

TEACHING FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN CANADA: TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES RESEARCH REPORT

September 2006

Principal Investigators:

Sharon Lapkin, OISE, University of Toronto

Alina MacFarlane, CASLT Research Officer

Larry Vandergrift, University of Ottawa

Consultant:

Doug Hart, OISE, University of Toronto



Canadian Teachers' Federation
Fédération canadienne des
enseignantes et des enseignants



Canadian Association of Second
Language Teachers
L'Association canadienne des
professeurs de langues secondes



Canadian Association
of Immersion Teachers
Association canadienne des
professeurs d'immersion

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the members of the working group for their invaluable input during all stages of this project:

Wendy Carr, Vice-president, BC Association of Teachers of Modern Languages, Intensive French helping teacher
Thierry Karsenti, Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT)
Karen Olsen, French consultant, Regina Public School Board
Maurice Poirier, Past President, Prince Edward Island Teachers' Federation (PEITF), Intensive French teacher
Linda Roméo, French consultant, Manitoba Ministry of Education
Miles Turnbull, President, Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT)
Liliane Vincent, Director, Francophone Services, Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF)
Lucie Wojciechowski, primary FSL teacher, Ottawa-Carleton Catholic School Board, OECTA representative

Special thanks also to:

Peter Cheung who provided technical support to post our questionnaires online;
Daniel Fletcher, President, CAIT, who provided input at our original brainstorming session;
Joan Howard who coded and analyzed the qualitative data;
Ginette Houle and Catherine Mareschal who translated our documents;
Margaret Oldfield who posted our questionnaires online;
Lise Robertson who sent out our invitations to participate and the many subsequent reminders to participants;
Marzieh H. Tafaghodtari who helped with tables for the final report; and
Nicole Thibault, Executive Director, CASLT, who provided ongoing administrative support during this project.

The financial support of the Department of Canadian Heritage is gratefully acknowledged.



Patrimoine
canadien

Canadian
Heritage

The Canadian Association of Second Language
Teachers
201-57 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, ON K2E 8B2
Phone: 613.727.0994
Fax: 613.727.3831
Email: admin@caslt.org
Web site: www.caslt.org

The Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers
201-57 Auriga Drive, Ottawa, ON K2E 8B2
Phone: 613.228.0333
Fax: 613.727.3831
Email: bureau@acpi-cait.ca
Web site: <http://acpi-cait.ca/>

The Canadian Teachers' Federation
2490 Don Reid Drive, Ottawa, ON K1H 1E1
Phone: 613.232.1505
Fax: 613.232.1886
Email: info@ctf-fce.ca
Web site: <http://www.ctf-fce.ca>

Principal investigators
Sharon Lapkin, OISE, University of Toronto
Alina MacFarlane, CASLT Research Officer
Larry Vandergrift, University of Ottawa

Consultant
Doug Hart, OISE, University of Toronto

Production
Nathalie Landry, CASLT Communications
and Project Support Officer

Editing
Lyne's Word

Graphic Design
Dwayne Elliott- Originals

Printing
National Printers

ISBN 0-921238-60-6

© CASLT/ACPLS CTF/FCE CAIT/ACPI 2006

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Introduction	3
1.0 Methodology.....	3
1.1 Working Group	3
1.2 Literature Review	3
1.3 Survey Instruments	3
1.3.1 Preliminary Questionnaire	3
1.3.2 Main Questionnaire	4
1.3.3 Piloting the Main Questionnaire	4
1.4 Participant Recruitment	4
1.4.1 Preliminary Questionnaire	5
1.4.2 Main Questionnaire	5
1.4.3 Sample Size	5
1.5 Data Analysis	5
2.0 Participants' Profiles	6
2.1 Gender	6
2.2 Type of FSL Program	7
2.3 Distribution by Province and Territory	7
2.4 Size of School Board/District and Size of School	7
2.5 Grades Taught	9
2.6 Teaching Experience and FSL Teaching Experience	9
2.7 French Proficiency	10
2.8 Language Background	10
2.9 FSL Methodological Training	12
2.10 Future in Teaching FSL	13
3.0 Survey Findings	14
3.1 Teacher Perceptions of FSL Resources Available to Them	14
3.1.1 FSL Resources: Overall Results	14
3.1.2 FSL Resources: Results by Program	15
3.1.3 FSL Resources: Results by Province and Territory	18
3.1.4 FSL Resources: Influence of Other Variables	18
3.2 Teacher Perceptions of Additional Resources Available to Them	18
3.2.1 Additional Resources: Overall Results	18
3.2.2 Additional Resources: Results by Program	19
3.2.3 Additional Resources: Results by Province and Territory	19
3.2.4 Additional Resources: Influence of other Variables	19
3.3 Teacher Perceptions of Stakeholder Support	21
3.3.1 Stakeholder Support: Overall Results	21
3.3.2 Stakeholder Support: Results by Program	21
3.3.3 Stakeholder Support: Results by Province and Territory	21
3.3.4 Stakeholder Support: Influence of Other Variables	22

3.4	Teacher Perceptions of Manageability of Teaching Conditions	22
3.4.1	Teaching Conditions: Overall Results	23
3.4.2	Teaching Conditions: Results by Program	23
3.4.3	Teaching Conditions: Results by Province and Territory	23
3.4.4	Teaching Conditions: Influence of Other Variables	23
3.5	Professional Development of FSL Teachers	25
3.5.1	Participation in PD Activities	25
3.5.1.1	Participation in PD Activities: Overall Results	25
3.5.1.2	Participation in PD Activities: Results by Program	26
3.5.1.3	Participation in PD Activities: Results by Province and Territory	26
3.5.1.4	Participation in PD Activities: Influence of Other Variables	28
3.5.2	Preferred Choice of PD	28
3.5.2.1	Preferred Choice of PD: Overall Results	28
3.5.2.2	Preferred Choice of PD: Results by Program	29
3.5.3	Accessibility of PD	29
3.5.3.1	Accessibility of PD: Overall Results	29
3.5.3.2	Accessibility of PD: Results by Program	30
3.6	Responses to Open-Ended Questions	30
3.6.1	Challenges in Teaching FSL	30
3.6.2	How Second Language Associations can Help FSL Teachers	32
4.0	Summary and Implications	34
4.1	Summary of the Sample	34
4.2	Summary of the Findings	34
4.2.1	FSL Resources	34
4.2.2	Additional Resources	34
4.2.3	Stakeholder Support	34
4.2.4	Manageability of Teaching Conditions	35
4.2.5	Professional Development	35
4.2.6	Teaching Context	35
4.2.7	Conclusion	35
5.0	Future Directions	36
5.1	Demographics	36
5.2	Preservice Education	36
5.3	Targeted Professional Development	36
5.4	Access to Adequate Resources	36
5.5	Lack of Prestige of FSL	36
5.6	Innovation in FSL	37
	References	38

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a national survey of the challenges faced by French as a second language (FSL) teachers, a project jointly undertaken by the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT), the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF) and the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT), and funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

A total of 1305 FSL teachers, representing all provinces and territories, completed a web-based questionnaire on their perceptions and opinions regarding teaching resources, other resources (e.g., classrooms, consultants, French-speaking support staff), support from key stakeholders, teaching conditions and professional development opportunities. All four FSL program types currently available in Canada were represented in the sample: Core French (CF), French Immersion (FI), Extended French and Intensive French.

The questionnaire also asked teachers to provide information about themselves, their schools, their teaching experience, and their educational background. Responding FSL teachers were: predominantly female; distributed across FSL program types; geographically representative (except in the case of Quebec and BC); representative of a range of size of board and school; generally very experienced teachers; generally Anglophone; quite confident about their own abilities in French; and, mostly from CF backgrounds.

Findings

This report presents the survey findings under the five main categories of questions: teaching resources, other resources, support from stakeholders, teaching conditions and professional development.

Overall, the majority of respondents considered commercial materials to be "poor" or "adequate" although CF teachers were more satisfied with these materials than FI teachers for whom few such materials exist, particularly materials representing Francophone culture. The quantity and quality of library resources, computer software and community resources were considered "poor" by the majority of respondents.

With regard to other resources, more than 40% of the teachers report that a classroom dedicated to FSL and an FSL consultant to help them with their teaching are not available to them. Funding for activities, lack of French-speaking supply teachers, consultants for students with special needs, French-speaking non-teaching staff also concern the majority of teachers. However, the majority of teachers report easy access to computers, the Internet, space for lesson preparation and storage space.

Most teachers considered the community in which they teach to be the least supportive of their work while the school administration was perceived as very supportive. CF teachers also reported less support from parents and students.

The majority of FSL teachers reported that teaching conditions (e.g., class size, special needs students, administrative duties) were slightly or somewhat manageable. It seems, however, that teachers found it difficult to interpret the differences between conditions that were "slightly", "somewhat", or "very" manageable since "class diversity" was the challenge most often mentioned by teachers in answer to the open-ended questions.

Most FSL teachers report participation in PD through discussions with colleagues, reading professional literature and attendance at one workshop each year. It appears that some provinces, instead of providing routine workshops and conferences, have moved into electronic delivery of PD. Teachers suggest that funding, relevant topics, PD during school hours and French-speaking supply teachers will make PD more accessible to them.

Future Directions

It is impossible to determine the representativeness of our sample of responding teachers, because there is no comprehensive listing of FSL teachers in Canada. An association such as CTF is best placed to gather such data. Better information on the demographics of FSL would greatly facilitate future research.

Almost 40% of respondents have considered leaving FSL teaching. This obviously signals the need for a follow-up study to discover their reasons and the role sponsoring associations could play to reduce this number.

Only 31.6% of respondents hold FSL specialist certificates. To what extent does this play a role in their ability to meet the challenges of FSL teaching and their future as FSL teachers? Sponsoring associations, in partnership with faculties of education, may be able to answer this question and ensure that faculty curricula reflect the resulting findings.

Survey respondents were mainly experienced teachers. As a result, we know relatively little about recent graduates from faculties of education: are they better equipped to deal with the challenges awaiting them? A study of teachers during their first years of teaching (graduates of a representative sample of faculties of education in several provinces/territories) could answer this question. Again, the sponsoring associations could undertake such a study.

Teachers expressed a need for PD to upgrade their language skills and learn about new FSL methodologies. The sponsoring associations could provide this PD.

Teachers expressed the need for resources reflecting Francophone culture as well as library resources and computer software. In this case, too, the findings point to a clear role for the sponsoring associations.

Negative attitudes towards French have been well documented in the literature and substantiated in our survey. The sponsoring associations could partner with the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages and Canadian Parents for French to improve the situation of the FSL teacher.

Open-ended comments indicated that instructional time is an issue for many FSL teachers. The associations could prepare and/or provide information concerning new innovative approaches to FSL teaching to officials.

Introduction

The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT), the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF), and the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT) have jointly sponsored a research project to investigate the challenges faced by French as a second language (FSL)¹ teachers in a study funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage.

In this report, we present the findings of this project. It is organized into five sections: the first section outlines the methodology, the second section describes the participants, the third section presents the findings, the fourth section summarizes these findings, and the fifth section outlines future directions for research and action.

1.0 Methodology

This section describes the methodology followed for this study: the formation of a working group for the project, the preparation of the literature review, the development and administration of the survey instruments, the selection of the sample, and the procedures for data analysis.

1.1 Working Group

During the fall of 2005, CASLT coordinated the formation of a working group to oversee a research project to examine the working situation of FSL teachers in Canada. This working group included representatives from the three sponsoring teacher organizations: The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT), the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF), the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT), and a team of researchers.

Discussions among the members of the working group led to the conceptualization of a study consisting of two components:

- a review of the recent literature concerning the FSL teaching context; and
- a web-based survey of FSL teachers in all provinces and territories.

Committee members provided feedback on the literature review, the proposed questionnaire, the translation of the questionnaire, the methodology for administering the questionnaire, and this report.

1.2 Literature Review

For this survey, we wished to build on a similar survey (Gilbert, LeTouzé, Thériault, & Landry, 2004) of teachers in minority French language schools conducted by CTF in 2004, in which the reasons for the difficulty in recruiting qualified teachers across Canada were examined. The literature review prepared for the 2004 CTF study described challenges currently faced by all teachers and those particular to teaching in a minority French language context in Canada. In addition to the CTF study, research on FSL teaching from the past ten years was also reviewed. These sources provided points of departure for our literature review.

Four main themes emerged concerning the working situation of FSL teachers:

- resources for FSL;
- student diversity;
- FSL teaching context; and
- teacher qualifications and needs.

The literature review is presented in Appendix A.

1.3 Survey Instruments

Two survey instruments were developed to gather data on the key themes identified in the review of the literature:

- a preliminary questionnaire intended to be used for sample selection; and
- the main questionnaire to gather data on the key themes.

1.3.1 Preliminary Questionnaire

The preliminary questionnaire was designed as a screening tool to guide in the selection of a representative sample of FSL teachers from all provinces and territories. Participants were asked:

- if they taught in a publicly funded school;
- how long they had been teaching FSL;

¹FSL includes Core French, French Immersion, Intensive French and Extended French.

- which program they were teaching;
- which grades they were teaching;
- in which province/territory they were located;
- whether they were from a large, medium, or small board or district; and
- whether they were from a small or large school.

See Appendix B for the preliminary questionnaire.

1.3.2 Main Questionnaire

Preliminary drafts of the main questionnaire were inspired by the questionnaire used for the earlier CTF survey (Gilbert, et al., 2004), the recent survey of Ontario elementary Core French teachers (Mollica, Phillips, & Smith, 2005) and the review of the literature. In the resulting questionnaire, the identified themes were organized into five sections, including questions about:

- teaching resources;
- other resources;
- support from key stakeholders;
- teaching conditions; and
- professional development opportunities.

A sixth section contained questions about participants' personal details (i.e., gender, language background, education, self-assessed French proficiency, teaching experience, desire to continue teaching French) and teaching context (i.e., province, territory, FSL program, size of board and school, grades taught) to permit exploration of the effects of these variables on participants' responses to questions about the key themes.

Participants were also asked to complete two open-ended questions:

- What are the three most important challenges you face in teaching FSL?
- What are the three most important ways that second language associations can help you?

Both pen-and-paper and web-based formats were considered for the questionnaires but the web-based format seemed most appropriate from financial and efficiency perspectives.

1.3.3 Piloting the Main Questionnaire

Before the main questionnaire was published online, a number of teachers were asked to complete a preliminary version.

A total of 20 experienced teachers, distributed over three regions of the country (west, central and east), completed this preliminary version and submitted their feedback to the research team. About one-half of the group completed the French version.

Comments were compiled and reviewed. Accordingly, appropriate revisions were made and two new questions were added. The revised questionnaire was then published on line. See Appendix C for the main questionnaire.

1.4 Participant Recruitment

There is no existing complete list of FSL teachers in Canada. Many teachers who teach FSL also teach other subjects and, in some cases, regular classroom teachers are required to teach FSL to their own class as well as all other subjects. Because of this difficulty in identifying all teachers who teach FSL, it was decided that the most efficient way to reach teachers was through the Canadian Teachers' Federation, which has school representatives in most publicly funded schools in Canada.

The provincial/territorial representative was asked to distribute a letter of invitation to complete the preliminary questionnaire to the CTF representative in every school in his/her province. This second representative, who would know who taught FSL in his/her school, was asked to give a copy of this invitation letter to each teacher involved in FSL in his/her school (see Appendix D for a copy of this letter).

At the same time, an invitation to participate in the survey was circulated through contacts provided by national and provincial language and teacher organizations and was advertised on their websites.

It is not clear, however, whether invitations reached all FSL teachers. While the CTF representative was expected to be able to identify the French teacher in his/her school, he/she may not have considered a regular classroom teacher who is required to teach his/her own French to be an FSL teacher. A similar difficulty would be likely regarding contact through national and provincial language associations: teachers who teach FSL exclusively are more likely to be members of national and provincial language teacher organizations than classroom generalists who also teach all other subjects.

1.4.1 Preliminary Questionnaire

Invitation letters were sent to provincial CTF representatives in mid-January 2006, asking teachers to complete the preliminary questionnaire online by mid-February.

1.4.2 Main Questionnaire

Two thousand three hundred and twenty-three (2323) teachers responded to the preliminary questionnaire. Upon analysis of the responses, it appeared that respondents represented the range of characteristics we were seeking in our sample in terms of teaching experience, FSL program, grades taught, province/territory, size of board/school. Consequently, all respondents to the preliminary questionnaire were invited by email to complete the main questionnaire located at a second web address.

1.4.3 Sample Size

Of the 2323 teachers who responded to the preliminary questionnaire, 1305 completed the main questionnaire, resulting in a response rate of 56.1%. Of these, 934 were completed in English (72%) and 371 in French (28%).

This is not a "nationally representative" sample in the statistical sense since the sample consists of a large but self-selected group rather than a stratified sample randomly selected from the total population. However, for the most part, it does capture the diversity of teaching contexts in which FSL instructors find themselves and permits us to report on these situations.

For the open-ended questions, data from a random sample of 20% of the total number of completed surveys were analyzed and tabulated. This sample consisted of 187 questionnaires completed in English (72%) and 73 in French (28%), to reflect the English/French ratio in the total number of completed questionnaires. Of this group, 59% taught Core French, 30% taught French Immersion and the remaining 11% taught in both programs.

1.5 Data Analysis

Basic frequencies were calculated for all questions in the five key sections. We then ran crosstabs, calculated Kendall correlations or means to determine if gender, language background, education, French proficiency, teaching experience, desire to continue teaching French, province/territory, FSL program, size of board and school, or grades taught affected the way in which participants perceived resources, support, teaching conditions and professional development.

Our cut-off points for reporting the results of these analyses are as follows: differences in crosstab percentages greater than 10%; correlations greater than .2; and, differences in means greater than 1 point (representing one scale point).

For the FSL program, the number of respondents representing Intensive French and Extended French was too low to support reliable interpretations. Thus we do not report results for these programs.

Since many teachers reported teaching in more than one program, we created another category for these respondents (i.e., Core French and French Immersion). Although the data for this combined group appear in the results tables for illustrative purposes, it is impossible to determine which program was affecting the perception of respondents in this category.

For the background variable representing methodological training, only 23 respondents reported not attending a Faculty of Education, so we did not pursue further analyses using this variable.

Responses to the two open-ended questions were analyzed by a trained research assistant. She analyzed an initial sample of 25 responses in order to develop a coding scheme for each question (see Appendix E). The coding schemes were then verified by one of the researchers, who independently coded the same sample and then reviewed the coding categories with the assistant. Based on this review, some minor revisions and additions were made to the categories and to the sub-categories for each of the two coding schemes. A new random sample of 25 responses was then coded independently by the assistant and the researcher, using the revised coding schemes. Inter-rater reliability was .90; any differences were resolved through discussion.

2.0 Participants' Profiles

Teachers were asked about themselves, their schools, their teaching experience, and their educational background. This included questions about:

- gender;
- the FSL program in which they taught;
- the province/territory in which they were teaching;
- the size of the school board/school district and the size of the school in which they taught;
- the grade(s) which they taught;
- their teaching experience (including both general teaching and FSL);
- their French proficiency (self-assessed French proficiency in performing 5 tasks);
- their language background (including their mother tongue and the programs in schools and in university in which they learned and studied French);
- their methodological training, including their teaching qualifications; and
- whether they had considered leaving FSL teaching.

(See Section E of main questionnaire in Appendix C).

These questions were intended to illustrate the representativeness of the sample as well as to inform subsequent data analysis. On the basis of the review of the literature, results of previous studies and our own knowledge of the field, we hypothesized that these factors might influence the perceptions of the participants regarding resources, support, teaching conditions and professional development opportunities.

The following section summarizes the responses to these questions. Overall totals and data for each province are presented for most variables. The territories have been grouped together to better protect the anonymity of these participants.

2.1 Gender

The majority of teacher respondents were female (87%)². The proportion of male and female respondents for each province and the territories is displayed in Table 2.1.

	Gender	Female	Male	Total		Gender	Female	Male	Total
TER	<i>Count</i>	19	2	21	QC	<i>Count</i>	23	4	27
	%	90.9	9.1	100.0		%	85.2	14.8	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	74	6	80	NB	<i>Count</i>	88	17	105
	%	92.5	7.5	100.0		%	83.8	16.2	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	104	12	116	NS	<i>Count</i>	116	24	140
	%	89.7	10.3	100.0		%	82.9	17.1	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	54	10	64	PE	<i>Count</i>	27	6	33
	%	84.4	15.6	100.0		%	81.8	18.2	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	49	11	60	NL	<i>Count</i>	63	13	76
	%	81.7	18.3	100.0		%	82.9	17.1	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	484	59	543	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	1101	164	1265
	%	89.1	10.9	100.0		%	87	13.0	100.0

*Valid cases 1265 (96.9%); Missing 40 (3.1%); Total 1305 (100%)

² In 2003, 72% of the members from professional teacher associations were women (according to statistics from CTF).

2.2 Type of FSL Program

Survey respondents represented all currently available FSL programs in Canada: Core French (CF), French Immersion (FI), Extended French (EF) and Intensive French (IF) as illustrated in Table 2.2.

		CF	FI	CF & FI	EF & IF	TOTAL			CF	FI	CF & FI	EF & IF	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	11	6	2	2	21	QC	<i>Count</i>	12	7	2	6	27
	<i>%</i>	52.4	28.6	9.5	9.5	100.0		<i>%</i>	44.4	25.9	7.4	22.2	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	38	31	11	2	82	NB	<i>Count</i>	28	43	30	5	106
	<i>%</i>	46.3	37.8	13.4	2.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	26.4	40.5	28.3	4.7	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	74	24	8	10	116	NS	<i>Count</i>	44	61	34	2	141
	<i>%</i>	63.7	20.6	6.9	8.6	100.0		<i>%</i>	31.2	43.2	24.1	1.4	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	39	17	4	4	64	PE	<i>Count</i>	14	13	4	2	33
	<i>%</i>	69.9	26.5	6.2	6.2	100.0		<i>%</i>	42.4	39.3	12.1	6.0	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	33	20	5	3	61	NL	<i>Count</i>	31	23	15	8	77
	<i>%</i>	54.0	32.7	8.1	4.9	100.0		<i>%</i>	40.2	29.8	19.5	10.3	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	387	84	36	39	546	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	711	328	151	83	1274
	<i>%</i>	70.8	15.3	6.6	7.1	100.0		<i>%</i>	55.8	25.7	11.8	6.5	100.0

The majority of respondents (55.8%) were CF teachers. This was also the case for the provinces and territories, except for Nova Scotia and New Brunswick where most respondents were FI teachers.

2.3 Distribution by Province and Territory

Teachers responded from every province and territory although the number of respondents from British Columbia and Quebec were proportionally low when compared to the FSL student population reported by province in the State of French Second Language Education Report (CPF, 2005) (see table 2.1 above).

Since the number of respondents from Quebec and British Columbia is particularly low, results for Quebec and British Columbia may not present accurate portrayals of the state of FSL teaching for those provinces.

2.4 Size of School Board/District and Size of School

Survey respondents taught in very small to very large school boards/school districts. The majority (52.8%) reported teaching in small districts (fewer than 9 secondary schools), while 32.3% reported teaching in medium-sized boards/school districts (10-24 secondary schools) and 14.9% reported teaching in large boards/school districts (25 or more secondary schools).

These proportions were similar in the provinces and territories with the exception of Alberta and Newfoundland where the majority of respondents taught in medium (10 to 25 secondary schools) and large (more than 25 secondary schools) boards/school districts (see Table 2.4a).

Table 2.4a: Number of Secondary Schools in School Board/District Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		< 9	10 - 25	25 +	TOTAL			< 9	10 - 25	25 +	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	17	3	0	21	QC	<i>Count</i>	14	9	2	25
	<i>%</i>	76.2	23.8	0.0	100.0		<i>%</i>	56.0	36.0	8.0	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	68	9	1	78	NB	<i>Count</i>	86	16	2	104
	<i>%</i>	87.2	11.6	1.3	100.0		<i>%</i>	82.7	15.4	1.9	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	38	32	37	107	NS	<i>Count</i>	38	69	26	133
	<i>%</i>	35.5	19.9	34.6	100.0		<i>%</i>	28.6	51.9	19.5	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	43	15	4	62	PE	<i>Count</i>	24	6	2	32
	<i>%</i>	69.4	24.2	6.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	75.0	18.8	6.3	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	46	11	2	59	NL	<i>Count</i>	8	33	31	72
	<i>%</i>	78.0	18.7	3.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	11.2	45.9	43.0	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	261	189	74	524	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	643	393	181	1217
	<i>%</i>	49.8	36.1	12.1	100.0		<i>%</i>	57.8	32.3	14.9	100.0

Survey respondents also reported teaching in very small to very large schools. The majority (60.4%) taught in medium-sized schools (301 - 999 students), while 27.4% taught in small schools (up to 300 students) and 12.2% taught in large schools (1000 students or more).

A similar distribution is reflected in the provinces and territories, with the exception of Quebec and the Territories. (see Table 2.4b).

Table 2.4b: Number of Secondary Schools in School Board/District Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		fewer than 150	150-300 students	301-500 students	501-999 students	1000 or more	TOTAL			fewer than 150	150-300 students	301-500 students	501-999 students	1000 or more	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	4	7	6	3	1	14	QC	<i>Count</i>	3	5	4	6	8	26
	<i>%</i>	23.8	39.5	14.3	15.7	6.7	100.0		<i>%</i>	11.5	19.2	15.4	23.0	30.8	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	3	10	23	29	15	80	NB	<i>Count</i>	4	20	34	30	15	103
	<i>%</i>	3.8	12.5	28.8	36.3	18.8	100.0		<i>%</i>	3.9	19.4	33.0	29.1	14.6	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	4	25	40	32	12	113	NS	<i>Count</i>	2	27	54	36	19	138
	<i>%</i>	3.5	22.1	35.4	28.3	10.6	100.0		<i>%</i>	1.4	19.6	39.1	26.0	13.8	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	4	21	26	11	1	63	PE	<i>Count</i>	1	8	10	14	0	33
	<i>%</i>	6.3	33.3	41.3	17.5	1.6	100.0		<i>%</i>	3.0	24.2	30.3	42.4	0.0	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	1	15	20	15	9	60	NL	<i>Count</i>	6	13	29	26	3	77
	<i>%</i>	1.7	25.0	33.3	25.0	15.0	100.0		<i>%</i>	7.8	16.9	37.7	33.8	3.9	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	28	133	174	137	70	542	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	60	284	420	339	153	1256
	<i>%</i>	5.2	24.5	32.1	25.3	12.9	100.0		<i>%</i>	4.8	22.6	33.4	27.0	12.2	100.0

2.5 Grades Taught

Participants taught all grades from K -12 as illustrated in Table 2.5.

Grades Taught	Frequency	%
K-3 only	141	10.8
K-3 and 4-6	125	9.6
4-6 only	195	14.9
4-6 and 7-9	194	14.9
7-9 only	183	14.0
7-9 and 10-12	192	14.7
10-12 only	90	6.9
K-3 through 7-9	131	10.0
4-6 through 10-12	8	0.6
All Levels	7	0.5
Total	1266	97.0
Missing	39	3.0
Total	1305	100.0

2.6 Teaching Experience and FSL Teaching Experience

The majority of participants (61.80%) had more than 10 years of teaching experience. Twenty-four percent (24.4%) had between 4 and 9 years of experience and 13.8% had 3 years or less (see Table 2.6a).

		< 4 years	4 - 9 years	10-19 years	+ 20 years	TOTAL			< 4 years	4 - 9 years	10-19 years	+ 20 years	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	3	3	12	3	21	QC	<i>Count</i>	5	7	7	8	27
	<i>%</i>	15.6	7.3	70.0	7.3	100.0		<i>%</i>	18.5	25.9	25.9	29.6	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	15	15	32	20	82	NB	<i>Count</i>	14	35	34	23	106
	<i>%</i>	18.3	18.3	39.0	24.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	13.2	33.0	32.1	21.7	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	16	30	37	33	116	NS	<i>Count</i>	31	29	42	39	113
	<i>%</i>	13.8	25.9	31.9	28.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	22.0	20.6	29.8	27.7	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	8	21	22	13	64	PE	<i>Count</i>	2	13	9	9	33
	<i>%</i>	12.5	32.8	34.4	20.3	100.0		<i>%</i>	6.1	39.4	27.3	27.3	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	5	15	24	16	60	NL	<i>Count</i>	4	13	42	18	77
	<i>%</i>	8.3	25.0	40.0	26.7	100.0		<i>%</i>	5.2	16.9	54.5	23.4	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	73	130	190	152	545	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	176	311	451	334	1272
	<i>%</i>	13.4	23.9	34.9	27.9	100.0		<i>%</i>	13.8	24.4	35.5	26.3	100.0

Similarly, the majority of participants (55.5%) had more than 10 years of FSL teaching experience. Twenty-six percent (26.2%) had between 4 and 9 years of experience and 18.3% had 3 years of FSL teaching experience or less (see Table 2.6b).

Table 2.6b: Years of FSL Teaching Experience Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		< 4 years	4 - 9 years	10-19 years	+ 20 years	TOTAL			< 4 years	4 - 9 years	10-19 years	+ 20 years	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	4	5	9	2	20	QC	<i>Count</i>	9	5	8	4	26
	<i>%</i>	32.6	26.9	35.9	5.1	100.0		<i>%</i>	34.6	19.2	30.8	15.4	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	16	19	27	15	77	NB	<i>Count</i>	18	33	31	18	100
	<i>%</i>	20.8	24.7	35.1	19.5	100.0		<i>%</i>	18.0	33.0	31.0	18.0	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	27	33	30	23	113	NS	<i>Count</i>	37	27	33	31	128
	<i>%</i>	23.9	29.2	26.5	20.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	28.9	21.1	25.8	24.2	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	10	20	21	10	61	PE	<i>Count</i>	3	12	8	8	31
	<i>%</i>	16.4	32.8	34.4	16.4	100.0		<i>%</i>	9.7	38.7	25.8	25.8	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	8	15	24	12	59	NL	<i>Count</i>	6	14	40	15	75
	<i>%</i>	13.6	25.4	40.7	20.3	100.0		<i>%</i>	8.0	18.7	53.3	20.0	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	82	132	183	114	511	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	220	315	414	252	1201
	<i>%</i>	16.0	25.8	35.8	22.3	100.0		<i>%</i>	18.3	26.2	34.5	21.0	100.0

2.7 French Proficiency

To determine to what degree they were proficient in French, participants were asked to assess their own proficiency in French in performing five tasks. These tasks included:

- modelling correct spoken French for their students;
- correcting student written work;
- having a conversation with a colleague about an activity their classes were doing together;
- writing a report about a class activity for a newsletter; and
- reading an article in an educational journal.

The greater majority of respondents reported no difficulty at all in modelling correct spoken French for their students (77.5%), correcting student written work (78.5%) or having a conversation with a colleague about an activity their classes were doing together (74.8%). Slightly fewer respondents, but still a majority, reported no difficulty in writing a report about a class activity for a newsletter (63.1%) or reading an article in an educational journal (71.2%). Complete results by province and territories are found in Appendix F.

2.8 Language Background

The majority of respondents (61.7%) reported English as their first language; 26.6% reported French as their first language; 3.1% reported being raised bilingual (English and French); and 9.3% reported that neither English nor French was their first language (see Table 2.8a).

		English	French	Bilingual	Neither	TOTAL			English	French	Bilingual	Neither	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	9	10	2	0	21	QC	<i>Count</i>	4	20	1	2	27
	<i>%</i>	30.0	60.9	9.1	0.0	100.0		<i>%</i>	14.8	74.1	3.7	7.4	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	55	20	3	4	82	NB	<i>Count</i>	54	46	4	2	106
	<i>%</i>	67.1	24.4	3.7	4.9	100.0		<i>%</i>	51.0	43.4	3.8	1.9	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	86	18	2	10	116	NS	<i>Count</i>	92	37	8	4	141
	<i>%</i>	74.1	15.5	1.7	8.6	100.0		<i>%</i>	65.2	26.2	5.7	2.8	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	50	9	3	2	64	PE	<i>Count</i>	21	12	0	0	33
	<i>%</i>	78.1	14.1	4.7	3.1	100.0		<i>%</i>	63.7	36.4	0.0	0.0	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	37	17	0	7	61	NL	<i>Count</i>	69	12	0	2	78
	<i>%</i>	60.7	27.9	0.0	11.5	100.0		<i>%</i>	88.5	9.0	0.0	2.6	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	301	143	17	85	546	TOTAL	<i>Count</i>	778	339	40	118	1275
	<i>%</i>	55.1	26.2	3.1	15.6	100.0		<i>%</i>	61.0	26.6	3.1	9.3	100.0

The majority of respondents (58.5%) reported that they had studied French in the Core French program themselves; 25.2% reported studying French in a program for Francophones; 17.9% reported studying in a French Immersion program; and 4.0% reported studying in an Extended French program (see Table 2.8b).

	Core French	French Immersion	Extended French	Francophone School
TER	10	3	1	10
BC	47	19	1	16
AB	78	18	5	12
SK	43	14	2	5
MB	38	9	3	15
ON	335	72	24	163
QC	10	2	1	14
NB	38	37	2	41
NS	85	36	9	34
PE	17	10	2	11
NL	63	12	2	8
TOTAL	764	233	52	329
<i>%</i>	58.5	17.9	4.0	25.2

As for their university program of study, 47.4% of participants reported studying French as a major; 22.2% reported completing coursework at a French or bilingual university; and 14.7% reported studying French as a minor. Only 8.7% reported taking a single French course during their university studies and 6.9% reported no university studies in French (see Table 2.8c).

Table 2.8c: University French Studies Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		French Major	French Minor	One University French Course	Completed Coursework at a French Bilingual University	No University French Course	TOTAL			French Major	French Minor	One University French Course	Completed Coursework at a French Bilingual University	No University French Course	TOTAL
TER	Count	6	4	2	6	2	20	QC	Count	6	0	2	13	6	27
	%	41.7	10.3	19.2	19.6	9.2	100.0		%	22.2	0.0	7.4	48.1	22.2	100
BC	Count	33	10	10	12	12	77	NB	Count	44	10	8	32	10	104
	%	42.9	13.0	13.0	15.6	15.6	100.0		%	42.3	9.6	7.7	30.8	9.6	100
AB	Count	55	20	12	16	8	111	NS	Count	53	16	23	37	7	136
	%	49.5	18.0	10.8	14.4	7.2	100.0		%	39.0	11.8	17.0	27.2	5.1	100
SK	Count	28	17	6	8	3	62	PE	Count	12	2	2	12	2	30
	%	45.2	27.4	9.7	12.9	4.8	100.0		%	40.0	6.7	6.7	40.0	6.7	100.0
MB	Count	19	14	6	17	3	59	NL	Count	48	9	5	13	2	77
	%	32.2	23.7	10.2	28.8	5.1	100.0		%	62.3	11.7	6.5	16.9	2.6	100
ON	Count	283	80	32	109	31	535	TOTAL	Count	587	182	108	275	86	1238
	%	53.0	15.0	6.0	20.4	5.8	100.0		%	47.4	14.7	8.7	22.2	6.9	100.0

2.9 FSL Methodological Training

The majority of participants (61.1%) reported having taken one or more methodology courses in teaching both CF and FI. Only 1.8% reported that they had not attended a Faculty of Education (see Table 2.9a).

Table 2.9a: Type of FSL Training Reported by Participants by Province and Territory*

	Courses in Core French and French Immersion Methodology	Courses in Core French Methodology	Courses in Immersion Methodology	Courses in Teaching Subjects in French	Did Not Attend a Faculty of Education		Courses in Core French and French Immersion Methodology	Courses in Core French Methodology	Courses in Immersion Methodology	Courses in Teaching Subjects in French	Did Not Attend a Faculty of Education
TER	10	11	6	10	0	QC	14	13	11	12	2
BC	44	32	18	15	2	NB	63	38	37	48	1
AB	57	51	31	27	6	NS	95	63	39	48	4
SK	34	26	22	24	1	PE	18	14	11	14	0
MB	34	22	20	22	0	NL	54	50	27	22	0
ON	375	256	84	109	7	TOTAL	798	576	306	351	23

*Multiple responses were possible

The majority of participants (73.5%) reported having a general provincial/territorial teaching certificate from the province/territory in which they teach. Just under one third (31.6%) reported having a specialist teaching certificate in FSL. Only 2.4% reported teaching with a letter of permission (see Table 2.9b).

Table 2.9b: Teaching Qualifications Reported by Participants by Province and Territory*							
	Teaching Certificate	Special FSL Certificate	Letter of Permission		Teaching Certificate	Special FSL Certificate	Letter of Permission
TER	19	3	0	QC	11	11	2
BC	57	23	0	NB	81	32	0
AB	97	26	1	NS	116	33	5
SK	52	12	1	PE	27	3	0
MB	52	10	0	NL	63	17	0
ON	384	243	22	TOTAL	959	413	31

*Multiple responses were possible

2.10 Future in Teaching FSL

Participants were asked if they had considered leaving FSL teaching in the last twelve months. Almost 40% of participants reported that they had. Table 2.10 below presents these results by province and territories.

Table 2.10: Percentage of Participants Who Considered Leaving FSL Teaching in the Last 12 Months by Province and Territory							
	Yes (%)	No (%)	Count		Yes (%)	No (%)	Count
TER	42.9	57.1	21	QC	29.6	70.4	27
BC	34.1	65.9	82	NB	31.1	68.9	106
AB	37.1	62.9	116	NS	42.6	57.4	141
SK	40.6	59.4	64	PE	33.3	66.7	33
MB	33.3	66.7	60	NL	30.8	69.2	78
ON	42.5	57.5	546	TOTAL	38.8	61.2	1274

3.0 Survey Findings

Results are presented in five sections following the divisions of the questionnaire:

- teacher perceptions of FSL resources available to them;
- teacher perceptions of additional resources available to them;
- teacher perceptions of stakeholder support;
- teacher perceptions of manageability of teaching conditions; and
- professional development of FSL teachers.

These sections are followed by a summary of the responses to the two open-ended questions:

- the three most important challenges faced in teaching FSL; and
- the three most important ways that second language associations could help.

3.1 Teacher Perceptions of FSL Resources Available to Them

The first section of the survey asked teachers to evaluate the following FSL resources potentially available to them:

- commercial teaching materials;
- teaching materials with Francophone culture;
- library resources;
- computer software; and
- community opportunities.

Teachers evaluated the quality and quantity of these materials, as well as the appropriateness of these materials for the age level and the language level of their students, using a scale of 1-7 (resources not available to me; resources available but do not use them; very poor; poor; adequate; good; excellent). For purposes of parsimony in reporting, the two categories related to availability were collapsed into one category: "not using". Likewise, the two "poor" categories, and the "good" and "excellent" categories were collapsed into one category each: "poor" and "good/excellent" respectively.

3.1.1 FSL Resources: Overall Results

Table 3.1.1 presents the responses of all participating teachers. Generally, fewer than half of the respondents considered the quality, quantity and appropriateness of commercial materials to be good or excellent. The majority judged these materials to be poor or adequate.

Teachers were even less satisfied with materials representing Francophone cultures: 80% of the respondents rated these materials as either poor or adequate.

Perceptions of the usefulness of library resources, computer software and community opportunities were even more unfavourable, with over 50% of all respondents rating these resources as poor.

Finally, it is worth noting that about 50% of the responding teachers reported not using computer software.

Table 3.1.1: Teacher Perceptions of FSL Resources					
	% Not Using	% Poor	% Adequate	% Good Excellent	Count
Commercial teaching resources					
• quality	4.0	19.8	38.4	41.8	1287
• quantity	4.1	35.5	33.8	30.7	1286
• appropriate age level	3.3	30.0	40.0	30.0	1279
• appropriate language level	3.7	39.7	36.5	23.9	1275
Resources with Francophone culture					
• quantity	10.5	41.7	40.9	17.5	1280
• quality	10.7	57.2	30.7	12.1	1256
• appropriate age level	11.1	44.2	39.6	16.3	1265
• appropriate language level	11.0	51.6	35.2	13.2	1269
Library resources					
• quality	19.2	55.8	28.6	15.6	1286
• quantity	18.1	66.7	21.4	11.9	1273
• appropriate age level	19.5	55.4	31.8	12.9	1274
• appropriate language level	19.3	63.0	26.3	10.7	1271
Computer software					
• quality	50.6	51.2	33.2	15.6	1281
• quantity	49.4	73.1	19.6	7.4	1262
• appropriate age level	49.6	54.7	32.4	12.9	1267
• appropriate language level	49.1	59.5	29.8	10.7	1268
Community opportunities					
• quality	20.9	50.0	25.0	25.0	1285
• quantity	19.0	67.8	17.6	14.6	1260
• appropriate age level	20.7	63.2	23.0	13.8	1272
• appropriate language level	20.3	69.2	20.6	10.2	1274

3.1.2 FSL Resources: Results by Program

Table 3.1.2 presents the responses of teachers by program: Core French (CF), French Immersion (FI) and teachers in both programs (CF and FI).

CF teachers appear to be more satisfied than their FI counterparts with the commercial resources available to them. In fact, almost one-half (49.2%) of the reporting CF teachers judged the quality of the commercial materials to be good or excellent compared to only 33.9% of FI teachers. In terms of quantity, age appropriateness and language appropriateness, fewer CF teachers and very few FI teachers judged these materials to be good or excellent. These differences likely reflect the fact that, whereas CF teachers can use materials written specifically for their students, FI teachers often have no other option but to use materials developed for French (mother tongue) students. These materials are often too difficult for FI students.

Table 3.1.2: Teacher Perceptions of FSL Resources by Program

	Core French (CF)					French Immersion (FI)					CF and FI				
	% Not Using	% Poor	% Adequate	% Good Excellent	COUNT	% Not Using	% Poor	% Adequate	% Good Excellent	COUNT	% Not Using	% Poor	% Adequate	% Good Excellent	COUNT
Commercial teaching resources															
• quality	2.7	13.9	36.9	49.2	710	5.2	26.5	39.6	33.9	330	6.5	27.8	42.4	29.9	154
• quantity	3.0	25.4	34.5	40.1	710	5.8	51.6	33.5	14.8	329	5.8	44.1	30.3	25.5	154
• appropriate age level	1.8	22.5	41.0	36.4	710	4.3	43.4	36.3	20.3	325	5.2	33.8	42.1	24.1	153
• appropriate language level	2.4	29.1	40.6	30.3	701	4.9	55.3	31.5	13.2	327	4.6	50.7	30.8	18.5	153
Resources with Francophone culture															
• quantity	8.2	39.7	39.1	21.2	708	14.6	43.2	44.6	12.1	328	9.8	44.9	42.0	13.0	153
• quality	8.9	53.6	31.9	14.5	695	14.5	64.6	27.8	7.6	324	8.8	54.1	31.9	14.1	148
• appropriate age level	9.0	39.2	40.1	20.7	701	14.5	51.3	40.1	8.7	324	12.0	49.2	35.6	15.2	150
• appropriate language level	8.7	45.6	37.4	17.0	702	14.5	61.5	32.0	6.5	325	11.3	56.0	32.8	11.2	151
Library resources															
• quality	27.7	65.3	25.7	9.0	710	4.9	42.2	34.8	23.0	329	12.9	52.6	32.6	14.8	155
• quantity	26.5	74.3	19.9	5.8	703	3.7	55.7	23.4	20.9	328	13.2	66.4	23.7	9.9	151
• appropriate age level	29.0	66.3	26.3	7.4	701	4.3	41.2	37.7	21.1	327	11.0	49.6	38.7	11.7	154
• appropriate language level	28.5	71.8	21.2	7.0	699	3.7	51.1	33.0	15.9	327	11.1	59.6	31.6	8.8	153
Computer software															
• quality	54.4	53.6	31.6	14.9	708	39.5	46.7	35.7	17.6	329	57.4	56.1	30.3	13.6	155
• quantity	53.2	69.0	23.0	8.0	696	37.7	77.3	14.8	7.9	326	56.6	75.8	19.7	4.5	152
• appropriate age level	53.6	56.2	31.5	12.3	699	38.5	53.2	34.3	12.4	327	54.9	56.5	30.4	13.0	153
• appropriate language level	52.9	59.3	29.2	11.6	698	38.3	60.2	29.9	10.0	326	54.8	58.6	31.4	10.0	155
Community opportunities															
• quality	24.5	55.5	23.5	21.0	711	14.0	45.2	29.3	25.4	329	16.1	41.5	26.9	31.5	155
• quantity	22.1	73.4	15.6	11.0	700	12.7	65.8	19.6	14.6	322	15.4	53.2	25.4	21.4	149
• appropriate age level	24.5	69.9	19.6	10.5	703	15.0	59.4	27.3	13.3	327	13.1	50.4	27.8	21.8	153
• appropriate language level	23.3	77.0	16.2	6.8	700	14.6	63.9	26.4	9.6	328	12.3	54.4	24.3	21.3	155

Table 3.1.3: Teacher Perceptions of FSL Resources by Province and Territory												
	TER	BC	AB	SK	MB	ON	QC	NB	NS	PE	NL	Count
Commercial teaching resources	• quality	5.60	5.33	5.11	5.21	5.46	5.30	5.11	5.23	5.42	5.20	1217
	• quantity	5.05	5.08	4.83	4.76	5.08	4.98	4.77	4.81	5.13	4.93	1212
	• appropriate age level	5.00	5.15	4.77	4.77	5.05	5.05	4.94	4.95	5.29	5.00	1218
	• appropriate language level	4.58	4.94	4.64	4.72	4.90	4.85	4.65	4.68	4.90	4.84	1210
Resources with Francophone culture	• quantity	4.76	4.77	4.72	4.70	4.92	4.67	4.55	4.64	4.70	4.47	1130
	• quality	4.35	4.58	4.59	4.47	4.70	4.36	4.47	4.43	4.45	4.23	1106
	• appropriate age level	4.75	4.79	4.57	4.56	4.83	4.66	4.62	4.61	4.67	4.47	1110
	• appropriate language level	4.25	4.68	4.38	4.38	4.67	4.53	4.32	4.51	4.63	4.32	1116
Library resources	• quality	5.44	4.81	4.48	4.61	4.57	4.15	4.34	4.38	4.58	4.13	1020
	• quantity	4.94	4.59	4.32	4.30	4.41	3.92	4.10	4.22	4.37	3.91	1024
	• appropriate age level	5.18	4.72	4.38	4.47	4.52	4.11	4.36	4.44	4.59	4.27	1007
	• appropriate language level	4.76	4.61	4.19	4.26	4.39	4.03	4.29	4.24	4.33	4.29	1007
Computer software	• quality	4.44	4.39	4.28	4.77	4.40	4.44	4.43	4.55	4.54	4.49	620
	• quantity	3.80	4.00	3.88	4.21	4.08	4.01	4.06	3.92	4.07	4.21	625
	• appropriate age level	4.36	4.35	4.26	4.73	4.27	4.30	4.22	4.49	4.50	4.65	626
	• appropriate language level	4.45	4.19	4.15	4.50	4.42	4.27	5.11	4.31	4.31	4.60	633
Community opportunities	• quality	5.06	4.40	4.68	4.41	5.48	4.46	4.62	4.39	4.53	4.42	1001
	• quantity	4.53	3.91	4.18	4.02	5.09	4.05	4.33	3.85	4.21	3.95	1005
	• appropriate age level	4.67	4.06	4.09	4.04	5.02	4.14	4.24	4.04	4.20	4.07	993
	• appropriate language level	4.47	3.87	4.01	3.81	4.86	4.02	4.14	3.94	4.17	4.02	1000

Means were calculated from responses on a 7-point scale: 1. unavailable; 2. available but do not use; 3. very poor; 4. poor; 5. adequate; 6. good; and 7. excellent.

About 25% of CF teachers do not make use of library resources but, among those who do so, about 90% judge these materials to be poor or adequate. Most FI teachers make use of school library resources but about 75-80% of these teachers judge these resources to be either poor or adequate. Appropriateness of these materials for the age and language level of their students was judged even lower, with 84% of FI teachers judging these to be poor or adequate.

There appear to be no noteworthy differences between perceptions of CF and FI teachers with regard to computer software and community opportunities, although more CF teachers reported not using computer software than their FI counterparts.

3.1.3 FSL Resources: Results by Province and Territory

The means presented in Table 3.1.3 show little variation in teacher response by province and territories. Of interest are the responses for Quebec and Manitoba with regard to community opportunities.

3.1.4 FSL Resources: Influence of Other Variables

In order to determine whether teacher satisfaction with teaching resources varied as a function of the size of board and/or school in which respondents taught, the grades they taught, their teaching experience, their language background, and their feelings regarding their future in FSL teaching, correlations were calculated between the scores for teacher satisfaction with resources and these variables. No significant relationships were found.

3.2 Teacher Perceptions of Additional Resources Available to Them

A second group of questions asked FSL teachers to evaluate the availability of additional FSL resources including:

- funding for FSL activities;
- access to computers and the Internet;
- technical support for integrating computer technology in the classroom;
- classrooms dedicated only to FSL teaching;
- suitable space for lesson preparation;
- suitable space for storage of materials;
- consultants (or other resource persons) to help with teaching;
- consultants (or other resource persons) to help students with learning difficulties or special needs (including ESL students);
- French-speaking supply/substitute teachers;
- French-speaking administrative staff (e.g., principals);
- French-speaking support staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians); and
- a French-speaking librarian.

Teachers evaluated availability on a 5-point scale (unavailable; rarely available; sometimes available; usually available; and always available). To simplify presentation of the results, these categories were combined to form three categories (unavailable/rarely available; sometimes available; and usually/always available).

3.2.1 Additional Resources: Overall Results

As seen in Table 3.2.1, the majority of teachers felt that access to computers and the Internet, space for lesson preparation, and space for storage of materials were usually or always available.

However, fewer than half of the teachers stated that classrooms for FSL teaching or consultants to help with teaching were usually or always available.

Very few respondents felt that funding for activities, consultants to help students with learning difficulties or special needs, French-speaking supply teachers, French-speaking administrative and support staff, and a French-speaking librarian were available.

Table 3.2.1: Teacher Perceptions of Availability of Additional Resources

	Unavailable/ Rarely Available	Sometimes Available	Usually/ Always Available	Count
	%	%	%	
Funding for activities	53.0	33.0	14.0	1280
Computers/Internet	18.5	21.8	59.6	1277
Technical support for computers	38.2	29.7	32.1	1276
Classrooms dedicated to FSL	40.9	11.8	47.3	1281
Space for lesson preparation	13.4	14.9	71.7	1277
Space for storage of materials	18.2	17.9	63.9	1278
Consultants to help with teaching	32.5	27.2	40.3	1278
Consultants (to help students with learning difficulties or special needs)	56.8	21.8	21.5	1271
French-speaking supply/substitute teachers	52.3	35.3	12.4	1279
French-speaking administrative staff (e.g., principals)	66.1	16.5	17.5	1279
French-speaking support staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians)	83.0	10.1	6.9	1276
French-speaking librarian	81.1	7.7	11.2	1281

3.2.2 Additional Resources: Results by Program

As for the overall results, the majority of CF teachers and FI teachers indicated that computer/Internet access, space for lesson preparation, and space for storage of materials were usually or always available.

However, only 35.6% of CF teachers reported that a classroom dedicated to FSL was available to them (compared to 69.1% of FI teachers). Many CF teachers do not have a classroom dedicated to the teaching of French and must travel from class to class to teach in the classroom of their students.

The majority of CF teachers also indicated that funding for activities and French-speaking substitute teachers were either rarely available or unavailable (See Table 3.2.2.).

3.2.3 Additional Resources: Results by Province and Territory

As seen in Table 3.2.3, only slight variations concerning availability of these additional resources were evident from the calculation of means by province and territories with the exception of higher availability of French-speaking substitutes, French speaking administrative staff, French-speaking support staff and French-speaking librarians in Quebec, which is understandable.

3.2.4 Additional Resources: Influence of Other Variables

Correlations were calculated between answers concerning availability of these additional resources and the size of board and/or school in which respondents taught, the grades they taught, their teaching experience, their language background, and their feelings regarding their future in FSL teaching. No significant relationships were found.

Table 3.2.2: Teacher Perceptions of Additional FSL Resources by Program

	Unavailable/ Rarely Available			Sometimes Available			Usually/Always Available		
	%			%			%		
	CF	FI	CF+FI	CF	FI	CF+FI	CF	FI	CF+FI
Funding for activities	58.5	43.4	49.7	28.5	38.3	38.1	12.9	18.2	12.2
Computers/Internet	25.0	8.0	12.9	24.9	12.9	27.7	50.1	79.1	59.3
Technical support for computers	42.2	29.7	36.6	29.7	28.2	32.0	28.2	42.1	31.4
Classrooms dedicated to FSL	52.5	21.6	29.8	12.0	9.4	12.3	35.6	69.1	57.8
Space for lesson preparation	13.0	11.9	15.0	15.3	12.4	13.7	71.7	75.8	71.2
Space for storage of materials	17.3	18.7	18.7	17.5	19.3	15.5	65.1	62.0	65.8
Consultants to help with teaching	32.9	30.8	37.2	27.1	28.7	24.2	40.0	40.5	38.6
Consultants (to help students with learning difficulties or special needs)	56.4	51.5	68.7	20.7	28.0	16.3	22.9	20.4	15.0
French-speaking supply/substitute teachers	57.4	43.4	49.6	35.0	35.8	36.8	7.4	20.8	13.5
French-speaking administrative staff (e.g., principals)	76.0	50.2	62.6	15.4	18.2	16.1	8.6	31.6	21.3
French-speaking support staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians)	88.1	79.2	79.9	7.9	10.7	11.7	4.0	10.1	8.4
French-speaking librarian	89.8	70.8	70.6	5.4	10.6	11.1	5.0	18.6	18.3

CF - Core French (N = 704-710)

FI - French Immersion (N = 325-330)

CF + FI - Both Core French and Immersion (N = 153-155)

Table 3.2.3: Teacher Perceptions of Additional FSL Resources by Province and Territory

Province/ Territory	Activity Funding	Computer Internet	Tech Support	Classroom	Space for Prep.	Space for Storage	Teaching Consultant	Consultant for Students	French Sub.	French Admin.	French Support Staff	French Librarian
TER	3.35	4.30	2.90	3.42	4.26	4.00	3.75	2.55	2.85	2.84	1.95	3.00
BC	2.71	3.77	2.73	3.13	3.77	3.43	2.89	2.45	2.39	1.98	1.46	1.99
AB	2.11	3.46	2.90	2.84	3.58	3.50	3.11	2.38	2.75	2.28	1.80	1.49
SK	2.14	3.84	3.13	3.32	4.11	3.79	3.10	2.90	2.52	2.03	1.59	1.84
MB	3.11	3.72	2.87	3.18	4.02	3.95	3.57	2.90	2.59	2.85	2.26	2.33
ON	2.33	3.39	2.70	2.76	3.94	3.74	3.01	2.29	2.46	2.05	1.66	1.63
QC	2.63	3.85	2.56	3.15	4.11	3.73	2.63	2.15	3.48	3.52	3.89	3.19
NB	2.44	3.88	2.97	3.24	4.18	3.71	2.97	2.29	2.63	2.58	1.60	1.45
NS	2.31	3.91	3.11	3.57	4.13	3.74	3.46	2.46	2.20	2.24	1.36	1.52
PE	2/64	4.06	3.06	3.27	4.27	4.06	4.03	2.42	2.88	2.42	1.53	1.76
NL	2.58	3.82	3.07	3.16	3.75	3.46	2.86	2.24	2.68	1.66	1.16	1.40
TOTAL	2.42	3.62	2.85	3.02	3.96	3.70	3.11	2.39	2.53	2.20	1.66	1.70

Means were calculated from responses on a 5-point scale:

1.unavailable; 2. rarely available; 3. sometimes available; 4. usually available; and 5. always available.

3.3 Teacher Perceptions of Stakeholder Support

This section of the survey asked teachers to evaluate the degree of support by the following:

- their school administration;
- school guidance counsellors;
- parents of their students;
- non-FSL teaching colleagues;
- community in which they teach; and
- their students.

Teachers evaluated the degree of support of each group on a scale of 1-4 (not at all supportive; slightly supportive; somewhat supportive; very supportive). Once again, for purposes of parsimony in reporting, the bottom two categories (not at all and slightly supportive) were collapsed into one category.

3.3.1 Stakeholder Support: Overall Results

As can be seen in Table 3.3.1, the majority of respondents perceived their school administration to be very supportive.

This was not the case for other groups with whom they interact. Teacher perceptions of the support provided by their school guidance counsellors and the parents of their students appear to be equally divided among the three categories. It should be noted that 42.6% of the respondents (likely elementary school teachers where no guidance counsellors are available) indicated that the category of guidance counsellor was not applicable.

As for teacher perceptions of the support of their non-FSL colleagues and their own students, most teacher responses fell under the "somewhat supportive" category (43.1% and 45.9% respectively).

Finally, teachers judged the community in which they teach to be the least supportive of all the groups; over 80% of the teachers judged the community to be "not", "slightly" or "somewhat" supportive.

	Not/Slightly Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Very Supportive	COUNT
	%	%	%	
School administration	15.6	31.3	53.1	1283
Guidance counsellors	31.3	34.6	34.2	1264
Parents	31.3	37.0	31.7	1279
Non-FSL teaching colleagues	29.9	43.1	27.0	1267
Community	34.6	47.8	17.7	1270
Students	22.4	45.9	31.7	1277

3.3.2 Stakeholder Support: Results by Program

Table 3.3.2 presents differences by program. Except for support from non-FSL teaching colleagues, FI teachers felt better supported than CF teachers. The most remarkable difference between the two programs is in teacher perception of parental support: 55.2% of FI teachers judged parents to be "very supportive" compared to only 20.2% of CF teachers.

Concomitantly, FI teachers also have more positive perceptions than CF teachers of student and community support.

Differences in perception of supportiveness of school administration and guidance counsellors between the two groups of teachers is less marked but slightly more positive for the FI teachers.

3.3.3 Stakeholder Support: Results by Province and Territory

The means presented in Table 3.3.3 show little variation in teacher perceptions of stakeholder support although Quebec teachers feel that they have slightly more support from the community in which they teach than teachers from other provinces and territories.

3.3.4 Stakeholder Support: Influence of Other Variables

There were no relationships between teacher perceptions of stakeholder support and the size of board and/or school in which respondents taught, the grades they taught, their teaching experience, their language background, and their feelings regarding their future in FSL teaching.

Table 3.3.2: Teacher Perceptions of Stakeholder Support by Program

	Core French (CF)				French Immersion (FI)				CF and FI			
	Not/Slightly Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Very Supportive	COUNT	Not/Slightly Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Very Supportive	TOTAL	Not/Slightly Supportive	Somewhat Supportive	Very Supportive	COUNT
	%	%	%		%	%	%		%	%	%	
School administration	16.4	32.6	51.0	710	12.5	27.7	59.9	330	18.1	34.8	47.1	155
Guidance counsellors	31.3	37.1	31.6	697	28.5	34.3	37.2	327	32.8	33.6	33.6	153
Parents	40.0	39.7	20.2	706	15.1	29.6	55.2	331	27.6	36.8	35.5	154
Non-FSL teaching colleagues	28.8	42.6	28.6	703	28.8	42.4	28.8	327	38.3	45.6	16.1	152
Community	37.0	49.5	13.4	701	28.6	45.7	25.7	330	36.4	45.0	18.5	154
Students	26.6	47.9	25.5	707	9.5	44.5	46.0	330	29.4	41.8	28.8	154

Table 3.3.3: Teacher Perceptions of Stakeholder Support by Province and Territory

	TER	BC	AB	SK	MB	ON	QC	NB	NS	PE	NL	COUNT
School administration	3.35	3.26	3.47	3.30	3.48	3.27	3.38	3.40	3.49	3.64	3.32	1264
Guidance counsellors	3.17	2.75	3.15	2.89	3.02	2.80	2.80	2.98	3.11	3.19	3.13	712
Parents	3.37	3.31	3.11	2.92	3.00	2.79	2.85	2.95	3.17	3.00	3.09	1240
Non-FSL teaching colleagues	3.30	2.80	3.02	2.72	3.15	2.97	3.09	2.76	2.90	3.00	2.64	1215
Community	2.89	2.72	2.76	2.80	2.98	2.67	3.35	2.76	2.82	2.72	2.71	1191
Students	3.16	3.20	3.20	3.11	3.22	2.96	3.07	3.03	3.21	3.09	3.11	1251

Means were calculated on a scale of 1-4:

1. not at all supportive; 2. slightly supportive; 3. somewhat supportive; 4. very supportive

3.4 Teacher Perceptions of Manageability of Teaching Conditions

A fourth group of questions asked FSL teachers to evaluate the manageability of the following teaching conditions:

- class size;
- proportion of students with learning difficulties/special needs;
- class composition (i.e., number of combined levels/grades);
- number of classes/lessons to prepare each day;
- choice regarding annual teaching assignments;
- supervision duties;
- administrative duties (e.g., report cards and comments); and
- personal level of stress.

Teachers evaluated manageability on a 4 point scale (not at all manageable; slightly manageable; somewhat manageable; very manageable).

3.4.1 Teaching Conditions: Overall Results

As seen in Table 3.4.1., the majority of teachers felt that these teaching conditions were only slightly or somewhat manageable.

Table 3.4.1: Teacher Perceptions of Manageability of Teaching Conditions					
	Not at all Manageable	Slightly Manageable	Somewhat Manageable	Very Manageable	COUNT
	%	%	%	%	
Size of classes	4.8	14.1	43.3	37.8	1281
Proportion of students with learning difficulties and/or special needs	8.7	27.1	38.9	25.4	1274
Composition (i.e., number of combined levels/grades)	5.5	17.8	34.7	42.0	1261
Number of classes/lessons to prepare each day	4.6	17.4	39.7	38.3	1275
Choice in annual teaching assignment	11.7	18.2	37.0	33.1	1278
Supervision duties	6.1	17.1	34.3	42.5	1272
Administrative duties (e.g., report cards and comments)	4.6	20.9	42.6	31.9	1272
Personal level of stress	4.5	24.6	51.1	19.8	1280

3.4.2 Teaching Conditions: Results by Program

As illustrated in Table 3.4.2., there are few differences between CF and FI teachers in their perception of these teaching conditions.

More FI teachers (33.9%) than CF teachers (21.5%) felt that the proportion of students with learning difficulties and/or special needs in their classes was very manageable. Similarly, 38% of CF teachers and 30% of FI teachers found the proportion of students with learning difficulties and/or special needs not at all manageable or only slightly manageable. This difference may reflect admission criteria for FI in some boards where it is recommended that students with learning difficulties and/or special needs remain in the regular English program (and thus the CF class).

Fewer FI teachers (23.7%) than CF teachers (37.3%) find administrative duties such as preparing report cards very manageable. This again reflects the different teaching contexts.

3.4.3 Teaching Conditions: Results by Province and Territory

As seen in Table 3.4.3, only slight variations concerning manageability of these teaching conditions were evident from the calculation of means by province and territories.

3.4.4 Teaching Conditions: Influence of Other Variables

When correlations between teacher responses concerning teaching conditions and the size of board and/or school in which respondents taught, the grades they taught, their teaching experience, their language background, and their feelings regarding their future in FSL teaching were calculated, no significant relationships were found.

Table 3.4.2: Teacher Perceptions of Manageability of Teaching Conditions by Program

	Not at all Manageable			Slightly Manageable			Somewhat Manageable			Very Manageable		
	%			%			%			%		
	CF	FI	CF & FI	CF	FI	CF & FI	CF	FI	CF & FI	CF	FI	CF & FI
Size of classes	3.9	3.9	11.0	14.1	12.4	20.6	44.4	40.8	40.0	37.6	42.9	28.4
Proportion of students with learning difficulties and/or special needs	9.3	5.2	13.6	28.7	24.8	28.6	40.5	36.1	35.7	21.5	33.9	22.1
Composition (i.e., number of combined levels/grades)	4.4	4.3	11.0	18.3	16.5	19.5	37.1	31.7	33.8	40.2	47.5	35.7
Number of classes/lessons to prepare each day	4.4	3.6	7.8	14.1	19.1	26.6	37.6	42.9	45.5	43.9	34.3	20.1
Choice in annual teaching assignment	13.0	8.2	15.5	18.7	17.0	21.3	35.8	39.7	35.5	32.5	35.2	27.7
Supervision duties	5.5	7.3	5.8	16.5	19.0	16.2	33.2	32.7	40.9	44.8	41.0	37.0
Administrative duties (e.g., report cards and comments)	3.3	7.3	3.9	15.9	25.2	32.5	43.6	43.8	37.7	37.3	23.7	26.0
Personal level of stress	3.8	5.4	5.8	22.3	27.2	29.0	52.8	50.2	48.4	21.1	17.2	16.8

CF - Core French (N = 701-711); FI - French Immersion (N = 322-331);
CF + FI - Both Core French and Immersion (N = 154-155)

Table 3.4.3: Teacher Perceptions of Manageability of Teaching Conditions by Province and Territory

Province/Territory	Class Size	Students with Learning Difficulties and/or Special Needs	Class Composition (i.e., number of combined levels or grades)	Number of Classes/Lessons to Prepare Each Day	Amount of Choice in Teaching Assignment	Supervision Duties	Administrative Duties (i.e., report cards and comments)	Personal Level of Stress
TER	3.40	2.80	3.40	3.20	3.20	3.11	2.95	2.85
BC	2.94	3.01	3.25	3.10	3.26	3.46	2.91	2.85
AB	3.24	2.99	3.28	2.97	3.01	3.11	2.90	2.77
SK	3.38	3.06	3.26	3.35	3.00	3.40	3.16	3.00
MB	3.18	2.81	3.22	3.03	3.03	3.14	2.93	2.92
ON	3.07	2.67	3.00	3.16	2.90	3.07	3.06	2.81
QC	3.30	2.59	3.11	3.26	3.56	3.37	3.41	3.33
NB	3.12	2.64	2.86	3.15	2.75	3.12	3.08	2.85
NS	3.25	2.98	3.24	3.05	2.82	3.16	3.04	2.92
PE	3.27	3.12	3.59	3.30	2.94	3.56	3.31	3.36
NL	3.12	2.93	3.52	2.91	2.51	2.66	2.59	2.75
Overall Mean	3.14	2.81	3.13	3.12	2.92	3.13	3.02	2.86

Means were calculated from responses on a 4-point scale:

1. not at all manageable; 2. slightly manageable; 3. somewhat manageable; 4. very manageable.

3.5 Professional Development of FSL Teachers

The last section of the survey asked teachers to report on professional development (PD) activities; that is, the activities in which they currently participate, the additional activities they would choose if these were available and the factors that would make these PD activities more accessible to them. The types of activities they were asked to evaluate included:

- local workshops, such as school or board organized, subject-specific PD days;
- provincial or national conferences, such as Ministry organized, subject-specific, PD days or provincial language association conferences;
- PD via electronic media;
- reading articles concerning the teaching of FSL;
- discussion and/or collaboration with colleagues;
- upgrading French language skills; and
- university courses in FSL methodology.

3.5.1 Participation in PD Activities

The first question asked teachers to state how often they participated in various kinds of PD activities. Teachers rated each activity on the scale of 1- 6 (do not participate; participate every 3 three years or more; every two years; once a year; more than once a year; not available).

3.5.1.1 Participation in PD Activities: Overall Results

Table 3.5.1.1 presents the results for all teachers. As can be seen, over 80% of all teachers reported participating in discussions and collaboration with FSL colleagues more than once a year. This is likely indicative of the ongoing support that FSL teachers provide to each other within schools and boards.

Over 58% of teachers report reading, more than once a year, articles concerning the teaching of French. About 50% reported participating in local workshops more than once a year, and about 27% indicated that they participate more that once a year in activities to upgrade French language skills.

PD via electronic media is least used: about 40% of teachers indicated that this form of PD was not available to them and another 38.5% reported that they do not take part.

With regard to provincial/territorial or national conferences, about 40% of the teachers reported participation in these activities once a year or more.

Finally, a total of about 30% of all teachers reported taking a university FSL methodology course either every three years or more often.

	No Participation	Every 3 Years +	Every 2 Years	Once a Year	Once a Year +	Not Available	COUNT
	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Local workshops	2.1	5.0	5.5	26.5	49.5	11.4	1275
Prov/national conferences	23.4	13.3	12.9	28.8	10.7	10.9	1273
Electronic PD	38.5	2.9	2.5	5.7	10.2	40.2	1264
Reading articles	12.4	2.9	2.1	14.7	58.2	9.7	1262
Discussion with colleagues	1.7	1.7	0.8	8.7	80.7	6.4	1262
Upgrading French language skills	27.9	14.6	6.9	14.0	27.1	9.5	1263
Courses in FSL methodology	58.7	14.2	4.7	5.9	5.5	11.0	1262

3.5.1.2 Participation in PD Activities: Results by Program

As can be seen in Table 3.5.1.2, the same basic patterns of reported participation in PD activities are reported by both CF and FI teachers, with some small differences.

Participation by FI teachers in discussions and collaboration with colleagues, upgrading French language skills and local workshops appear to be about 10% higher than that for CF teachers. Results show that, overall, CF teachers report less frequent participation in PD activities than their FI counterparts.

3.5.1.3 Participation in PD Activities: Results by Province and Territory

As illustrated in Table 3.5.1.3, teachers in Newfoundland/Labrador report slightly less participation in local workshops than teachers in other jurisdictions. These same teachers, along with their counterparts in British Columbia, Alberta and Ontario, also report less participation in provincial and national conferences.

On the other hand, teachers in these same provinces also report higher participation in PD via electronic media. Obviously, these provinces have chosen to deliver more professional development for teachers via electronic media rather than supporting attendance at local workshops or conferences.

All other means for the provinces and territories are relatively similar, except for the means on upgrading French language skills. Teachers in the Territories, Quebec and New Brunswick reported a higher incidence of participation in PD to upgrade French language skills than teachers in the other provinces.

Table 3.5.1.2: Frequency of Teacher Participation in PD Activities by FSL Program																		
	Core French (CF)					French Immersion (FI)					CF and FI							
	No Participation	Every 3 Years +	Every 2 Years	Once a Year	Once a Year +	Not Available	No Participation	Every 3 Years +	Every 2 Years	Once a Year	Once a Year +	Not Available	No Participation	Every 3 Years +	Every 2 Years	Once a Year	Once a Year +	Not Available
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Local workshops	2.1	4.9	4.4	29.5	46.6	12.5	1.5	3.6	5.8	24.5	54.5	10.0	3.9	9.1	9.7	14.9	51.9	10.4
Prov/National conferences	25.8	12.7	14.2	27.2	6.9	13.2	19.7	15.2	11.5	33.0	14.2	6.4	14.9	13.0	12.3	31.2	20.8	7.8
Electronic PD	37.9	3.1	1.8	5.2	9.3	42.6	44.4	2.1	3.0	5.2	9.1	36.2	30.7	4.0	3.3	10.0	13.3	38.7
Reading articles	12.9	2.6	2.7	15.6	56.7	9.6	11.3	3.4	1.8	15.2	58.8	9.5	12.3	3.9	1.3	14.3	57.1	11.0
Discussion with colleagues	2.1	1.8	1.1	10.8	75.5	8.7	0.3	1.2	0.3	6.4	88.7	3.1	2.6	1.3		5.2	87.0	3.9
Upgrading FR language skills	27.6	18.2	8.0	15.2	21.7	9.4	31.7	10.5	5.2	12.3	33.5	6.8	25.2	8.4	7.7	13.5	31.6	13.5
Courses in FSL methodology	59.0	15.4	4.4	5.4	4.0	11.8	58.3	14.1	5.8	4.6	6.7	10.4	56.5	11.7	4.5	7.8	7.8	11.7

Table 3.5.1.3: Frequency of Teacher Participation in PD Activities by Province and Territory

	TER	BC	AB	SK	MB	ON	QC	NB	NS	PE	NL	COUNT
Workshops	4.36	4.06	4.31	4.19	4.44	4.39	4.25	4.21	4.55	4.41	3.64	1120
Conferences	3.33	2.84	2.74	3.21	3.58	2.51	3.32	3.31	3.50	3.41	2.54	1123
Electronic PD	1.93	2.46	2.35	1.93	1.54	2.14	1.94	1.95	2.02	1.77	2.28	747
Reading articles	3.81	4.17	3.94	4.20	4.09	4.30	4.11	4.05	3.86	4.27	4.12	1130
Discussion with colleagues	4.61	4.84	4.69	4.80	4.79	4.81	4.58	4.76	4.71	4.97	4.56	1170
Upgrading FR language skills	3.50	2.65	2.94	3.09	2.88	2.97	3.68	3.63	2.92	2.43	2.43	1134
Courses in FSL methodology	1.25	1.79	1.57	1.44	1.43	1.75	1.96	1.74	1.96	1.67	1.59	1115

Means were calculated on a scale of 1-6:

1. not available;
2. do not participate;
3. participate every 3 years or more;
4. participate every two years;
5. participate one a year;
6. participate more than once a year.

3.5.1.4 Participation in PD Activities: Influence of Other Variables

Correlations were calculated between teachers' participation in PD and the size of board and/or school in which respondents taught, the grades they taught, their teaching experience, their language background, and their feelings regarding their future in FSL teaching. No significant relationships were found.

3.5.2 Preferred Choice of PD

Teachers were also asked to indicate which additional professional development activities they would choose if these were made available. They were asked to choose from the same list of activities cited in 3.5 above and then to check as many possibilities as applied.

3.5.2.1 Preferred Choice of PD: Overall Results

As can be seen in Table 3.5.2.1, local workshops was the most popular choice (21.8%). This was followed by provincial/national conferences and discussions with colleagues (both 15.8%), upgrading French language skills (13.5%), PD via electronic media and reading professional articles (both 12.3%), and, finally, university courses in methodology (7.9%).

	Count	%
Local workshops	871	21.8
Prov./Nat. conferences	629	15.8
Electronic PD	490	12.3
Discussions with colleagues	632	15.8
Upgrading French language skills	540	13.5
FSL methodology course	315	7.9
Reading articles	491	12.3
None of above	25	0.6
Total	3993	100.0

3.5.2.2 Preferred Choice of PD: Results by Program

As can be seen in Table 3.5.2.2, there is very little difference by program in teacher preference for PD; percentages for each category are virtually the same.

	Core French (CF)		French Immersion (FI)		CF and FI	
	Count	% of Responses	Count	% of Responses	Count	% of Responses
Local workshops	501	21.5	218	22.2	99	21.6
Prov./Nat. Conferences	350	15.0	165	16.8	77	16.8
Via electronic media	296	12.7	114	11.6	55	12.0
Discussions with colleagues	369	15.8	161	16.4	67	14.6
Upgrading Fr. lang skills	331	14.2	117	11.9	65	14.2
Univ FSL method	177	7.6	79	8.1	41	8.9
Reading articles	300	12.9	119	12.1	50	10.9
None of above	10	0.4	7	0.7	5	1.1
Total	2334	100	980	100	459	100

3.5.3 Accessibility of PD

Finally, teachers were asked to indicate what would help make PD activities more accessible to them. They were given the following choices and asked to check all that would apply:

- funding;
- shorter PD sessions;
- PD during school hours;
- FSL supply teachers; and
- relevant topics.

3.5.3.1 Accessibility of PD: Overall Results

Table 3.5.3.1 presents the results for all teachers regarding factors which would facilitate accessibility of PD for them. Funding was cited the most often (27.8%), followed by relevant topics (24%), PD during school hours (23.3%), FSL supply teachers (17.3%) and shorter PD sessions (7.7%).

	Count	% of Responses
Funding	965	27.8
Shorter PD sessions	267	7.7
PD during school hours	808	23.3
FSL supply teachers	599	17.3
Relevant topics	832	24.0
Total	3471	100.0

3.5.3.2 Accessibility of PD: Results by Program

Table 3.5.3.2 shows that, with regard to the accessibility of PD activities, teacher responses vary minimally by program.

	Core French (CF)		French Immersion (FI)		CF and FI	
	Count	% of Responses	Count	% of Responses	Count	% of Responses
Funding	532	27.3	253	27.6	121	31.0
Shorter PD sessions	143	7.3	78	8.5	24	6.2
PD during school hours	476	24.4	200	21.8	79	20.3
FSL supply teachers	336	17.2	161	17.6	70	17.9
Relevant topics	464	23.8	224	24.5	96	24.6
Total	1951	100.0	916	100.0	390	100.0

3.6 Responses to Open-Ended Questions

Participants were asked to respond to two open-ended questions:

- what they perceived to be their three major challenges in teaching FSL; and
- ways in which second language associations (provincial or national) could help facilitate their task as FSL teachers.

3.6.1 Challenges in Teaching FSL

Question 31 asked teachers to list what they perceived to be their three major challenges in teaching FSL. A random sample of 20% of the teacher responses ($N=260$) were analyzed and coded, resulting in 643 separate comments. Table 3.6.1 presents the results for all teachers in the sample, as well as results by program (Core French and French Immersion).

Category*	All Teachers		Core French (CF)		French Immersion (FI)	
	# of Comments	%	# of Comments	%	# of Comments	%
1.1 Class diversity	89	13.8	58	14.1	31	13.3
2.1 Lack of resources	87	13.5	51	12.4	36	15.5
1.2 Student motivation	86	13.4	66	16.1	20	8.6
2.2 Appropriate resources	76	11.8	44	10.7	32	13.8
4.2 In-school support/respect	69	10.8	37	9.0	32	13.7
4.3 Scheduling, physical space	62	9.7	50	12.2	12	5.2
4.1 Community support	38	5.9	29	7.1	9	3.9
3.4 Preparation time	24	3.7	9	2.2	15	6.4
2.5 Opportunities to use French	20	3.1	13	3.1	7	3.0
3.1 Covering the curriculum	19	2.8	11	2.6	8	3.4
5.0 Creative FSL pedagogy	18	2.7	12	2.8	6	2.6
2.6 Teach other subjects in French	16	2.4	0	0	16	6.9
Other	39	6.1	30	7.4	9	3.7
Total	643	100.0	410	100.0	233	100.0

*Numbers correspond to the categories and sub-categories of the coding scheme (see Appendix E).

The challenge most often cited (13.8%) by teachers concerned the diversity of students in their FSL classroom; both CF and FI teachers cite this challenge equally often. It appears that the range of students in one class (different FSL abilities, ESL students, special education students), without adequate support, represents the greatest overall challenge for the FSL teacher. The nature of this challenge is captured in the following teacher quotes:

- *meeting the needs of all students including learning disabled, physically challenged (non-verbal) and gifted all in one classroom (CF)*
- *dealing with Francophone students in a immersion class (FI)**

Lack of resources is the next greatest challenge cited (13.5%), FI teachers (15.5%) citing this more often than CF teachers (12.4%). This challenge includes lack of materials and resources in general, inadequate grammar exercises, as well as lack of funding for materials such as workbooks and notebooks. The following quotes capture some of these challenges:

- *lack of funds to purchase materials like books, CDs, posters, teacher resources...I have to buy all supplies myself (CF)*
- *resources are not available in French; there's always translation (FI)**

Student motivation, the next greatest challenge (13.4%), is cited almost twice as often by CF teachers (16.1%) than FI teachers (8.6%). This category encompasses the apathy and disinterest that is associated with the attitude that French is unimportant. It manifests itself in a failure to participate and communicate in class and, ultimately, in students dropping French as soon as possible. The following quotes capture the spirit of this challenge:

- *the general attitude that FSL is a course to be tolerated only until the end of grade 9 (FI)**
- *it is difficult to change students' belief that French (Core French) is not really part of the overall curriculum and does not have to be taken seriously (CF)*

Resources that do not match the students' needs, interests and abilities is the next most cited challenge (11.8%), with CF teachers (13.8%) citing this more often than FI teachers (10.8%). When resources do not meet the needs of their students, teachers feel compelled to create new materials, adapt materials or search for new materials, all of which takes more time than they have. This challenge is captured in the following quotes:

- *outdated texts (CF)*
- *very few resources for late immersion students (FI)**

The next most cited challenge involves perceived lack of moral support and respect for French by school administration and non-FSL colleagues. FI teachers (13.7%) cite this challenge more often than CF teachers (9.0%). This result is somewhat surprising since it is generally believed that FI programs have more institutional support than CF programs. Lack of moral support and respect is illustrated in the following quotes:

- *little value placed on FSL programs (extended French in particular) by one of the two administrators in our school and by a lot of other teachers, especially department heads (CF)*
- *total lack of comprehension on the part of "support staff" (FI)**

School support is the next most cited challenge (9.6%). It involves issues such as scheduling of French, availability of classrooms, class sizes and supply teachers. CF teachers (12.2%) cite this challenge more than twice as often as their FI counterparts (5.2%). The following quotes capture some of the representative issues:

- *lack of supports such as a librarian, a teacher's aide (FI)**
- *not having my own space (classroom) to create an atmosphere conducive to second language learning, even if it's only hanging up French materials (instead of posters in English about things related to other subjects) (CF)**
- *how to do an oral program with 30 kids and me!! (CF)*

* Translated from French.

Community support is the next most cited challenge (5.9%); it is cited about twice as often by CF teachers (7.1%) as by FI teachers (3.9%). It involves issues such as general lack of parental support and community interest in French. It can also involve high parental expectations in the case of French immersion programs. The spirit of this challenge is captured in the following quotes:

- *French is not generally supported in our area...some [parents] don't care because "it's just French" (CF)*
- *very high or very low expectations on the part of parents (FI)**

The remaining challenges were cited less frequently, their totals accounting for less than 5% of the total responses. However, some of these challenges were cited by either one (not both) of the groups at over 5%. For example, preparation time accounted for 6.4% of the challenges cited by FI teachers. Similarly, teaching other subjects in French accounted for 6.9% of the challenges cited by FI teachers, a challenge not cited by CF teachers, for obvious reasons. Other challenges accounting for less than 5% of the total comments included time to cover the curriculum, lack of opportunities to use French in the "real world", and finding creative and interesting FSL pedagogical techniques.

The "other" category (too infrequent to itemize separately) included challenges such as finding time for oral activities, upgrading teaching and language skills, classroom management and lack of technological resources.

3.6.2 How Second Language Associations Can Help FSL Teachers

Question 38 asked teachers to list three ways in which second language associations (provincial or national) could help facilitate their task as FSL teachers. A random sample of 20% of the teacher responses ($N=260$) was analyzed and coded, resulting in 350 comments. Table 3.6.2 presents the results for all teachers, as well as results by program (Core French and French Immersion).

Category*	All Teachers		Core French (CF)		French Immersion (FI)	
	# of Comments	%	# of Comments	%	# of Comments	%
3.1 Provide teaching info	70	20.0	40	19.0	30	21.4
2.2 Local workshops	56	16.0	33	15.7	23	16.4
3.3 Materials, resources	48	13.7	31	14.8	17	12.2
4.2 Collaborate, discuss, share	39	11.2	17	8.2	22	15.8
2.1 Personal PD opportunities	35	10.0	25	11.9	10	7.1
1.2 Lobbying school boards	25	7.1	15	7.1	10	7.1
3.2 Cultural resources	21	6.0	13	6.2	8	5.7
Other	56	16.0	36	17.1	20	14.3
Total	350	100.0	210	100.0	140	100.0

**Numbers correspond to the categories and sub-categories of the coding scheme (see Appendix E).*

The suggestion most often cited by all teachers is that second language associations should provide them with more information on teaching (20%). The types of information that FSL teachers are seeking include articles on pedagogy, teaching tips, current trends, sample lesson plans and how to deal with special needs students. This suggestion, most often cited by both CF teachers (19%) and FI teachers (21.4%), is captured in the following teacher quotes:

- *review commercial courses (CF)*
- *innovative ideas (CF)*
- *micro lessons on very precise aspects of how to teach FSL (CF)*
- *outline lesson plans concerning literacy (FI)**

Local workshops was the next most often cited suggestion (16%), cited almost equally often by CF teachers (15.7%) and FI teachers (16.4%). FSL teachers are looking for opportunities to improve FSL pedagogical competencies and, at the same time, upgrade language skills. The following quotes illustrate this desire:

- *offer practical and affordable PD...closer to our community (CF)*
- *on-line workshops for easy access (CF)*
- *offer workshops dealing with teaching the language through subject matter (science in particular) during the day; I have no energy after school (FI)**

The next most cited suggestion concerned information on teaching resources and how to find this information (13.7%). This was cited almost equally by CF teachers (14.8%) and FI teachers (12.1%). FSL teachers would like their second language associations to provide links (electronic or other) to classroom materials, resources and test item banks, as illustrated in the following quotes:

- *resources, resources, resources! (especially for those kids with learning difficulties in class) (CF)*
- *more secondary school resources (CF)*
- *I can prepare most things myself but sometimes I need resources dealing with language (FI)**

Providing opportunities for collaboration, discussion and sharing in order to decrease feelings of isolation was the next most often cited suggestion (11.2%). These suggestions often took the form of electronic, not necessarily face-to-face, discussion and collaboration. This need was cited almost twice as often by FI teachers (15.7%) than by CF teachers (8.1%). The following quotes capture this particular need:

- *provide us with a "network" where we can discuss our problems and our strategies in an online forum (CF)*
- *highlight successes and allow us to see how other districts are performing in order to keep us compatible. Sometimes we feel isolated; it's good to see examples of immersion in progress in other provinces and districts (FI)*
- *opportunity to network... to decrease the feeling of isolation (FI)*

Personal professional development opportunities such as specific courses for upgrading language skills or university courses focusing on FSL methodology was the next most often cited suggestion (10%). CF teachers (11.9%) cited this suggestion more often than FI teachers (7.1%). This suggestion is captured in the following quotes:

- *set up language skills classes...to sharpen skills (CF)*
- *offer free courses in French to improve the French language proficiency level to teachers who are not Francophone; often our only source of communication in French is with our students in our classrooms; we don't have the opportunity to speak at an advanced level (FI)**

Other suggestions accounting for less than 10% of the total (but cited equally by both CF and FI teachers) included lobbying of school boards/districts to allocate funding for more FSL positions, support services and resources; and, providing information on cultural resources and links with the French-speaking community as sources for guest speakers and field trips.

The "other" category included less frequently cited suggestions such as lobbying provincial/territorial governments for more funding, mentoring with new/younger teachers, promoting the importance and quality of strong FSL programs, annual conferences, and more effective communication by the associations with all FSL teachers.

* *Translated from French.*

4.0 Summary and Implications

This section of the report will briefly summarize the findings and outline some future directions for research and action.

4.1 Summary of the Sample

Responding FSL teachers were:

- *predominantly female;*
- *well distributed across FSL program types;*
- *geographically well represented except for Quebec and BC;*
- *representative of a range of size of board and school;*
- *generally very experienced teachers;*
- *mostly certified teachers but only 30% FSL specialists;*
- *generally Anglophone;*
- *quite confident about their own abilities in French; and*
- *mostly from core French backgrounds.*

It is impossible to know how representative our sample of responding FSL teachers is, even in the provinces where responses were high in number. As mentioned earlier, it is unclear whether generalist teachers who are required to teach FSL to their own students are represented here. This would seem unlikely, given the high level of French proficiency claimed by most participants. It may be that relatively experienced teachers tend to respond to these kinds of surveys (similar to the Mollica, et al. [2005] study). This may imply the need for studies of FSL teachers during the induction phase of their career, a period in which many choose to move into other teaching domains.

4.2 Summary of the Findings

4.2.1 FSL Resources

Fewer than 50% of respondents considered commercial materials to be "good" or "excellent," although CF teachers were more satisfied with these materials than FI teachers, for whom few such materials exist, particularly materials representing Francophone culture.

The majority of respondents considered the quality, quantity and appropriateness of library resources, computer software and community resources to be "poor".

The need for appropriate resources, as well as a lack of adequate classroom materials such as workbooks and notebooks, also ranked very high in the challenges cited by FSL teachers in the open-ended question.

4.2.2 Additional Resources

Although the majority of teachers reported easy access to computers, the Internet, space for lesson preparation and storage space, fewer than half stated that classrooms for FSL teaching or consultants to help them with their teaching were available. Respondents also expressed a need for support staff to provide help for students with learning difficulties and for French-speaking support/administrative staff.

A classroom dedicated to FSL, funding for activities and availability of French-speaking supply teachers appear to be of more concern for CF teachers.

4.2.3 Stakeholder Support

Most respondents perceived their school administration to be very supportive of their work and teaching goals while the community in which they teach is perceived to be the least supportive.

CF teachers reported less support from parents and students than FI teachers and this finding was corroborated by the responses to the open-ended question regarding teaching challenges.

4.2.4 Manageability of Teaching Conditions

The majority of FSL teachers felt that teaching conditions were slightly or somewhat manageable. Comments in the open-ended question on teaching challenges indicated a great need for help in dealing with diversity in the classroom.

4.2.5 Professional Development

Most teachers report participation through discussions with colleagues, reading professional literature and attendance at one workshop each year. It appears that some provinces, instead of providing routine workshops and conferences, have moved into electronic delivery of PD.

Teachers suggest that funding, relevant topics, PD during school hours and French-speaking supply teachers will make PD more accessible to them.

When given free voice to state, in the open-ended question, what the second language associations can do for them, FSL teachers want these associations to provide them with the information or links to access the information and resources that will help them improve teaching and cope with the challenges they face in the classroom. Teachers are looking for the same thing in local workshops, as well as opportunities for discussion and collaboration with colleagues. Interestingly, many of the comments suggested that this take the form of sharing via electronic networking and chat rooms.

4.2.6 Teaching Context

Perhaps the most striking feature of our findings is the lack of variability by geographic area, panel, program, size of school and school board, teaching experience, language background, and teaching future. It is difficult to interpret this homogeneity of views; it may be that, over time, experience simply "washes out" potential differences.

4.2.7 Conclusion

Generally, there is remarkable consistency between the findings reported here and those emerging from the literature review about the challenges facing FSL teachers. Many findings (such as the need for PD) have not changed from earlier surveys (e.g., Day & Shapson, 1996). Others, such as the need to access newer technologies for teaching and PD are in keeping with new developments in the 21st century.

5.0 Future Directions

5.1 Demographics

One of the weaknesses of this study stems from our inability to determine the representativeness of our sample of responding teachers. In fact, no agency or individual in Canada knows the number of FSL teachers, and how they are distributed in school boards and schools. This is crucial information that an association such as CTF is best placed to gather. One weakness in our sample was the absence of generalist teachers who teach CF in British Columbia; a local study could be undertaken to fill this gap. Future research on FSL teachers and teaching would be greatly facilitated by information on the demographics of FSL teaching.

5.2 Preservice Education

Although almost three quarters of the respondents reported holding a provincial/territorial teaching certificate, just under one third held a specialist teaching certificate in FSL. From the literature review (Appendix A) we know that one of the greatest challenges for FSL teachers in any program is meeting expectations in terms of a high level of proficiency in French, excellence in teaching, and knowledge of experiential, interactive second language teaching approaches. It is unclear to what extent FSL teachers without specialist preparation are equipped to deal with these expectations. The associations sponsoring this study have a role to play in liaising with faculties of education to ensure that FSL teacher preparation curricula take this into account. Provincial and territorial departments of education and school board officials might consider establishing basic teacher competence requirements to support effective second language teaching. Since the survey respondents were, for the most part, experienced teachers, we know relatively little about recent graduates from faculties of education: are they better prepared for the challenges awaiting them?

A study should be done of teachers in the induction period (during their first years of teaching) perhaps involving in-depth interviews with graduates of a representative sample of faculties of education in several provinces/territories. The associations, with support from provincial and territorial teacher federations and school board administrators, are well positioned to undertake such a study.

5.3 Targeted Professional Development

Our findings point to the need for PD activities that target areas such as upgrading French language skills and providing information on newer methodologies, among others. About one half of the respondents reported not using computer software, indicating that there is a need for inservice in technology related to language teaching. A collective effort among the departments of education, school boards and provincial and national associations can play a direct role in facilitating the organization of this PD.

5.4 Access to Adequate Resources

There are clear needs in the area of resources: our respondents were overwhelmingly dissatisfied with the ways in which Francophone culture is reflected in available teaching materials, with library resources, computer software and opportunities for French language support in the community. As shown in past studies (e.g., Day & Shapson, 1996), immersion teachers signal the urgent need for materials geared to the proficiency level of their students, so that they can avoid having to translate material from English to French or adapt Francophone materials to make them more accessible. In this case, too, the findings point to a clear role for the sponsoring associations who could work closely with educational publishers to inform the development of new resources reflecting appropriate language proficiency levels and topics of interest to students.

5.5 Lack of Prestige of FSL

Negative attitudes towards French have been well documented in the literature (e.g., APEF, 2003; Marshall, 2002; Richards, 2002). Groups that need more information about the importance of French in Canadian society include guidance counselors, superintendents and trustees. The Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (OCOL) is aware of negative attitudes in the society at large and is developing a plan for a major publicity campaign to make learning the French language more appealing and to change public attitudes; Canadian Parents for French (CPF) also makes efforts along these lines. In large urban centres with substantial immigrant communities, attitudes to French are much more positive than in the society at large (Mady, 2002, 2006). Changing societal attitudes may have to be left to OCOL and CPF; but if the teacher federations at the national, provincial/territorial and local levels, could partner with them, this would go a long way to improving the situation of the FSL teacher who is all too often marginalized.

One striking finding of our survey is that 40 percent of the respondents have considered leaving FSL teaching. This calls for a follow-up study to discover more about their reasons and how the sponsoring associations might help to address this systemic problem and reduce the number of disaffected teachers.

5.6 Innovation in FSL

One theme emerging from our analysis of open-ended comments is that of the time for CF: a lot of instructional time is lost from short daily periods for setting up and closing the period. We know that longer blocks of teaching time (Marshall, in preparation) can lead to better outcomes for core French, as can newer program models (intensive French); but often administrators/trustees are not open to timetable and other changes that can allow for innovation. The associations could provide departments of education and school board officials with documented research outlining such innovations to inform their policy decisions.

References

- Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation. (2003). *Core French survey: A regional report*. Halifax, NS: Author.
- Canadian Parents for French. (2005). *The State of French Second Language Education in Canada 2005*. Ottawa, ON.
- Day, E., & Shapson, S. (1996). A national survey: French immersion teachers' preparation and their professional development needs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52 (2), 248-270.
- Gilbert, A., LeTouzé, S., Thériault, J., & Landry, R. (2004). *Le personnel enseignant face aux défis de l'enseignement en milieu minoritaire francophone*. Report prepared for the Canadian Teachers' Federation, Ottawa, ON: CIRCEM.
- Mady, C. (2006). *The suitability of core French for recently arrived English as a second language adolescent immigrants*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Mady, C. (2002). *Motivation to study and investment in studying core French at the secondary level: Comparing English as a second language and Canadian-born students*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Toronto, Toronto.
- Marshall, P. (2002). *Community attitudes toward language learning: Implications and impact on the core French classroom*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Marshall, P. (in preparation). *A case study of compact core French models: A pedagogical perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Mollica, A., Phillips, G., & Smith, M. (2005). *Teaching and learning French as a second language: Core French in the elementary schools of Ontario*. Report prepared for the Ontario Modern Language Teachers' Association (mimeo).
- Richards, E. (2002). *Positioning the elementary core French teacher: An investigation of workplace marginality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

APPENDIX A

TEACHING FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN CANADA: TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES RESEARCH REPORT

PREPARING TO PROFILE THE FSL TEACHER IN CANADA 2005-06: A LITERATURE REVIEW*

Sharon Lapkin, Callie Mady and Stephanie Arnott
Modern Language Centre
OISE/UT

*Canadian Heritage provided funds to support this project, jointly undertaken by the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers, and the Canadian Teachers' Federation. The principal investigators are Sharon Lapkin (OISE/UT), Alina MacFarlane, and Larry Vandergrift (University of Ottawa).
This document has benefited greatly from feedback from Alina MacFarlane and Larry Vandergrift.



Acronyms and Abbreviations:

Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation	APEF
Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers	ACPI
Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers	CASLT
Canadian Parents for French	CPF
Canadian Teachers' Federation	CTF
English as a Second Language	ESL
French as a Second Language	FSL
First (usually dominant) language	L1
Ontario Modern Language Teachers' Association	OMLTA
Second language	L2

Program Definitions

Core French:

FSL is generally taught as a subject for one period each day, or a few times a week.

Compact Core French:

FSL is taught in longer, more intensive daily periods, usually for only one semester in the school year.

Extended French:

An FSL program designed to provide additional exposure to French by using French as the language of instruction for one or more subjects in addition to core French.

French Immersion:

A program designed for students whose L1 is not French, in which French is the language of instruction for a significant part of the day; several or all subjects are taught in French

Intensive French:

An FSL program delivery format that offers learners a concentrated exposure to the L2 (from a half to a full day) over one semester, usually in grade 5 or 6.

PREPARING TO PROFILE THE FSL TEACHER IN CANADA 2005-06: A LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT), the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT), and the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF) are interested in French second language (FSL) teachers' needs and issues affecting the delivery of FSL programs throughout Canada. The mandates of these associations include an emphasis on the professional development of all teachers (CTF), and, in the case of CASLT and CAIT, FSL teachers in particular. Current information on the profile and perceived needs of FSL teachers will enable the sponsoring associations to continue to provide informed and effective support to FSL teachers across Canada.

In 2004, the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF) conducted a survey of teachers in French minority language schools entitled *L'école en milieu minoritaire: Le personnel enseignant face au défi de l'enseignement en milieu minoritaire*. It was prompted by the difficulty in recruiting qualified teachers for French minority language schools across Canada. CTF wanted to discover the reasons underlying this problem, with specific reference to characteristics of the minority French language teaching context. In commissioning the present research, the sponsoring associations wished to build on the 2004 study.

The literature review done for that study (LeTouzé, 2004) was organized in two parts: the first described the challenges encountered in the teaching profession in general in the 21st century, in any context; the second focused on challenges particular to French minority language teaching in Canada. The first part of the 2004 literature review is equally relevant to the present study, summarizing challenges faced by all teachers in Canada: increasing workloads, meeting the needs of special needs children and those with behaviour problems, increasing violence in our schools, the growing heterogeneity of the student population, the effective incorporation of new technologies in teaching, and the pre-service and in-service needs of teachers.

The major themes of Part 2 of the earlier literature review (LeTouzé, 2004) informed our presentation of literature relevant to the FSL teaching context, including issues of teacher supply and qualifications, and the importance of maintaining and fostering the development of the French language and culture. Like LeTouzé, we also allowed themes to emerge from the research literature we reviewed.

Teacher shortages in FSL education remain acute. In Alberta, for example, where the starting age is being lowered to grade 4 for second language instruction, community members may work under the supervision of a teacher to deliver the FSL program. Distance delivery of FSL to students in remote areas and in smaller schools is also in the planning stages¹. In Ontario, FSL is the curriculum area where the highest number of letters of approval are issued by the College of Teachers to persons without Ontario teaching certificates². FSL teachers often leave core French teaching to work in regular classrooms, seeking more reasonable workloads. Sometimes, they "move up to" immersion classrooms for the same reason³. At a time of teacher shortages, we need a better, more systematic understanding of the factors that contribute to FSL teacher satisfaction or dissatisfaction if we hope to retain FSL teachers in our schools and attract new recruits.

We are writing this literature review at an interesting time in the history of FSL education in Canada. In 2003, the federal government produced a document entitled *The next act: New momentum for Canada's linguistic duality*. It articulates a political commitment to "double the proportion of secondary school graduates with a functional knowledge of their second official language" (p. 27) by 2013. It has helped to create a sense of urgency to improve FSL program outcomes and implement a set of initiatives to realize this ambitious goal (Department of Canadian Heritage, 2004). This puts new pressure on provincial and territorial governments, school districts and perhaps most intensely, on FSL teachers.

Throughout this literature review the emphasis is on research - what we know, and what we need to find out through the proposed teacher survey. We concentrate on studies published in the last ten years, which, we have found, tend to confirm and elaborate on findings of research carried out in the 80s and 90s⁴. In past overviews of

¹ Personal communication, J. Gibson.

² Personal communication, M. Salvatori.

³ Personal communication, N. Halsall.

⁴ For a summary of earlier research on immersion, see, for example, Lapkin and Swain (1990), Harley (1998), For a summary of earlier research on core French, see, for example, Lapkin, Harley, and Taylor (1993), Turnbull (2000).

research on FSL, relatively little attention was given to teachers. Even now, it is surprising how little research has been done on the characteristics and needs of FSL teachers⁵.

One exception is a recently commissioned teacher survey by the Ontario Modern Language Teachers' Association (OMLTA). Mollica, Phillips, and Smith (2005) surveyed elementary core French teachers in 69 of 72 Ontario school boards, with the help of two professional elementary teachers' associations who distributed the questionnaires⁶. Close to 1500 teachers responded. Most were full-time core French teachers, and although a full range of years of teaching experience was reflected in the sample, the largest number (about 30%) reported having more than 20 years of FSL teaching experience. The main focus of the survey was to find out if conditions were in place "to foster excellence in the FSL learning environment" (p. 8).

What emerges from the quantitative and qualitative analyses of the OMLTA survey is echoed in many of the studies that we review below. Core French teachers in Ontario elementary schools perceive that core French is underfunded, and that their own role in the school is often seen primarily as preparation time for other teachers in the school. They feel peripheral to the schools in which they teach. They usually teach in multiple classrooms, they are excluded from staff meetings, and they are given double supervision responsibilities in cases where they work in different schools. They feel unsupported by parents, colleagues, and administrators.

We will revisit these issues as they arise in the remaining sections of this literature review, bearing in mind, of course, that the proposed survey includes FSL teachers at elementary and secondary levels, and in all FSL program types: core French, intensive French, extended French, and French immersion⁷. Our literature review has been informed by the recent study of teachers in French minority language schools conducted by CTF (Gilbert, LeTouzé, Thériault, & Landry, 2004), by the OMLTA survey and by all the studies reviewed below. The themes that arose from the research literature we have reviewed fall into four broad categories reflected in the following headings:

1. **Teacher Qualifications and Needs**
2. **Resources for FSL**
3. **Student Diversity**
4. **FSL Teaching Context**

1. Teacher Qualifications and Needs

Included in this section are issues relating to the linguistic qualifications of FSL teachers, their knowledge of language-teaching methodologies, and in the case of content-based programs (extended French and French immersion), their knowledge of subject matter to be taught in French. We also address their inservice needs.

Linguistic Qualifications of FSL Teachers

In 2001-02, the Edmonton Public School Board reviewed its core French and French immersion programs "to strengthen program success and increase student enrolments" (Evaluation Plus Inc., 2002a, p. 2) Interview or questionnaire data were collected from principals, teachers, students, and parents. One outcome was a list of characteristics of successful FSL programs. It was clear that teacher proficiency in the target language was a key to program success. The school board determined that core French teachers must possess an intermediate or high level of French competency, and French immersion teachers need an advanced or superior level of proficiency. At that time, most responding principals reported that all their core French teachers had intermediate level language proficiency (p. 4), while some (25%) said levels were lower among the teachers. The teachers' ratings (self-assessments) of their own proficiency spanned the entire scale, from Beginning to Superior.

New Brunswick core French and French immersion teachers are also expected to be very proficient in French (Rehorick, 2002). As of 2001, all FSL teachers in the Anglophone school districts of New Brunswick were required to demonstrate their competence in French by taking a test and being rated relative to the New Brunswick Second Language Proficiency Scale (New Brunswick Department of Education, 2001). In terms of overall

⁵ For example, a recent inventory of unpublished research (completed or proposed between 1995 and 2002) on French immersion conducted at Canadian universities undertaken by CAIT (Sanaoui, 2004) lists 88 studies, of which only 11 are categorized under "teachers". Some of these have not yet been completed, and others are only marginally relevant to this review.

⁶ The cooperating elementary teachers' associations chose a random sample of teachers in each board; however there is no information in the report on what proportion of schools/teachers was included in each case. Without information on the size of the total population of FSL teachers in Ontario, we do not know the response rate.

⁷ The last large-scale survey of immersion teachers was sponsored by CAIT and conducted by Day and Shapson (1996). The data were gathered from 1123 respondents, who then represented 56% of the immersion teacher population in Canada.

linguistic proficiency, core FSL teachers must have a minimum rating of Advanced, and French immersion teachers must have a minimum rating of Superior in order to be eligible to teach French at their respective levels. According to provincial policy documents, all FSL teachers in these programs are required to instruct their classes entirely in French⁸.

Research by Turnbull (1999) and others (e.g., Salvatori, in progress) suggests that FSL teachers may not always be confident of their French skills, and may not always teach in the target language. There is a clear need to support FSL teachers who are trying to develop and maintain their skills in the target language.

Along with highly developed French language skills, the FSL teacher needs an up-to-date knowledge of development in language teaching methodologies, and in content-based programs like immersion, of specialized content knowledge in subject matters taught in French. We address each of these in the two following subsections.

Knowledge of Language-Teaching Methodologies

Most provincial/territorial departments of education encourage communicative language teaching, following the recommendations of the CASLT-sponsored National Core French Study (LeBlanc, 1990). The goals of that study were “to substantially strengthen Core French so that higher proficiency levels are reached” (p. 2). The multidimensional curriculum was to be driven by the communicative/experiential syllabus. Yet in a survey of former grade 11 core French students no longer studying FSL in grade 12, the Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation (APEF) reported that respondents wanted “improved methods of teaching” with an emphasis on speaking, more relevant themes, and opportunities for out-of-classroom contact with French (APEF, 2003, p. 18). Research on core French teachers by Turnbull (1999), Calman and Daniel (1998), Lewis (1998) and others suggests that not all teachers embrace an experiential approach to the teaching of French. This underlines a need for continuing professional development to reinforce interactive, experiential pedagogical approaches⁹.

In discussing the reasons for the success of intensive French in Newfoundland and Labrador, Germain and Netten (2004) elicited the characteristics required of the intensive French teacher. Principals, teachers, and others associated with the program (in 23 grade 6 classes) specified: flexibility in adapting to a new FSL teaching context, enthusiasm, willingness to share ideas and work cooperatively with teaching colleagues, and the ability to implement a child-centred pedagogy.

In the case of content-based programs, in the Edmonton Public School Board's immersion review, teachers reinforced the need for an interactive, experiential approach, and spoke of the need to integrate language and grammar instruction with content (Evaluation Plus Inc., 2002b, p. 4). Best practices in the Edmonton public schools included English and French language arts teachers working together to plan the language arts instruction for their students, to encourage positive transfer between the languages. In one case, aspects of the health curriculum were integrated into French language arts to provide program flexibility across the English and French curricula.

Specialized Content Knowledge for Subject-Matter Instruction

A case study of six Ontario boards with extended French programs (CPF, 2004b) found that it was rare to “have teachers who are specialists in both FSL and the subjects they teach in French” (p. 47). The authors stated that knowledge of French is considered to be primary, and that it is expected that teachers will learn the course content of the subjects they teach in French.

In the content-based programs (extended French and French immersion), it is seen as most important for teachers to have a high level of proficiency in French, and then to be knowledgeable about L2 teaching approaches. There is little in the current literature, apart from calls for more and better materials for subject-matter teaching, that addresses the issue of the teaching of specialized subjects in extended or immersion programs. The CPF (2004a) pan-Canadian report highlights the demand for FSL teachers with qualifications in math and science. The proposed survey should explore teachers' qualifications and needs in this neglected area.

Inservice Needs of Teachers

In their immersion teacher survey, Day and Shapson (1996) included questions related to the continuing education of these teachers. They found that workshop participation was the most frequent form of professional development: over 60% of teachers had taken such workshops. Other activities that teachers considered most important were collaborative planning or teaching in the school, district, or province; workshops in the district or at

⁸ *The same is true for intensive French.*

⁹ *Only in the case of intensive French does there appear to have been a concerted, systematic effort to inservice FLS teachers to meet the demands of this relatively new program. MacFarlane (2005, p. 13) describes the summer workshops and follow-up activities that have characterized intensive French professional development to date.*

a conference; mini-courses or intensive courses; and inservice related to implementing a new curriculum (p. 257). In most cases, except for workshops, under one-third of respondents had experienced those forms of inservice. They reported wanting more opportunities for contact among immersion teachers.

French immersion teachers in the Edmonton Public School Board also indicated a need for more professional development opportunities that can work to “strengthen the communication network among immersion teachers at both the school and district levels” (Evaluation Plus Inc., 2002b, p.4). One possible response to this need is suggested by a recent case study conducted by Muhling (2004). Muhling describes the implementation and observation of a collaborative Professional Learning Community (PLC) involving 24 French immersion teachers from three different schools located within a large urban school board in Ontario. Muhling interviewed and administered questionnaires to eight of the teachers she had observed, to elicit their views and reflections on the process and development of their PLC. The participants reported that the collaboration among French immersion teachers in the same board created a great environment for resource sharing. Teachers said they felt a lot more motivated to take part in a professional development initiative that was school-based and that took place during school hours¹⁰, and many revealed that they had benefited most when they themselves were called upon to share their knowledge with their colleagues by being a workshop presenter. Such an initiative can address the frustration felt by teachers who often have to plan and participate in PD workshops on their own time and using their own money. Until we have case studies of similar initiatives, we cannot generalize about the applicability of such a model to other settings.

Tibbs (in preparation) plans an alternative, "virtual" approach to the PLC: she plans to establish a computer network among practicing immersion teachers in schools that differ in size and rural/urban location. She will assess in what ways teachers come to feel better supported in their teaching through regular electronic interaction with their peers.

There is some discussion in recent surveys about the professional development available to FSL teachers through the sponsoring associations and their publications, and through other publications and local associations. Mollica et al. (2005, p. 10) report that 24% of their respondents belong to the OMLTA, but that membership in other professional associations such as CAIT or CASLT is “minimal.” Just over 40% of respondents read professional journals, and just under half attend some type of professional development conference (almost 30% attend the OMLTA spring conference).

Recent Alberta-based reviews of both core French and immersion programs document needs for inservice on L2 pedagogy, integration of technology, and regular meetings with colleagues to discuss teaching practices and challenges (Evaluation Plus Inc., 2002a; 2002b). The authors recommend that schools subscribe to relevant professional journals and provide consultant services to FSL teachers.

Questions of access to professional development, whether through workshops, conferences, publications, Web sites, or electronic networks remain highly relevant to our survey and to the mandates of the sponsoring associations.

2. Resources for FSL

In a study sponsored by CAIT and the Department of the Secretary of State, Day and Shapson (1996) distributed a survey to 2000 French immersion teachers (representing 17% of all immersion teachers in Canada in 1992) from over 600 Canadian schools across Canada in order to gather descriptive information on their characteristics and needs. The issue that ranked highest in importance¹¹ was the development of curriculum and resources appropriate for immersion students. Materials for subject-matter teaching needed to be conceptually complex, but linguistically accessible. Teachers reported the need to develop strategies to mediate between the materials and the learners (pp. 262-263).

Recently, an Alberta based study (Evaluation Plus Inc., 2002b, p.11) reported similar findings. Principals, teachers, students and parents in 12 schools of the Edmonton Public School Board were interviewed. Core French and French immersion teachers reported spending their own money on resources, and spending too much time locating and translating appropriate resources¹². They applauded the Board for making some elementary science materials available, but expressed concern about the lack of appropriate materials for most subject areas, including mathematics and even language arts. Library resources, especially above the grade 4 level, were generally found to be inadequate. Students found the few audio-visual and technical support resources used in the classroom hard to understand, and the interactive use of computer technology was virtually nonexistent at that time.

¹⁰ *Edmonton Public School immersion teachers also expressed a preference for inservice sessions held during the year or in short summer workshops, like those offered for the preparation of intensive French teachers (MacFarlane, 2005).*

¹¹ *Tied for first rank in importance was the issue of teaching French language arts in immersion.*

¹² *With respect to core French, the OMLTA survey (Mollica et al., 2005) reports that most respondents have program-specific resources and that some perceive that insufficient funds are allocated to buying new materials.*

The most recent annual *State of FSL Education in Canada Report* (CPF, 2004b) included a focus on extended French. The six school boards surveyed reported a dearth of resources that were compatible with the (initially) relatively low level of students' proficiency in French for teaching subject-matter content that may be conceptually complex - a situation that is equally applicable to French immersion.

It seems that including questions related to materials for all FSL programs in the proposed survey is justified. The available data suggest that for content-based FSL programs, materials and resources remain a problematic issue.

3. Student Diversity

The need to accommodate diverse students may be seen as problematic, involving program adaptations, additional staff resources, and so on; it may also be seen as advantageous. In urban Canada, an increasing number of ethnically and linguistically diverse children are involved in FSL programs. Little research has been done on this phenomenon in an FSL setting; but Swain and Lapkin (2005) review three studies that suggest that immigrant children fare well in French immersion programs¹³. One qualitative study (Dagenais & Day, 1998) found that immersion teacher interviewees “viewed trilingualism as a resource, not a 'handicap’” (p. 338). In a similar vein, in the CPF mini-study of extended French in six Ontario boards of education (CPF, 2004b), one board reported a majority of students from immigrant backgrounds in its extended French program. These students were seen as successful and advantaged in learning French.

In Calman and Daniel's (1998) review of the elementary core French program in the former North York Board of Education in southern Ontario, core French teachers raised concerns about having ESL students integrated into their classes. Concern about ESL students was more prevalent in the later grades where ESL students were said to have problems integrating, participating, completing work, writing, and catching up to their peers' level of French. Some teachers reported that the ESL students were withdrawn for French, a practice that may be questioned, given that on test results reported in the study, ESL students' performance did not differ significantly from that of the mainstream students.

At the secondary level, Mady (2002) also documented the fact that sometimes ESL students are excluded from taking core French - an unfortunate situation in view of their generally high motivation to do so. The six FSL teachers she interviewed did identify a need for resources to address the needs of this group, however¹⁴.

The topic of inclusion embraces not only immigrant students, but also students with special needs. Germain and Netten (2004) note that in two school boards involved in their longitudinal research on intensive French, not a single student (of close to 600) dropped out of the program over the three-year period of their study. The make-up of the classes was similar to that of any regular English class, and included children with special needs. The researchers found that such children learned French and that they gained confidence from doing so.

In the OMLTA survey, one third of respondents reported receiving support from resource teachers in special education in their core French classrooms. Most participating core French teachers reported providing accommodations for their special needs students, although short teaching periods made it difficult to do so.

Most immersion teachers (62%) surveyed by Day and Shapson (1996) reported not having access to bilingual or francophone learning assistance in their schools. Research findings reviewed in this section are in line with CPF's (2004a) national FSL stakeholder consultations that highlight a pan-Canadian need for teacher support to address the needs of students with exceptionalities.

It is clear that issues relating to inclusion are important as classrooms grow increasingly diverse: the needs of FSL teachers in all program types with respect to integrating special needs and ESL students merit assessment in our survey.

4. Teaching Context

The literature we could locate suggests that the issue of working conditions applies mainly to elementary core French. French immersion teachers, intensive and extended French teachers generally have their own classrooms, for example, while core French teachers are frequently itinerant. Since this is a multifaceted section, we have divided it into the following subsections: funds for FSL, space for FSL, and status of FSL (including the marginalization issue).

¹³ This is not an issue confined to FSL, of course; urban schools are constantly adapting to a heterogeneous student body (e.g., Chow & Cummins, 2003).

¹⁴ Mady (in preparation) is currently studying the achievement of ESL students, recently arrived from other countries, in special core French classes designed for them. Usually, such students are exempted from core French, and her research will help determine what is “best practice” with respect to these students.

Funds for FSL

In her study of the marginalization of elementary core French teachers in Ontario (to be discussed in greater detail below), Richards (2002) reported on material marginalization in FSL (see also issue 2 above). Although the federal government provides special funds earmarked for FSL, the perception is that these funds are often absorbed by the school district or even the school, and rarely reach the classroom. This diversion of earmarked funds leaves the FSL program chronically under-resourced. Mollica et al. (2005, p. 17) also state that school boards are under no obligation to dedicate earmarked funds to FSL, and that many of their respondents reported buying resources and supplies “with their personal funds.”

With respect to immersion, the Edmonton Public School Board's immersion review (Evaluation Plus, Inc., 2002b, p. 12) identified a need for more funding in the areas of resources, professional development, cultural events, and marketing.

Space for FSL

The issue of appropriate space for teaching FSL arises especially in the case of core French. Mollica et al. (2005) found that just over one-third of responding core French teachers assigned to a school do have their own classroom. Just under half of the participating itinerant teachers have a classroom in one of their schools. Between 50 and 60% of responding itinerant teachers have access to carts for their materials. About one-fifth of the respondents teach in seven or more classrooms, while one quarter of the respondents reported empty, available classrooms in their schools (p.14).

Richards (2002) suggests that the fact that the core French teacher is often without his/her own classroom indicates that French is not taken seriously. Without classrooms, teachers are denied privacy and control over the organization of their classes (e.g., seating, class rules, board space, place for materials, French milieu-bulletin boards, word walls, and so on). Mollica et al. (2005, p. 14) summarize the situation this way: “The fact of a dedicated Core French classroom [is] a direct reflection of the importance placed on the program and its teachers by local school boards and administrators.”

Status of FSL

In *Positioning the elementary core French teacher: An investigation of workplace marginality*, Richards (2002) interviewed 21 elementary core French teachers in Ontario to discover that the majority of them viewed themselves as marginalized. Richards ascertained that this marginalization was directly connected to the teaching subject itself: French. Richards posited that the structure of French in short daily instructional periods (20-40 min.) positioned the French teacher as an outsider. The result of such short contact time decreased the quality of student-teacher rapport and increased the number of teacher-pupil contacts. This problem was compounded by the need to combat negative attitudes on the part of the school and larger community. Itinerant teachers reported experiencing extra stress because they might be in two schools each day and were often given supervision duties in each school (i.e., double supervision). Given these factors, the core French teacher was often not in a position to offer extra help to students. Moreover, he/she was not treated as an integral part of school staff.

The teacher-participants also revealed that their students considered French to be one of the least important school subjects. This contributed sometimes to severe misbehaviour. Often, by grades 6, 7, and 8 students demonstrate blatant contempt for French and pride themselves on breaking core French teachers down. The participants also reported that principals and parents saw French as less important than other subject areas (see also Marshall, 2002).

Finally, through her 90-minute interviews Richards discovered that core French teachers often lack parental and administrative support. Parents often fail to attend parent-teacher interviews. This lack of parental contact was perceived to encourage students to misbehave and be less accountable. Similarly, the French teacher had to interact with many more parents than the regular classroom teacher, and this was perceived to reduce parents' and their children's accountability.

Lack of administrative support was manifested in many ways, including: excluding core French from the planning process and cross-curricular opportunities; loss of French time for other subject needs; lack of administrative responsibility for misbehaving students; excluding core French teachers from school events and meetings; and creating a perception among core French teachers that their input was not valued.

Because core French teachers are often "invisible" and not involved in interacting regularly with others in the school community, negative stereotypes may be formed about them and FSL in general. The Mollica et al. (2005) Ontario-based study records similar perceptions, though it is difficult to determine how widespread they are in the sample. Some comments from respondents also indicate considerable satisfaction with their working conditions.

The status of FSL in a school or school system may vary as a function of program type. Thus, Germain and Netten (2004) report that persons they interviewed¹⁵ in two school boards housing intensive French in Newfoundland and Labrador claimed that FSL had a much higher profile than it had had before the implementation of intensive French: “On souligne que le français est désormais vu comme une matière importante” (p. 397). Other program formats may accomplish the same thing. Marshall (in preparation), a grade 7 core French teacher in mid-northern Ontario, is implementing compact core French, delivered in 80-minute instructional periods over half the school year. This type of program requires creative timetabling on the part of the school, and puts core French on a par with the subject(s) that are back-to-back with it. French classes are scheduled according to best teaching practice, as opposed to accommodation of teacher preparation time or other subject demands. In addition, the core French teacher is an integral part of the school staff, as s/he must work collaboratively with other staff members to determine the subjects that will be back-to-back with it, as well as the changeover dates for the two sessions. Thus, communication with other staff members regarding the needs of the core French program is encouraged. The longer instructional periods facilitate the implementation of pedagogical strategies more closely related to those suggested in the National Core French Study (LeBlanc, 1990), and permit the core French teacher to develop greater student-teacher rapport.

It is clear that marginalization issues discussed in this section¹⁶ require further exploration with a wider, more representative sample of FSL teachers from across the country.

Conclusion

The goal of this literature review is to inform a national survey of FSL teachers in all FSL program types. This summary of past research profiling FSL teachers' characteristics and needs is valuable in designing the planned survey instrument. It provides a data-driven rationale for key questions to be addressed in the survey.

The literature review builds on a CTF-sponsored survey of French minority language teachers across Canada conducted in 2004. Taking the pulse of the FSL teacher in Canada in 2006 is a timely exercise; ideally the findings of our survey will contribute to realizing the federal government's goal of doubling the number of functionally bilingual young Canadians by 2013. Without an enthusiastic and competent corps of teachers, FSL programs cannot be implemented successfully.

The main challenges faced by the FSL teacher in Canada are presented in the attached summary table.

Summary Table: Challenges Faced by the FSL Teacher in Canada	
General Challenges Applicable to all FSL Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting high expectations in terms of a high level of proficiency in French, excellence in teaching, and knowledge of experiential, interactive L2 teaching strategies/approaches • Need to integrate technology • Need for richer, appropriate library resources in French • Need for professional development tailored to specific FSL programs • Need for remedial assistance for special needs students in French • Need for inservice to address the integration of ESL students • Need for networking with other FSL teachers
Specific Challenges Core French Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underfunding of the core French program • Relatively low status of FSL; marginalization of the core French teacher • Lack of designated classrooms • Lack of administrative support • Need to interact with multiple classes, sets of parents; sometimes need to interact with two school administrations and staffs • Additional supervision duties
Specific Challenges Intensive French Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to collaborate with teaching colleagues and implement a child-centred pedagogy
Specific Challenges Extended French and French Immersion Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Underfunding for materials and resources • Qualifications to teach content in the L2 • Need to integrate language and content teaching • Need for conceptually complex and linguistically accessible materials; need for time to translate and adapt materials • Need to collaborate with English language arts teachers to maximize positive transfer

¹⁵ Persons interviewed included Department of Education personnel, school board administrators, French consultants, teachers and principals in schools with intensive French, and others.

¹⁶ Many of the issues reviewed here are recurring themes whenever FSL teachers have the opportunity to discuss their working conditions. For example, in the case of core French teachers, all of the themes discussed above were raised in focus group sessions facilitated by CASLT (n.d.).

References

- Atlantic Provinces Education Foundation. (2003). *Core French survey: A regional report*. Halifax, NS: Author
- Calman, R., & Daniel I. (1998). A board's eye view of core French: The North York Board of Education. In S. Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada* (pp. 281-323). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers. (2004). *Status of language educators: Who are we and what are we all about?* Retrieved July 11, 2005, from http://caslt.org/docs/Status_Q_A_03.doc survey.
- Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers. (n.d.). *Status of core French teachers and their programs (executive summary and focus group sessions)*. Retrieved August 8, 2005, from www.caslt.org/docs/FocusGrpExecSummary.doc.
- Canadian Parents for French. (2002). *The state of French second language education in Canada 2002*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Canadian Parents for French. (2004a). *Provincial and national French second-language education stakeholder consultations: Pan-Canadian Report*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Canadian Parents for French. (2004b). *The state of French second language education in Canada 2004*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Chow, P., & Cummins, J. (2003). Valuing multilingual and multicultural approaches to learning. In S. R. Schecter & J. Cummins (Eds.), *Multilingual education in practice* (pp. 32-61). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Dagenais, D., & Day, E. (1998). Classroom language experiences of trilingual children in French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, 376-393.
- Day, E., & Shapson, S. (1996). A national survey: French immersion teachers' preparation and their professional development needs. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52, (2), 248-270.
- Department of Canadian Heritage. (2004). *Plan 2013: Strategies for a national approach in second language education*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Edmonton Public Schools (2005b). *French language education: French renewal project year 1 and 2*. Retrieved July 5, 2005, from <http://french.epsb.ca/reportsHome.htm>
- Evaluation Plus Inc. (2002a). *Program review: French as a second language. Summary report*. Edmonton, AB: Edmonton Public Schools.
- Evaluation Plus Inc. (2002b). *Program Review: French Immersion. Summary Report*. Edmonton, AB: Edmonton Public Schools.
- Germain, C., & Netten, J. (2004). *Étude qualitative du régime pédagogique du français intensif*. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* (special issue). 60, 393-408.
- Gilbert, A., LeTouzé, S., Thériault, J. Y., & Landry, R. (2004). *Le personnel enseignant face aux défis de l'enseignement en milieu minoritaire*. Ottawa, ON: CIRCEM.
- Government of Canada. (2003). *The next act: New momentum for Canada's linguistic duality. Action plan for official languages*. Ottawa, ON: Author.
- Harley, B. (1998.) French immersion research in Canada: The 1990s in perspective. *Mosaic*, 6, 3-10.
- Lapkin, S., Harley, B., & Taylor, S. (1993). Research directions for core French in Canada. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 49, 476-513.

- Lapkin, S., & Swain, M. (1990). French immersion research agenda for the 90s. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 638-674.
- LeBlanc, R. (1990). *National core French study: A synthesis*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.
- LeTouzé, S. (2004). *L'école en milieu minoritaire : Le personnel enseignant face au défi de l'enseignement en milieu minoritaire*. Ottawa, ON: Centre interdisciplinaire de recherches sur la citoyenneté et les minorités. (mimeo)
- Lewis, C. (1998). Exploring teachers' knowledge. In S. Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada* (pp. 237-255). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- MacFarlane, A. (2005). *An examination of intensive French: A pedagogical strategy for the improvement of French as a second language outcomes in Canada*. Ottawa, ON: The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.
- Mady, C. (2002). *Motivation to study and investment in studying core French at the secondary level: Comparing English as a second language and Canadian-born students*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Mady, C. (in preparation). *The suitability of core French for recently arrived adolescent immigrant secondary school students*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Marshall, P. (2002). *Community attitudes toward language learning: Implications and impact on the core French classroom*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Marshall, P. (in preparation). *A case study of compact core French models: A pedagogical perspective*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Mollica, A., Phillips, G., & Smith, M. (2005). *Teaching and learning French as a second language: Core French in the elementary schools of Ontario*. Report prepared for the Ontario Modern Language Teachers' Association (mimeo).
- Muhling, S. (2004). *Re-visioning staff development for K-6 French immersion teachers: A case study of a professional learning community*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- New Brunswick Department of Education. (2000). *French second language program evaluation*. Retrieved July 13, 2005, from www.gnb.ca/0000/publications/comm/fsl_raportfinale.pdf.
- New Brunswick Department of Education. (2001). *Policy Statement 309: French second language programs*. Retrieved June 28, 2005, from www.nbt-fenb.nb.ca.
- Rehorick, S. (2002). *The critical role of the educational system in creating bilingual citizens: New Brunswick as a microcosm of Canada*. Symposium on Official Languages, New Brunswick, Canada.
- Richards, E. (2002). *Positioning the elementary core French teacher: An investigation of workplace marginality*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Salvatori, M. (in preparation). *Learning, discerning and yearning: The development of language proficiency of non-native French as a second language teachers in Ontario*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ontario Institute

for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Sanaoui, R. (2004). *La recherche universitaire en immersion française au Canada 1995 à 2002*. Ottawa, Ontario : Association canadienne des professeurs d'immersion.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (2005). The evolving socio-political context of immersion education in Canada: Some implications for program development. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 169-186.

Tibbs, S. (in preparation). *Investigating French immersion teacher needs and collegial support through on-line collaboration*. Unpublished master's thesis, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Turnbull, M. (1999). Multidimensional project-based second language teaching. Observations of four Grade 9 core French teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56 (1), 7-31.

Turnbull, M. (2000). Second language education in Canada: A focus on core French in elementary schools. In M. Nikolav & H. Curtain (Eds.), *An early start: Young learners and modern languages in Europe and beyond* (pp.173-190). Graz, Austria: European Center for Modern Languages.

APPENDIX B

TEACHING FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN CANADA: TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES RESEARCH REPORT

FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE Preliminary Questionnaire

Conducted by
The Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers,
The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers,
and The Canadian Teachers' Federation.

(2006)



Thank you for responding to our call for participants in the 2006 national survey of French as a second language (FSL) teachers in Canada. This questionnaire is intended for teachers of FSL, including those teaching Core French (also known as Basic French and FSL), French Immersion (also known as Alternative Language Programs), Extended French, and Intensive French.

To ensure that our survey captures the views of the majority of FSL teachers, we ask you to complete the following preliminary questionnaire. Responses to this questionnaire will assist us in selecting FSL teachers for the final representative sample.

No one except the research team will see your completed questionnaire. All results will be aggregated, and no individual or school will be identifiable.

1. Do you teach FSL in a publicly funded Canadian school?
 yes no

2. How long have you been teaching FSL?
 3 years or fewer 4 to 10 years more than 10 years

3. In which program(s) do you teach? (Please check all that apply.)
 Core French (also known as Basic French or FSL in some provinces/territories)
 French Immersion (known as Alternative French Language Programs in some provinces)
 Extended French
 Intensive French

4. Which grade(s) do you teach? (Please check all that apply)
 K (JK/SK) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

5. In which province/territory do you teach?

6. Approximately how many secondary schools are there in your school board?
 fewer than 5 5-9 10-14 15-24 25-49 50+

7. Approximately how many students attend your school?
 fewer than 150 150 - 300 students 301-500 students 501-999 students 1000 or more

Thank you very much for your interest in this important survey. If you are selected, you will be contacted by e-mail before February 15, 2006.

E-mail address at which you prefer to be contacted _____

Glossary

FSL:

French as a second language.

When used as an adjective to describe programs, teachers, and/or resources, it includes Core French (known as Basic French in Manitoba and FSL in Alberta and British Columbia), Extended French, French Immersion (known as Alternative French Language Programs in Alberta), and Intensive French.

Core French:

(also known as Basic French in Manitoba and FSL in Alberta and British Columbia)

An FSL program where French is the object of instruction and is taught as a subject in classes which are given for a specified number of minutes per week/cycle.

Extended (Core) French:

An FSL program designed to provide additional exposure to French for Core French students (less exposure than in French Immersion). French is the language of instruction for one subject such as social studies (occasionally more than one subject) in addition to French Language Arts. Extended French is mainly offered from middle school through early high school.

French Immersion:

(also known as Alternative French Language Programs in Alberta)

An FSL program where French is used as the language of instruction for the teaching of other subjects as well as French language arts during the entire school day or a significant portion thereof.

Intensive (Core) French:

An enrichment of the Core French program in grades 5 or 6, in which French instruction is offered intensively (approximately 70% of the school day) in a concentrated period of time (five months). During the remaining five months, students follow their regular curriculum in a compacted format.

APPENDIX C

TEACHING FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN CANADA: TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES RESEARCH REPORT

FIRST NATIONAL FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TEACHER SURVEY

Conducted by
The Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers,
The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers,
and The Canadian Teachers' Federation.

(2006)



This questionnaire is intended for teachers of French as a second language (FSL) in Canada, including Core French teachers (also known as Basic French teachers and FSL teachers), French Immersion teachers, Extended French teachers, and Intensive French teachers.

Through this national survey, a first of its kind, we are hoping to draw a clear picture of the unique characteristics of teaching FSL in Canada. Your responses will point to the most urgent and critical needs of FSL teachers across the country. We will then develop an action plan to address the challenges you have identified.

A. Please evaluate the quality, quantity, and appropriateness of the following FSL resources for meeting your program needs.

Scale: 1. these resources are not available to me
 2. these resources are available but I do not currently use them
 3. very poor
 4. poor
 5. adequate
 6. good
 7. excellent

1. Commercially prepared FSL teaching materials (print and non-print):
 - a) quality of teaching materials
 - b) quantity of teaching materials
 - c) appropriateness of teaching materials for age of my students
 - d) appropriateness of teaching materials for language level of my students

2. FSL teaching materials (print and non-print) which incorporate francophone culture:
 - a) quality of teaching materials which incorporate francophone culture
 - b) quantity of teaching materials which incorporate francophone culture
 - c) appropriateness for age of my students of teaching materials which incorporate francophone culture
 - d) appropriateness for language level of my students of teaching materials which incorporate francophone culture

3. School library FSL resources:
 - a) quality of library resources
 - b) quantity of library resources
 - c) appropriateness of library resources for age of my students
 - d) appropriateness of library resources for language level of my students

4. FSL computer software:
 - a) quality of computer software
 - b) quantity of computer software
 - c) appropriateness of computer software for age of my students
 - d) appropriateness of computer software for language level of my students

5. Opportunities for French use (i.e., theatre, film, radio, television, etc.) in the community where you teach:
 - a) quality of community opportunities
 - b) quantity of community opportunities
 - c) appropriateness of community opportunities for age of my students
 - d) appropriateness of community opportunities for language level of my students

B. Please evaluate the availability of the following additional FSL resources.

- Scale:
1. unavailable
 2. rarely available
 3. sometimes available
 4. usually available
 5. always available
-
6. Funding for FSL activities (e.g., class trips)
 7. Access to computers and the Internet
 8. Technical support for integrating computer technology in the classroom
 9. Classrooms dedicated to only FSL teaching
 - 10 (a). Suitable space for lesson preparation
(b). Suitable space for storage of materials
 11. Consultants (or other resource persons) to help you with your teaching
 12. Consultants (or other resource persons) to help your students with learning difficulties or special needs (including ESL students)
 13. French-speaking supply/substitute teachers
 14. French-speaking administrative staff (e.g., principals)
 15. French-speaking support staff (e.g., secretaries, custodians)
 16. French-speaking librarian

C. Please indicate the degree to which the following persons are supportive of your FSL program.

- Scale:
1. not applicable
 2. not at all supportive
 3. slightly supportive
 4. somewhat supportive
 5. very supportive
-
17. My school administration
 18. My school guidance counsellor(s)
 19. Parents of my students
 20. My non-FSL teaching colleagues
 21. The community where I teach
 22. My students

D. Please indicate the degree to which you consider the following teaching conditions manageable.

- Scale:
1. not at all manageable
 2. slightly manageable
 3. somewhat manageable
 4. very manageable
-
23. The size of my classes.
 24. The proportion of students with learning difficulties/special needs in my classes.
 25. The composition (i.e., number of combined levels/grades) of my classes.
 26. The number of classes/lessons I prepare each day.
 27. The amount of choice I have in what I am assigned to teach for the year.
 28. Supervision duties.

29. Administrative duties (e.g., report cards and comments).

30. My level of stress.

31. What are the three most important challenges you face in teaching FSL?

32. Please indicate to what extent you take part in the following FSL professional development (PD) activities using the following scale:

1. not available
2. do not take part
3. take part every 3 years or more
4. take part every 2 years
5. take part once a year
6. take part more than once a year

- (a). local workshops (i.e., school/board organized subject-specific professional development days)
- (b). provincial/national conferences (i.e., Ministry organized subject-specific PD days; provincial language association conferences)
- (c). PD via electronic media
- (d). reading articles concerning the teaching of French
- (e). discussions and/or collaboration with colleagues
- (f). upgrading French language skills
- (g). university courses in FSL methodology
- (h). other (Please specify and indicate how often you take part in this activity)
(_____)

33. If you are not currently taking part in FSL professional development (PD) activities or in as many as you would like, which activities would you choose if they were more accessible?
(Please check all that apply.)

- local workshops (i.e., school/board organized subject-specific professional development (PD) days)
- provincial/national conferences (i.e., Ministry organized subject-specific PD days; provincial language association conferences)
- PD via electronic media
- reading articles concerning the teaching of French
- discussions and/or collaboration with colleagues
- upgrading French language skills
- university courses in FSL methodology
- none of the above
- other (Please specify _____)

34. What would make professional development (PD) more accessible to you? (Please check all that apply)

- funding
- shorter PD sessions
- offering PD during school hours

- availability of FSL supply teachers
- relevant topics
- other (Please specify _____)

35. What type of FSL professional development (PD) do you find the most helpful?
(Please check all that apply.)

- local workshops (i.e., school/board organized subject-specific PD days)
- provincial/national conferences (i.e., Ministry organized subject-specific PD days; provincial language association conferences)
- PD via electronic media
- reading articles concerning the teaching of French
- discussions and/or collaboration with colleagues
- upgrading French language skills
- university courses in FSL methodology
- none of the above
- other Please specify _____

36. If you indicated that you read journal articles, please specify the source.

- Canadian Modern Language Review*
- Réflexions*
- Le Journal de l'Immersion*
- provincial/territorial language association newsletters
- other(s) Please specify _____

37. Are you a member of the following second language associations?

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACPI/CAIT | yes <input type="checkbox"/> | no <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CASLT/ACPLS | yes <input type="checkbox"/> | no <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> CPF | yes <input type="checkbox"/> | no <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Provincial Language Teachers' Association | yes <input type="checkbox"/> | no <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Please specify name of association | _____ | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other(s) | yes <input type="checkbox"/> | no <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Please specify name of association(s) | _____ | |

38. What are the three most important ways that second language associations could help you?

E. In order to help us better interpret your answers, we would ask you to answer the following questions about your school, your experience as a teacher, and your background. Your answers will be treated with the strictest confidence. Neither you, your school, nor your school board will be identified in any way in our final report.

1. What grades are taught at your school?

- K-6
- K-8
- 7-9
- 7-12
- 9-12
- 7-11
- other (Please specify _____)

2. Which grades do you teach? (Please check all that apply)

K (JK/SK) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

3. In your school, how many teachers teach

	Full-time	Part-time
Core French	_____	_____
French Immersion	_____	_____
Extended French	_____	_____
Intensive French	_____	_____

4. What percentage of your workload is devoted to

- Core French _____%
- French immersion _____%
- Extended French _____%
- Intensive French _____%
- other _____% (Please specify _____)

5. In how many schools do you teach?

- 1
- 2
- 3 or more

6(a). How many different classes /groups do you teach this year?

- 1
- 2-3
- 4-6
- 7-10
- 11 or more

6(b). How many students do you teach in total? _____

7. Are you female male

8(a). How long have you been teaching?

- 3 years or less
- 4-9 years
- 10-19 years
- 20 years or more

8(b). How long have you been teaching FSL?

- 3 years or less
- 4-10 years
- more than 10 years

9(a). In the past 12 months have you considered leaving FSL teaching?

- yes no

9(b). If yes, did this reflect

- mainly dissatisfaction with teaching in general
 mainly dissatisfaction with teaching FSL
 both about equally
 other (Please specify _____)

10(a). As it stands now, do you think you will be teaching FSL a year from now?

- definitely probably probably not definitely not

10(b). As it stands now, do you think you will be teaching FSL 3 years from now?

- definitely probably probably not definitely not

11. In which province/territory do you teach?

12. What is the name of your school board/district? (We ask this question so that we can make sure our survey adequately represents the views of teachers across regions, in large and small, and urban and rural school districts. Results of this survey will NOT be reported by school board/district. Your school board will not be identified).

13. Approximately how many secondary schools are there in your school board/school district?

- fewer than 5 5-9 10-14 15-24 25 -49 50+

14. Approximately how many students attend your school?

- fewer than 150 150 - 300 students 301-500 students 501-999 students 1000 or more

15. Which of the following courses related to FSL teaching did you complete at your Faculty of Education? (Please check all that apply)

- a course or courses in FSL methodology (core French and immersion)
 a course or courses in core French methodology
 a course or courses in immersion methodology
 a course or courses in how to teach other subjects in French
 did not attend a Faculty of Education
 other (Please specify _____)

16. What teaching qualifications do you hold? (Please check all that apply)

- a general provincial/territorial teaching certificate from the province/territory where I teach
 a specialist provincial/territorial teaching certificate in FSL from the province/territory where I teach
 a letter of permission
 other (Please specify _____)

17. In which program(s) did you study French from K-12? (Please check all that apply)
- Core French
 - French Immersion
 - Extended French
 - program for francophones
 - other (Please specify _____)
18. Did you study French in university either before or after beginning teaching?
- yes, as a major
 - yes, as a minor
 - yes, one course
 - I completed my coursework in French at a francophone or bilingual university
 - no
 - other (Please specify _____)
- 19(a). Were you tested in French when you applied for your job?
- yes no
- 19(b). If yes, what type of assessment was used? (Please check all that apply)
- interview conducted in French
 - written test
 - other (Please specify _____)
20. What is your mother tongue (first language that you learned to speak and can still understand now)?
- English
 - French
 - other (Please specify _____)
21. How much difficulty would you have in doing each of the following in French?
- Scale 1. a great deal
2. quite a lot
3. a fair amount
4. a little
5. none at all
- a. Modelling correct spoken French for students
 - b. Correcting student written work
 - c. Having a conversation with a colleague about an activity that your classes are doing together
 - d. Writing a report about a class activity for a newsletter
 - e. Reading an article in an educational journal
22. Do you have any additional comments that have not been covered by the survey?

Thank you very much for your participation in this important survey. Your responses will remain confidential and be analyzed with the utmost care.

APPENDIX D: LETTER SENT TO THE PARTICIPANTS



Canadian Teachers' Federation
Fédération canadienne des
enseignantes et des enseignants



Canadian Association of Second
Language Teachers
L'Association canadienne des
professeurs de langues secondes



Canadian Association
of Immersion Teachers
Association canadienne des
professeurs d'immersion

January 13, 2006

Dear colleague,

Teaching French as a second language in Canada poses particular challenges. The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT/ACPLS), the Canadian Association of Immersion Teachers (CAIT/ACPI) and the Canadian Teachers' Federation (CTF/FCE) invite you as a French as a second language (FSL) teacher to participate in a major survey to describe the challenges you face and how you deal with them in order to do the best job possible from day to day.

Our objective is to reach Canadian FSL teachers located in as many communities across the country as possible. To ensure that our survey captures the views of the majority of FSL teachers, we ask you to complete the preliminary questionnaire at:

www.oise.utoronto.ca/surveys/surveyviewer2/index.php?surveyID=A672 before February 15, 2006.

Through this national survey, a first of its kind, we are hoping to draw a clear picture of the unique characteristics of teaching FSL in Canada. Our analysis of your responses to the survey questions will point to the most urgent and critical needs identified by practicing FSL teachers. We will then develop an action plan with the involvement of all partners in education to address these issues.

This study is being carried out in partnership with the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the University of Ottawa. Canadian Heritage is providing generous financial support, for which we are deeply grateful.

Thank you in advance for your participation in this important survey. We assure you that your responses will be analyzed with the utmost care. No teacher, school, or school district will be identified in any way in our final report. All responses will remain completely anonymous.

If you require any further information, please feel free to contact Alina MacFarlane (amacf@ripnet.com) or Sharon Lapkin (slapkin@oise.utoronto.ca).

Yours sincerely,

Miles Turbull. Ph.D.
President
CASLT/ACPLS
(613) 727-0994

Winston Carter
President
CTF/FCE
(613) 232-1505

Daniel Fletcher
President
CAIT/ACPI
(613) 998-0051

Codebook for Questions 31 and 38

Question 31 Challenges

1. Students

- 1.1 Diversity in 1 class: FSL ability levels (some students unprepared, esp. for HS level), ESL, Special Ed, lack of support to deal with special needs, split classes.
- 1.2 Lack of motivation/apathy/disinterest: think Fr not important. Leads to poor results. Includes: How to motivate (1) to continue in HS, retention beyond grade 9, (2) to participate/communicate in class?

2. Materials/Resources

- 2.1 Lack of materials/resources generally: include lack of funding and/or high price for materials (no textbook, no workbooks, text exercises inadequate, lack of oral/listening materials, testing materials) so much teacher time required to find and/or prepare.
- 2.2 Inappropriate/not geared to Ss' needs, abilities, interests (age + ability level mismatch) so much teacher time required to find and/or prepare.
- 2.3 Not appropriately tied to curriculum; new curriculum/old materials so much teacher time required to find and/or prepare.
- 2.4 No tech resources: audio, video, electronic, FSL computer software. Much time spent finding web sites, etc.
- 2.5 Lack of extra-curricular resources/opportunities to use French in real world: no francophones in community.
- 2.6 Other subject areas, i.e., math, science: L1 textbooks too complex for Ss, need to translate from English.

3. Time Management

- 3.1 Not enough time to cover expected curriculum: 40-min period too short; lose travel time between classes, move from school to school, floor to floor.
- 3.2 Not enough time for listening/speaking tasks to adequately assign marks: no. of Ss in class, 3 strands to evaluate.
- 3.3 Classroom management/discipline: time lost due to behavioural issues.
- 3.4 Prep/planning time.

4. Support Issues

- 4.1 General lack of interest/support overall for French: no/little parental support, little wider community support.
- 4.2 Little school support: moral support - admin not positive, no other Fr-speaking Ts or aides, little respect from other staff, do lots of 'prep' coverage for other Ts, feeling of isolation.
- 4.3 School support: physical plant no special classroom, working "out of a cart"; scheduling issues - large class size, no T aides, supply Ts for French, poor choice of French electives, no computer time scheduled.

5. FSL Pedagogy

FSL methodology, teaching/learning strategies, lesson plans, pacing, creative activities, motivating activities

6. PD + Language Skills Upgrade

Question 38 How can the association help?

1. Advocacy/ Lobbying

- 1.1 Provincial level: mandate a L2 across the province; curriculum changes; mandate specialist FSL teachers, especially in middle school.
- 1.2 Boards: Funding, awareness and support generally - more FSL positions & programs, support services, i.e., French consultant, materials, remediation.
- 1.3 General: Promote the importance & quality of FSL generally, esp. with parents; community awareness.

2. PD Opportunities

- 2.1 Information about & funding for personal PD: language upgrade, improve FSL competencies, university courses.
- 2.2 Provide local workshops: classroom-related topics, methodology, in-service PD, affordable PD, designed specifically for FSL, topic-specific for immersion teachers.
- 2.3 Annual conferences: language learning theory, techniques, methodology, current trends.

3. Provide Information

- 3.1 Articles, notes re FLS pedagogy: teaching tips, current trends, latest research, technology, program evaluation, "how to" (i.e., special needs students), example lessons, innovative ideas.
- 3.2 Provide info and/or contacts for real world contacts, cultural resources: guest speakers in school, cultural resources, community events, and field trips out of school.
- 3.3 Provide info and/or links (electronic or otherwise) to resources, classroom materials, reviews of new resources, test item data banks, teacher-approved resources (esp. films, software).
- 3.4 More info on association itself, better communication, greater visibility.

4. Foster Contacts, Interrelationships

- 4.1 "Make connections" in general: boost morale; mentoring.
- 4.2 Opportunities to collaborate/discuss/share ie materials development. Networking. Online forums.

APPENDIX F

TEACHING FRENCH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE IN CANADA: TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES RESEARCH REPORT

Tables of Participants' Self-Assessed French Proficiency

To determine to what degree they were proficient in French, participants were asked to assess their own proficiency in French in performing five tasks. These tasks included:

- modelling correct spoken French for their students;
- correcting student written work;
- having a conversation with a colleague about an activity their classes were doing together;
- writing a report about a class activity for a newsletter; and
- reading an article in an educational journal.

Tables 2.8a, 2.8b, 2.8c, 2.8d, and 2.8e present the results for these questions by province/territory.

		Great Deal	Quite A Lot	Fair Amount	A Little	None At All	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	1	19	20
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	97.9	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	0	2	1	24	55	82
	<i>%</i>	0.0	2.4	1.2	29.3	67.1	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	1	1	2	32	78	114
	<i>%</i>	0.9	0.9	1.8	28.1	68.4	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	0	1	3	24	36	64
	<i>%</i>	0.0	1.6	4.7	37.5	56.3	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	0	1	0	17	42	60
	<i>%</i>	0.0	1.7	0.0	28.3	70.0	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	0	0	2	101	442	545
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.4	18.5	81.1	100.0
QC	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	4	23	27
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.8	85.2	100.0
NB	<i>Count</i>	1	1	2	15	87	106
	<i>%</i>	0.9	0.9	1.9	14.2	82.1	100.0
NS	<i>Count</i>	0	2	3	2	110	141
	<i>%</i>	0.0	1.4	2.1	18.4	78.0	100.0
PE	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	3	30	33
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	91.0	100.0
NL	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	16	62	78
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.5	79.5	100.0
Total	<i>Count</i>	2	8	13	263	984	1270
	<i>%</i>	0.2	0.6	1.0	20.7	77.5	100.0

Table 2.8b Perceived Difficulty in Correcting Student Written Work as Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		Great Deal	Quite A Lot	Fair Amount	A Little	None At All	TOTAL
TER	Count	0	0	1	2	18	23
	%	0.0	0.0	16.7	9.1	74.2	100.0
BC	Count	0	1	4	22	54	81
	%	0.0	1.20	4.90	27.2	66.7	100.0
AB	Count	1	2	3	29	78	113
	%	0.9	1.8	2.7	25.7	69.0	100.0
SK	Count	1	0	4	16	43	64
	%	1.6	0.0	6.3	25.0	67.2	100.0
MB	Count	0	0	1	19	40	60
	%	0.0	0.0	1.7	31.7	66.7	100.0
ON	Count	0	0	9	73	462	544
	%	0.0	0.0	1.7	13.4	85.0	100.0
QC	Count	0	0	0	0	27	27
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0
NB	Count	1	1	4	20	78	104
	%	1.0	1.0	3.8	19.2	75.0	100.0
NS	Count	1	2	7	30	98	138
	%	0.7	1.4	5.1	21.7	71.0	100.0
PE	Count	0	0	0	4	27	31
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	87.1	100.0
NL	Count	0	0	0	13	65	78
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.7	83.3	100.0
Total	Count	4	6	33	228	990	1261
	%	0.3	0.5	2.6	18.1	78.5	100.0

Table 2.8c Perceived Difficulty in Discussing Pedagogy in French with a Colleague as Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		Great Deal	Quite A Lot	Fair Amount	A Little	None At All	TOTAL
TER	Count	0	0	0	4	16	20
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.5	90.5	100.0
BC	Count	3	3	3	16	56	81
	%	3.7	3.7	3.7	19.8	69.1	100.0
AB	Count	1	3	8	34	67	113
	%	0.9	2.7	7.1	30.1	59.3	100.0
SK	Count	1	3	4	22	34	64
	%	1.6	4.7	6.3	34.4	53.1	100.0
MB	Count	0	2	4	11	42	59
	%	0.0	3.4	6.8	18.6	71.2	100.0
ON	Count	3	1	12	121	407	544
	%	0.6	0.2	2.2	22.2	74.8	100.0
QC	Count	0	0	0	1	26	27
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.7	96.3	100.0
NB	Count	2	1	1	17	85	106
	%	1.9	0.9	0.9	16.0	80.2	100.0
NS	Count	2	4	0	15	120	141
	%	1.4	2.8	0.0	10.6	85.1	100.0
PE	Count	0	0	0	5	28	33
	%	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.2	84.8	100.0
NL	Count	0	0	1	11	66	78
	%	0.0	0.0	1.3	14.1	84.6	100.0
Total	Count	12	17	33	257	947	1266
	%	0.9	1.3	2.6	20.3	74.8	100.0

Table 2.8d: Perceived Difficulty in Writing About a Class Activity as Reported by Participants by Province and Territory

		Great Deal	Quite A Lot	Fair Amount	A Little	None At All	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	1	0	2	3	15	21
	<i>%</i>	4.2	0.0	9.4	19.4	67.1	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	4	2	6	30	40	82
	<i>%</i>	4.9	2.4	7.3	36.6	48.8	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	3	6	8	43	52	112
	<i>%</i>	2.7	5.4	7.1	38.4	46.4	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	3	3	7	23	28	64
	<i>%</i>	4.7	4.7	10.9	35.9	43.8	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	0	2	5	21	32	60
	<i>%</i>	0.0	3.3	8.3	35.0	53.3	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	2	2	27	143	365	539
	<i>%</i>	0.4	0.4	5.0	26.5	67.7	100.0
QC	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	3	24	27
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	11.1	88.9	100.0
NB	<i>Count</i>	2	1	6	25	72	106
	<i>%</i>	1.9	0.9	5.7	23.6	67.9	100.0
NS	<i>Count</i>	3	5	9	29	92	138
	<i>%</i>	2.2	3.6	6.5	21.0	66.7	100.0
PE	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	10	23	33
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	30.3	69.7	100.0
NL	<i>Count</i>	0	0	3	22	52	77
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	3.9	28.6	67.5	100.0
Total	<i>Count</i>	18	21	73	352	795	1259
	<i>%</i>	1.4	1.7	5.8	28.0	63.1	100.0

Table 2.8e: Perceived Difficulty in Reading an Educational Journal in French Reported by Participants by Province and Territories

		Great Deal	Quite A Lot	Fair Amount	A Little	None At All	TOTAL
TER	<i>Count</i>	0	1	1	3	16	21
	<i>%</i>	0.0	4.9	4.9	14.4	76.8	100.0
BC	<i>Count</i>	4	1	4	16	56	81
	<i>%</i>	4.9	1.2	4.9	19.8	69.1	100.0
AB	<i>Count</i>	3	5	14	27	65	114
	<i>%</i>	2.6	4.4	12.3	23.7	57.0	100.0
SK	<i>Count</i>	5	2	4	14	36	61
	<i>%</i>	8.2	3.3	6.6	23.0	59.0	100.0
MB	<i>Count</i>	0	0	6	16	37	59
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	10.2	27.1	62.7	100.0
ON	<i>Count</i>	1	6	15	116	396	534
	<i>%</i>	0.2	1.1	2.8	21.7	74.2	100.0
QC	<i>Count</i>	0	0	0	2	25	27
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.4	92.6	100.0
NB	<i>Count</i>	0	1	2	14	88	105
	<i>%</i>	0.0	1.0	1.9	13.3	83.8	100.0
NS	<i>Count</i>	2	2	9	29	98	140
	<i>%</i>	1.4	1.4	6.4	20.7	70.0	100.0
PE	<i>Count</i>	0	1	0	7	25	33
	<i>%</i>	0.0	3.0	0.0	21.2	75.8	100.0
NL	<i>Count</i>	0	0	1	26	50	77
	<i>%</i>	0.0	0.0	1.3	33.8	64.9	100.0
Total	<i>Count</i>	15	19	56	270	892	1252
	<i>%</i>	1.2	1.5	4.5	21.6	71.2	100.0