.95

*Teachers' Reported Proficiency Levels in French and English and Frequency of Use of French and English*

<b>French</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Mean	2.63	3.25	1.75
SD	2.63	2.63	0.96
<b>English</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Mean	5.50	6.25	5.50
SD	1.29	0.50	1.91

*Pastors' Reported Proficiency Levels in French and English and Frequency of Use of French and English*

<b>French</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Mean	2.38	3.25	1.50
SD	1.50	2.22	1.00
<b>English</b>	<b>Speaking</b>	<b>Comprehension</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
Mean	4.75	6.25	4.25
SD	1.50	0.96	2.06

Overall, all the adult members' self-reported proficiency levels in English (M = 4.61, SD 1.54 in speaking; M = 5.17, SD = 1.54 in comprehension) are higher than their proficiency levels in French (M = 2.67, SD 1.81 in speaking; M = 3.33, SD = 1.85 in comprehension) in both speaking and comprehension. The frequency in use of English (M = 4.00, SD = 2.06) in their daily lives is also higher than their frequency of use of French (M = 2.50, SD = 1.86).

박성만 (Seong Man Park)

단국대학교 교육대학원 교육학과

경기도 용인시 수지구 죽전로 152

전화번호: (041)-550-1398

전자우편: seongmanpark@dankook.ac.kr

배상희 (Sanghee Bae)

단국대학교 교양기초교육원

충남 천안시 동남구 단대로 119 인문관 233호

전화번호: (041)-550-1390

전자우편: bsh102@dankook.ac.kr

접수일자: 2013년 4월 20일

심사(수정)일자: 2013년 6월 9일

게재확정: 2013년 6월 20일