

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

Bell & Howell Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA

UMI[®]
800-521-0600

NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available

UMI

**MULTIDIMENSIONAL PROJECT-BASED TEACHING IN CORE
FRENCH: A CASE STUDY**

by

Miles Sydney Turnbull

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the
University of Toronto

© Copyright by Miles Sydney Turnbull 1998



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-41524-4

Canada

MULTIDIMENSIONAL PROJECT-BASED TEACHING IN CORE FRENCH: A CASE STUDY

Doctor of Philosophy, 1998

Miles Sydney Turnbull

Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the

University of Toronto

Abstract

The overall objective of this field-based process-product case study is to examine the effectiveness of Stern's multidimensional curriculum as it has been applied to teaching core French in one school district in Canada. The study compares the pedagogical approaches of four grade 9 core French teachers. Students completed tests of general French proficiency and a questionnaire at the beginning of the study. The same tests and questionnaire were readministered near the end of the school year. The four classes were observed over an 8-week period during which each teacher implemented the same project-based instructional unit based on the principles of the multidimensional curriculum. I collected observation data using the MOLT (multidimensional orientation of language teaching) observation scheme based on the multidimensional curriculum as a theoretical framework and project-based learning as the guiding pedagogical principle. Students also completed achievement tests following the observation period based on the objectives of the instructional unit.

Two teachers were classified as multidimensional project-based and two as less-multidimensional. Statistical analyses compared student outcomes (linguistic, affective, cultural, strategic objectives) across classes according to their teachers' pedagogical approach.

Students from the multidimensional project-based classes obtained higher test scores, as compared to the less-multidimensional classes, on some components of the French proficiency and achievement tests. Similarly, questionnaire data indicated that a multidimensional project-based program may lead to more satisfactory outcomes with respect to the general language education objectives in core French. However, there was no evidence to suggest that multidimensional project-based teaching leads to more satisfactory outcomes in terms of attitudinal and cultural objectives.

Possible confounding variables are discussed in the final chapter. It is not possible to conclude with certainty that project-based multidimensional teaching was the single cause of superior test performance and more positive questionnaire results by the students from the multidimensional project-based classes. However, this study represents a first step in the investigation of multidimensional project-based core French classrooms with respect to second language and affective outcomes.

Acknowledgements

There are many people to acknowledge without whom I would not have made it to the end of my thesis journey.

First there's Sharon Lapkin, my supervisor, for her guidance, constant encouragement, and unparalleled availability throughout every stage of this project. I will be indebted to her forever.

I thank Merrill Swain for her inspiration and superb advice throughout the study, and for helping me through the rough times.

I thank Birgit Harley for her dedication, support and sharp insights into multidimensional core French teaching.

I also acknowledge and thank the four teachers and their students who participated in my study and without whom none of my work would have been possible. I am also very grateful for support from the PEI Department of Education, French Services (especially Helen Lockerby).

Thanks also to Sue Elgie and Doug Hart for their expert statistical advice: I could not have survived without them! Thanks also to Iva Baltova and Rodney St. Pierre who did inter-rater reliability checks on my data at different stages of the study.

And last, but not least, Wade, I could not have done it without your love and support.

Dedication

My dear friend, Reverend Lou Murphy, died suddenly and tragically while I was in the final stages of my thesis preparation. He planned to be with me outside the room on the day of my thesis defence. Although he unfortunately couldn't make it physically, I know he was there with me in spirit...as he always will be.

I dedicate my thesis to your memory, Lou.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgments	iv
Dedication	v
List of Tables	x
Chapter 1: Introduction and Rationale	1
1.1. Introduction	1
1.2. Overall Goal and Overview	4
1.3. Research Questions	6
1.4. Rationale for the Study	6
1.4.1. Classroom Practice	7
1.4.2. Theory	14
1.4.2.1. The Development of Stern's Multidimensional Curriculum	15
1.4.2.2. The <i>National Core French Study</i> : A Schwabian Analysis	17
1.4.2.3. Project-Based Learning	30
1.4.3. Previous Research	33
1.4.3.1. Research Directions for Core French	35
1.4.3.2. The Core French Observation Study	36
1.4.3.3. The North York Board of Education Core French Review	39
1.4.3.4. Teachers' Experiences with a Multidimensional Project-Based Curriculum	44
1.4.3.5. The Alberta FSL Study	46
1.5 Summary	51

Chapter 2: Description of Participants and Methodology	54
2.1. Research Design	54
2.1.2. Program Evaluation	55
2.2. The Participants	57
2.2.1. Recruitment and Selection of Teachers	57
2.2.2. Characteristics of the Four Participating Teachers	59
2.2.3. Characteristics of the Students	62
2.3. Procedures	68
2.3.1. Pre- and Post-Tests	71
2.3.2. Student Questionnaire	76
2.3.3. The Observation Scheme	77
2.3.4. Coding and Analyzing the Observation Data	91
2.3.5. The Teaching Unit: <i>La Mode et la Publicité</i>	93
2.3.6. Achievement Tests	100
2.4. Summary	108
Chapter 3: Results	110
3.1. Results: Part 1	110
3.1.1. Observation Data	111
3.1.2. Qualitative Field Notes	120
3.1.2.1. Classroom Set-Up	121
3.1.2.2. The Uses of English and French	122
3.1.2.3. Time Off Task	122
3.1.3. Summary: The Four Teachers	123
3.1.3.1. Teacher 1	123
3.1.3.2. Teacher 2	124
3.1.3.3. Teacher 3	126
3.1.3.4. Teacher 4	128

3.2. Results: Part 2	130
3.2.1. Pre-Tests	130
3.2.2. Post-Tests	133
3.2.3. Achievement Tests	136
3.2.4. Summary of Test Results	141
3.3. Results: Part 3	142
3.3.1. Self-Assessment Data	145
3.3.1.1. Self-Assessment of French Skills	145
3.3.1.2. Self-Assessment of Cultural Knowledge	147
3.3.1.3. Self-Assessment of Improvement Since Starting French Studies	149
3.3.2. Attitudes Towards French Language and Culture	150
3.3.3. Usefulness of Activities	151
3.3.4. Strategy Use	152
3.3.4.1. Speaking	153
3.3.4.2. Listening	154
3.3.4.3. Reading	155
3.3.4.4. Writing	156
3.3.5. Motivations for Learning French	158
3.3.6. Summary of Questionnaire Data	162
Chapter 4: Discussion	168
4.1. Summary and Interpretation of Findings	168
4.1.1. Classroom Observations	168
4.1.2. Test Scores	172
4.1.3. Questionnaire Results	178
4.1.4. General Discussion	182
4.2. Shortcomings and Limitations	187
4.2.1. The Case Study Design	188
4.2.2. Instruments	189

4.3 Implications for SL Curriculum Theory and Practice	191
4.4 A Return to the Research Questions	195
4.5 Directions for Future Research and Concluding Remarks	196
References	198
Appendices	
Appendix A: Teacher Recruitment Survey	217
Appendix B: Teacher Questionnaire	220
Appendix C: Student Questionnaires (Pre- and Post-)	224
Appendix D: MOLT Observation Scheme	246
Appendix E: Questionnaire Data	249
Appendix F: Student Survey of Grade 7 & 8 Core French	278

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1 Use of a Language Other Than English or French at Home (Percentages): Comparisons per Class	63
Table 2.2: Percentage of Student Enrolment in French Immersion by Grade and Class (Previous to Grade 9)	64
Table 2.3: Percentage of Students Who Had Lived in a Francophone Environment	64
Table 2.4: Core French Starting Grade (Percentages)	65
Table 2.5: Students' Self-Report: Overall School Achievement (Percentages)	66
Table 2.6: Teachers' Assessment of Students' Overall Academic Abilities	67
Table 2.7: Percentages of Professional and Non-Professional Mothers by Class	67
Table 2.8: Percentages of Professional and Non-Professional Fathers by Class	67
Table 2.9 Observation Details by Class	70
Table 2.10 - A Summary of Pre- and Post-Test Measures (General Proficiency in French)	72
Table 2.11 - Defining Multidimensional Features Contrasted with Unidimensional and Less Multidimensional Features	94
Table 2.12 - Typical but Not Defining Multidimensional Features	95
Table 2.13- Summary of Achievement Tests: <i>La Mode et la Publicité</i>	101
Table 3.1: Percentage of Time Spent on Defining Features of a Multidimensional Project-Based Approach by Teacher	112
Table 3.2: Percentage Time Spent on Typical but Not Defining Features by Teacher	114

Table 3.3: Teachers' Uses of English and French - Average Percentage of Observed Time Over All Visits by Teacher	115
Table 3.4: Content Summary - Average Percentage of Time Observed by Teacher (all visits) for Each Category	116
Table 3.5: Student Modality as Primary or Equal Focus- Average Percentage of Observed Time Per Class (all visits)	119
Table 3.6: Student Modality as Secondary Focus - Average Percentage of Observed Time Per Class (all visits)	120
Table 3.7: Pre-Test Scores by Class (General Proficiency Tests)	131
Table 3.8: Post-Test Scores by Class (General Proficiency Tests), Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores	134
Table 3.9: Achievement Test Scores by Class, Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores	138
Table 3.10 : A Summary of Significant Differences on Pre- and Post-Questionnaire Data (Based on Chi-Square Analyses)	143
Table 3.11 Student Satisfaction With Grade 9 French by Class	153
Table 3.12: Student Report: <i>I Want to Continue Studying French in High School</i> (Pre-Questionnaire)	159
Table 3.13: Student Report: <i>I Want to Continue Studying French in High School</i> (Post-Questionnaire)	160
Table 3.14: Student Report: <i>I Intend to Study French Next Year (in Grade 10)</i>	160

Chapter 1

Introduction and Rationale

1.1. Introduction

Relatively few studies have been conducted in core French programs¹, even though they have been a part of most mainstream curricula in Canada for many years and despite the fact that about 90% of Canadian students studying French in this country are enrolled in these programs (see Foley, Harley & d'Anglejan, 1988, for a bibliographic review of about 100 studies conducted; Lapkin, 1998; Lapkin, Harley & Taylor, 1993). In contrast, since the establishment of the first French immersion program in St. Lambert, Québec in 1965, hundreds of research projects have been conducted related to these programs to examine questions like the effectiveness of immersion as compared to regular core French programs, the degree to which immersion students' French is native-like, and more recently, how to improve immersion pedagogy and resulting French proficiency of the students (see, e.g., Genesee, 1987; Lapkin, Swain with Shapson, 1990; Lyster, 1994a, 1994b, 1987; Swain, 1996; Swain & Lapkin, 1995).

¹ Core French is defined in the *National Core French Study* (LeBlanc, R., 1990:2) as " a basic program in French as a second language where French is the subject being studied and the language is taught in periods that vary between 20 and 50 minutes a day."

Core French has indeed become "l'enfant pauvre" (Stern, 1985) of French second language (FSL) teaching and research in Canada. This imbalance in research attention is probably best attributed to the excitement created by the newer immersion programs. Researchers' enthusiasm increased even more after the successes of French immersion students had been documented. Some people have even called the immersion concept the most successful second language (SL) program ever (e.g., Krashen, 1984). Moreover, Stern (1985) refers to many observers in the Canadian educational scene who regarded immersion as "the only practical solution to the language problem [i.e., they perceive learning French to be difficult] of Anglophone Canadians (p.36)." The successes of immersion programs in Canada have also created considerable interest amongst researchers and educators from all over the world (e.g., Artigal, 1997; de Courcy, 1997; Johnson, 1997; Johnson & Swain, 1997; Met & Lorenz, 1997). This excitement and public attention, along with the Canadian government's *Official Languages Act*, may have also prompted government funding agencies to favour immersion-related research projects.

In 1985, however, the Canadian government granted funds to the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) to conduct a major research project whose principal aim was to examine how core French programs could become more effective. A major impetus for this study was the groundswell created by French immersion programs, instilling a desire in core French advocates to learn

from and improve on what had been discovered from immersion research and classroom practice in order to establish core French as a viable educational alternative to immersion. As a result, CASLT commissioned H.H. Stern to conduct the *National Core French Study (NCFS)*, which remains a subject of much interest and discussion today. In fact, Poyen (1990:22) has suggested that the NCFS is "perhaps the most wide-scale national project to be undertaken in Canadian education." Unfortunately, Dr. Stern did not see the end of this national project due to his untimely death. The final NCFS report (LeBlanc, 1990), however, was dedicated to his memory not only for his role as founding director of the study, but mostly because his convictions on SL teaching served as inspiration for the 'soul' of the project. In fact, Stern's multidimensional model (1982, 1983b) for SL teaching, including four syllabuses - communicative activities, language, culture, general language education - was the principal theoretical basis of the LeBlanc report. The NCFS reflects Stern's belief (see, e.g., Stern, 1970, 1974, 1980, 1983a) that any understanding of SL teaching must be founded in the disciplines of linguistics (and related fields such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics etc), psychology, sociology/anthropology and pedagogy which consider the social and cultural, as well as the structural, nature of language.

Since the publication of the NCFS report in 1990, a great deal of time and money have been allotted to the implementation of the recommendations of the report (see CASLT, 1994). Ministries of Education across Canada have integrated the

recommendations of the NCFS, either explicitly or implicitly, into their guidelines for core French teaching. Furthermore, teaching materials based on the NCFS have been created by provincial working committees and publishers, and these are presently being used in schools at all grade levels. However, researchers and administrators report that teachers have implemented and accepted these guidelines and materials to varying degrees (see CASLT, 1994; Lapkin, Harley & Hart, 1995; Lewis, 1995, 1998). The diverse levels of acceptance of the guidelines and materials by teachers may be due, in part, to skepticism about the potential of a multidimensional project-based curriculum to improve student achievement (see Lapkin et al., 1995). Research is clearly needed to investigate the overall effectiveness of this curriculum model related to such topics as: 1) the improvement of students' French proficiency; 2) students' attitudes towards SL learning; 3) students' cultural knowledge; 4) the amount students actually use their SL outside school. The need for such research is supported by Shapson (in Harley, d'Anglejan & Shapson, 1990), Lapkin, Harley and Taylor (1993), and most recently by CASLT itself (1994).

1.2. Overall Goal and Overview

I believe that research which attempts to examine effective ways to reach the communicative, linguistic, attitudinal, cultural and general language education objectives of core French will help the process of implementing new curricula in core French. This is the overall goal of the field-based process-product case study I

conducted in four grade nine core French classes in Prince Edward Island (P.E.I.). Students in these classes completed a pre-test of general French proficiency and a questionnaire which included questions designed to assess the attitudinal, cultural and general language education objectives of core French. This was followed by an observation period during which the teachers of all four classes implemented the same teaching unit (*La Mode et la publicité*) based on the principles of the NCFS. The teachers' classroom approach was documented using the MOLT (Multidimensional Orientation of Language Teaching) observation scheme, an adapted version of the COLT (Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching) (Spada & Fröhlich, 1995). The MOLT includes indicators of multidimensional, communicative and project-based SL teaching (see details below). Following this observation period, students completed achievement tests based on the objectives and activities of the unit that all of the teachers used during the study. Near the end of the academic year, students also completed the same French proficiency tests and questionnaires as at the beginning of the study.

This dissertation is presented in four chapters. The first includes an introduction to the research, the specific research questions to be addressed and an examination of the rationale for the study including the origins of the research questions - classroom practice, theory and previous research. In Chapter 2, I describe the sample and methodology for the data collection and analysis. Chapter 3 presents

the results in three sections: classroom observation data, test results and questionnaire results. In the fourth and final chapter, I discuss the findings in light of variations observed in the four teachers' classroom practices. The study's shortcomings and limitations are then discussed. This final chapter also includes a final section summarizing the extent to which the study responds to the research questions within which it was framed; research directions for the future are also proposed.

1.3. Research Questions

My research examines the effectiveness of two different teaching approaches to reach the communicative, linguistic, attitudinal, cultural and general language education objectives of core French. The following specific questions are examined:

1- Does a core French teaching approach based on a multidimensional project-based curriculum lead to higher language proficiency and achievement than one which is principally focussed unidimensionally on grammar teaching?

2- Does a core French teaching approach based on a multidimensional project-based curriculum lead to more satisfactory outcomes with respect to the attitudinal, cultural and general language education objectives of core French than one which is principally focussed unidimensionally on grammar teaching?

1.4. Rationale for the Study

In keeping with Swain's (1995a) suggestion that second language acquisition (SLA) research is more likely to provide a relevant basis for pedagogical application

when the sources of the research questions are "simultaneously three-fold," coming from SL classroom practice, theory, and previous SLA research, I present the rationale for my study within this framework.

1.4.1. Classroom Practice

It was following a trip to Colombia, South America, with the Canadian Red Cross, that I finally admitted that I did not want to pursue a career in medicine. I had been truly "immersed" in the latino culture and I learned Spanish because I had to survive so I could help the patients under my care in the refugee camps. Here I realized the power of experiential learning for SLA and discovered that I wanted to teach languages to others in an experiential way as well.

My earliest teaching experiences in SL classrooms included my job as a language monitor in grade eight late French immersion in Charlottetown, P.E.I.. Also while attending university, I did some substitute teaching in both immersion and core French. Both of these experiences gave me an opportunity to observe other students in a learning environment where I was able to share with them some of my background as a learner of French and Spanish.

While completing my Master's degree in French, I taught a first year French course as a teaching assistant. I recall being quite frustrated by this experience because its orientation was almost exclusively grammatical. We (all teaching assistants) were also required to teach for a series of quizzes set by the coordinators

of the course. We were constantly so rushed to finish the required material to be assessed by the discrete-point, decontextualized exams that we never had time to use the language in authentic, interesting contexts. This was a demotivating and unproductive experience for me and the students. At the same time, I was hired as a part-time instructor at l'Alliance Française in Hamilton, Ontario, where I taught a group of interested and eager adults using a notional-functional approach devised in France (*Sans frontières*; Verdelhan-Bourgade, Verdelhan & Dominique, 1982). Although the method created unrealistic contexts and situations, I had the freedom to adapt them, making them more relevant to the lives and experiences of my students. Grammar, vocabulary and phonetics were integrated into the activities, taught explicitly, but in some sort of meaningful context.

Following my studies at McMaster University, I began teaching in the Modern Languages Department at the University of Prince Edward Island (UPEI). During the first year, I was one of three instructors in an intensive French program. I was asked to use an audio-visual method (*Dialogue Canada*; Public Service Commission of Canada, 1972) designed by and for the Public Service of Canada. Although I stuck quite closely to its syllabus at first in order to cope with the three other courses I was teaching, strict adherence to it would have meant buying into behaviorist psychology. Gradually, I eliminated all the stimulus-response exercises and memorization of the dialogues. Most of our class time was spent exploiting the vocabulary and grammar

structures developed in the dialogues in order to prepare the students for an exercise in which students applied this vocabulary and these structures to create their own dialogue related to a situation relevant to their lives. This was not exactly experiential or project-based but it was more relevant and effective than dialogue memorization.

During the next three years at UPEI, I taught a variety of courses, some with a prescribed curriculum, others in which I had the freedom to design my own. In addition, I organized student trips to different parts of France. These experiences provided the students with an opportunity to use the language they were learning and to experience culture from one part of *la francophonie*. As a result, they returned more motivated to continue their study of French.

One of my other assignments at UPEI was to teach a course in Applied Linguistics related to teaching FSL. In my first class, I had 15 students, most of them in the Bachelor of Education program. There were also two FSL consultants from the local school board. My approach to the course was theoretical, based mostly on a similar course I had taken during my year at McMaster. However, these consultants and future teachers pushed me to make the course more practical. In addition, they introduced me to professional organizations for immersion and FSL teachers. I started attending conferences where I learned many things about the realities of teaching FSL and immersion in the school system. I got excited about the *NCFES* (LeBlanc, 1990) and the multidimensional project-based teaching units that were

being developed by colleagues in P.E.I. and Nova Scotia. As a result, I began experimenting with a multidimensional project-based approach in my own language classes. Inspired by the work of the interprovincial curriculum teams mentioned above, I created multidimensional, project-based units based on the following themes: *Travel; Love, sex and union* (Turnbull, 1996); and *The Environment*.

From 1992-94, I taught at Lester B. Pearson College, an international school which offers the International Baccalaureate program. Here the curriculum was driven largely by the final evaluation system. Although the first year of the two-year program was much more open-ended and, as a result, I was able to implement some elements of a multidimensional project-based approach, the second year had to be dedicated to explicit exam preparation. This summative exam² required students to have a thorough knowledge of the grammar system of French, especially the exceptions. Grammar and vocabulary were tested by a discrete-point, multiple-choice exam. It was necessary to train students to do these exams by practising old ones, especially because the vocabulary and idiomatic expressions taken up were often specialized and rarely used by ordinary francophones. Literary analysis was also important. The oral exam consisted of a traditional, structured *explication de texte* in addition to questions about other literature studied. The written exam required

² The syllabus and assessment procedures for second language instruction for International Baccalaureate courses were changed in 1994. The current syllabus reflects a much more "communicative" orientation. Assessment procedures are both formative and summative and I believe these are much more valid measures of student achievement.

students to prepare a commentary of a text with which they were unfamiliar and to write a literary essay, all in three hours. Teaching in this environment with motivated, interesting students from all over the world was stimulating, but I definitely compromised my principles on SL curriculum.

In attempting to reconstruct the meaning of all these experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988), I would summarize my philosophy on SL curriculum as follows:

- To learn a SL most effectively one should be totally immersed in the target culture (as I was in Colombia). This should be combined with a formal learning experience where the focus is on the needs (communicative, linguistic, affective, cultural, etc.) of the learner.
- Given that total immersion is not feasible for most SL learners, I believe that the next best situation would be an intensive classroom setting in which French is learned through the medium of content (e.g., French immersion) or in a multidimensional project-based core French program. In other words, starting from subject-matter or a theme relevant to the lives of the students, the teacher organizes activities that promote the use of the target language in a meaningful and purposeful way. Students work towards the completion of an educationally relevant final project. Thus the activities leading up to the project are needs-based, meant to prepare the students for project completion.

- Grammar should have an important place in the curriculum. However, it is crucial that explicit focus on language (form) be negotiated through meaningful, communicative and project-related activities. The language focus should relate to the linguistic needs created by the project the students will complete. There may be some occasions, however, where a focus on form may be required to prevent or reduce errors in students' oral and/or written production (e.g., French gender).
- Instruction should take place in the target language, but students must be taught strategies to make this possible (i.e., survival strategies, cognates, listening strategies: see CASLT, 1994, for more detail).
- Teachers must also use strategies to help the students understand (i.e., actions, visual aids, gestures, sound effects). They must also relate the curriculum to the lives of the students and build on what they already know.
- In this approach, listening comprehension will most likely be the first skill developed (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) but this alone will not ensure fluency or accurate oral and written production.
- The perspective of francophones from around the world (related to the themes developed) should be exploited as part of the learning

activities.

- Collaborative learning and experiential educational projects will provide opportunities for oral and written production (output). This combined with the focus on form will enhance proficiency in the target language as Swain (1993, 1995b, 1997) suggests.

- As I learned from former teachers, hard work and perseverance are absolutely necessary. I believe that students should be required to do relevant work at home on a daily basis, be it grammar exercises, reading interesting magazine articles or watching television in the target language.

- My immersion experiences have convinced me that use of the language outside the classroom is also necessary. Ideally, learners (with the help of teachers and parents) must find opportunities for contact with francophones (e.g., linguistic partners, visits to francophone areas, internet communications, youth or special interest groups).

My philosophy on SL curriculum is, admittedly, idealistic and some of it may seem unrealistic in many contexts. Nevertheless, from my teaching experience, I believe it is possible to implement most of the principles I describe. I am convinced that learners who graduate from a core French program in which the teaching approach is multidimensional and project-based (as opposed to a unidimensional

approach focussed primarily on grammar teaching) will have greater listening and reading comprehension skills, greater fluency and accuracy in oral and written production, more positive attitudes hence stronger motivation and a more sensitive appreciation for francophones and their culture. They will also be more aware of culture, language learning, how language works and the strategies they use to learn and communicate. However, these convictions are based on intuition and my own personal experience. They must be tested in a more systematic way, hence one source of the research questions for this study.

1.4.2. Theory

In 1982 (pp. 34-36), Stern suggested that curriculum organization was the key issue for a renewal and strengthening of SL teaching in Canada at that time. The theoretical framework in which my research is embedded is the multidimensional curriculum, proposed by Stern (1982, 1983b) as a more effective approach for SL teaching than one focussed unidimensionally on grammar. In this section, I first trace the development of Stern's multidimensional curriculum. Second, I examine the application of Stern's model to core French curriculum in Canada as published in the NCFS (LeBlanc, 1990) and in the follow-up document, *National Core French Study: A model for implementation* (CASLT, 1994).

It would be perhaps fitting to use Stern's (1982) definition of curriculum, consisting of content (what is taught), objectives (what is to be achieved) and

teaching strategies (how these objectives will be realized), as the framework for my analysis. However, I believe that using Schwab's (1962) four commonplaces of curriculum (subject matter, milieu, learner and teacher) allows for a more comprehensive perspective on a multidimensional project-based curriculum in core French while still covering Stern's content, objectives and teaching strategies. Schwab began his career as a teacher of biology and was known for his experiential approach to learning, which he acknowledges was profoundly influenced by the work of Dewey. Later in his career, Schwab joined the faculty of education at the University of Chicago where he was involved in a reform of science education, but he also became internationally renowned for his writing on the meaning of liberal education and the character of educational thought.³ Schwab (1962) argues that curriculum reform, in any discipline, must consider how each of his four commonplaces influence educational practice. Moreover, more recent curriculum experts, Clandinin and Connelly (1992), suggest that any statement of curriculum should describe its subject matter, milieu, learner and teacher.

1.4.2.1. The Development of Stern's Multidimensional Curriculum

As stated above, Stern argued consistently over the years (e.g., 1970, 1974, 1980) that any understanding of SL teaching must be founded in the disciplines of linguistics (and related fields such as sociolinguistics, pragmatics, etc.), psychology,

³ See Westbury & Wilkof (1978) for a comprehensive review of Schwab's influence on curriculum reform and science education.

sociology/anthropology and pedagogy. He referred to a near-consensus in the field about the inadequacy of grammar-based SL curricula (involving the presentation and practice of linguistic elements in artificial, non-communicative contexts) for developing communication skills, cultural knowledge and empathy (see, e.g., Grittner, 1977; Krashen, 1982; Rivers, 1981). Stern's ideas were consistent with developments in psychology and sociology, a rejection of the over-rigid application of audiolingual language teaching and a resulting embracing of the concept of communicative language teaching. Stern's convictions resulted in his multidimensional curriculum model which includes four syllabuses, reflecting the multidisciplinary nature of his conception of SL teaching: communicative activities, language, culture and general language education.

Stern's model is an extension of Dodson's (1976) two-level perspective on SL learning and Allen's (1983) three-level approach to SL education. Dodson (1976) proposed a medium-oriented level of language learning where formal features of language are the focus and a message-oriented level where language becomes the vehicle for real-life expression. Allen (1983) proposed 1) a structural-analytic level, corresponding to Dodson's medium-oriented level, where the focus is grammar and other structural features of language, using formal grammatical teaching techniques and medium-oriented practice; 2) a functional-analytic level involving equal reference to language as a medium and language as communication, focussing on

discourse features of language, using controlled communicative teaching techniques and medium as well as message-oriented practice; 3) a non-analytic or experiential level involving a focus on the natural, unanalyzed use of language, using fully communicative, experiential techniques and message-oriented practice. Stern (1982, 1983b) also acknowledged being influenced by the work of the Council of Europe (see Wilkins, 1976, 1980) on the functional or notional approach in which the SL curriculum is determined by the contexts in which the target language will be used, subsequently identifying the functions or notions which the speaker is most likely to use. The linguistic content is determined by choosing the forms which are typically used to express such concepts.

1.4.2.2. *The National Core French Study: A Schwabian Analysis.*

I now turn to an analysis of Stern's multidimensional curriculum as it has been applied to core French in the NCFS. As stated above, I use Schwab's (1962) four commonplaces (subject matter, milieu, learner, teacher) as a framework for this analysis. This description served, in part, as the basis for the development of the multidimensional observation scheme (MOLT) used in the data collection stage of this project (see description below in Chapter 2).

Subject Matter

The four syllabuses of the NCFS constitute the subject matter of this multidimensional project-based curriculum model. I describe the objectives and content specifications of each syllabus separately for ease of presentation. However,

it is important to note that in their implementation, the syllabuses are not to be treated in isolation, but integrated such that they complement each other. Stern (1992) suggested that any of the syllabuses could be the starting point for the organization of the curriculum; however, the NCFS recommends that these four syllabuses be integrated into teaching units in which the communicative-experiential syllabus, via a final educational project, provides the experiences and contexts within which the integration takes place.

The overall general goal of all syllabuses of the NCFS is "the learning of French as a means of communication and the...general education of the student" (LeBlanc, 1990: 20). This objective was significantly influenced by Canale and Swain's (1980) and Canale's (1983) versions of communicative competence which include linguistic, sociolinguistic, discourse and strategic abilities when listening, reading, speaking, or writing in the target language. The objectives and content specifications for each syllabus are presented below:

a) Communicative-Experiential (C/E) Syllabus

Inspired in large measure by Stern's communicative activities syllabus and the success of French immersion programs in which language is learned through content like math and history (see, e.g., Genesee, 1987; Swain & Lapkin, 1982), the content of this syllabus is derived from what the authors of this syllabus (Tremblay, Duplantie & Huot, 1990) call *fields of experience*. These are "themes" which consider the life experiences, intellectual development and interests of the learners. However,

these fields of experiences do not include just any theme. In fact, Tremblay et al. (1990) argue:

The more we examined our list of themes, the more we realized that the very concept of theme was ill-suited for our purposes: a number of the themes listed had no place at all in a C/E syllabus.... We, therefore, decided to define our content in terms of fields of experience. By field of experience, we understand that aspect of reality on which the individual has already developed certain knowledge, patterns of behaviour, and attitudes (p.26).

The authors also argue that the fields of experience chosen must have educational value and should broaden the students' experience, thereby contributing to their general education (Tremblay et al., 1990: 25). They propose drawing from the following 5 dimensions for content choice:

- 1) Physical: This relates to the survival of individuals and their physical well-being encompassing fields of experience like nutrition, physical exercise and self-protection;
- 2) Social: This dimension refers to the students' social life including fields of experience like school, friends, family, relationships and social activities;
- 3) Civic: This pertains to human rights and social responsibilities and includes fields of experience such as consumerism, substance abuse, the environment, crime and violence;
- 4) Leisure: This dimension relates to students' use of free time and includes fields of experience like clubs and associations, travel and outdoor activities;

5) Intellectual: This involves fields of experience relating to "activities of the mind" like the sciences and the arts.

The principles of fields of experience are supported by Dewey's (1897, 1938) notion of curriculum which draws on the interests and capacities of the learners. Dewey would suggest that the overall education of the core French student will grow out of these fields of experience.

The general communicative objectives of this syllabus are stated in terms of students' abilities to comprehend oral and written messages, to negotiate meaning in authentic communicative exchange and to produce contextually appropriate oral and written messages which reflect their personal intentions (Tremblay et al., 1990, 20). The general experiential objectives of the syllabus relate to developing students' knowledge, behaviours and attitudes in relation to a variety of fields of experience. These objectives reflect Stern's vision (1983b) of a non-analytic syllabus and Rogers' (1969) ideas about experiential learning (see also Carver, 1996; Keeton, 1994; Keeton & Tate, 1978; Luckmann, 1996). Rogers believes that experiential learning is learning through personal involvement, self-initiation, pervasiveness and self-evaluation in meaningful tasks (p.5).

It is, in fact, these meaningful tasks, the methodology and the way teaching units are organized which characterize the pedagogical approach promoted by the NCFS (CASLT, 1994) and which expanded Stern's vision of a multidimensional curriculum model for SL teaching most dramatically. The general communicative and

experiential objectives of the syllabus will be met through students' active participation in an educationally valid project. This project is the focal point and defining characteristic of a multidimensional teaching approach (see Tremblay et al., 1990, 58-59; CASLT, 1994, 8-9). The project (also called the experiential goal) is clearly defined at the beginning of a unit of work so that students and teachers decide which activities will be most relevant to prepare them to complete this project. Activities (a series of tasks), included in a unit of work based on a field of experience, are therefore needs-based (CASLT, 1994, 8) because they are meant to prepare students for the completion of their project. This creates an authentic reason for learning.

Tremblay et al. (1990) also argue that students, especially more advanced learners, should be encouraged to define their projects, to make decisions regarding what they need to learn and research to complete their projects and to evaluate their progress and success (p.58).

b) Language Syllabus

The general objectives of this syllabus relate to students' ability to understand and produce correct and appropriate messages in French in authentic oral and written contexts (Painchaud, 1990,19). The content of the language syllabus (see Painchaud, 1990) concentrates on the grammatical, lexical, contextual and referential elements of language which are necessary to develop communicative skills in a natural context. The intention of the author of this syllabus was to extend the Chomskian notion

(1965) of language competence to reflect more closely Hymes' (1972) and Widdowson's (1978, 1981) distinction between linguistic knowledge (usage) and the ability to communicate using this knowledge (use).

The teaching approach for the language syllabus is analytical, but language study is meant to be contextualized within the situations created by the communicative-experiential syllabus. In other words, the language learned is needs-based, necessary to complete the educational project of the thematic unit being implemented in the core French class. This ensures a contextualized focus on form, congruent with the views of researchers like Harley (1989, 1993), Lyster (1993, 1994a, 1994b), and Spada and Lightbown (1993), who argue that although a focus on the message in communicative-experiential language teaching is important, a focus on form is also necessary to ensure the learner learns to communicate accurately.

c) Culture Syllabus

In this syllabus, culture is considered an integral part of the SL curriculum. This view corresponds to a near-consensus among SL pedagogues who include culture as an integral component in any SL program (see Lado, 1957; Moirand, 1982; Seelye, 1985; Stern, 1983a; Valdes, 1986). Although deciding upon the "best" definition of culture was difficult, the authors of this syllabus (LeBlanc, Courtel & Trescases, 1990) decided to adopt Debyser's (1981) perspective which includes the anthropological, sociological and semiotic nature of civilization. The general

objectives of the culture syllabus relate to students' understanding and appreciation of culture and language as well as multicultural diversity in their communities and in the francophone world (LeBlanc et al., 1990, 19-22). The teaching objectives of the culture syllabus focus on developing educational experiences to learn about present-day francophone culture, with an emphasis on the French element in Canada. In addition, the learners are encouraged to make comparisons with their own culture, and to critically analyze ethnic diversity and cultural stereotypes, in order to personalize the process of inquiry. The prescribed pedagogical approach ranges from simple sensitization to interpretation, analysis, understanding and finally actualization wherein the goal is "living" the culture (LeBlanc et al., 1990, 68-73). Students are encouraged, where possible, to offer a francophone perspective on the topic of their educational projects. Teaching units may also be organized such that the educational project has a cultural focus (see, e.g., Turnbull, 1996).

d) General Language Education Syllabus

The general language education syllabus is an inventory of linguistic, cultural and strategies content designed to help SL learning as well as to contribute to the overall general education of the learner. This syllabus aims to develop in the learner an awareness of the realities of language, culture and society, and language learning strategies so that students understand how these realities and strategies relate to the students' language learning experiences. This syllabus is not only focussed on the French language in particular, but on all languages. The content of the general

language education syllabus was highly influenced by the work of Hawkins (1981, 1984) who argues for the importance of building bridges between the first and target language in order to foster the learner's understanding of the role of language in society. Hawkins seeks to reduce prejudices while creating interest for languages in general through a variety of activities examining the nature of language, aspects of linguistic structure, language in use, language varieties and comparisons, and finally, first and SL acquisition. The author of this syllabus (Hébert, 1990) also suggests that the idea of general language education is supported by a Vygotskian perspective as interpreted by Wertsch (1985). Wertsch clearly articulated the link between communication, culture and cognition using Vygotsky's ideas on the social development of the child. According to Vygotsky (1962), a child constructs knowledge first through social interaction and second on an intrapsychological (cognitive) level through appropriation. Vygotsky (1962) argues that this developmental process is similar for voluntary attention, logical memory, concept formation and the development of desires. Hébert (1990) suggests that efforts made through a general language education syllabus to establish linkages among language, culture and cognition will contribute significantly to the overall educational development of the SL learner.

Hébert (1990, 73-79) suggests that the objectives of this syllabus be integrated within the activities which prepare students to complete an educational project. These activities might include reflection on learning and establishing strategies and

corrective measures as they arise to prepare for the educational project. Hébert also suggests that the General Language Education syllabus could be the starting point for organizing a multidimensional project-based teaching unit.

Milieu

Connelly and Clandinin (1988) suggest that curricular milieu is multidimensional. It is comprised of layers of overlapping contexts (King, 1994) that shape and are shaped by the curriculum. The ideas of Connelly and Clandinin and King are congruent with Schwab's (1962) reference to a plurality of curricular milieux. This multidimensionality or plurality of milieux in the core French classroom are created by the integration of four syllabuses with distinct objectives but a common overall goal, that is, SL communicative competence and the overall education of the learners.

The living and learning milieu of the core French classroom

The experiential emphasis of the multidimensional project-based curriculum transforms the classroom into a living and learning space for the learners and the teacher. Tremblay et al. (1990) underscore the importance of a supportive classroom environment which encourages respect for the opinions, feelings and problems of others. This creates a sort of affective haven in which the "affective filter" (Krashen, 1982) or inhibitions are relaxed. In fact, such affective relaxation has been claimed to have a positive effect upon language learning success (see also Lambert & Gardner, 1972; Schumann, 1978). The supportive classroom reflects the ideas of

Moskowitz (1978) on "caring and sharing in the foreign language classroom" and, in a broader context, Wells' (1981) idea of "communities of inquiry."

The physical set-up of the core French classroom: a flexible milieu

Tremblay et al. (1990) also suggest that the physical set up of the multidimensional core French classroom must be flexible to allow for different types of activities, especially different groupings of students. In fact, they recommend collaborative learning as an important teaching strategy to promote interaction and SL learning. This use of collaborative learning is supported theoretically because it allows students to be exposed to more comprehensible input⁴ (Krashen, 1982) and more opportunities to talk or produce output (Swain, 1985, 1993, 1995a, 1997). Furthermore, as indicated above, according to Vygotskian learning theory, collaborative learning promotes social interaction, which Vygotsky argues is the foundation for the construction of knowledge. Swain (1995a, 1997) and Kowal and Swain (1994, 1997) have shown in their research with French immersion students that collaborative learning promotes students' language awareness which pushes them beyond their present level of language development. Moreover, McGroarty (1993)

⁴ Some may argue that although students working in groups may be exposed to more or different qualities of comprehensible input, this input is undoubtedly less accurate than that of the teacher. However, many others (see, e.g., Kagan & Widaman, 1987) argue that allowing students to produce more language will facilitate accurate L2 production far more than limiting students to formal accurate input from only one source. Some may also argue that students' production will be even more inaccurate when working in groups, when the teacher cannot monitor and correct what they say. However, Long & Porter (1985) cite Porter (1983) who showed that this was not the case in a study of adult learners learning Spanish.

claims that collaborative groupings are superior to individualistic learning structures by providing redundancy that is important for language learning, cognitive growth and mastery of cognitively demanding content. This redundant support may indeed be especially important in the core French milieu where the cognitive and/or linguistic demands of the subject matter (or fields of experience) are likely to surpass the SL proficiency of the students, especially in the beginning.

The authentic milieu of the core French classroom

Dewey (1897, 1938) suggests that school must represent real life. In the same vein, the authors of the NCFS (LeBlanc, 1990; Tremblay et al., 1990) advocate the creation of authenticity in the classroom, not only through real experience in an educational project but also through the use of materials designed for native speakers of the target language which reflect their language and culture. This idea of authenticity includes using French as much as possible in the classroom. This intralingual strategy is supported by many researchers and curriculum designers who suggest that L2 learning will be more effective if overt use of the learner's first language is avoided as much as possible (Krashen, 1982; Omaggio, 1986; Rinvoluceri, 1984). However, Tremblay et al. (1990) recognize that an exclusively intralingual core French classroom, especially in the early stages of a learner's SL development, may be difficult to achieve. Consequently, they suggest teaching the learners communication strategies such as circumlocution (Berry-Bravo, 1993; Oxford, 1990)

and survival vocabulary (Cashman, 1988) as part of the general language education syllabus.

Core French milieux beyond the classroom

In addition, it is important that the activities of the core French classroom extend beyond its four walls. The core French milieux can include other classes (such as French immersion or neighbouring core classes) as well as institutions and individuals outside school (e.g., a francophone centre, language partners). This will foster authentic cultural contact which is designed to be an integral component of the core French milieux.

Learner

The role of the learner in a multidimensional project-based curriculum is central. Like Schwab (1962), who refers to the creative child actively involved in enquiry, the authors of the NCFS (LeBlanc, 1990; Tremblay et al., 1990) refer to the learner as an active participant in the creative process of learning. As an active participant, the learner will become fully aware of the objectives of the overall thematic unit, the final project and the activities (or tasks) designed to prepare students for its completion. Tremblay et al. (1990) suggest that the learner is responsible for, and in control of, the learning process; ideally students and teachers negotiate choice of themes, final projects, activities and assessment criteria. The overall curriculum should be designed so that the learner plays a variety of roles

including observer, problem solver, risk-taker, team member, information processor and negotiator. This learner-entered language curriculum reflects a paradigm shift in education, recognizing the learner's input in the educational process. The concept of learner autonomy has been advocated by many educators, including Breen (1983, 1989), the Council of Europe (1981), Dickinson (1987), and Holec (1981, 1985, 1987). Here, the learners must be accountable for their own learning, are involved in negotiating classroom activities, and not merely passive recipients of information. In a similar vein, this echoes research from an experiential (e.g., Luckmann, 1996; Carver, 1996) and constructivist point of view (e.g., Delay, 1996; von Glaserfeld, 1995); these authors all refer to the importance of students determining or negotiating what and how they will learn.

Furthermore, as indicated above, the subject matter of the entire multidimensional project-based curriculum will be determined by the interests, needs, habits and past experiences of the learners. As Dewey (1897, 1938) would suggest, the past experiences of the learner are the basis for future growth; school should take up and continue the activities with which the child is already familiar.

Teacher

Schwab's (1962) conception of the multiple roles of the teacher (e.g., expert, task-master, inquisitor, source of emotional welfare) is analogous to the ideas of Tremblay et al. (1990) who suggest that core French teachers have a

multidimensional role as facilitator, animator, negotiator, instructor, diagnostician, language model and stimulator. Their function will be determined by the demands and nature of the classroom activity. This multiple role extends therefore beyond the passive recipient of mandated policy and curriculum guidelines. Consequently, the teacher becomes what Clandinin and Connelly (1992) refer to as the "curriculum maker", an active creator and integral part of the curriculum. Just as the students' interests, needs, habits and past experiences are important in the multidimensional project-based core French curriculum, so are those of the teacher. Their intersection provides for a rich and authentic learning environment. Moreover, although learner autonomy is crucial, the ultimate responsibility for curriculum lies with teachers. They must manipulate the subject matter and language learning milieu so that the learners become engaged in educationally valid experiences. This complex role reflects the ideas of Dewey (1897, 1938), who suggests that the teacher is in some ways a social servant, involved not only, in this case, in the SL training of the learners, but also in the development of their social identities.

1.4.2.3. Project-based learning

Project-based learning is the guiding pedagogical principle of the multidimensional curriculum model proposed by the NCFS (LeBlanc, 1990; CASLT, 1994). In 1990, Tremblay et al. offered a "working definition" of a SL educational project:

A unit of work involving constructive thought and action in connection with learning...including a goal, a series of actions (activities or tasks) and a pre-defined sequence. (pp.58-59)

CASLT (1994:9-11) proposed a model for organizing instructional units which presents a clearly defined project (or experiential goal) at the outset of a teaching unit. This project creates the need to know certain language elements and the need to practice certain communicative situations to successfully complete the final project. It also provides an interesting and authentic context for the integration of cultural and general language education content related to the students' project. The activities or tasks of the units are sequenced in such a way as to lead the students step-by-step to the final project. The beginning step of any unit is designed to allow students and teachers to pool their pre-existing knowledge (linguistic and content) of the topic area for the unit. The goal of the beginning step of any unit also involves stimulating students' interests and motivation for the topic. In the beginning stages, students and teachers also agree on the final project and identify together which elements of French they will need and which activities or tasks will be most helpful or enriching for project completion. The final phase of a project-based unit involves student presentations (oral and written) of their final products and reflection on learning, successes and difficulties encountered during the unit.

This approach to project-based learning resembles and has been influenced by work in other second and foreign language contexts as well as by literature on

project-based learning in other subject areas. For example, Fried-Booth (1986) describes an ESL program in Bath, England, which is entered around the completion of a series of tasks, outside the classroom in contact with native speakers of English. These tasks lead to the students' final project: creating a wheel-chair guide for the city of Bath. Fried-Booth (1986) also suggests that development of language skills and knowledge are not imposed by the teacher or a syllabus but arise out of the authentic communicative needs created by the project.

Legutke and Thomas (1991:160) define project-work as "a theme and task-entered mode of teaching and learning which results from a joint process of negotiation between all participants." They emphasize that project-based SL learning is deeply rooted in Dewey's ideas about democracy and participation in education. They refer to a "jointly constructed and negotiated plan of action (p.158)" in which a group of learners, guided by their teacher, gathers information about the topic of their project, learn and practice language structures, lexis or skills they need for the project, prepare and present their final product (which they refer to as the target task) and plan and monitor the process, their progress and the product. They refer to 1) "Project Airport" (Legutke, 1984) in which FL learners explore the communicative use of English and other foreign languages at an international airport near Frankfurt, Germany; 2) A project in the Giessen/Frankfurt area in Germany in which students meet with, interview and describe the experiences of Americans living in the area

(Legutke, 1984).

The research literature related to the effectiveness of project-based learning in SL contexts is limited. Legutke and Thomas (1991) refer to documented accounts of classroom procedures and project experiments in case studies reviewed (in German) by Edelhoff and Liebau (1988), Legutke (1988) and Schiffler (1980). Others offer informal teacher accounts of their experiences with project-based learning (e.g., Carter, 1985b; Carter & Thomas, 1986; Petronio, 1985; Turner, 1987). Blumenfeld, Soloway, Marx, Krajcik, Guzdial and Palincsar (1991) review empirical research and theory related to task-based and project-based learning in other disciplines like science, technology and law. They link project-based work to student motivation and cognitive engagement in schoolwork (citing, for example, Ames & Archer, 1988; Nolen, 1989; Pokay & Blumenfeld, 1990). They argue that project-based learning provides contexts for co-construction of knowledge, key principles and concepts.

In summary, Stern's (1982, 1983b) multidimensional curriculum, and its adaptation by the NCFS (1990; CASLT, 1994) as a project-based model, make theoretical and intuitive sense but research is required to verify the curriculum model empirically.

1.4.3. Previous Research

In this section, I first examine a seminal paper in FSL education in which

Lapkin, Harley and Taylor (1993) propose research directions for core French programs. I then review four empirical studies which are relevant to my thesis project. The first, *The Core French Observation Study* (Allen, Carroll, Burtis & Gaudino, 1987) compared the effect of experiential and analytic instructional techniques on French achievement. The second, *The North York Board of Education Core French Review* (Calman, 1988; Calman & Daniel, 1998), was a system-wide evaluation of the implementation and effectiveness of the elementary core French program in a large metropolitan school board in Ontario. The final two (Lewis, 1995, 1998; Hart, Lapkin & Harley, 1996) examined the implementation of multidimensional project-based curricula in core French.

Although many other studies have been conducted in core French contexts (see Foley et al., 1988), these four are the most directly related to my study. The bulk of the others compare core and immersion French programs (e.g., Barik & Swain, 1975; Genesee, 1981). A few examine issues like time allotment per day in core French (Lapkin, Harley & Hart, 1995; Pawley & Bonyun, 1981; Stennett & Issacs, 1979), program supplements such as cultural exchanges in a francophone region (e.g., Gardner, Smythe & Brunet, 1977; Hanna, Smith, McLean & Stern, 1980), student characteristics (Bialystok & Fröhlich, 1977; Naiman, Fröhlich, Stern & Todesco, 1978), factors affecting enrolment in core French (e.g., Durward, 1983; Heffernan, 1981), teacher characteristics (e.g., Marrin-McConnell, 1978; Shapson,

Kaufman & Durward, 1978), and development and validation of tests and materials (e.g., New Brunswick Department of Education, 1979; Stern, Ullmann, Balchunas, Hanna, Scheiderman & Argue, 1980). Though these studies may be interesting, they contributed little to the rationale for my study.

1.4.3.1. Research Directions for Core French

Lapkin, Harley and Taylor (1993) review empirical studies in core French and propose research directions in four main topic areas: program design, program objectives and outcomes, curriculum issues and teacher education. These authors argue that "the traditional format of core French has imposed limitations on the kinds of objectives that were envisaged and the instructional approaches that could be accommodated....the time has come to experiment with the structure and delivery of core French programs" (p.477). They suggest research to examine program designs which would allow for more intensive, initial exposure to French instruction. They question whether existing program objectives and outcomes are accurate reflections of what can be achieved in core French programs. This question is linked to investigating whether core French programs can/do provide students with a "threshold of proficiency and strategic competence" which make it possible and desirable to continue studying French or "relearn" it easily (p.494). Similarly, they call for studies to determine if a "strong, well implemented culture syllabus" (p.491) will make students more empathetic and understanding of French Canadians. In terms

of teacher education, the authors call for research to study the "distinctive" features of core French teacher education. They also address the level of French proficiency required to deliver core French programs which reflect the principles of the NCFES.

The most relevant section of the Lapkin, Harley and Taylor (1993) article for my study relates to curriculum issues in core French. They call for research to examine the multidimensional approach as well as core French teaching techniques and resources. Three of the questions they posed are addressed by my study:

Does an experientially based multidimensional core French curriculum lead to improved language proficiency compared with a traditional grammar-based approach? (p.496).

Does the multidimensional approach lead to more satisfactory outcomes with respect to other core French curriculum goals (affective, cultural, strategic, experiential)? (p.496).

How do teachers implement thematically organized, experientially oriented SL texts and materials in the core French classroom? (p. 500).

The authors also question what is the most appropriate balance of experiential and analytic language content for core French programs. The study that follows next echoes the need for such research.

1.4.3.2. The Core French Observation Study

The aim of this study (Allen, Carroll, Burtis & Gaudino, 1987) was to relate instructional differences in core French classes to SL outcomes. Eight grade 11 core French classes from the metropolitan Toronto area were preselected, with the help of board personnel, based on the perception that they reflected a range of SL

instructional techniques. The students in all classes completed the following pre-tests: a multiple-choice grammar test, two written production tasks - a formal and informal letter (scored for discourse and sociolinguistic features), a multiple-choice global listening comprehension test and an oral interview (administered to a sub-sample of students from each class), scored using grammatical, sociolinguistic and discourse features. The classes were observed four times during the school year during which an observer coded (in real-time) Part A of the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme (Allen, Fröhlich & Spada, 1984; Fröhlich, Spada & Allen, 1985; Spada & Fröhlich, 1995), which includes a list of indicators of communicative classroom activity such as a focus on meaning and group work interaction, student involvement in curriculum decisions, four skills (listening, speaking, reading and writing) development and the use of extended authentic texts. A timed sample of the transcripts/tape recordings of the classroom observations was coded using Part B of the COLT observation scheme (indicators of communicative features of teacher-student interaction). The same tests mentioned above were administered to all classes at the end of the school year.

Using the analysis of both Part A and B of the observation scheme, the classes were ranked on a bi-polar composite scale from 'most experiential' to 'most analytic'. Although none of the classes was categorized as completely 'experiential' or 'analytic', two classes were classified as 'high' communicative or Type-E (experiential) groups

and the other four were classified as 'low' communicative or Type-A (analytic) groups. Classroom observations using the COLT were supplemented by teacher questionnaires which solicited information on classroom activities during the year.

The test results indicated no significant differences between Type-E and Type-A classes on any measure. When the two most experiential Type-E classes were compared to the two most analytic Type-A classes, the latter did significantly better on the multiple-choice grammar test, the use of the conditional in the formal letter-writing task and they provided a better rationale and closing for this letter. Correlations calculated between the COLT categories and the test scores were not statistically significant but suggested some positive relationship between proficiency and extended writing, information gap activities, students' reaction to messages and students' ability to incorporate topics into their discourse.

The authors of this study (Allen, Carroll, Burtis & Gaudino, 1987) recommended that in future research, the COLT be combined with more detailed discourse analyses to view more closely how meaning is negotiated in the classrooms. This recommendation comes from a qualitative analysis completed of the transcripts of the two most experiential Type-E classes involved in this study. It was discovered that one of them recorded the greatest overall gains in French proficiency of any of the classes, whereas the other made the least overall gains. This qualitative analysis revealed that the high-gain Type-E class was characterized by frequent

communicatively-rich interaction, involving feedback and negotiation of meaning. The students in the low-gain Type-E class received less feedback and spent more time on stereotyped routines.

In my thesis study, I included considerably more observation time (about ten classes per teacher) in an attempt to make a more reliable assessment of the instructional characteristics of the classrooms which I observed. In my estimation, observing four class periods is inadequate to make a reliable assessment of the nature of any classroom, even when these observations are supplemented by teacher questionnaires.

1.4.3.3. The North York Board of Education Core French Review

This evaluation study (Calman, 1988; Calman & Daniel, 1998) aimed to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the elementary (grades 3-8) core French program in this large urban school board. The scope of the study was broad, including questions about resources and student learning materials available to teachers, program implementation (focussing on program content, teaching strategies and student evaluation), administrative practices, staffing issues, parental perceptions of the program, program outcomes and professional development needs (for more details see Calman, 1988; Calman & Daniel, 1998). In this review, I focus on the following three issues most relevant to my study: resources and student learning materials available to teachers, program implementation and student outcomes.

Data were collected using a variety of techniques including focus group interviews with small groups of teachers, principals and parents, teacher and principal questionnaires, classroom observation and follow-up interviews and testing of students' listening comprehension. The focus groups provided an opportunity to solicit participants' opinions related to the study's goals in relative depth. These sessions provided the basis for the development of the teacher/principal questionnaires. The latter were distributed to all elementary core French teachers and to all their principals. The questionnaires for teachers solicited opinions on topics like the adequacy of resource documents and student learning materials, program effectiveness, staffing issues, supervision and support as well as professional development. Questionnaires for principals included many of the topics addressed in the teacher questionnaire as well as integration of French into the overall curriculum, time tabling, budget and staffing concerns as well as teacher and program evaluation by principals. Classroom observations were conducted in 41 grade 5 and 31 grade 8 classes. The focus of these observation sessions was program content, teaching strategies, use of instructional materials, student interest as well as teachers' command and use of French. Each observation lasted one class period and was followed by an interview with the teacher during which there was a discussion of the lesson as well as topics including student evaluation, cultural objectives and integration of exceptional and ESL students into the class. The two researcher-observers used an

observation scheme, based on criteria for an effective core French program as outlined in board and ministerial curriculum documents. This observation scheme described a range of core French practices, ranging from ideal to unacceptable. Finally, the listening comprehension of the grade 8 students was formally assessed using a 37-item multiple choice test, based on the *Ontario Assessment Instrument Pool for French as a Second Language* (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1980). Information about student achievement in other skill areas was collected from the teacher questionnaires.

Results indicate that the teachers were generally satisfied with the quality of the curriculum guidelines and other curriculum documents. They did, however, indicate a need to include cultural objectives in teacher resource documents and student learning materials.

When the implemented curriculum, as documented through observation, questionnaire and interview data, was compared to the guidelines prescribed by the board and ministry, the following results were noted:

1. Consistent with the board and ministry guidelines, more time was spent on listening and speaking than reading or writing. However, at both grade 5 and 8, the greatest difference between the prescribed and implemented curriculum was in speaking; students were spending less time speaking than recommended. More time was dedicated to

reading and writing at grade 8 than in the earlier grades.

2. A majority of the teachers reported that they did not cover the cultural objectives in their classes. This corresponds to the results of observations which showed that a large majority of the classes observed paid no attention to culture at all.

3. Observation data relating to teaching strategies indicated a wide range of instructional practices in classes at both grade 5 and grade 8. However, in a majority of classes at both grades (56% at grade 5; 74% at grade 8), students' use of spoken French was limited to either drill-type activities or no French was spoken.

4. The use of a variety of student groupings was an area which differed significantly (especially at the grade 8 level) from the prescribed guidelines which suggested a balance of whole class, small group and individual activities. In grade 5, 37% of the observed classes conformed to the prescribed ideal whereas only 6% did so at grade 8. About half (48%) of the classes observed in grade 8 conducted all activities as a whole class.

5. A wide range of student-centeredness was observed in classes at both grade levels. At least one indicator of student-entered learning was observed in 85% of grade 5 classes and in 68% of grade 8 classes.

No indicators were observed in 32% of the grade 8 classes and no classes at this grade level exhibited the 'ideal' number of indicators (9 or more).

6. A wide range of formal and communicative foci was observed in both grades. Only 32% of grade 5 classes and 19% at grade 8 presented lessons with either a communicative orientation or one with a balance of communicative language experiences and formal language experiences. An exclusive focus on formal language practice was observed in 22% of grade 5 classes and 42% at grade 8.

7. Although observation data indicated a wide range in teacher use of French during class, a majority of teachers in the classes observed (58% at grade 5; 83% at grade 8) used an unacceptable amount of English.

The teachers' perceptions of student progress in listening, reading, writing and the development of learning skills pertinent to language study indicated that they were in keeping with program objectives. However, teachers expressed concerns that students were not progressing according to these objectives in speaking and cultural knowledge. In addition, the grade 8 listening test results indicated that student progress in listening comprehension was generally on target (62% of students' scores fell within the pre-established target range of 74-82% on the listening test).

It is obvious from the data reported in this study that a wide range of instructional strategies existed in the core French classes observed. I presume that one would likely find a similar range of instructional strategies in other school boards. Although the criteria used to describe the classes in this study were not reflective of the NCFS, I suggest that a similar range of multidimensional project-based teaching practices exists in core French classes in which the prescribed curriculum reflects the NCFS recommendations. The two studies that I describe below support this hypothesis.

1.4.3.4. Teachers' Experiences with a Multidimensional Project-Based Curriculum

Lewis (1995, 1998) offers an interpretation of the experiences and knowledge of a group of nine female core French teachers, and herself over a two-year period, as they made sense of a new multidimensional project-based core French curriculum. The study was conducted in a large school board in British Columbia, Canada. The researcher constructed the narratives of nine teachers based on the following three sources of data: 1) an individual interview at the beginning, middle and end of the study; 2) transcriptions and field notes from five meetings with the whole group; 3) field notes reflecting two visits by the researcher to each participant's classroom. The participants also visited each others' classrooms, and articulating reactions from these visits became part of the group meetings. All the teachers had at least five years of teaching experience; six were teaching at the secondary level and the others in grades

5 though 7.

Lewis reports that the implementation of the new multidimensional project-based core French curriculum required these teachers to continually integrate and reassess their beliefs about the mandated program, their personal life experiences and their personal theories and practices about language learning and teaching. Lewis (1998: 253) refers to the teachers being " a little off balance in the midst of certain tensions." These tensions related to the continual challenge to their assumptions about what learning French was all about; working within a multidimensional project-based core French curriculum meant a much more complex role for teachers and students. Lewis and her participants conclude that working within a multidimensional project-based curriculum may require teachers to pay more attention to the affective factors in language learning. Ongoing tension was reported surrounding the teachers' attempts to take risks in order to create more affectively engaging contexts for language learning in their classes. This involved a change in practice for most of the teachers. They reported that this was perhaps the most important aspect of the new curriculum but it was also challenging to implement effectively. Tensions were also reported relating to the complex meaning of *negotiation* which evolved. These teachers reported recreating the curriculum based on real negotiation with students about evaluation processes and learning activities, which made the students more engaged and interested in their learning. Lewis also

reported that these teachers found themselves struggling with their new and more complex roles; they were required to take risks and commit themselves to change as they shared control of their classroom with students.

This study is the first I know of that addresses the new multidimensional project-based curriculum in core French since the publication of the NCFS in 1990. It is particularly relevant for me because it suggests that teachers are at different stages of acceptance of the new curriculum. Consequently, I assume that varying degrees of multidimensionality will be evident in different core French classes, depending upon the experiences and the way each individual teacher interprets the prescribed curriculum. Moreover, I believe that one of the reasons for this variation in acceptance by teachers of the multidimensional project-based curriculum is the lack of research basis for it.

1.4.3.5. The Alberta FSL Study

The Alberta FSL study (Hart, Lapkin & Harley, 1996) evaluated the extent to which the new multidimensional project-based curriculum in core French (introduced in September, 1993, in Alberta) was being implemented in this Canadian province. It also identified program needs for the following five years. This study included two stages, the first targeted at administrators and the second at classroom teachers. The responses from the administrative questionnaires were used, in part, to create the surveys used with the teachers.

Administrator Survey

Questionnaires were sent to administrators in all school districts in the province. The response rate was 81%. The following topics were addressed in the questionnaire: 1) Perceptions of the extent of implementation of the new curriculum (relating to the classroom and professional development); 2) Overall assessments of implementation of the new curriculum; 3) Perceptions of teachers' views on workload, support, needs and outcomes as well as their assessments of the new curriculum and its implementation; 4) Factors affecting implementation; 5) Future changes required. The following findings are the most relevant to my study:

- Administrators in about a third of the school districts felt that most beginning level teachers were basing most of their instruction on the new multidimensional project-based curriculum. Another fifth of respondents indicated that some teachers were doing so. A similar number felt this was the case at the intermediate level. However, at the advanced level, reported levels of implementation were substantially lower (however, some school boards had not yet begun to offer the new program at the advanced level).
- Results from the section in which successes and problems of the implementation process were indicated suggest that there were varying opinions and stages of implementation of the new multidimensional

project-based program. The most frequent indicators mentioned, whether of success or of problems in implementation, concerned the satisfaction/dissatisfaction of teachers, students and/or parents. Good or improved student performance was cited quite frequently as an indicator of success but poor performance was rarely cited as an indicator of problems.

- An almost equal number of administrators reported that teachers believed the new program either eases or increases their workload (46% easier, 41% more difficult).
- There was little consensus among administrators concerning the adequacy of the support documents and professional development provided by the Alberta Ministry of Education to facilitate the implementation of the new program.
- There was little consensus concerning the impact of the new program on student outcomes in French.
- About two thirds of the respondents thought that most teachers were at least somewhat positive about the new program. However, only about 40% of them thought that they were at least somewhat positive about the implementation process.

Teacher survey

Of the 2000 FSL (core French) teachers in Alberta, 40% returned a completed questionnaire. These participants were teaching at all levels of the FSL program in Alberta, with the highest proportion of participants being from the beginning and intermediate levels. Only 10% of the respondents were teaching at the advanced level. The following results are the most relevant for the present study:

- A majority of participants (62.5%) indicated they were very confident of their French language skills to meet the demands of the new FSL program. Only 8% of the participants indicated that they were not very confident in their skills.
- Teachers' reactions to the new FSL program were mixed. About half of the teachers (45-50%, depending on the level) considered the new program a big improvement over the former program. The participating teachers were equally mixed in their assessment of the new program's impact on student learning; more teachers at the advanced level, than at the beginning or intermediate levels, disagreed that the new program was improving student learning of French.
- Teachers were quite uncertain about whether students liked the new program more than the former program.
- A majority of participants (61%) reported having changed the way

they teach either a great deal or a moderate amount. A similar percentage of participants reported having changed the curriculum content, their evaluation practices and their expectations for students either a great deal or a moderate amount.

- Teaching grammar and correct usage in the new program was an area upon which teachers were divided. A majority of intermediate and advanced level teachers (52% and 60% respectively) disagreed that the new program puts enough focus on teaching grammar and correct usage. Forty percent of beginning level teachers concurred with this opinion.

- A majority of participants at all teaching levels disagreed that too much emphasis is put on oral skills in the new program.

- Although opinions varied, a majority of teachers at all levels assessed the implementation process positively (giving it a grade of either A or B). When asked to assess how other teachers in their school district felt about the implementation process, responses were less positive. At the beginning and intermediate levels, more teachers perceived other colleagues to have positive feelings about the implementation process (although not a majority). However, the situation was reversed with advanced level teachers: more of them

perceived colleagues' opinions of the implementation process to be negative.

The results from this study indicate a wide range of opinions on the new FSL program. I infer that one is likely to find that teachers in Alberta vary significantly in the ways their core French classes reflect the principles of the multidimensional curriculum. I would assume that this is likely to be the case in other provinces as well.

1.5. Summary

The rationale for my study is based simultaneously on personal SL classroom experience, theory and previous research. My philosophy on SL teaching and learning, inspired largely by the multidimensional project-based curriculum (Stern, 1982, 1983b; NCFS, 1990) as a planning framework for SL programming, needs to be empirically tested.

The results from four previous research studies conducted in core French also support the rationale for the current study:

1) Allen, Carroll, Burtis and Gaudino (1987) examined how teachers, whose approach was described as either experiential or analytical, influenced student outcomes in core French. They found no statistically significant differences between the groups on any test measure. A similar study should be replicated in core French classes which are implementing curriculum based on Stern's multidimensional model

and the NCFS. Furthermore, this replication study must include more than four one-hour observation periods in order to capture an accurate picture of each teacher's pedagogical approach.

2) The *North York Board of Education Core French Review* (Calman, 1988; Calman et al., 1998) documented a wide range of instructional strategies in 41 core French classrooms observed. For example, teachers spent more time on listening and speaking activities than reading and writing. In addition, teachers spent less time on speaking activities than recommended by board and ministry guidelines. A majority of teachers reported that they ignore cultural activities in their classes. A wide range of student groupings and student-centeredness was observed. In addition, a majority of teachers used an unacceptable amount of English in their classes. These data were collected in classes in which programs did not reflect the NCFS. Although it seems logical that a wide range of classroom practice will be found when observing a number of teachers following any curriculum⁵, my study will verify such pedagogical variation in programs to which the principles of the NCFS have been applied.

3) Lewis's (1995, 1998) study reported the experiences of nine female core French teachers as they came to terms with the multidimensional project-based core French curriculum that is prescribed in British Columbia. Lewis described the tensions these teachers experienced as they experimented and struggled with the demands and

⁵ See Beretta (1992) and Freeman and Richards (1993) for reviews of method comparison studies which support this hypothesis.

changes which accompanied this new curriculum. Lewis's study documented different levels of acceptance of this new SL curriculum, which are likely to exist in other jurisdictions. Furthermore, I suggest that one of the reasons for teachers' tension and skepticism regarding this new curriculum is the lack of empirical evidence which links it to positive student outcomes.

4) The Alberta FSL study (Hart et al., 1996) surveyed both administrators and teachers involved in the implementation of the new FSL (core French) programs in that province. These new programs are based largely on the NCFES. Participants in the survey indicated a wide range of opinions and acceptance of the new programs. A near majority of the teachers were uncertain about whether the program was improving student learning. Similarly, many of the teachers surveyed were quite uncertain about whether students liked the new program more than the former one. I presume that similar attitudes exist amongst teachers in other provinces. I would hope that the empirical evidence provided by my study will help confirm or disconfirm such teacher opinion, wherever it may be found, and will contribute to effective program implementation.

Chapter 2

Participants and Methods

This chapter, divided into three main sections, describes the research design, the participants and the methods for this case study. The first section reviews the research design for the study. Section 2 describes the participants. In the third section, the procedure for the study is described, including details about the instruments used for data collection (questionnaires, tests, classroom observation scheme), the coding and analysis of the observation data and the quantitative analyses of the test and questionnaire data.

2.1. Research Design

A case study approach is most appropriate to capture what Johnson (1992) refers to as a "careful and holistic" (p.76) view of the classes I observed. The unit of analysis is the core French teacher's classroom practices. In my study, I focus on four teachers working in their own classrooms. I describe their teaching processes using an observation scheme (MOLT) based on the multidimensional curriculum as a

theoretical framework and project-based experiential learning as the guiding pedagogical principle. Anecdotal field-notes on the teachers' classrooms, students and teaching approaches complement the data collected with the observation scheme. Product data were collected from the students in these four classes. Students completed pre- and post-tests of overall French proficiency, pre- and post-questionnaires, and achievement tests based on the objectives and activities of the classroom activity during the observation period. Students' French proficiency and achievement as well as affective, cultural and strategic objectives were compared across classes (using ANOVA, Tukey *a*, ANCOVA) according to their teacher's pedagogical approach.

2.1.2. Program Evaluation

Although my intention from the outset was not to evaluate a whole program but to explore the relationship between multidimensional project-based core French teaching and student outcomes, in considering the many definitions of program evaluation which exist (Alderson & Beretta, 1992; Cumming, 1987; Eisner, 1984; Fetterman, 1988; Guba & Lincoln, 1989; Lynch, 1996), it is possible to say that my study could fall loosely into one or more of them. However, I aim to establish that my thesis study does not meet the criteria of a proper program evaluation. Moreover, it is important that the results of this study are not interpreted as such.

Lynch (1996:1) suggests that program evaluation may take many forms,

including asking students to rate their language courses, teacher questionnaires, achievement tests administered at the beginning and end of a program or visits from a language teaching expert from another institution who prepares a report of the program's strengths and weaknesses.

Beretta (1992:9) examines 33 studies which he calls method evaluations. He points out significant variation in them, especially in terms of the duration of the studies, the number of participants involved, randomization of participants, research methods and control of the teacher variable.

Stern (1992) and Shapson (1990) refer to differences between summative and formative program evaluations; the former aim at policy decisions whereas the latter focus on every phase of program implementation in order to help improve delivery. As part of the NCFS (1990:62-63), in fact, Shapson calls for "multisite qualitative policy research" to examine the implementation of multidimensional project-based core French programs across Canada. He also recommends that a number of descriptive, naturalistic case studies, which examine the same evaluation questions, be undertaken in a variety of core French contexts so that a strong basis for generalizing findings can be created.

Both Alderson (1992) and Lynch (1996) set out guidelines for evaluation of language programs. The first step is to negotiate the purpose of the study with the sponsors (funding agency) who request the evaluation. From there, the content, the

methodology for data collection and analysis, evaluators, the timing and the communication of findings are determined. This first guideline disqualifies my study as a proper program evaluation. First of all, I do not have a sponsor for this study. Second, although I did consult staff at the Ministry of Education in P.E.I., I did not negotiate the purpose of the study. I arrived with a pre-determined agenda. However, as I explain below, I did respond to some of their concerns about test content and administration.

Furthermore, since we have no way to know if the four core French classes (teachers and students) in this study are representative of teachers and students in Canadian core French programs in general, this study should not be considered an evaluation of these programs. Moreover, although I do use a variety of research techniques which are characteristic of program evaluations, my sample is small and not at all randomly chosen.

2.2. The Participants

This section includes a description of how the four teacher participants were recruited and selected for the study. This is followed by a characterization of the four teachers and their students.

2.2.1. Recruitment and Selection of Teachers

Teacher participants were recruited at a province-wide inservice session for core French teachers in P.E.I. in April, 1996. Following a short description of my

study, the participating core French teachers completed a short questionnaire designed to assess their willingness to participate (see Appendix A). The survey also included questions concerning their first language, amount of teaching experience, and a preliminary self-assessment of their French skills; teachers were also asked to give a global description of the format, structure, content, materials, lessons and activities of their core French classes. The information gleaned from this questionnaire helped me to make an initial list of potential participants. For this initial list, I wanted to select three teachers who described their teaching approaches as multidimensional and project-based. I wanted three others who described their approaches as principally unidimensional and grammar-based. From these six teachers, I intended to choose four participants to participate in the study. Pedagogical consultants from the French Services Division of the P.E.I. Department of Education also offered me their perspective on the teaching approaches of the potential participants. In addition to providing their assessment of these teachers' pedagogical approaches (in terms of multidimensionality), they provided an assessment of the general teaching effectiveness of the volunteers. It was important that all participating teachers be perceived as 'good' teachers (to avoid pitting a 'good' teacher against a 'poor' one). The ministry officials also provided an assessment of the participating teachers' proficiency in French. I wanted to choose non-francophone teachers, because a large number of core French teachers in Canada are non-

francophones. It was also important that they have similar SL proficiency levels. The teacher surveys and the input received from these ministry contacts permitted me to create a 'short-list' of 6 potentially willing participants (out of 20 participants at the professional development session). The final selection of four (out of the six) participants was to occur in the first two weeks of the main study which began at the beginning of October, 1996. This selection was to be based on a two-week observation period in the classes of the willing participants on the 'short-list'. However, when September came around, I was left with only four available teachers. The other two withdrew either because of a change in teaching assignment or because of a change of heart.

2.2.2. Characteristics of the Four Participating Teachers⁶

All four participating teachers come from different schools in the same school board in Prince Edward Island. They completed an adapted version of a background questionnaire used in other core French research (see Hart, Lapkin & Harley, 1996). Teachers were asked to indicate their teaching experiences, including number of years in both core French and immersion, as well as teaching other subjects. They were also asked to describe their teacher training, focusing specifically on their specialist training in FSL. Finally, the teacher questionnaire included a section in which the teachers were asked to

⁶ In order to help ensure confidentiality, I refer throughout the dissertation to teachers according to the number of their class. Although there were 2 male and 2 female participants, I use male pronouns and possessive adjectives throughout to make reading easier and also as another way to ensure confidentiality. This is not intended to be sexist.

assess their proficiency in French. In the first part of this section, they were asked to rate how difficult it was for them to do certain every-day activities in French as compared to English. In the second part, the teachers were asked to indicate their confidence level vis à vis their French skills for the core French program materials currently in use in the province. They were also asked to indicate the degree to which they had changed their teaching approach and expectations of students since the new program based on the recommendations of the NCFS was implemented in 1990. See Appendix B for a copy of this questionnaire. A general description of each teacher follows, including teaching experience, native language and a score on a self-assessment of French proficiency:⁷

Teacher 1 of Class 1 had 10 years' teaching experience in both core and late-immersion French programs as well as English language arts. He indicated that he was *very confident* of his French skills for the new core French program. He scored 30/35 on a self-assessment survey of French proficiency meaning that he found real-life communicative tasks "slightly more difficult" in French than in English (see Teacher Questionnaire in Appendix B).

Teacher 2 of Class 2 had been teaching core and late immersion French programs as well as English language arts for 20 years. He also indicated that he was *very confident* of his skills for the new core French program. He scored 32/35 on the self-assessment

⁷ This self-assessment is taken from Hart and Lapkin (1990) and asks the participants to assess the ease with which they would be able to complete a variety of real-life situations (e.g., telephone a travel agent for ski trip information, read a novel, write a memo) in French as compared to English. The higher the score, the more positively the participants rated their proficiency in French (5 point scale: 5 being *no more difficult than in English* and 1 being *much more difficult than in English*).

survey of French proficiency meaning that, like Teacher 1, he found most communicative tasks "slightly more difficult" in French than in English.

Teacher 3 (Class 3) had been teaching in core French and English language arts for 12 years. He indicated that he was *somewhat confident* of his French skills for the new core French program. He scored 25/35 on the self-assessment survey of French proficiency meaning that he found most communicative tasks "somewhat more difficult" in French than in English.

Teacher 4 (Class 4) had 22 years of teaching experience in core and immersion French and Language arts programs in English. He indicated that he was *somewhat confident* of his French skills for the new core French program. He scored 26/35 on the self-assessment survey of French proficiency meaning that he reported⁸ finding most communicative tasks "somewhat more difficult" in French than in English.

All four teachers are native speakers of English. In addition, all four participating teachers were invited to participate in the same inservice training sessions⁹ related to the multidimensional curriculum and project-based, experiential program in use in core

⁸ Although Teacher 4 assessed his French skills less positively than Teachers 1 and 2, I believe that his proficiency in French was the strongest of all teachers in my study (based on personal observations).

⁹ This professional development involved a series of workshops for core French teachers at the grade 7-9 level on the following topics: the NCFS and project-based core French teaching, the learner and teacher role in the new approach, team teaching in core French, l'unité zéro: a focus on learning and communication strategy training, L2 use by the teacher, grammar teaching in a project-based approach, use of authentic documents, cooperative learning, organization and planning of multidimensional and project-based modules, the change process and evaluation in project-based multidimensional core French. In addition, all grade 9 teachers were invited to participate in full-day workshops on each of the multidimensional and project-based modules prescribed at that grade level (Lockerby, H., March, 1998, personal communication). There are unfortunately no records to indicate if all 4 teachers attended the same workshops.

French in P.E.I.

2.2.3. Characteristics of the Students

Most of the students in these classes had been exposed to at least five years (approximately 540 hours) of core French at the beginning of the research.¹⁰ Student participants were not randomly selected but, rather, were from intact classes of the participating teachers. A summary of the students' characteristics appears in Tables 2.1-2.5. These data come from the background information section (the first part) of the student questionnaire described below. In addition, a summary of the teachers' assessments of these students' overall academic ability is found in Table 2.6. A summary of the socio-economic background of the students' parents is found in Tables 2.7 and 2.8. Chi-square analyses, using the CROSSTABS function on SPSS, were conducted to compare the categorical distributions of these data per teacher group.

It is clear that students across the four classes are relatively comparable. Table 2.1 shows that a similar percentage (from 59% to 65%) of students across teachers "never" use a language other than English or French at home.¹¹ Chi-square analyses confirm that no statistically significant differences exist among the classes in terms of

¹⁰ Core French begins in grade 4 in most P.E.I. schools. However, earlier starting points exist on an experimental basis in some schools. Grade 9 is the last year in which core French is compulsory in P.E.I. schools.

¹¹ One student from Teacher 3's class was removed from the database because grade 9 was his first year studying French, having recently immigrated to Canada. This student speaks a language other than English or French "all the time" at home.

use of another language other than English or French at home.

Table 2.1 Use of a Language Other Than English or French at Home (Percentages): Comparisons per Class

Frequency of use	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=29	Class 4 N=28	Chi-Square (.05)
Most of the time	7	0	3	0	0.65 (n.s.)
sometimes	10	9	0	0	
hardly ever	0	0	34.5	25	
never	62	65	59	64	
can't say	21	26	3	11	

Table 2.2 suggests that Class 2 differs somewhat from the others in that no student had ever previously been in an immersion program. However, Chi-square analyses reveal no statistically significant differences among the classes in terms of overall distribution of students who report having been enrolled in immersion.

Table 2.3 indicates that no students from Classes 2 and 4 had ever lived in a francophone environment; few students from Classes 1 and 3 (10% and 7%, respectively) had had this experience. Chi-square analyses indicate that there is no statistically significant difference across classes in the number of students who reported having lived in a francophone environment.

Table 2.2: Percentage of Student Enrolment in French Immersion by Grade and Class (Previous to Grade 9)

Grade	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=29	Class 4 N=28	Chi-square (.05)
1	14	0	7	0	0.16 (n.s.)
2	10	0	7	0	
3	10	0	3	0	
4	10	0	0	18	
5	7	0	0	7	
6	7	0	0	4	
7	10	0	0	0	
8	3	0	0	0	
Total % in immersion at some point	14	0	7	18	

Note: It was decided to keep the immersion "dropouts" in the database because it is a reality that most core French classes have a small percentage of such students.

Table 2.3: Percentage of Students Who Had Lived in a Francophone Environment

	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=29	Class 4 N=28	Chi-Square (.05)
Yes	10	0	7	0	.30 (n.s.)

Table 2.4 indicates that the majority of students in Classes 1, 2, and 3 started core French in grade 4. About two fifths of students from Class 4 started core French in grade 2, about one third started in grade 3 and 14% started in grade 4. Chi-square analyses confirm that there are statistically significant differences across classes in terms of the grade at which students report starting core French, caused by the different starting grades for students in Class 4.

Table 2.4: Core French Starting Grade (Percentages)

Grade	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=29	Class 4 N=28	Chi-Square (.05)
2	0	0	0	39	.000
3	21	9	31	28	
4	59	83	55	14	

Note: In some cases, the sum of percentages does not equal 100% because students who had previously been in French immersion are included in the data. Two different starting points for core French exist because students often come from different feeder schools, some of which experiment with core French in grades 2 or 3.

Unfortunately, no normalized test scores were available to give an overall profile of the general academic ability of the students in each class. However, students were asked to indicate how they were doing in school in general, compared to other students in their class. Similarly, teachers were asked to provide an assessment of the students' overall academic ability, compared to all grade 9 students

they had taught in their careers. Table 2.5 shows students' mean ratings of their overall school achievement. A majority of students from all classes rated themselves as average (from 65% to 76%). Chi-square analyses indicate no statistically significant differences in the distribution of above average, average and below average students, according to self-assessments, across classes.

Table 2.5: Students' Self-Report: Overall School Achievement (Percentages)

Assessment	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=29	Class 4 N=28	Chi-Square (.05)
Above Average	25	22	23	16	.21 (n.s.)
Average	68	74	65	76	
Below Average	7	4	11.5	8	

Table 2.6 describes the teachers' ratings of students' overall academic abilities. Chi-square analyses reveal no statistically significant differences in these ratings. In summary, it is clear that, in general, these classes were relatively comparable in terms of overall academic ability (based on teacher and student self-reports).

Tables 2.7 and 2.8 present teachers' reports of parental occupations. Statistical analyses conducted on these results indicate that there are no statistically significant differences among classes in terms of parental occupational background¹².

¹² This information on parental occupations (presented in Tables 2.7 and 2.8) was requested from the teachers after the study was completed and is therefore based on memory and may be somewhat incomplete.

Table 2.6: Teachers' Assessment of Students' Overall Academic Abilities

Rating	Class 1 N=32	Class 2 N=22	Class 3 N=22	Class 4 N=26	Chi-Square (.05)
Exceptional	3/32= 9%	2/22= 9%	2/22= 9%	1/26= 4%	.84 (n.s.)
Above Average	8/32= 25%	8/22= 36%	7/22= 32%	7/26= 27%	
Average	15/32= 47%	8/22= 36%	8/22= 36%	14/26= 54%	
Below Average	3/32= 9%	1/22= 4.5%	2/22= 9%	4/26= 15%	
Very weak	3/32= 9%	3/22= 14%	3/22= 14%	0/26= 0%	

Table 2.7: Percentages of Professional and Non-Professional Mothers by Class

Socio-economic category	Class 1 N=28	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=22	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square (.05)
Professional	23	19	18	24	.40 (n.s.)
Non-Professional	77	81	82	76	

Table 2.8: Percentages of Professional and Non-Professional Fathers by Class

Socio-economic category	Class 1 N=28	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=22	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square (.05)
Professional	43	38	21	45.5	.25 (n.s.)
Non-Professional	57	62	79	54.5	

Note: Occupational classifications are based on Statistics Canada (1981) and Pineo, Porter and McRoberts (1977).

2.3. Procedures

At the beginning of the study (in October, 1996) I spent two class periods¹³ in each school observing informally and taking some field notes. During this time, the teachers and I had the opportunity to explain the general, overall objectives¹⁴ and methodology of the study to the students. I had the opportunity to work closely with the students and teacher from each class to build a comfortable rapport such that my presence in the classes during the main part of the study would disturb as little as

¹³ The length of the class periods varied from 40 to 50 minutes depending on the teacher and the day. In other words, each teacher had periods of slightly different lengths. Moreover, the length of each teacher's period varied depending on the day. For example, the periods in Class 1 were either 36 or 40 minutes long, depending on the day. Teacher 2's periods were either 40 or 45 minutes long, depending on the day. Teacher 3's classes were either 40 or 45 minutes long. Only Teacher 4's periods were consistently 40 minutes long.

¹⁴ Before they accepted to volunteer in my study, I explained to the teachers that I was exploring the influence of teaching approach on students' outcomes such as French proficiency and attitudes. There was concern that I was "hired" or sponsored by the P.E.I. Ministry of Education to prove that the new multidimensional, project-based approach was superior to former, more traditional methods. I clearly indicated that I was not on contract with or sponsored by the ministry in P.E.I. I also indicated that although I did have some hypotheses about the results, I would definitely report the results as they turned out, even if they did not support the multidimensional project-based curriculum. Ensuring that the participants viewed me as a trustworthy and objective researcher, and not an agent to misrepresent evidence in favor of the ministry, was a priority. From a positivistic point of view, it is possible to suggest that the classroom observation data could be inaccurate because teachers did what they thought I wanted to see. From a more naturalistic point of view, revealing the objectives of the study was necessary to gain the teachers' trust so that they felt as comfortable as possible to teach "naturally" during my visits. See Lynch (1996) for a discussion of positivistic and naturalistic approaches to language research. See also Rounds (1996) and Spada, Ranta and Lightbown (1996) for discussions of the ethics, the pros and cons about revealing research objectives to participants.

possible the natural activity of each class.

This was followed by pre-testing (see description of pre-tests below). Whole-class testing (listening, reading and writing) was conducted over three class periods. Administration of these tests included a five-minute pre-activity designed to activate students' background knowledge (see Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997; Vandergrift, 1998) of the themes and difficult vocabulary in the texts. Individual speaking tests were administered over two sessions in a separate room and did not interrupt classroom activity. Students also completed a pre-questionnaire during one of the whole-class testing sessions (see description of student questionnaire below).

Immediately following the pre-testing, I conducted in-depth observations of the classes over approximately eight weeks (from October to December).¹⁵ A breakdown of the time devoted to observations in each class is found in Table 2.9. During this time, each teacher used the same thematic unit (see below for description of *La Mode et la publicité*), interpreting it in the way which reflected what he would do normally (i.e., giving the emphasis to each syllabus as he would naturally). During all observation sessions, teachers wore a pouch containing a small tape-recorder, equipped with an external clip microphone. The MOLT observation scheme (see description below) was coded during actual class time. In addition, field notes were recorded during and after

¹⁵ The observation schedule was determined entirely by the teachers' timetables which were all based on a six-day cycle. It was possible for me to coordinate my observation schedule to visit each class an average of four of these six days.

Table 2.9 Observation Details by Class

	Class 1	Class 2 ^a	Class 3	Class 4
Number of visits	12	7	11	11
Total time observed (minutes)	440.5	301	421.5	407.5

^aLess time was spent in Class 2 because the teacher was absent for two weeks due to illness.

each class. The tape-recordings were used to verify the coding of the observation scheme when there were questions about the coding.¹⁶ I, as the observer, sat at the back of the class and tried to be as inconspicuous as possible. In addition, teachers were consulted, after class, where necessary, to gain greater insight into the activities of some classes. The content of these debriefing sessions was included in my field notes. On four occasions (one period in each class), a second trained person observed the classes and coded the observation scheme in order to allow for a check on the reliability of my coding. An inter-rater reliability check was conducted, and following discussions after the observation sessions between the other coder and myself, at least 90% agreement was reached on almost all categories of the observation scheme (two exceptions described below).

¹⁶ I did not do this verification systematically and therefore I did not conduct a check for intra-coder reliability.

This observation period was followed by achievement tests (December, 1996) directly related to the objectives and activities of the unit implemented during the observation period (see description of achievement tests below).

Near the end of the academic year, I returned to all classes and administered the same general French proficiency test package (post-test) used at the beginning of the study. Students also completed the same questionnaire as in the beginning of the study (with a few additions; see description below).

The sections which follow include descriptions of the pre- and post-tests, the student questionnaire, the MOLT observation scheme, the multidimensional teaching unit used by all teachers, and the achievement tests, including details concerning the coding and analysis of the observation data.

2.3.1. Pre- and Post-Tests

All students completed tests of overall French proficiency assessing listening and reading comprehension and writing skills, using a slightly adapted version of the Grade 8 core French test package developed by researchers at the Modern Language Centre at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE), Canada. A subsample of eight students in each class completed the speaking tests. A brief summary description of the tests is provided in Table 2.10.

The OISE test package was developed as an outgrowth of the NCFS, as part

Table 2.10 - A Summary of Pre-and Post-Test Measures (General Proficiency in French)

<u>Skill area</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Test measure</u>
Listening comprehension (Max=15)	Test de compréhension auditive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● count of correct responses to multiple-choice information questions (topics related to student interest and experiences)
Speaking ability (Max=41)	Role play	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● correct pronunciation of specific phonemes (Max=7) ● sociolinguistic appropriateness (Max=2)
	Picture description, Image A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● correct identification of objects including color, size and location (Max=10)
	Picture description, Image B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● correct identification of objects including color, size and location (Max=22)
General second language proficiency (Max=71)	Dictation (Dictée)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● up to 3 points per word, based on correct grammatical spelling, phonological accuracy and indication of comprehension plus 5 'technical' points
Writing ability (Max=10)	Composition 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● task fulfillment- including specified elements of an informal advertisement using a majority of words in comprehensible French (Max=6)
	Composition 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● task fulfillment- stating and supporting an opinion using a majority of words in comprehensible French (Max=4)
Reading comprehension (Max=20)	Word identification (Section A)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● matching objects with their owner identified in an authentic text (Max=10)
	Multiple-choice questions based on a series of postcards (Section B)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● correct answers (Max=5)
	Multiple-choice questions based on a journalistic interview (Section C)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● correct answers (Max=5)

Note: This description is adapted from Lapkin, Harley and Hart, 1998.

of a project related to the development of communicative instruments for testing outcomes in core French (Harley, Lapkin, Scane & Hart, 1988). However, in response to concern for content validity expressed by ministry officials in P.E.I., some of the tests used in the present study were adapted to make them more reflective of the core French programs currently in use in P.E.I. The administration of all tests was adapted to include a pre-activity phase of about five minutes, deigned to prepare students for the themes and difficult vocabulary in the tests; this is consistent with the pedagogical approach encouraged by the NCFS and the P.E.I. Ministry of Education (see Foster & Skehan, 1997; Skehan, 1996; Vandergrift, 1998, for a discussion of the pre-activity and its importance in SL pedagogy).

The listening comprehension test required students to listen to a tape-recorded interview with two francophone students from Montreal. The interview covered topics related to student interest and experiences such as favourite pastimes, sports, television and vacations. The test involved students responding to 15 multiple choice questions based on this taped interview.

The reading comprehension test consisted of three parts. In the first part, students were required to match ten objects with their owners as identified in a text describing the cherished possessions of four young people. Part 1 of the reading test used in this study was different from the OISE package in which there were a series of street signs and a list of possible meanings. Parts 2 and 3 were identical to the

OISE test package. In Part 2, students were required to answer five multiple choice questions about four post cards written by students on a bicycle trip in Quebec. In Part 3, students answered five multiple choice questions based on a sports interview on skateboarding between a grade 8 girl and a 13-year old boy.

The writing test was also divided into three parts and was identical to the OISE version. The first consisted of a partial dictation exercise about a bicycle race around Montreal. It was scored for general comprehensibility as well as spelling of words missing from the original text. For this test component, students listened to a tape-recording of the complete passage three times: the first and third times at normal speed, the second at slower speed and in partial sentences. Students filled in missing portions of the passage as they were repeated. This partial dictation, a type of cloze test, is considered in the literature as a good indicator of overall French proficiency (Pico, 1990; Tonnes-Schnier & Scheibner-Herzig, 1988; Young, 1987).¹⁷ Part 2 of the writing test asked students to write an advertisement for a magazine in which students described themselves in hopes of finding a pen pal. In Part 3, students were required to state and justify their opinions concerning mandatory school uniforms. Assessment for both Parts 2 and 3 was based on students' ability to fulfil the task with a majority of words in comprehensible French.

¹⁷ See Swain, Lapkin and Barik, 1976, for a discussion of cloze tests as measure of overall SL proficiency.

The individually administered speaking test also involved three parts. The first part (identical to the OISE version) involved a restaurant role-play task scored for sociolinguistic elements as well as correct pronunciation of seven selected phonemes. Parts 2 and 3 of the speaking test involved two picture tasks which required the testee to give comprehensible instructions to a friend such that he could draw the pictures (information gap task). The objects used in these information gap oral production tasks (Parts 2 and 3) were changed from geometric shapes in the original OISE version of the test, to apples, people and modes of transportation, all of which are part of the grade 7 and 8 curriculum in P.E.I. Testees were scored for their ability to convey the key information (identify or describe objects, their size, color and location on the page) such that the friend could complete the drawing.

This same test package was administered at the beginning of the study (October, 1996) and near the end of the academic year (late April, 1997). Therefore these tests were used to check the comparability of the pre-test French proficiency among classes in order to control for any differences. The same students who completed the oral pre-tests were selected for the speaking test in April as well. A second person (a fellow graduate student with excellent French skills) scored 15% of the tests which were not multiple choice. At least 95% agreement was reached between the two raters on all these tests.

Differences in mean pre-test scores among classes were first analyzed using

analysis of variance (ANOVA). In cases where the F-ratio of the ANOVA was statistically significant, the pair-wise Tukey *a* measure (.05) was used to identify specific statistical differences among classes. Analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were conducted on the post-test scores, adjusting for initial differences on the pre-test.¹⁸

2.3.2. Student Questionnaire

An adapted version of a questionnaire used in immersion research by Hart and Lapkin (1990) was completed by all students at the beginning of the study (in October, 1996) and at the end of the academic year (late April, 1997). The survey completed in October included a background information section which solicited information on students' family, language and educational backgrounds, including a general description of their core French classes in grades 7 and 8. Both versions of the questionnaires included a self-assessment of French proficiency, as well as information related to their attitudes and motivation towards learning and using French, cultural understanding and empathy, actual use of French outside school and general language education skills. The survey administered near the end of the school year also asked students to give an overall assessment of their grade 9 core French experiences as well as their intentions to continue or not to continue studying French

¹⁸ Gain scores were not calculated because they are considered as unreliable indicators of progress over time. Collins (1996) and Humphreys (1996) advise that gain scores be used with caution when examining differences in test scores.

in high school. See Appendix C for copies of these questionnaires.

2.3.3. The Observation Scheme

The Multidimensional Orientation of Language Teaching (MOLT) observation scheme, which I modified from Part A of the Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching (COLT) observation scheme (Allen, Fröhlich & Spada, 1984; Fröhlich, Spada & Allen, 1985 ; Spada & Fröhlich, 1995), was used in this study to document the classroom activity of the four teacher participants. In this section, I describe the development of the COLT observation scheme. I also describe the MOLT, including the adaptations made to Part A of the COLT. A copy of the MOLT is found in Appendix D.

As indicated above in Chapter 1, the COLT observation scheme was created as part of a large-scale research project, the Development of Bilingual Proficiency study, completed by researchers (see Harley, Allen, Cummins & Swain, 1990, for an overview) at OISE. That study examined instructional differences in SL classrooms, using the COLT observation scheme, and related these differences to student outcomes in the target language. Theoretical and pedagogical literature on communicative language teaching, centered in large part around Canale's and Swain's (1980) model of communicative competence, provided the framework within which the COLT was created. The COLT observation scheme included a number of variables which were hypothesized to be important predictors of success in first and

second language acquisition. In general, it included indicators of communicative classroom activity and communicative teacher-student interaction. The main characteristics of the COLT are embedded in the detailed description of the MOLT that follows.

I created The MOLT using Part A of the COLT as a basic foundation. Adaptations were made, in large part, to reflect the four syllabuses of the multidimensional, project-based curriculum as proposed by the NCFE (1990). Like the COLT, the MOLT describes classroom events at the level of activity and episode¹⁹ and includes the following observation categories:

1. Time: The time of the beginning of each activity or episode is recorded in this column.
2. Activity: For this indicator, no predetermined descriptors have to be checked off by the observer. Each classroom activity and its constituent episodes are documented, timed and described separately.
3. Content: This macro-category expands on the three sub-categories included in the COLT (management, language and other topics) to

¹⁹ Spada and Fröhlich (1995: 30) indicate that it is difficult to precisely define *activity and episode*. They suggest that the beginning or end of an activity is generally marked by change in theme or content; an episode is one component of an activity which shifts the focus of the classroom activity but is still centered around the theme or content of the activity. Spada and Fröhlich (1995) also suggest that both activities and episodes are relatively easy to identify in the classroom.

encompass seven sub-categories including the four syllabuses of the multidimensional curriculum (communicative-experiential, language, culture, general language education), assessment, management and other. This category allows one to assess the extent to which a multiple focus in language teaching, including a balance on meaning and form, may contribute to differences in SL development.

The communicative-experiential category (columns 3-6 of the MOLT) is an addition to the original COLT; it aims to capture activities which are authentic in the sense of being focused on communication of real messages based on definitions of communicative language teaching (Breen & Candlin, 1980; Brumfit, 1984). Columns 3 and 5 of the MOLT distinguish between communicative-experiential activities which are project-driven and communicative activities which are not related to a project (Tremblay et al., 1990; CASLT, 1994; Legutke & Thomas, 1991). In the MOLT, an attempt was also made to distinguish between "real" and "unreal" communicative activities, or in other words, activities which involve message transmission but which are not likely to be or have been experienced by the learners being observed (see, e.g., Breen, 1983; Duplantie, 1986; Stern, 1992; for a discussion of the notion of

authenticity in classroom activities in language teaching). However, this distinction was abandoned during the present study because I realized that it was difficult to operationalize a distinction between real and unreal communicative activities. This is indicated by the fact that an acceptable level of inter-rater reliability on this item was not reached.

The Language category (columns 7-15 of the MOLT) expands on the four sub-categories of the COLT (form, function, discourse, sociolinguistics) but includes basically the same foci. First, a coder determines whether the language-focused activity is project-driven (column 7), contextualized within a communicative situation but not project-driven (column 8) or decontextualized (column 9). In columns 10-15 of the MOLT, the activity or episode is classified according to the aspect of language on which it focusses, including grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, sociolinguistics (e.g., social appropriacy, the use of *tu* versus *vous*), function (explicit focus on illocutionary acts such as requesting and explaining), and discourse (explicit focus on the way sentences combine into cohesive and coherent sequences). The sociolinguistic and discourse categories are included to reflect Canale's and Swain's (1980) sociolinguistic and discursive competences,

respectively. The function category reflects notional-functional influences in communicative language teaching (CLT) (e.g., Wilkins, 1981).

I added the culture category (columns 16-21 of the MOLT) to the COLT. Similar to the coding of the other content-based sub-categories, the coder first determines whether the cultural activity is project-driven (columns 16 and 17). Activities coded as cultural include a focus on the way of life, behaviors and beliefs of a community and their history, institutions and commonalities (LeBlanc, Courtel & Trescases, 1990). Columns 18-19 indicate whether the activity focuses on local or non-local culture. Columns 20-21 reflect whether the activity focuses on present or past cultural information. In the NCFES, it is hypothesized that cultural activities which focus first on present-day francophones from communities near the students' school (therefore student-centered) will foster more student interest and cultural empathy than cultural activities which focus on cultural facts from the past and from far-away francophone regions (LeBlanc, 1990:72-73).

The General Language Education category (columns 22-27 of the MOLT) was also added to the original COLT. Like the other

content sub-categories, the coder first determines whether the activity is related to a final project (columns 22-23). In columns 24-27, the activity or episode is classified according to the aspect of general language education on which it focuses, including reflection (e.g., self and peer evaluation), metalanguage (e.g., language awareness), strategies (learning and communication) and comparison (cultural and linguistic awareness).

The Assessment category (columns 28-45 of the MOLT) was added to the original COLT and reflects the belief that a variety of data collection methods (e.g., anecdotal observation, authentic performance assessment, pencil and paper tests, portfolios, self and peer evaluation) give a more accurate picture of student performance and abilities than just one method such as summative pencil and paper tests (e.g., Allal, 1991; Lussier, 1991; Lussier & Turner, 1995). In columns 27-28, formative and summative assessment are distinguished. Here formative assessment refers to "the ongoing gathering of information which will inform teachers and students about the degree of success of their respective efforts in the classroom" (Harley, d'Anglejan & Shapson, 1990, 3). Summative assessment differs in that it "has as its goal the assessment of students' performance at the end of a course of study"

(Harley, d'Anglejan & Shapson, 1990,3), such as the end of a teaching unit. Columns 37-40 pertain to the criteria (form, function or both) used in the assessment method observed. Columns 41-45 determine whether students receive feedback from the teacher (column 41), whether it is oral or written (column 42), whether it is given to one individual or to a group (column 43), whether it is general or specific feedback (column 44) and whether the feedback is positive or negative in nature. The criteria and feedback sub-categories were added to the COLT observation scheme to reflect current beliefs in SLA that assessment and feedback should focus both on function and form, and the belief that feedback is more effective when given directly to the student requiring the feedback, at the time an error is committed (see, e.g., Lyster, 1998a, 1998b; Lyster & Ranta, 1997).²⁰

The Management category (columns 46-47 of MOLT) is identical to the COLT and is broken down into procedural directives and time spent disciplining students. The Other category (columns 48-51 of MOLT) expands on the COLT "other topics" classification. It adds a category to determine whether the activities are personalized

²⁰ The criteria and feedback categories were abandoned during the current study because it became apparent that it is difficult, if not impossible, to document such feedback patterns in real-time. Future analysis of transcriptions of the tape-recorded lessons will make this documentation possible.

(i.e., student-centered) or not. As in the COLT, this category is also designed to determine whether the range of reference of the content is narrow (the immediate classroom and immediate student experience) or broad (ranging well beyond the classroom and the students' lives).

4. Student modality: This category (columns 52-56 of MOLT) is identical to the COLT and categorizes the various receptive (listening, reading) and productive (writing, speaking) language skills in which the students are involved during the classroom activities. The "other" column (56) is included to cover activities like drawing, modelling, acting or viewing a video or film. Coding reflects whether students are involved in one of these skills more than the others or whether the skills are being developed in combination. This category reflects beliefs (e.g., Widdowson, 1978) that language teaching is more effective and communicative if classroom activities focus on a variety of skills (as opposed to reading and writing only) and if the activities aim to develop more than one skill at a time to reflect a more integrated use of language.

5. Participant organization: This category (columns 57-63 of MOLT) is broken down into three sub-categories related to the way students are organized during classroom activities: as a whole class, in

groups or alone. This category remains intact from the COLT, motivated by theoretical and pedagogical literature which suggests that classroom activity is more motivating if a variety of grouping strategies are used (Johnson, 1994). Furthermore, authors of the NCFS (e.g., Tremblay et al., 1990) promote group and cooperative learning as part of a multidimensional project-based core French approach because of the linguistic (e.g., Swain, 1985, 1993, 1997; Swain & Lapkin, 1995, in press), affective (e.g., Kagan, 1986) and social (e.g., Johnson, 1994) benefits of cooperative groupings in classroom activity.

The Class sub-category distinguishes among activities in which the teacher (columns 57-59) interacts with the whole class or individual students and activities in which students direct the whole class or interact with individual students as if they were the teacher. This sub-category also includes choral work (students repeating a model provided by a textbook or teacher) by a whole class or groups of students. The Group sub-category refers to group work in which groups of students either work on the same tasks (column 60) or different tasks (column 61). The Individual sub-category refers to activities where students do individual "seat work" working on either the same tasks (column 62) or on different tasks (column 63).

6. Content Control: Who chooses classroom content and activities is the focus of this category (columns 64-66 of MOLT). The categories included in the MOLT remain unchanged from the COLT and include the possibility that the teacher controls the content (column 64), possibly in conjunction with a text, and that the teacher negotiates content with students (column 65), maybe with a text as well. Students may also choose the classroom content (column 66). The theoretical rationale for this sub-category is linked to the work of some authors who promote student involvement in curriculum decisions and autonomous learning in CLT (Breen, 1983, 1989; Dickinson, 1987; Holec, 1987, 1985) and constructivist theorists (von Glaserfeld, 1995).

7. Materials: This category (columns 67-76 of MOLT) is designed to describe the materials used in conjunction with classroom activities. It is divided into type and source of material. Material types (columns 67-71) include text (written), audio, visual or real person. I added Real Person to the original COLT material types to indicate when a visitor comes to class. Also included under this category were occasions when a teacher, or student, read the tape-script for a listening activity, for example (when the tape is not available). The length of the

written text is distinguished in columns 67 and 68 as either minimal (e.g., captions, isolated sentences, word lists) or extended (e.g., dialogues, stories, connected paragraphs). The hypothesis here is that more extended text will expose students to more comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981: 107) in an understandable context which will promote incidental language acquisition.

The source or purpose of the materials are distinguished by five separate sub-categories (columns 72-76 of MOLT). The materials could be in the target language and designed specifically for SL teaching (L2-NNS), they could be designed in the target language for native speakers, therefore unadapted and completely authentic (L2-NS). They could also be designed in the target language for native speakers but slightly adapted for SL learners (L2-NSA), they could be written in the first language of the students (L1) or they could be student-made. The issue here is the language and authenticity of the materials used in classroom activities. On the one hand, it is hypothesized that authentic materials in the target language will be most effective for SL acquisition (SLA) (see Stern, 1992:167-182, for a discussion of authentic materials in communicative language teaching). On the other hand, research in SLA has shown that

simplified and/or adjusted input can increase a learners' ability to comprehend (see, e.g., Ellis, 1994: 247-275).

8. Target language: This category (columns 77-82 of MOLT) comes from Part B of the COLT and is designed to make a global (see Spada & Fröhlich, 1995: 124-125) assessment, in real-time, of student and teacher use of the target language during classroom activities. Three possibilities exist for both students and teachers: exclusive use of the first language (L1), exclusive use of the target language (L2) or equal use of both the first and target languages (mix). The issues here are student output (Swain, 1985, 1993, 1997) and intralingual and crosslingual teaching strategies (see Stern, 1992: 279-299). Swain (1985, 1993, 1997) has hypothesized that students need opportunities to "output" in the target language in classroom activities. However, there is some suggestion that learning can occur through collaborative dialogue even when students produce output in their L1 but work on a project or task to be completed in the SL (see Behan, Turnbull & Spek, 1997; Brooks & Donato, 1994). Similarly, research findings suggest that teachers' use of the SL leads to increased student proficiency in the SL (e.g., Burstall, 1970; Carroll, 1975; Wolf, 1977). However, Stern (1992:288-289) argues that such research may be

biased against crosslingual strategies and more research is needed to investigate how crosslingual teaching strategies may be used effectively in CLT.

9. Student production: This category (columns 83-85 of MOLT) is also derived from Part B of COLT and is designed to assess, globally and in real-time, the extent to which students engage in extended discourse. Swain (1985, 1993, 1997) and others (Allen et al., 1987) have hypothesized that students' sustained discourse is necessary to promote SLA. However, Brown and Yule (1983) also suggest that short turns are typical of ordinary conversation and must be part of CLT as well as opportunities for students to engage in sustained speech. This category is divided into three parts: ultra-minimal (column 83), minimal (column 84) and sustained (column 85). Ultra-minimal refers to utterances which consist of one or two words only. Minimal utterances consist of more than two words and include long phrases, and one or two main clauses or sentences. Sustained speech consists of at least three main clauses.

10. Teacher role: This category was added to the existing COLT categories following what Tremblay et al. (1990) and Duplantie (1995) refer to as the "multiple roles" of the teacher in multidimensional

project-based core French teaching. Columns 86-89 of the MOLT allow the researcher to record the specific role the teacher is playing during classroom activity: as the expert, as a facilitator in activities like group work, or in a "sharing" role where teachers tell students about their interests and opinions related to classroom activities. The "other" category (column 89) allows recording of other possible teacher roles such as negotiator, care-giver or diagnostician.

11. Pedagogy: The final category I added to the original COLT scheme is intended to document pedagogical strategies which are promoted by the NCFS (1990) and in the pedagogical CLT literature. Columns 90-93 target step-by-step activity development, including a pre-activity designed to activate students' prior knowledge or schemata. Column 94 reflects if teachers communicate the objectives of classroom activities to their students, considered by constructivists (e.g., von Glaserfeld, 1995) to contribute to student motivation and involvement in learning. Columns 95 and 96 aim to document if teachers provide students with a model when they ask them to produce a written or oral text in the L2. Boyle and Peregoy (1990), Ervin-Tripp (1982) and Johnson and Milne (1995) suggest that such models scaffold and promote success in the students' second language.

In order to better reflect the purpose of this particular study, the modified observation scheme was renamed the MOLT - *Multidimensional Orientation of Language Teaching* observation scheme. I piloted the observation scheme, on an informal basis, in grade 8 and 9 core French classes in Ontario in April and May, 1996, to practice coding and to determine if refinements were required before the beginning of the main study. I decided that no refinements were necessary following this piloting period.

2.3.4. Coding and Analyzing the Observation Data

I coded each lesson observed, in real-time, in terms of activities and episodes (see description in previous section). The beginning time for each activity/episode was recorded and the corresponding descriptors on the observation scheme were checked off. I also specified the focus for each activity/episode as either 1) Exclusive - when all of the time was spent on this category; 2) Primary - when most, but not all, of the time was spent on a particular category; 3) Equal - when approximately the same amount of time and emphasis were spent on more than one category; 4) Secondary - less time and emphasis was spent on a particular category. Following all observations, I calculated the time in minutes for each episode. I then assigned a time value to each descriptor for that episode. For example, reading an article about the fashion trends amongst young people in France occurred over three episodes. This activity was related, indirectly at least, to the final project of the unit in which

students prepared and presented a fashion show. In the first episode (10 minutes long), the teacher led a pre-activity to provide students with some key vocabulary and to help them predict the article's contents based on its title and some of the pictures. In the content categories of the MOLT, I checked off "project" and "vocabulary" under the language syllabus on the observation scheme. Simultaneously, project and strategies under the general language education syllabus were indicated and given equal focus on the observation scheme. In the second episode (20 minutes), students worked through comprehension questions as they read the article in pairs. Here, I checked off "project" under the communicative-experiential syllabus as the exclusive content focus of this episode (a communicative activity related to the students' final project). In the third episode, students and teacher discussed the fashion trends of the youth presented in the article. They talked about the similarities and differences in fashion between their culture and those in France. I checked off "project" under the culture syllabus (as well as "non-local" and "present" or contemporary).

Following all observations, I totalled the time values for each category for each class period observed, I calculated a percentage of the total time for that class period and then calculated the average percentage of time over the total time observed for each category for each teacher.

Following these calculations, I used the *National Core French Study* (see LeBlanc, 1990; CASLT, 1994) as the basis for defining a multidimensional project-

based approach. In order to classify each teacher's overall pedagogical approach, I divided the MOLT categories into 1) *Defining* and 2) *Typical But Not Defining* groups. I contrasted each Defining feature with a corresponding unidimensional feature (see third column of Table 2.11). Moreover, I created a "less multidimensional" category (see second column of Table 2.11) for the defining features to reflect the continuum of multidimensionality observed in the four teachers' classroom approach. Tables 2.11 and 2.12 summarize the defining and typical but not defining features of a multidimensional project-based teaching approach. I then determined the average amount of time each teacher spent on each of these categories to describe their teaching approaches as either multidimensional and project-based or less-multidimensional.²¹ These results are described in Chapter 3.

2.3.5. The Teaching Unit: *La Mode et la publicité*

The unit used by each participating teacher during the 8-week observation period is based on the fields of experience, fashion and advertising. It is

²¹ After consulting several statisticians, I decided not to conduct statistical analyses, such as regression or multilevel analyses, which might allow me to assess the impact of teacher variables, like project use and teachers' uses of French, on students' test scores. Stevens (1992:72) argues that about 15 participants per predictor in a regression equation (for the social sciences) are needed for a reliable analysis, otherwise the equation will not cross-validate and will lose predictive power. Tabachnick and Fidell (1989) argue that a minimum of 20 participants per independent variable (IV) in the regression equation is required. When the number of participants falls below 20 per IV, they argue that the regression analysis is meaningless (p.128). In my case, the teacher is the participant and therefore the number of participants in my study falls well short of the required minimum to conduct regression analyses.

Table 2.11 - Defining Multidimensional Features Contrasted with Unidimensional and Less Multidimensional Features

<u>Defining Multidimensional Features</u>	<u>Less Multidimensional</u>	<u>Unidimensional Features</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicative-Experiential activity related to a project • Communicative-Experiential activity related to a project <i>integrated with another syllabus</i> • Language syllabus activity related to a project • Language activity related to a project <i>integrated with another syllabus</i> • Culture syllabus activity related to a project • General Language Education syllabus related to a project • Assessment activities related to a project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communicative activities not related to a project • Communicative activities not related to a project but <i>integrated with another syllabus</i> • Language syllabus activity with a context but not related to a project • Language syllabus activity not related to a project but <i>integrated with another syllabus</i> • Culture syllabus activity with a context but not related to a project • General Language Education syllabus activity with a context but no project • Communicative assessment activities but not related to project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No communicative activities • No communicative activities related with another syllabus • Language syllabus activities without a context • Language activities without a context and without cross-syllabus integration • No culture activities • No General Language Education activities • Decontextualized assessment activities

Table 2.12 - Typical but Not Defining Multidimensional Features

- Personalized activities
- Second language use by students
- Second language use by teacher
- Group work
- Use of authentic documents
- Teacher as facilitator
- Students choose activities (content control: students)
- Teacher and students negotiate choice of activities (content control: teacher/text/student)

multidimensional²², given that its objectives are based on all four syllabi of the multidimensional curriculum(NCFS, 1990), and project driven: it is designed such that students prepare, at the end of the unit, either a fashion advertisement or a fashion show related to a line of clothing that they select or create. All activities in the unit prepare students, either directly or indirectly, to complete this final project. The overall goal of the unit is the development of communicative competence. The

²² However, analysis of this teaching unit reveals that four out of 46 (8.7%) of the objectives relate to culture and six out of 46 (13.0%) relate to general language education. It therefore does not give equal focus to all four syllabuses of a multidimensional curriculum (45% and 32% of the objectives are from the communicative-experiential and the language syllabuses, respectively).

communicative, experiential, language, cultural and general language education objectives²³ are as follows:

Communicative objectives:

- Responding to questions on personal fashion preferences
- Expressing personal fashion preferences
- Describing in detail different styles and outfits and personal experiences with the fashion industry
- Expressing opinions on various fashion advertisements
- Creating slogans for fashion advertisements
- Presenting a fashion advertisement or a fashion show (oral and written)

Experiential objectives:

- Comparing fashion styles of teenagers and adults
- Analyzing clothing prices
- Preparing an inventory of popular brand names for clothing and analyzing fashion trends
- Analyzing and evaluating different types of fashion advertisements
- Learning about the development of fashion advertisements
- Examining the influence of the media on teenagers' fashion decisions

²³ Based on Ministère de l'éducation de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, 1996: 3-5.

and consumerism

Language objectives:

- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) vocabulary associated with fashion and advertising: names of clothing items, including what they're made of, the designs and brand names; accessories; hair styles; vocabulary related to fashion advertisements
- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) comparative structures: plus que, moins que, meilleur, le plus..., le moins...
- Comprehending and using regular and irregular adjectives related to fashion and advertising (with proper agreement and positioning)
- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) the following verbs (présent, passé composé, impératif, infinitif): porter, acheter, trouver, regarder, influencer, attirer, voter, apprécier, présenter, ressembler à, oublier, vouloir, choisir
- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) numbers for pricing and dates
- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) possessive adjectives: mon, ma, mes etc.
- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) direct

object pronouns: *le, la, l', les*, in sentences like *je l'aime* and *je ne la porte jamais*

- Comprehending (oral and written) and using (oral and written) interrogative expressions, including inversion, in the *passé composé* (e.g., *Où as-tu vu cette annonce?*)

Cultural objectives:

- Recognizing popular brand names for young people in France
- Recognizing preferred fashion styles of young people in France
- Examining similarities and differences between fashion trends for young people in P.E.I. and in France
- Researching France's influence on the development of the fashion industry

General Language Education objectives:

- Learning how to use dictionaries, fashion catalogues and magazines as learning resources
- Learning to use the context to better understand an oral or written text
- Working in small groups to develop the target language and social skills
- Demonstrating abilities of an autonomous learner

- Evaluating one's own learning and that of one's peers
- Analyzing how language is used in advertising

The prescribed unit includes 16 recommended steps (étapes) or activities which prepare students to complete their final project. It is important to note that these activities draw on a variety of resources (including photocopies of authentic documents, grammar exercises and other tasks from commercial materials such as *Entre amis 3* (Jean, 1992), *Communication plus 1* (Boucher & Ladouceur, 1988), fashion catalogues and magazines). The unit is quite flexible in the sense that teachers can choose or negotiate with students which activities they will actually do, including the final project. The 16 possible activities are recommended in the following order:

- Sharing background knowledge (including vocabulary in French) and experiences about fashion and advertising
- Discussing and negotiating the final project and possible steps leading up to it
- Identifying different ways to dress for different occasions
- Creating a collage representing personal fashion preferences
- Describing different outfits in detail
- Examining teenager fashion trends
- Researching fashion trends among young people in France and

comparing them to trends in P.E.I.

- Preparing a mini-survey on brand names, prices and popular fashion outlets
- Examining fashion trends of the past and how things have changed
- Discussing the influence of the media on teenagers' fashion decisions and consumerism
- Listening to, reading, watching and analyzing a variety of fashion advertisements/fashion shows
- Learning about how fashion ads/shows are made
- Preparing the final project, in groups: a fashion advertisement or a fashion show
- Presenting the final project, in groups (oral and written)
- Reflecting on the unit, self and peer progress and performance

2.3.6. Achievement Tests

In December 1996, after the observation period and after the four teachers had completed the unit on *La Mode et la publicité* (both described above), their students completed tests designed to assess their achievement of the objectives of this unit. See Table 2.13 for a brief summary of the achievement tests. I created these tests and piloted them in a grade 9 class which had completed the same unit but which was not participating in my thesis study. This class was from another school board and region

Table 2.13- Summary of Achievement Tests: *La Mode et la publicité*

<u>Skill area</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Test Measure</u>
Listening comprehension (Max= 26)	Test de compréhension auditive: Partie 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of clothing items correctly matched to 2 authentic telephone conversations (Max= 13)
	Test de compréhension auditive: Partie 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of correct responses to multiple choice information questions (Max=8)
	Test de compréhension auditive: Partie 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of correct responses to multiple choice questions related to an authentic TV ad for ski clothing (Max=5)
General L2 proficiency (Max=24)	Cloze test: Part 1 (gap-filling exercise)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Up to 2 points for each verb chosen correctly from a list: points given for choice of correct verb as well as correct conjugation in present tense. 2 points given for accents. (Max= 14)
	Cloze test: Part 2 (gap-filling exercise)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Up to 3 points for each verb chosen correctly from a list: points given for choice of correct verb as well as correct conjugation in passé composé - points given for correct auxiliary and correct participle. One point given for correct subject-verb agreement. (Max=10)

Table 2.13- Summary of Achievement Tests: *La Mode et la publicité* (continued)

<u>Skill area</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Test Measure</u>
Reading comprehension (as well as knowledge of possessive adjectives and comparison)	Test de lecture: Partie 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of responses matched to correct correct descriptive statement (Max=6)
Reading comprehension (Max=2)	Test de lecture: Partie 3a	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of correct responses to multiple choice questions related to an authentic magazine ad for men's formal wear
Writing ability (Max=18)	Partie 3b: Écrit- Task 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fulfillment of description of model from magazine ad (see Test de lecture: Partie 3a above) including correct identification of clothing names, colors, materials and brand names. Extra point given for attempt entirely in French (Max=15).
	Partie 3b: Écrit- Task 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Task fulfillment, involving explanation of an idiomatic expression from magazine ad (from Test de lecture: Partie 3a above). Points given for an incorrect attempt in French, a correct explanation in English or a correct explanation in understandable French (Max=3).

Table 2.13- Summary of Achievement Tests: *La Mode et la publicité* (continued)

<u>Skill area</u>	<u>Test</u>	<u>Test Measure</u>
Speaking ability (Max=78)	Picture Description: 1, 2 and 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Correct description of the clothing of 3 models, including clothing names, colors, materials, hair type and color and accessories (Max=69).
	Opinions: 1, 2 and 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Stating and supporting an opinion about the outfits from the pictures above (Max=9).
Cultural Knowledge (Max= 20)	Test de connaissances culturelles: Partie 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of number of brand names (clothing) popular in Québec or France (Max=5)
	Test de connaissances culturelles: Partie 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of most popular fashion styles in Québec or France. Extra point given for attempt entirely in French (Max=7).
	Test de connaissances culturelles: Partie 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Count of similarities and differences between student's fashion preferences and those in Québec and France (Max=8).

in P.E.I.. As a result of piloting, some test items were refined to ensure an appropriate level of difficulty, validity and reliability. All students in the main study completed tests of listening and reading comprehension as well as writing achievement and cultural knowledge. A sub-sample of eight students per class participated in an oral interview. The same students who completed the oral pre-tests of general French proficiency were selected. A second person (the same fellow graduate student who helped score the general French proficiency tests) scored 15% of all achievement tests which were not matching or multiple choice and at least 95% agreement was reached on all tests.

As with the tests of general French proficiency, the administration of all parts of the achievement tests included a five-minute pre-activity designed to activate students' background knowledge of the themes and difficult vocabulary in the test components.

The listening comprehension test consisted of three parts. In Part 1, students listened to two telephone conversations. In the first, a teenaged girl tells a friend what she will wear on the first day of school. In the second conversation, a teenaged boy tells a friend what he will wear to an upcoming party. Students were required to write the initial of the name of the speaker who named clothing items beside pictures of several items of clothing. Part 2 was a multiple choice comprehension task based on eight short oral texts in which native speakers give their opinions on fashion-related issues. Part 3 was a multiple-choice comprehension task based on a television advertisement (taped from TéléQuébec⁵, with permission) for a store with a sale on ski and snowboarding

apparel.

The reading and writing test package consisted of three principal parts. The first part of the reading and writing test package consisted of two cloze tasks (or gap-filling exercises). In both cloze tasks, students were required to choose from a list of verbs to complete the two texts. The first text involved an adolescent French girl giving her opinion on fashion trends in general. In the second text, a teenage girl talks about her mother's reactions to an outfit she wore to a school dance. Students were asked to conjugate the verbs in the first text in the present tense and the *passé composé* in the second. The list of possible verbs was taken directly from the language objectives of the unit *La Mode et la publicité*. Students received one point for choosing the correct verb for each blank in the text. Another point was awarded if the verb was correctly conjugated in the specified tense. In the case of the text in the past tense, students received one point for a correct auxiliary verb and another point if the past participle was also correct. Two points were also given for difficult accent changes required by verb conjugations. One additional point was awarded for correct subject-verb agreement in the past tense (with a female subject and the auxiliary *être*).

The second part of the reading and writing test package evaluated reading comprehension as well knowledge of possessive adjectives and comparative structure formation (language objectives of the unit *La Mode et la publicité*). Students were given pictures of two models wearing similar but different outfits. The task required students

to indicate which model (or both or neither) most likely uttered each of the six sentences which included clothing items, possessive adjectives and comparative structures. One point was awarded for correctly identifying the author of each sentence.

The third part of the reading and writing test package was based on an advertisement from a Quebec-based fashion magazine in which a male model wearing formal attire describes his ensemble, including a tuxedo, a silk shirt and polka dot bow-tie. Students were first asked to respond to two multiple-choice comprehension questions based on their reading of the advertisement. Second, students were asked to write a detailed description of the model's outfit based on the magazine advertisement. Points were awarded for an understandable message with a majority of words in French which correctly identified clothing names, colors, materials and brand names (maximum of 14 points). One additional point was awarded if the student's attempt was entirely in comprehensible French. Finally students were asked to explain the meaning of an idiomatic expression included in the magazine advertisement. One point was awarded for either an incorrect attempt completely in French or a correct answer in English. Two points were awarded to a student whose answer in French was correct but laden with many errors. Students who gave a correct explanation in which a majority of words were in understandable French were awarded the maximum of three points.

The individually administered speaking tests involved two parts. First, students were given colored pictures (from a fashion magazine) of three models wearing

different clothing and accessories. Students were asked to give detailed descriptions of each model. One point each was awarded for correct descriptions of 69 items including the names of the model's clothing and accessories, colors and materials of which the clothing and accessories were made and the color and type of each model's hair. Students were then asked their opinion of each model's "look". One point was awarded for stating an opinion in comprehensible French. In addition, one point was given for each reason in support of the stated opinion (in comprehensible French, to a maximum of two points).

The culture test package consisted of three tasks directly related to the cultural objectives and activities of the unit *La Mode et la publicité*. In Part 1, students were asked to name up to five brand names for popular clothes in France or Québec. One point was awarded for each legitimate brand name. In Part 2, students were asked to describe, in French or English,²⁴ up to five popular fashion styles for young people in France and/or Québec. Points were awarded for naming different, legitimate styles. Students were also clearly informed that points would be awarded for responding in

²⁴ The authors of the Culture Syllabus of the NCFS (LeBlanc et al., 1990) recommend strongly that culture teaching be done in French. However, they do not indicate in which language assessment of cultural knowledge should occur. I decided to offer students a choice of English or French to respond to questions of cultural or content-based knowledge. Like Genesee and Hamayan (1994), I believe that allowing students to choose the language in which they respond for culture or content-based tests is appropriate so that language production skills in the SL do not hinder the students' results. Cultural knowledge and not writing skills were being assessed in the tests I describe above. However, I also believe students who choose to respond in their SL should receive extra points.

French. One point was given for a partial attempt in French. Two points were awarded for a text written using a majority of comprehensible French words. The third part of the culture test required students to identify up to three similarities and three differences between their personal fashion preferences and those of young people in France and Québec. As in Part 2 of the culture test, students were given the choice to answer in either French or English. Students were also clearly informed that points would be awarded for responding in French. Points were awarded for each distinct similarity and difference. One additional point was given for a partial attempt in French. Two additional points were awarded for a text written using a majority of comprehensible French words.

As in the case of the post-tests, the achievement test scores were adjusted for initial differences on the pre-test using analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). The same pre-test measure, the dictée, was used as the covariate for the ANCOVA. This procedure is justified for two reasons. First, the dictée is considered as a good predictor of overall language proficiency (see Pico, 1990; Tonnes-Schnier & Scheibner-Herzig, 1988; Young, 1987). Second, correlations between the pre-test dictée scores and the achievement test measures were all statistically significant.

2.4. Summary

This chapter described the research methods used in this field-based process-product case study, including descriptions of the participating teachers' and students'

characteristics and of the instrument used to record observations of the teaching approaches of four grade 9 core French teachers. The general French proficiency tests (pre- and post-) and the achievement tests were also detailed. The statistical analyses described (ANOVA, Tukey *a*, ANCOVA) compared student outcomes (French proficiency and achievement, affective, cultural, strategic) across classes according to their teacher's pedagogical approach. The analysis of the observation data, using the *Defining* and *Typical but not defining* features described above, appears in the first section of the next chapter. These data are then related in Chapter 3 to results of proficiency and achievement tests in order to address the following two research questions posed in Chapter 1:

1- Does a core French teaching approach based on a multidimensional project-based curriculum lead to higher language proficiency than one which is principally focused unidimensionally on grammar teaching?

2- Does a core French teaching approach based on a multidimensional project-based curriculum lead to more satisfactory outcomes with respect to the attitudinal, cultural and general language education objectives of core French as compared to one which is primarily unidimensionally focused on grammar teaching?

Chapter 3

Results

This chapter reporting the results of the research is divided into three sections. The first section presents the data from the classroom observations and the classification of the participants' teaching approaches based on analyses using the MOLT observation scheme and field notes. In the second section, results of the pre- and post-tests as well as the achievement tests are presented. In the third section, results of the student questionnaires are reported.

3.1. Results: Part 1

In this section, classroom observation data for all four teachers are presented. Each participant's teaching approach is classified using the MOLT observation scheme and the defining features of multidimensional project-based teaching. Details from field notes are also presented as a complement to the classroom observation completed using the MOLT observation scheme, paying particular attention to classroom set-up, the uses of French and English, and time off task. This section concludes with a summary of each teacher's classroom approach and their demeanor

and behaviour with their students.

3.1.1. Observation Data

Table 3.1 indicates the total percentage of time each teacher spent, during the observation periods,²⁵ on each of the features which define a multidimensional project-based approach. As the Table clearly shows, Teachers 1 and 2 were the only two participants who spent time during this observation period on classroom activities which were related to completing a project (the defining feature of a multidimensional approach, LeBlanc, 1990; CASLT, 1994. See also Table 2.11 above) during the unit on *La Mode et la publicité*. Eighty-two percent of Teacher 1's activities and 62% of Teacher 2's reflected the defining features of a multidimensional project-based approach. Neither Teacher 3 nor Teacher 4 spent any time on classroom activities which fall into the defining features category because they did not complete a project at the end of the teaching unit.

In keeping with procedures used in similar research of this type in which teaching approach and classes were ranked and grouped according to their experiential or analytic nature (for example, Harley, Allen, Cummins & Swain, 1990;

²⁵ It is important to specify that the results represent time spent on activities when I observed the four classes. I do therefore not imply that more time was not spent on a particular category at another time when I was not present (the 4 teachers' schedules were based on a 6-day cycle. I was able to coordinate my schedule in order to observe an average of 4 of these 6 days). For example, only 2.8% of the time observed in Teacher 1's class was dedicated to cultural activities related to the project. It becomes obvious from the results of his students' culture test that he did in fact do the prescribed culture activities which would allow his students to complete the culture test successfully.

Table 3.1: Percentage of Time Spent on Defining Features of a Multidimensional Project-Based Approach by Teacher

Feature	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3	Teacher 4
Communicative-Experiential activity related to project	23	30	0	0
Communicative-Experiential activity related to project integrated with another category	31.5	13	0	0
Language activity related to project	20	13	0	0
Language activity related to project integrated with another category	2	5	0	0
Culture activity related to project	2.8	0	0	0
General Language Education activity related to project	2.8	0	0	0
Assessment activity related to a project	0	0	0	0
Total	82.1	62	0	0

Note: The mean percentage for all classes on the defining features is 36%

Sanaoui, 1992), I calculated the mean score²⁶ for all classes ($M=36$ out of a possible 100).²⁷ Subsequently, I divided the classes into two groups, multidimensional project-based and less-multidimensional,²⁸ for comparisons of test scores and questionnaire results in order to respond to the research questions guiding the thesis research.

Table 3.2 indicates the percentage of time each teacher spent on typical but not defining features during the observation period. On most features, there is no pattern that differentiates the multidimensional project-based teachers from the less-multidimensional teachers, with the exception of the percentage of French they used during their classes and the amount of student input to the choice of activities.

Teacher 2 was observed using French exclusively 89% of the time and Teacher 1, 54% of the time. The percentage of time during which Teachers 3 and 4 used French exclusively in their classes differs substantially: 28% for Teacher 3 and 9% for Teacher 4. Table 3.3 presents a more detailed analysis of the teachers' language use. The results show that the percentage of activities in which teachers

²⁶ I calculated the mean by dividing the sum of the total of defining features for each teacher by four (see Table 3.1: therefore $82.1 + 62 + 0 + 0 / 4 = 36$).

²⁷ Since all defining features of a multidimensional project-based approach come from the same MOLT content section, the mean score is therefore out of a possible 100%.

²⁸ Less-multidimensional is being used instead of uni-dimensional because although Teachers 3 and 4 did not spend any time on activities related to a final project, their teaching did have a multiple focus including activities from different syllabi of a multidimensional curriculum model.

Table 3.2: Percentage of Time Spent on Typical but Not Defining Features by Teacher

Feature	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3	Teacher 4
personalized activities	60.0%	18.5%	55.6%	14.0%
L2 use by students	54%	66%	51%	32%
L2 use by teacher	54%	89%	28%	9%
group work	27.9%	13.3%	12.8%	0%
authentic documents	8.3%	14.3%	5.0%	11.6%
teacher as facilitator	43.9%	27.3%	46.5%	25.3%
students choose activities	12.5%	0%	0.4%	0%
teacher and students negotiate choice of activities	15.6%	9.4%	0%	0%

Note: The percentages included in this table do not add up to 100% because they correspond to different macro-categories of the MOLT observation scheme.

Table 3.3: Teachers' Uses of English and French - Average Percentage of Observed Time Over All Visits by Teacher

Category	Teacher 1 %	Teacher 2 %	Teacher 3 %	Teacher 4 %
Activities with teacher production	94	100	97	94
L1 only	22	11	37	63
L2 only	54	89	28	9
Mix L1 and L2	24	0	35	28

actually spoke was nearly equivalent for all four teachers. Both Teachers 3 and 4 used English exclusively (37% and 63% of observed time respectively) during their classes, much more than either Teachers 1 or 2 (22% and 11% respectively). In addition, Teachers 3 and 4 were observed to use a mix of English and French (35% and 28% respectively), more often than either Teacher 1 or Teacher 2 did (24% and 0% respectively).

In terms of student input to the choice of activities, Table 3.2 shows that students in Teacher 1's class chose their activities 12.5% of the time and negotiated their activities with their teacher 15.6% of the time observed (total of 28.1%). Although Teacher 2's students were not observed choosing any activities, they did negotiate activity choice with their teacher 9.4% of the time. No student input was observed in Teacher 4's class and only 0.4% of the time in Teacher 3's class.

Table 3.4 summarizes the average percentage of time spent by each teacher on

Table 3.4: Content Summary - Average Percentage of Time Observed by Teacher (all visits) for Each Category

Category	Teacher 1	Teacher 2	Teacher 3	Teacher 4
Communicative-Experiential Project	23	30	0	0
Communicative-Experiential - Project - Integrated	31.5	13	0	0
Communicative No Project	4.5	0	37	16
Communicative - No project - Integrated	0	0	9	3
Language - Project	20	13	0	0
Language - Project - Integrated	2	5	0	0
Language - No Project	0	8	27	27
Language - No project - Integrated	0	0	9	1
Language - No Context	0	0	0	18
Culture - Project	2.8	0	0	0
Culture - No Project	0	0	0	16
General Language Education - Project	2.8	0	0	0
General Language Education - No Project	0	4	3	0
Assessment	0	0	0	1
Discipline	0	2	1	0
Procedure	14	27	15	18

the various sub-categories of the content section of the MOLT observation scheme. In addition to the categories included in the Defining Features Table (see Table 3.1), Table 3.4 also indicates the percentage of time each teacher spent on classroom activity which was either less multidimensional or completely unidimensional. It also indicates the percentage of time spent on classroom discipline and procedures. It is clear that all teachers spent a significant amount of time on procedures (including explaining activities). For example, Teacher 2 spent a bit more than a quarter of the time observed (27%) on procedural-type activities, such as explaining how to complete an activity.

It is integral to my research questions to note the amount of time each of the teachers spent on activities which define a multidimensional project-based approach. Neither Teacher 3 nor Teacher 4 was completely unidimensional in his teaching approach; both of them included some activities which reflect a multiple perspective on language teaching, including communicative, language-based and cultural activities. Although Teacher 3 spent no time on culture activities of any kind during the observations, Teacher 4 spent more time than any of the four teachers (16%) on culturally-related activities, albeit not related to doing a project.²⁹ Teacher 3 also

²⁹ As indicated in Chapter 2, many of these activities involved students reading the articles included as resources for the cultural activities prescribed in the unit called *La Mode et la publicité*. In Teacher 4's classes, however, this involved one student reading one paragraph aloud, followed by translation into English by the teacher. This was then followed by students reading other paragraphs and subsequent translation of them.

spent a small amount of time (3%) on general language education activities. Teacher 4 was the only teacher observed doing language-based activities without any context provided (18%).

Table 3.5 presents a summary of the primary focus (i.e., most but not all of the time was spent on this category) or equal focus (i.e., approximately the same amount of time and emphasis were spent on more than one category) in terms of student modality over all observations. Although many of the activities in all teachers' classes aimed to develop speaking skills, according to the teacher's guide for the unit *La Mode et la publicité* (Ministère de l'Éducation de l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, 1996), it was obvious that the principal student modality observed in all classes was listening or listening combined with another skill. Many of the activities which aimed to develop speaking were teacher-fronted, wherein the teacher would ask a question and one student at a time would give a short response. For example, most of the four teachers asked students, one at a time, to describe orally what clothes they or their classmates were wearing. In these cases, one student would speak for about 30 seconds. Therefore, the majority of the students were listening in such cases, so I coded this type of episode as listening as the primary focus and speaking as the secondary focus. Listening was either the primary focus or an equal focus (combined with another skill) in 61% of the activities in Class 1, in 71% in Class 2, 52% in Class 3 and 79% in Class 4. Writing was the next most prominent skill practiced in

Table 3.5: Student Modality as Primary or Equal Focus - Average Percentage of Observed Time per Class (all visits)

Category	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Listening	44	64	44	71
Reading	0.4	2	2	2
Writing	6	17	22	14
Speaking	8	9	21	3
Other (viewing or representing)	3	2	0.6	0
Listening <u>and</u> Speaking	4	0	3	3
Listening <u>and</u> Reading	0	0	0	3
Listening <u>and</u> Writing	4	7	5	2
Listening <u>and</u> Other	9	0	0	0
Writing <u>and</u> Speaking	15	0	2	0
Reading <u>and</u> Writing	8	0	0	0
Writing <u>and</u> Other	0	0	0	3

all classes. Writing was either the primary or equal focus in 33% of the activities in Class 1, 24% in Class 2, 29% in Class 3, and 19% in Class 4. Speaking was either primary or equal focus in 27% of the activities in Class 1, 9% in Class 2, 26% in Class 3, and 6% in Class 4. Episodes in which speaking was the primary focus were typically group activities (except in Class 4) where the students shared their opinions on some topic such as fashion trends. Reading activities were given the least amount of time in all classes. Reading was either primary or equal focus in 8.4% of the activities in Class 1, in 2% in Classes 2 and 3, and 5% in Class 4.

It seems clear that only the teacher in Class 1 spent significant time on the development of all four language skills when student modality, primary or equal focus, is considered (with reading taking less than 10% of class time observed). When secondary focus (some but not most time is spent on this category during one episode or activity) is considered (see Table 3.6), it becomes clear the development of all language skills, except reading (Class 4 is an exception at 27.9%), was given at least a secondary focus. It is also clear that speaking received more attention as a secondary focus (31.5% in Class 1, 37.4% in Class 2, 54.8% in Class 3, and 59.5% in Class 4) than as a primary or equal focus in all classes.

Table 3.6: Student Modality as Secondary Focus - Average Percentage of Observed Time per Class (all visits)

Category	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4
Listening	6.3	18.3	14.9	4.0
Reading	3.0	3.9	9.6	27.9
Writing	23.3	27.4	17.5	5.6
Speaking	31.5	37.4	54.8	59.5

3.1.2. Field Notes

In addition to coding the MOLT observation scheme during the classroom visits, I took note of details about the teaching approach, the teacher and the students which were not captured by the observation scheme. The three features which emerged as recurring themes in my notes are discussed below in order to paint a more

complete picture of each class: classroom set-up, the use of English and French, and time off task. In a summary section about each class, I also include an overall personal impression of each teacher's demeanor and behaviour in the classroom.

3.1.2.1. Classroom Set-up

I documented the set-up of the four classrooms observed in my field notes. Students were seated in clusters of two to five students in Classes 1, 2 and 3. In Class 4, students were seated in rows, one behind the other. Seating students in clusters does not guarantee, but facilitates, group work. The structured rows in Class 4 indicate a less flexible and less collaborative learning environment. In fact, I observed no group work during my observations in this class. Moreover, the students changed places in all classes once during my visits, probably as one way for the teachers to control their class. However, in Classes 1, 2 and 3, this seating plan change also meant that students were exposed, during group and pair work, to different classmates with different strengths and weaknesses. Once during my visits, the location of the teacher's desk in Class 1 was changed and consequently the direction in which the students were oriented also changed (all students were faced away from the window in the latter configuration). This served principally to focus students' attention, preventing some of them from day-dreaming while looking out the window.

3.1.2.2. Uses of English and French

In Classes 1 and 2, students were required to ask permission to speak English. In Class 2 the teacher even asked his students' permission to use English during his teaching. The field notes indicate that the teacher in Class 1 became a bit more permissive of the use of English when students were working in small groups to complete their projects. Translation was used as a teaching strategy in all classes; however, the amount of translation varied noticeably among the classes. For example, there are 17 references in my notes to significant uses of translation over the 11 visits in Class 4. In Class 3, I made 12 references to the use of translation over 12 visits. In the case of Classes 1 and 2, my field notes indicate, for the most part, that translation was used for a few words at a time to aid student comprehension (except for one activity in Class 1). There were five references to translation over 12 visits in Class 1 and seven such references in Class 2 over seven visits.

3.1.2.3. Time Off Task

My field notes indicate some occasions in all classes, except in Class 2, when students were off task, especially during group work, but also during teacher-fronted activities when only one student was interacting with the teacher at a time. References to off-task activity were made five times over 12 visits in Class 1, 16 times over 11 visits in Class 3 and six times over 11 visits in Class 4. No references were made to off-task activity in Class 2.

3.1.3. Summary: The Four Classes

The teaching approach of each teacher, individually, is described below drawing on the observation data and my field notes, including an overall personal impression of each teacher's demeanor and behaviour in the classroom.

3.1.3.1. Teacher 1 (Class 1)

Teacher 1's classroom practice during the observation period reflected, in large part, a multidimensional project-based approach. His students were aware from the beginning of the unit on *La Mode et la publicité* that they were to complete a final project (a fashion show) and that the activities they would do were to prepare and help them do so. A majority of the activities observed in Teacher 1's classes (54.5%) reflected objectives of the communicative-experiential syllabus, coded as either primary focus, or equal focus, in combination with another content category such as language. In fact, almost one-third of the activities in this class had a dual focus (31.5%), although the principal content objective was communicative-experiential. Only a small percentage of the communicative activities in Class 1 (4.5%) were not related to the students' project. About one fifth (22%) of the activities observed were related to the language syllabus. All of the language syllabus activities observed in Teacher 1's classes were related to the students' final project. Teacher 1 was the only teacher observed doing cultural and general language education activities related to the students' project; however, this was a small percentage of observed time (2.8%

for each syllabus). A majority of his activities were personalized (60%), students were involved in group work twice as frequently as the students from all other classes (27.9%) and his students were involved in choosing or negotiating the content of the classes much more than any of the other classes (28.1% vs 9.4% in Class 2, 0.4% in Class 3 and 0% in Class 4). Teacher 1 was observed using French exclusively in class a majority (54%) of the time and English exclusively about one fifth (22%) of the time. The activities in this class were aimed at developing all four language skills. The students were sitting in pairs, arranged in rows. The students were required to speak French as much as possible; almost exclusively when addressing their teacher individually. Some students were observed to be off-task on five occasions over the entire observation period. Teacher 1 had a positive attitude towards his students and the core French curriculum. He enjoyed working with his students and frequently used humor with them. He rarely raised his voice during the time I observed his teaching. The students appeared to like him and, in general, enjoyed the activities in his classes.

3.1.3.2. Teacher 2 (Class 2)

Teacher 2's classroom activities during the observation period also reflected many features of a multidimensional project-based approach. As in Teacher 1's case, the students in Class 2 were aware from the beginning of the unit, *La Mode et la publicité*, that they would work towards a final project. They were also aware that the

activities they would do were designed to prepare and help them complete their project successfully. A near majority (43%) of the content activities observed in Teacher 2's classes were part of the communicative-experiential syllabus, coded as either primary focus, or equal focus, in combination with another content category. All of them were related to the students' project. Thirteen percent of the communicative-experiential activities observed in Class 2 had a dual focus. Approximately one quarter (26%) of the content activities were related to the language syllabus, with almost one fifth (18%) being related to the project. No cultural activities were observed in Class 2; As I discovered during a post-observation discussion, Teacher 2 decided to eliminate the prescribed cultural activities due to his extended absence for health reasons. A small percentage (4%) of general language education-type activities were observed, but they were not related to the students' project. One of the most distinctive features of the teaching in Class 2 was the use of French in the classroom. Teacher 2 was observed using French exclusively 89% of the time and English exclusively only 11% of the time. The students in this class were observed using French exclusively 66% of the time. I noted that these students were required to ask permission to speak English, at least when addressing their teacher, either in a large group or individually. Teacher 2 also asked his students' permission to use English in class. It is fair to say that Teacher 2 "ran quite a tight ship.". He spent considerable time ensuring that students understood

his explanations completely; he spent more than a quarter (27%) of observed time on classroom procedures. This may explain, in part, why his students were not observed to be off-task during the observation periods. The activities in Class 2 provided a large amount of time for students to listen to spoken French (71%). Writing was the primary or equal focus in nearly one-fifth (17%) of the activities in this class whereas speaking and reading received relatively little attention as a primary or equal focus (9% and 2% respectively). Speaking was given much more attention as a secondary focus (37.4%). Although students were sitting in clusters of four or five, which would be conducive to group work, students worked cooperatively only 13.3% of the time observed. There were many occasions when Teacher 2 expressed concern for his students' well-being and their learning. I would describe Teacher 2 as nurturing and protective. Although Teacher 2 rarely used humor, the tone of his voice was supportive and encouraging. He talked about and insisted on respect in his classroom (for the teacher and for other students). Students certainly respected their teacher and seemed to enjoy their classes very much.

3.1.3.3. Teacher 3 (Class 3)

Teacher 3's classroom approach was neither project-based nor completely unidimensional (labeled therefore less-multidimensional). During the observation period, he did not spend any time on activities which define a multidimensional project-based approach. However, a near-majority of his activities were

communicative in nature although not related to a project. For example, his students did discuss their preferences regarding different fashion trends, the difference being that the skills and language learned during this activity were not intended to prepare the students to complete a project or task. In other words, many of the activities completed in Class 3 were drawn from the prescribed unit called *La Mode et la publicité* but the students did not complete any final project, thus they were not aware of a purposeful reason for doing them (unless of course they were intrinsically motivated to learn, despite the absence of a project). Similarly, the language activities (36%) were not related to any obvious communicative need which a project creates. Almost one-tenth (9%) of both the communicative and language activities had a dual focus, combined with another content category. Teacher 3 spent no time on culture activities during the observation period and only 3% of the time on general language education activities, not related to a project. Although a majority (55.6%) of Teacher 3's activities were personalized (meaning the theme or topic of the task or activity was related first to the students' lives and previous knowledge and experiences), students actually chose or negotiated choice of these activities only 0.4% of the time observed. Teacher 3 used French exclusively only slightly more than a quarter of the time (28%) whereas English was used exclusively more than a third of the time (37%). Translation was observed 12 times in 12 visits. A majority (52%) of the activities in Class 3 focused primarily on developing students' listening skills. Almost

a third (29%) of the activities in Class 3 also focused on developing writing skills and about a quarter (26%) of the activities aimed primarily at speaking skills. Reading, both as a primary and secondary focus, was given little attention. Speaking was given a secondary focus in a majority (54.8%) of the activities in Class 3. The students were sitting in clusters of two or three, conducive to group work; however, Teacher 3's students were observed working in groups only 12.8% of the time. Students were observed to be off-task in Teacher 3's class more than in any other: 16 times over 11 visits. Although it was not apparent to me that the students generally enjoyed all of their core French classes, a large majority of Teacher 3's students (88%) reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their grade 9 French classes (see Table 3.11 below).

3.1.3.4. Teacher 4 (Class 4)

Like Teacher 3, I classified Teacher 4's teaching approach as less-multidimensional. Although Teacher 4 spent no time on activities related to a student project, data were collected reflecting activities from three of four syllabuses of a multidimensional curriculum model. A near majority (46%) of the activities observed in Class 4 were related to the language syllabus, including 18% without any real context. Nearly one-fifth (19%) of Teacher 4's activities were communicative in nature. Although Teacher 4 spent no observed time where the primary focus was general language education, he did spend 16% of the observed time on culture

activities. Like Teacher 3, many of these were drawn from the unit *La Mode et la publicité* but were related in no way to a student project. Students were sitting in single-file rows; it is therefore not surprising that they did no group work during the time observed even though such a seating arrangement does not preclude cooperative activities. Only 14% of Teacher 4's activities were personalized. Moreover, students did not choose or negotiate the content of any activities. Most notable in Class 4 was the low tally for exclusive use of French. Students were observed using French exclusively only 32% of the time (as compared to 54% in Teacher 1's class, 66% in Teacher 2's and 51% in Teacher 3's). There were 17 references in my field notes to the use of translation over 11 visits in Class 4. This appears to relate to Teacher 4's exclusive use of French in only 9% of observed activities. In fact, Teacher 4 was observed using English exclusively 63% of the time. When student modality is considered, Teacher 4's students were involved to a large degree (79%) in activities where they listened to others speaking (mostly in English or a mixture of English and French). Writing was a primary or equal focus in nearly one-fifth (19%) of Teacher 4's activities. Speaking was a secondary focus in 59.5% of Teacher 4's activities and reading was a secondary focus in slightly more than a quarter (27.9%) of his activities. Students were observed off-task six times over 11 visits. Like Teacher 3's students, my impression was that the students in Class 4 generally did not enjoy all of their core French classes. However, a large majority of Teacher 4's students (91%)

reported that they were either satisfied or very satisfied with their grade 9 French classes (see Table 3.11 below).

3.2. Results: Part 2

In the following section, results from the pre- and post-tests as well as the achievement tests are reported. Following from the previous section, comparisons are based on the grouping of Teachers 1 and 2 in the "multidimensional project-based" category and Teachers 3 and 4 in the "less-multidimensional" category.

3.2.1. Pre-Tests

Table 3.7 presents the results of the pre-tests, for each class, administered at the beginning of the study in September, 1996. Mean test scores, by class, were first compared using ANOVA. Where the *F*-ratio was statistically significant (at the .05 level), more conservative post-hoc Tukey multiple comparisons ($p < .05$) were conducted. The following statistically significant differences emerged on the Tukey comparisons:

- Class 1 outperformed Class 4 on the following five test measures (out of 14 possible pre-test measures): Listening Total, Composition 2, Composition Total, Reading Total, Oral Part 3.
- Class 1 outperformed Class 3 on the Composition Total.
- Class 2 outperformed Class 4 on the following three test measures: Composition 1, Composition Total and Oral Part 3.

Table 3.7: Pre-test Scores by Class (General Proficiency Tests)

Test	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4		F-ratio Sig. (.05)	Tukey (.05)			
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD			N		
Listening (Max= 15)	10.2	2.2	27	9.2	2.2	23	8.7	3.1	3.1	25	.002	1>4 (.001) 3>4 (.02)	
Writing Total (dictée + compositions Max= 81)	45.0	17.3	29	45.3	13.9	18	42.9	17.2	34.5	17.0	24	.31	
Dictée (Max= 71)	38.4	15.7	29	39.1	12.7	19	37.9	14.8	29.9	15.6	24	.36	
Composition 1 (Max= 6)	4.6	1.4	29	5.1	1.3	18	3.5	1.9	3.6	1.5	24	.007	2>3 (.03) 2>4 (.02)
Composition 2 (Max= 4)	2.1	1.5	29	1.7	1.0	18	1.6	1.3	0.96	1.2	24	.07	
Composition Total (Max= 10)	6.7	2.6	29	6.7	2.0	18	5.1	2.8	4.6	2.1	24	.009	1>4 (.03) 2>4 (.05)
Reading Total (Max= 20)	12.1	2.9	25	11.2	2.8	22	11.1	3.1	9.7	2.3	23	.04	1>4 (.03)
Reading Part 1 (Max= 10)	8.6	2.1	25	8.0	1.8	22	7.5	2.0	7.2	2.1	23	.06	

Table 3.7: Pre-test scores of general French proficiency by class (continued)

Test	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4		F-ratio Sig. (.05)	Tukey (.05)				
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD			N			
Reading Part 2 (Max= 5)	1.0	1.0	25	1.1	0.9	22	1.3	1.2	27	0.96	0.9	23	.91	
Reading Part 3 (Max= 5)	2.5	1.4	25	2.0	1.3	22	2.3	1.2	27	1.6	1.2	23	.04	1>4 (.05)
Oral Total (Max= 41)	28.9	3.8	9	28.1	2.9	8	26.7	5.7	9	23.8	4.7	8	.06	
Oral Part 1 (Max= 9)	5.4	1.7	9	4.4	1.3	8	4.9	2.3	9	4.1	1.2	8	.84	
Oral Part 2 (Max= 10)	7.1	1.3	9	6.9	1.0	8	7.0	2.0	9	6.9	1.6	8	.57	
Oral Part 3 (Max= 22)	16.3	1.9	9	17.0	1.3	8	14.8	3.3	9	12.8	3.5	8	.003	1>4 (.03) 2>4 (.002)

- Class 2 outperformed Class 3 on Composition 1.

In summary, the general French proficiency of the students in the four classes differed in many ways at the beginning of the study, especially when the students from Classes 1 and 2 were compared to the students from Classes 3 and 4. This is an important consideration for further statistical analyses and is discussed below in more depth.

3.2.2. Post-Tests

Table 3.8 below reports the adjusted post-test scores (adjusted for differences on the pre-tests) administered near the end of the academic year in which this study was conducted. The post-tests were identical to the pre-tests administered at the beginning of the study. They are therefore one way to assess students' progress in general French proficiency over the academic year.

ANCOVAs were conducted to adjust the post-test scores for initial differences on the pre-tests and to identify statistical differences among the classes. The pre-test score for each test was used as the covariate in each case. Tests of significance in SPSS were programmed specifically to compare the adjusted means for "multidimensional project-based" classes and the "less-multidimensional" classes (1&2 vs 3&4). These tests also determined whether there were significant differences in the adjusted mean

Table 3.8: Post-test Scores by Class (General Proficiency Tests), Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores

Test	Class 1		Class 2		Class 3		Class 4		ANCOVA (.05)				
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
Listening (Max= 15)	10.5	2.9	27	10.1	2.1	21	8.9	2.5	21	8.6	3.0	26	1&2>3&4 (.004)
Writing Total (Dictée + compositions Max= 81)	50.9	17.0	28	53.1	12.2	20	47.5	13.8	22	43.3	17.4	26	1&2>3&4 (.04)
Dictée (Max=71)	44.6	15.6	28	47.4	10.9	20	42.0	11.8	22	37.9	15.5	26	1&2>3&4 (.03)
Composition 1 (Max= 6)	4.7	1.2	28	4.7	1.2	20	3.8	1.7	22	3.8	2.0	26	1&2>3&4 (.02)
Composition 2 (Max= 4)	1.8	1.4	28	1.9	1.1	20	1.6	1.3	22	1.8	1.0	26	n.s.
Composition Total (Max= 10)	6.4	2.4	28	6.6	2.0	20	5.5	2.7	22	5.7	2.7	26	n.s.
Reading Total (Max= 20)	11.0	4.2	28	12.2	2.4	21	10.0	3.6	21	10.4	3.2	24	n.s.
Reading Part 1 (Max= 10)	6.8	3.1	28	8.5	1.2	21	7.2	2.7	21	7.3	2.4	24	n.s.

Table 3.8: Post-Test Scores by Class (General Proficiency Tests), Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores (continued)

Test	Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4			ANCOVA (.05)
	<u>M</u>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>										
Reading Part 2 (Max= 5)	1.8	1.1	28	1.2	1.0	21	1.3	1.0	21	1.0	1.0	24	n.s.
Reading Part 3 (Max= 5)	2.5	1.7	28	2.5	1.1	21	1.6	1.4	21	2.0	1.4	24	1&2>3&4 (.03)
Oral Total (Max= 41)	32.4	3.8	8	31.9	3.8	8	29.2	4.8	8	30.0	4.8	8	n.s.
Oral Part 1 (Max= 9)	6.2	1.5	8	4.7	0.7	8	5.1	1.7	8	4.2	1.4	8	1>2 (.05)
Oral Part 2 (Max= 10)	7.9	1.4	8	8.6	1.2	8	7.5	1.6	8	8.6	1.3	8	n.s.
Oral Part 3 (Max= 22)	18.3	2.5	8	18.3	2.5	8	16.7	2.4	8	17.4	3.3	8	n.s.

Note: ANCOVA conducted using Pre-test scores as covariates. I designed the tests of significance to make the following 3 contrasts: Classes 1&2 vs. Classes 3&4, Class 3 vs. Class 4, Class 1 vs. Class 2.

post-test scores between Classes 1 and 2 and between 3 and 4, respectively.³⁰ The following statistically significant differences emerged when the adjusted post-test score means were compared using ANCOVA ($p < .05$):

- Classes 1 and 2 (the multidimensional project-based classes) significantly outperformed Classes 3 and 4 (the less-multidimensional classes) on the following five post-tests (out of 14 possible test measures): Listening Total, Writing Total, Dictée, Composition 1 and Reading Part 3.
- Only one significant difference was identified when Classes 1 and 2 were compared: Class 1 significantly outperformed Class 2 on Part 1 of the Oral test when post-test scores were adjusted for initial differences on the same pre-test.

3.2.3. Achievement Test Results

Table 3.9 presents the results of the achievement tests, administered at the end

³⁰ Whereas the Tukey test makes all possible pair-wise contrasts of means in the data set, the ANCOVA allowed only for 3 contrasts (degrees of freedom, or the N , minus one). Comparing the "multidimensional project-based" classes against the "less-multidimensional" classes is logical because this corresponds to the research questions posed above in Chapters 1 and 2. This choice of statistical comparison is also justified because pre-test results and exploratory Tukey comparisons conducted on the post-test data (not reported) established that trends were emerging in a multidimensional project-based vs. less-multidimensional dichotomy.

of the observation period, in December, 1996. As indicated above in Chapter 2, these tests were designed to assess students' achievement of the skills and knowledge of the project-based teaching unit implemented by all teachers during the time they were observed.

Mean test scores were adjusted for initial differences on the pre-tests of general French proficiency using ANCOVAs. As indicated above in Chapter 2, I decided to use one pre-test measure (the dictée) as the covariate for all achievement test measures. The ANCOVA contrasts were programmed, in SPSS, specifically to compare the mean adjusted achievement test scores from the "multidimensional project-based" classes and the "less-multidimensional" classes (1&2 vs. 3&4). These tests also determined whether there were significant differences between the adjusted achievement test scores Classes 1 versus 2 and then between Classes 3 versus 4, respectively.

The following statistically significant differences emerged when ANCOVA was conducted on the achievement test scores, adjusted for pre-test differences:

- Classes 1 and 2 outperformed Classes 3 and 4 on the following 11 test measures (out of a possible 18 test measures): Listening total, Listening Part 1, Listening Part 3, Reading/Writing total, Cloze total, Cloze présent, Cloze passé, Writing, Oral total, Describe total, Opinion

Table 3.9: Achievement Test Scores by Class, Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores

Test	Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4			ANCOVA (.05)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>										
Listening Total (Max=26)	13.4	5.6	25	12.3	4.3	20	10.5	4.3	25	9.6	3.6	21	1&2>3&4 (.006)
Listening Part 1 (Max=13)	7.2	3.7	25	6.6	3.1	20	5.2	3.4	25	4.7	2.7	21	1&2>3&4 (.01)
Listening Part 2 (Max=8)	2.9	1.7	25	2.6	1.5	20	2.5	1.2	25	2.4	1.4	21	n.s.
Listening Part 3 (Max=5)	3.3	1.3	25	3.2	1.2	20	2.8	1.3	25	2.4	1.1	21	1&2>3&4 (.03)
Reading/Writing Total (Max=50)	17.3	6.2	29	13.9	5.5	21	11.7	7.8	24	8.9	3.6	26	1&2>3&4 (.000)
Matching (Max=6)	3.8	1.3	30	3.0	1.2	21	2.9	1.6	24	3.1	1.5	26	n.s.
Cloze Total (Max=24)	4.6	3.0	29	3.9	3.1	21	2.9	2.8	24	1.7	1.7	26	1&2>3&4 (.000)

Table 3.9: Achievement Test Scores by Class, Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores (continued)

Test	Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4			ANCOVA
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>										
Cloze (présent) (Max=14)	3.6	2.4	29	2.8	2.3	21	2.5	2.4	24	1.1	1.3	26	1&2>3&4 (.002) 1>2 (.05)
Cloze (passé) (Max=10)	1.1	1.7	29	1.1	1.5	21	0.4	0.7	24	0.6	0.8	26	1&2>3&4 (.02)
Multiple choice (Max=2)	0.9	0.6	29	1.0	0.7	21	0.6	0.6	24	1.1	0.7	26	4>3 (.03)
Writing (Max=18)	8.0	3.6	29	6.1	3.1	21	5.3	4.1	24	3.0	2.8	26	1&2>3&4 (.000) 3>4 (.03)
Oral Total (Max=78)	63.1	6.6	8	54.4	6.8	8	54.0	12.4	8	39.7	10.8	8	1&2>3&4 (.001) 3>4 (.002)
Describe Total (Max=69)	55.8	5.6	8	48.2	6.0	8	48.1	11.5	8	36.2	8.4	8	1&2>3&4 (.002) 3>4 (.003)

Table 3.9: Achievement Test Scores by Class, Adjusted for Pre-Test Scores (continued)

Test	Class 1			Class 2			Class 3			Class 4			ANCOVA (.05)
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>										
Opinion Total (Max=9)	7.3	1.4	8	6.3	1.4	8	5.9	1.9	8	3.5	2.6	8	1&2>3&4 (.004) 3>4 (.01)
Culture Total (Max=20)	9.6	4.3	28	6.3	4.3	21	7.3	4.8	24	7.9	4.0	26	1>2 (.01)
Culture Part 1 (Max=5)	3.6	1.4	28	3.9	1.5	21	3.2	1.6	24	3.5	1.5	26	n.s.
Culture Part 2 (Max=7)	3.5	2.1	28	2.1	2.8	21	2.7	2.5	24	2.7	1.9	26	n.s.
Culture Part 3 (Max=8)	2.6	2.5	28	0.3	1.2	21	1.6	1.7	24	1.8	1.9	26	1>2 (.000)

Note: ANCOVA was conducted using the Pre-test dictée score as covariate. I designed the tests of significance to make the following 3 contrasts: Classes 1&2 vs. Classes 3&4, Class 3 vs. Class 4, Class 1 vs. Class 2

total.

- Class 3 outperformed Class 4 on the following five measures: Listening Part 2, Writing, Oral total, Describe total, Opinion total.
- Class 1 outperformed Class 2 on three test measures: Cloze présent, Culture total, Culture Part 3.
- Class 4 outperformed Class 3 on one test measure: reading comprehension (multiple choice).

3.2.4. Summary of Test Results

Statistically significant differences emerged among the students' test scores in the four teachers' classes on some pre-test measures (using ANOVA and Tukey, $p \leq .05$). When ANCOVA was conducted on adjusted post-test scores, Classes 1 and 2 (the multidimensional project-based classes) achieved statistically significant superior scores on the following post-test measures (when compared to Classes 3 and 4): Listening Total, Writing Total, Dictée, Composition 1, Reading Part 3. When ANCOVA was conducted on adjusted achievement test scores, Classes 1 and 2 (the multidimensional project-based classes) achieved statistically superior scores on the following test measures (when compared to Classes 3 and 4): Listening Total, Listening Part 1, Listening Part 3, Reading/Writing Total, Cloze Total, Cloze (présent and passé), Writing, Oral Total, Describe Total, Opinion Total.

3.3. Results: Part 3

Given the large volume of questionnaire data, I report only results where statistically significant differences, relevant to the main research questions guiding the study, emerged when the pre- and post-questionnaires were analyzed. The data are presented in detail in Tables 3.3.1.-3.3.20. in Appendix E. Two types of descriptive statistics are presented in these Tables: 1) frequency calculations indicating the percentage of student responses for each of the four classes on each questionnaire item; 2) statistical analyses of differences in the distribution of student responses across classes, using Chi-square comparisons ($p < .05$). Table 3.10 summarizes the significant differences among classes but does not indicate where these differences lie among classes. In the text, below, I identify where the statistical differences lie using adjusted standardized residuals³¹ on the Chi-square analyses. Where possible, particular emphasis is placed on differences which distinguish between the "multidimensional project-based" classes and the "less-multidimensional" classes (1&2 vs. 3&4).

For ease of presentation, the questionnaire data (pre- and post-) have been

³¹ The residual equals the difference between the observed and expected frequency for each item and is calculated at the cell level. The residual is used to identify interactional effects at the cell level of the Chi-square which deviate extremely from the expected residual if there were no interaction or dependence. The adjusted standardized residual corrects for random deviation errors. Significant differences on the Chi-square analysis are caused by residuals, at the cell level, which exceed ± 2 standard deviations. The assumption here is that the residuals should be normally distributed.

Table 3.10 : A Summary of Significant Differences on Pre- and Post-Questionnaire Data (Based on Chi-Square Analyses)

Category	Pre-questionnaire Significant differences	Post-questionnaire Significant differences
Self-assessment of French skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● reading a menu ● writing a letter to a friend ● writing an essay (environment) ● conducting an interview ● doing an oral presentation ● participating in a group discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● understanding a job ad ● writing a letter to a friend ● understanding a film
Self-assessment of cultural knowledge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● francophones in western Canada ● popular francophone singers ● eating habits of local French people ● different cultures in student's community 	
Self-assessment of improvement since starting French studies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● listening ● speaking ● reading ● self-confidence while speaking French ● motivation to learn French ● understanding of francophone youth ● ability to anticipate meaning when reading or listening 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● writing

Note: This table does not identify where differences among classes lie. Please refer to the text in Section 3.3.

Table 3.10 : A Summary of Significant Differences on Pre- and Post-Questionnaire Data (Based on Chi-Square Analyses) (...continued)

Category	Pre-questionnaire Significant differences	Post-questionnaire Significant differences
Attitudes towards French language and culture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● learning a second language is good ● I look bad if I make mistakes when speaking French 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● it's important to learn about French culture ● official bilingualism is good
Activity usefulness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● learning vocabulary ● oral presentations ● listening to videos ● doing grammar exercises 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● oral presentations
Strategy use: Speaking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● rephrasing what you say 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● switching to English temporarily ● asking for help in French
Strategy use: listening	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● giving up and tuning out 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● using the context ● asking the speaker questions
Strategy use: reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● using the context ● using cognates ● looking up only the necessary words in the dictionary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● using the context
Strategy use: writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● asking the teacher to read my writing ● using a dictionary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● writing a rough copy and revising ● asking a friend for help ● asking a teacher to read my writing ● asking a friend to read my writing
Motivations for learning French	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● French is my favorite subject 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● French is my favorite subject ● intentions to study French in high school ● French in grade 10

Note: This table does not identify where differences among classes lie (based on Chi-square analyses). Please refer to the text in Section 3.3.

divided into the following categories corresponding to the different sections of the questionnaires completed by all students: self-assessment (French skills, cultural knowledge, improvement in French), attitudes towards the French language and culture, usefulness of activities, strategy use, and motivations for learning French.

3.3.1. Self-Assessment Data

In both pre- and post-questionnaires, students were asked to assess their skills in French and their cultural knowledge. They were also asked to indicate how much their French skills had improved since beginning their second language studies.

3.3.1.1. Self-Assessment of French Skills

Chi-square analyses conducted on the pre-questionnaire data revealed statistically significant differences (See Appendix E) amongst the four classes on the following six communicative tasks in French (out of ten self-assessment measures): reading a menu, writing a letter to a friend, writing an essay about the environment, conducting an interview, doing an oral presentation on the environment and participating in a group discussion entirely in French.

Using adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square analyses to identify the source of the differences amongst the classes, these significant differences on the pre-questionnaire are attributed principally to Class 4. In almost all cases, significantly more students from this class indicated that all these tasks were either much more difficult in French as compared to English or they reported that they

probably couldn't do the tasks in French. In the case of writing an essay about the environment, Class 2 also contributed to the significant differences. Nearly 70% of the students in Class 2 reported that writing an essay about the environment was much more difficult in French than in English (as compared to 38% of students in Class 1, 41% in Class 3 and 23% in Class 4).

Fewer differences remained amongst the classes at the end of the academic year when the post-questionnaire was administered. Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire data revealed significant differences amongst the four classes on the following three communicative tasks in French (out of ten self-assessment measures): understanding a job ad, understanding a film, and writing a letter to a friend.

In the case of understanding a job ad in French, significant differences emerged in favor of the multidimensional project-based classes as compared to the less-multidimensional classes on the post-questionnaire. About a quarter (23%) of the students in Class 4 indicated that understanding a job ad in French was either just as easy or a little more difficult than in English; this compares to a majority of students from Classes 1 and 2 (58% and 50% respectively). In addition, nearly one quarter of the students from Class 3 indicated that they probably couldn't understand a job ad in French, whereas no students in Classes 1 and 2 indicated this.

Significant differences emerged to distinguish the multidimensional project-based students from the less-multidimensional students when they were asked in the

post-questionnaire to assess their ability to write a letter to a friend. On the one hand, a majority of students in Classes 1 and 2 (64% and 55%, respectively) reported that writing a letter to a friend was either just as easy or just a little more difficult in French as compared to English. On the other hand, quite a large majority of students from Classes 3 and 4 (60% and 77%, respectively) reported that writing a letter was either much more difficult in French than in English or impossible.

Chi-square analyses revealed significant differences among the classes on students' post-questionnaire self-assessment of their ability to understand a film in French, but these differences did not distinguish between the multidimensional project-based and the less-multidimensional classes. A majority (54%) of students in Class 1 and 36% of the students in Class 3 indicated that understanding a film in French was just as easy or just a little more difficult in French compared to English; significantly fewer students from Classes 2 and 4 indicated the same. In fact, a large majority of students in Classes 2 and 4 indicated that understanding a film in French was either much more difficult in French than in English, or impossible (75% and 86%, respectively).

3.3.1.2. Self-Assessment of Cultural Knowledge

Students were asked to assess their level of knowledge of various aspects of francophone culture, including 13 different questionnaire items (see Appendix E). Chi-square analyses conducted on the pre-questionnaire data revealed significantly

different knowledge levels amongst the four classes on the following four aspects of francophone culture: francophones in western Canada, popular francophone singers, eating habits of local French people, and different cultures in the students' communities. No significant differences remained amongst the classes at the end of the academic year when the post-questionnaire was administered.

Using adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square analyses on the pre-questionnaire, in the case of students' knowledge of francophones in western Canada, significantly more students in Class 1 (14%) reported that their knowledge was good, as compared to all other classes (0% in Classes 2 and 4, 7% in Class 3). Similarly, significantly more students from Class 1 (21%) reported that their knowledge of the eating habits of local French people was either good or very good, as compared to all other classes (4% in Classes 2 and 3, and 8% in Class 4).

Significant differences which emerged among classes, related to students' knowledge of different cultures in their community and of popular singers, can be attributed to Class 4. Eighty-nine percent of students from Class 4 indicated that their knowledge of different cultures in their community was poor, or they couldn't say; this contrasts significantly with 48% in Class 1, 72% in Class 2, and 38% in Class 3. In addition, significantly fewer students from Class 4 (8%) indicated that their knowledge of popular singers was either good or very good: This compares to 31% of students in Classes 1 and 2 and 44% of students in Class 3.

3.3.1.3. Self-Assessment of Improvement Since Starting French Studies

In this category, students were asked nine related questions to assess how much they had improved, since beginning their SL studies, in different areas related to learning French. Many differences existed amongst the four classes on the pre-questionnaire (see Appendix E): listening, speaking, reading, self-confidence while speaking French, motivation to learn French, understanding of francophone youth cultures and ability to anticipate meaning when reading or listening.

Adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square analyses showed many of the differences originated from Class 4. Significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported that their listening, reading, self-confidence while speaking French, understanding of francophone youth, and their ability to anticipate meaning when reading or listening, had improved either a great deal or somewhat since beginning studies in French.

In the case of speaking and motivations to learn French on the pre-questionnaire, significant differences relate to both Classes 2 and 4. Significantly more students from Class 2, as compared to all other classes, reported that their speaking and their motivation to learn French had improved either a great deal or somewhat, since beginning French studies. Moreover, significantly more students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, responded either “no improvement” or “don’t know”, when asked how much their speaking and motivation for learning

French had improved since starting French studies.

Only one statistical difference remained when the post-questionnaire was administered: improvement in writing. An analysis of adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests identified the following sources for the differences amongst the classes: Significantly more students in Class 2, as compared to students from all other classes, reported that their writing skills had improved either a great deal or somewhat (95% as compared to 65% in Class 1, 71% in Class 3 and 55% for Class 4). In addition, two fifths of the students in Class 4 reported that their writing skills had not improved at all since they began studying French (this contrasts significantly with 0% in Class 2, 19% in Class 1, and 13% in Class 3).

3.3.2. Attitudes Towards French Language and Culture

In this category, students were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with a series of attitudinal questions related to French language, francophone culture, language learning and multiculturalism.

Significant differences (see Appendix E) existed amongst the four classes on two attitudinal items on the pre-questionnaire (out of nine attitudinal items): "learning a second language is good" and "I look bad if I make mistakes when speaking French." Adjusted standardized residuals link the statistical differences in the first case, learning a SL is good, to Class 2: Significantly more students from this class (91%), as compared to all others, either agreed or strongly agreed that learning a SL

is good (72% in Class 1, 61% in Class 3, and 50% in Class 4). Significantly more students from Class 4 (39%), as compared to all other classes, strongly disagreed that making mistakes makes them look bad when speaking French (17% in Class 1, 9% in Class 2, and 7% in Class 3).

Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated that significant differences existed among the classes on two different attitudinal items: "it's important to learn about French culture" and "official bilingualism is good". An analysis of adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests identified the following sources of the differences amongst the classes: Statistical differences emerged on the first item principally because of a higher number of students in Class 1 (24%) who agreed strongly that it is important to learn about French culture (as compared to 5% in Class 2, 4% in Class 3 and 0% in Class 4).

Almost one third of students from Class 1 strongly agreed that official bilingualism is important (compared to 5% of students in Class 2, 13% of Class 3, and 10% of Class 4). In addition, significantly more students in Class 2, as compared to all other classes, agreed that official bilingualism is good.

3.3.3. Usefulness of Activities

In this category, students were asked to indicate how useful a series of 11 classroom activities are for learning French. Significant differences (see Appendix E) existed amongst the four classes on four pre-questionnaire items: learning

vocabulary, oral presentations, listening to videos, and doing grammar exercises.

Significant differences, using adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square analyses, on all four pre-questionnaire items can be traced to Class 4. Significantly fewer students in Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported that learning vocabulary, oral presentations, listening to videos and doing grammar exercises, were either useful or very useful.

Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated that significant differences remained for one classroom activity only: Significantly more students from Class 2 (95%) reported that oral presentations were either useful or very useful as compared to students from all other classes (61% in Class 1, 80% for Class 3, and 64% for Class 4).

Also related to students' assessment of the usefulness of activities are their reports of satisfaction with their grade 9 French. Mean results of student reports of their satisfaction with grade 9 French by class are found in Table 3.11. A large majority of students in all classes were either satisfied or very satisfied with their grade 9 French classes. No statistically significant differences emerged on the Chi-square analyses which compared the distribution of student responses across classes.

3.3.4. Strategy Use

In this section of the questionnaires, students were asked to indicate which strategies they use, from a list, when encountering difficulties speaking, listening,

Table 3.11 Student Satisfaction With Grade 9 French by Class

Scale	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=21	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Very satisfied	19	29	12	14	.25 (n.s.)
Satisfied	73	67	76	77	
Not very satisfied	-	-	8	9	
Very unsatisfied	8	5	4	-	

reading and writing in French. Data showing the percentage of students in each class indicating use of various strategies, broken down by skill, for both the pre-and post-questionnaires, are found in Appendix E. These tables also include Chi-square analyses of differences in the distribution of responses across the four classes.

3.3.4.1. Speaking

Significant differences existed amongst the four classes on only one of the six suggested speaking strategies on the pre-questionnaire: “rephrasing what you say”. Adjusted standardized residuals from the Chi-square analyses indicate that the difference is linked to Classes 2 and 4. Significantly more students in Class 2 (48%), as compared to all other classes, reported rephrasing what they wanted to say when speaking (38% for Class 1, 26% for Class 3, and 4% for Class 4). Moreover, significantly fewer students from Class 4 (4%), as compared to all other classes, reported using this strategy when encountering problems speaking French.

Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated significant

differences on two different strategies on the post-questionnaire: “switching to English temporarily and then continuing on in French”, and “asking for help in French”. An analysis of adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests identified the following sources of the differences amongst the classes: Significant differences emerged on the first strategy principally because of a greater number of students in the multidimensional project-based classes (69% in Class 1 and 71% in Class 2), as compared to the less-multidimensional classes (36% in Class 3 and 45% in Class 4), who reported switching to English temporarily (to keep the conversation going) and switching back to French.

The significant differences which emerged on the "asking for help" strategy can be traced to a contrast between the students in Classes 2 and 4. A majority of students in Class 2 (57%) indicated they would ask for help in French, whereas 5% of students in Class 4 indicated they would do the same.

3.3.4.2. Listening

Significant differences existed amongst the four classes on only one of the five suggested listening strategies on the pre-questionnaire: “give up and tune out”. According to the adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square analyses, these differences are attributed to Classes 2 and 4. Significantly fewer students in Class 2 (4%) and significantly more students in Class 4 (39%), as compared to all other classes, reported giving up and tuning out when encountering difficulties listening

in French (17% in Class 1, and 30% in Class 3).

Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated significant differences on two different listening strategies on the post-questionnaire: “using the context”, and “asking the speaker questions”. An analysis of adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests identified the following sources of the differences amongst the classes: Significantly fewer students in Class 4 reported using the context when listening as compared to students from all other classes (9% of students in Class 4 as compared to 52% in Class 3, 48% in Class 2 and 31% in Class 1). Similarly, significantly fewer students from Class 4 (23%) indicated that they would ask the speaker questions when having difficulty understanding (compared to 67% in Class 2, 60% in Class 3 and 50% in Class 1).

3.3.4.3. Reading

Significant differences existed amongst the four classes on three of the five reading strategies suggested on the pre-questionnaire: “using the context”, “using cognates” and “looking up only the necessary words in the dictionary”. Analysis of the adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests reveals that significantly fewer students from Class 4 (23%), as compared to all other classes, reported using the context to help with difficulties in reading French (48% in Class 1, 52% in Class 2 and 59% in Class 3). Similarly, significantly fewer students from Class 4 (27%), and significantly more students from Class 2 (78%), as compared to all other classes,

reported that they used the dictionary to look up only the necessary words when reading (62% in Class 1 and 59% in Class 3). In the case of cognate use to facilitate reading comprehension, significantly fewer students from Class 1 (41%), as compared to all other classes, reported using cognates to help them read in French (78% in Class 2, 56% in Class 3, and 73% in Class 4).

Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated that significant differences remained on only one of these strategies on the post-questionnaire: “using the context to understand”. The adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests indicated that significantly fewer students in Class 4 reported using the context when reading: 23% of students in Class 4 reported using the context when reading as compared to a majority in all other classes (86% in Class 2, 64% in Class 3, and 58% in Class 1).

3.3.4.4. Writing

On the one hand, significant differences existed amongst the four classes on two of the eight writing strategies suggested on the pre-questionnaire: “asking the teacher to read one’s writing”, and “dictionary use”. Analysis of the adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests reveals that significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported using these strategies: 1) 20% of students in Class 4 reported asking their teacher to read their writing, as compared to 59% of students in Class 1, 57% in Class 2, and 41% in Class 3; 2) 56% of

students from Class 4 reported using a dictionary when writing, as compared to 76% of students in Class 1, 91% in Class 2, and 85% in Class 3.

On the other hand, Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated significant differences on four writing strategies on the post-questionnaire: “writing a rough copy and revising”, “asking a friend for help”, “asking a teacher to read one's writing”, and “asking a friend to read one's writing”. Again, the adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests indicated the source of the significant differences. In two cases, significant differences emerged which distinguished the multidimensional project-based classes (1 and 2) from the less-multidimensional classes (3 and 4). A large majority of students from Classes 1 and 2 reported that they asked their teacher to read their writing (65% and 62%, respectively), whereas only about a quarter of the students in Classes 3 and 4 did the same (24% and 23%, respectively). Similarly, a large majority of students in Classes 1 and 2 (85% and 95%, respectively) reported that they asked a friend for help when writing. This contrasts significantly with 59% of students in Class 4 and 64% in Class 3.

The source of significant differences for the two other strategies can be traced to the students in Class 4, once again. Fewer students in this class reported writing a rough copy and revising it (9% as compared to 65% in Class 1, 52% in Class 2 and 44% in Class 3). Significantly fewer students from Class 4 (5%), as compared to students from Class 2 (67%), reported that they asked a friend to help them with their

writing.

3.3.5. Motivations for Learning French

In the motivation section of both the pre- and post-questionnaires, students were asked to indicate the degree to which they agreed with five different indicators of motivation for learning French, learning languages in general and for cultural integration. Only one significant difference emerged on the Chi-square analyses of both the pre- and post-questionnaire data. In both cases, significantly more students from the multidimensional project-based classes, as compared to the students from the less-multidimensional classes, reported that French was their favorite subject (Chi-square= .001 on the pre-questionnaire, and .04 on the post-questionnaire).

Related to students' motivations for learning French are their plans for future study in French; the results from two related questions are presented below. The first, presented in Tables 3.12 and 3.13, is a general question concerning the students' intention to continue studying French at high school (see results for pre-questionnaire in Table 3.12 and the post-questionnaire results in Table 3.13). The second question related to student motivations is more specifically related to the students' intentions to study French in grade 10, which is the first year when core French becomes optional in P.E.I. (see Table 3.14).

Whereas no significant differences emerged amongst the classes on the pre-questionnaire, the adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests indicated that significantly more students from Class 2 (81%), compared to all other classes,

reported the intention to continue studying French in high school on the post-questionnaire (50% in Class 1, 40% in Class 2, and 36% in Class 4).

Furthermore, when asked specifically about the intention to study French in grade 10 (see Table 3.14),³² adjusted standardized residuals on the Chi-square tests indicated that significantly more students from Class 2 (90.5%) planned to study French in grade 10 compared to the three other classes in this study.

It is intriguing to note in Tables 3.12 and 3.13 that a shift, from pre- to post-questionnaire, appears to have occurred in the students' desire to continue studying

Table 3.12: Student Report: *I Want to Continue Studying French in High School* (Pre-Questionnaire)

Scale	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Strongly agree	17	22	11	4	.21 (n.s.)
Agree	45	30	26	27	
Disagree	7	9	11	31	
Strongly disagree	10	4	15	15	
Can't say	21	35	37	23	

³² I attempted to administer the post-questionnaire after the students had registered for their grade 10 courses. This was possible for all classes, except Class 3. The day on which these students were supposed to register for grade 10 was canceled because of a snow storm. More students in this class, as compared to all other classes, were undecided about grade 10 French because they hadn't yet made a decision about their course selections for the following school year at the time they completed the post-questionnaire.

Table 3.13: Student Report: *I Want to Continue Studying French in High School (Post-Questionnaire)*

Scale	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Strongly agree	31	43	4	9	.001
Agree	19	38	36	27	
Disagree	19	10	8	18	
Strongly disagree	31	10	20	36	
Can't say	-	-	32	9	

Table 3.14: Student Report: *I Intend to Study French Next Year (in Grade 10)*

Intention	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3	Class 4	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Yes	50	90.5	32	41	.000
No	46	9.5	40	54.5	
Not sure	4	-	28	4.5	

French in high school in Classes 1 and 2. On the pre-questionnaire, 62% of students in Class 1 and 52% in Class 2 indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that they would continue studying French in high school (and 21% and 35% of these students, in Class 1 and 2 respectively, reported "can't say). On the post-

questionnaire, administered in both of these classes after they had registered for their grade 10 courses, fewer students in Class 1 (50%) and more students in Class 2 (81%), as compared to the pre-questionnaire, indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that they would continue studying French in high school. Moreover, in both cases, no students chose the "can't say" category. On the one hand, it is clear that most of the undecided students in Class 2 made a decision that they would like to continue studying French in high school. On the other hand, it is not clear what happened to the undecided students in Class 1: Whereas the "strongly agree" category increased from 17% to 31% from pre- to post-questionnaire, the "agree" category decreased from 45% to 19% and the "disagree" and "strongly disagree" categories increased from 17% to 50%.³³ These students had already chosen their grade 10 courses, including French, and as a result, their responses related to the general question about continuing French in high school were probably directly influenced by having made this decision. Furthermore, it is possible that students in Class 1 may have been counseled out of French or prevented from taking this subject because of scheduling conflicts. The high school which most of the students from Class 1 would attend has allegedly been unsupportive of core French (P.E.I. Ministry of Education, personal communication; March 23, 1998).

³³ However, the Wilcoxon signed ranks test revealed significant differences between pre- and post-questionnaire results on this question for Class 2 only ($p = .04$).

3.3.6. Summary of Questionnaire Data

At the beginning of the study (in the pre-questionnaire), significantly more students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, indicated that the following communicative tasks were either much more difficult in French or they probably couldn't do them: reading a menu, writing a letter to a friend, writing an essay about the environment, conducting an interview, doing an oral presentation on the environment and participating in a group discussion entirely in French. Near the end of the academic year (in the post-questionnaire), a greater percentage of students from the multidimensional project-based classes (1 and 2) assessed their French skills more positively than students from the less-multidimensional classes (3 and 4) on the following communicative tasks: understanding a job ad, and writing a letter to a friend.

When students were asked to assess their cultural knowledge at the beginning of the study, significant differences emerged amongst the classes on the following four aspects of francophone culture: francophones in western Canada, eating habits of local French people, popular francophone singers, and different cultures in the students' communities. Significantly more students from Class 1, as compared to all other classes, reported better knowledge of the first two cultural aspects listed. The significant differences on the latter two aspects of francophone culture listed are attributed to Class 4, which assessed its knowledge level of these cultural aspects less

favorably than students from all other classes. No significant differences were found among the classes when they were asked to assess their cultural knowledge at the end of the school year (in the post-questionnaire).

Many significant differences emerged among the four classes on the pre-questionnaire when students were asked how much they had improved in different areas related to learning French since beginning their SL studies. Significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, indicated that their skills in the following areas had improved either a great deal or somewhat: listening, reading, self-confidence while speaking French, understanding of francophone youth, and their ability to anticipate meaning when reading or listening. Significantly more students from Class 2, as compared to all other classes, reported that their speaking, and their motivation to learn French, had improved either a great deal or somewhat, since beginning French studies. Moreover, significantly more students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, responded either “no improvement” or “don't know”, when asked how much their speaking and motivation for learning French had improved since starting French studies. Only one statistically significant difference remained when the post-questionnaire was administered: improvement in writing. More students from Class 2, as compared to the other classes, reported that their writing skills in French had improved either a great deal or somewhat since starting to study this language.

Few statistically significant differences appeared among the classes on questions related to students' attitudes towards the French language and culture. Two exceptions emerged on both the pre- and post-questionnaire data. On the pre-questionnaire, significantly more students from Class 2, as compared to all other classes, either agreed or strongly agreed that learning a SL is good. In addition, significantly more students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, strongly disagreed that making mistakes makes them look bad when speaking French (17% in Class 1, 9% in Class 2, and 7% in Class 3). On the post-questionnaire, significantly more students from Class 1, compared to students from all other classes, agreed that 1) learning about French culture in school is important and 2) official bilingualism is important.

When students were asked to assess the usefulness of various classroom activities on the pre-questionnaire, significantly fewer students in Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported that learning vocabulary, oral presentations, listening to videos and doing grammar exercises, were either useful or very useful. On the post-questionnaire, only one statistically significant difference emerged when Chi-square analyses were conducted on the post-questionnaire data. Significantly more students from Class 2, as compared to students from the other classes, reported that doing oral presentations in French was either useful or very useful. In addition, a large majority of students from all classes reported being either satisfied or very

satisfied with their grade 9 core French: No significant differences among the classes surfaced on this item.

Students were also asked to report their use of certain strategies when faced with a problem in SL communication. On the pre-questionnaire, significantly more students in Class 2, as compared to all other classes, reported rephrasing what they wanted to say when speaking. Moreover, significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported using this strategy when encountering problems speaking French. On the post-questionnaire, more students from the multidimensional project-based classes (1 & 2), as compared to the less-multidimensional classes (3 & 4), reported that they switch to English temporarily and continue on in French to maintain conversation in French; the students from the multidimensional project-based classes also reported asking for help more often when having problems speaking French.

In terms of listening strategies on the pre-questionnaire, significantly fewer students in Class 2, and significantly more students in Class 4, as compared to the other classes, reported giving up and tuning out when encountering difficulties listening in French. On the post-questionnaire, significantly fewer students in Class 4 reported using the context when listening as compared to students from all other classes. Similarly, significantly fewer students from Class 4 indicated that they would ask the speaker questions when having difficulty understanding.

Significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported using the context to help with difficulties in reading French on the pre-questionnaire. Similarly, significantly fewer students from Class 4 (27%), and significantly more students from Class 2, as compared to the two other classes, reported that they used the dictionary to look up only the necessary words when reading. In the case of cognate use to facilitate reading comprehension, significantly fewer students from Class 1, as compared to all other classes, reported using cognates to help them read in French on the pre-questionnaire. Chi-square analyses on the post-questionnaire responses indicated that significant differences remained on only one of these strategies on the post-questionnaire: Significantly fewer students in Class 4 reported using the context when reading (as compared to a majority in all other classes).

Students were also asked to indicate their use of various writing strategies. Significant differences existed amongst the four classes, on the pre-questionnaire, on two writing strategies: significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to all other classes, reported using a dictionary when writing and asking their teacher to read their writing. On the post-questionnaire, a large majority of students from Classes 1 and 2 reported that they ask their teacher to read their writing, whereas only about a quarter of the students in Classes 3 and 4 do the same. Similarly, a large majority of students in Classes 1 and 2, as compared to students in Classes 3 and 4,

reported that they ask a friend for help when writing. In addition, fewer students from Class 4 reported writing a rough copy and revising it. Significantly fewer students from Class 4, as compared to students from Class 2, reported that they ask a friend to help them with their writing. Similarly, more students from the multidimensional project-based classes (Classes 1 and 2), than less-multidimensional students (Classes 3 and 4) reported asking the teacher to read their writing or asking a friend for help.

Few statistically significant differences emerged among the classes in terms of topics related to student motivation. However, more students from the multidimensional project-based classes (Classes 1 and 2) reported that French was their favorite subject on both the pre- and post-questionnaires. In addition, more students from Class 2 reported, on the post-questionnaire, the intention to continue studying French in high school than students in all other classes. In addition, significantly more students from Class 2, as compared to students from all other classes, had registered to study French in grade 10.

Chapter 4

Discussion

This chapter summarizes the observation data, test scores and questionnaire results and offers an interpretation of these findings. Differences among classes (on tests and questionnaire results) are discussed in light of variations observed in the four teachers' classroom practices. The study's shortcomings and limitations are then discussed in terms of the research design and the instruments for data collection and testing. Finally, theoretical and practical implications of the study for core French teaching are considered.

4.1. Summary and Interpretation of the Findings

The findings are summarized and interpreted in terms of the data from the classroom observations, proficiency and achievement tests and student questionnaires so that I can respond to the research questions which guided my thesis study.

4.1.1. Classroom Observations

During the observation period for my study, the four participating teachers were implementing the same multidimensional project-based module (*La Mode et la publicité*) prescribed by the Ministry of Education in P.E.I. and their school board. Furthermore, they had all participated in inservice training sessions on the implementation of this "new" approach. However, the observation data suggest that

the four teacher participants were implementing the multidimensional project-based approach in different ways in their core French classes. This is consistent with other "method" comparison research which reports similar findings wherein teachers modify the same method to render it compatible with their own beliefs on and past practices for SL teaching and learning (see, e.g., Beretta, 1992; Freeman & Richards, 1993).

Nevertheless, two of the teachers (Teachers 1 and 2) were following the prescribed multidimensional project-based approach to a significant degree. They both organized their teaching around a final project which created an authentic context for the activities that prepared the students to complete this project. The other two teachers (Teachers 3 and 4) did many of the prescribed activities of the unit and were therefore not completely unidimensional in their approach. To be principally unidimensional would mean that most classroom activities would focus primarily on only one syllabus (for example, the language syllabus) to the exclusion of the three other syllabuses; the teaching would also not be directed towards the completion of a project. Whereas neither Teacher 3 nor Teacher 4 did a project with their students during the observation period, neither of them focused their classroom activities primarily on one syllabus only (although 46% of the activities observed in Teacher 4's classes were language-related). Therefore, the inclusion of the project was the main factor that distinguished the pedagogical approaches of Teachers 1 and 2 from

those of Teachers 3 and 4 (see Table 3.2 above). This tendency provides the rationale for the statistical comparisons done on the test and questionnaire data. I argue, along with some authors of the NCFS (Tremblay et al., 1990) and CASLT (1994), that the project is what defines the teaching approach as experiential because the students are learning to communicate effectively in the target language while completing a series of authentic needs-based tasks which culminate in a final "direct experience" (Wurdinger, 1996) or product. Carver (1996) and Luckmann (1996) suggest that authenticity, active problem-solving-type learning, drawing on student experience and knowledge, and connecting learning to students' future experiences, are the salient features of experiential learning. Project-based core French teaching, such as observed in Classes 1 and 2, does just that.

Although the project creates two polar extremes in terms of teaching approach, only Teacher 1's teaching was completely "multidimensional" if one considers that focusing on all four syllabuses is required (and even he dedicated only about 3% of his teaching to both culture and general language education in the time I observed). It is important to note here that the data reflect only the time observed in the classes, so I cannot therefore be certain that some content areas were not covered in a class period which I was unable to observe. Furthermore, as indicated in Chapter 2, the module, as prescribed by the Ministry of Education in P.E.I. (Ministère de l'Éducation de L'Île-du-Prince-Édouard, 1996), does not give equal attention to all

four syllabuses. In fact, only four out of 46 (8.7%) of the indicated objectives in the module are related to culture and only six out of 46 (13.0%) have general language education objectives. The approach in this module obviously favors its experiential, project-based nature (45% of the objectives are communicative-experiential and 32% are language-related) over an equal focus on all four syllabuses. However, the appropriate weighting to be assigned to any one syllabus in a multidimensional project-based teaching unit remains unresolved. Stern (1986, cited in Tremblay et al., 1990: 84) indicated that he did not envisage the four syllabi as representing 25% each in a core French course. His main point was that core and SL teaching should be driven by a multiple perspective thereby reducing the emphasis being placed on the language syllabus. Furthermore, the authors of the NCFS (e.g., LeBlanc, 1990; Tremblay et al., 1990; Hébert, 1990) offer no clear recommendation on the relative weighting of each syllabus in core French teaching units. Further research is required to determine in what ways a balance among the four syllabi is achieved in the multidimensional project-based modules currently in use, not only in P.E.I., but also in commercial materials on the market which reflect a multidimensional project-based approach in core French teaching. Furthermore, research is required to determine what theoretically might be the best balance among the four syllabuses in multidimensional project-based SL teaching.

Although the project clearly distinguishes the teaching approaches of Teachers

1 and 2 from those of Teachers 3 and 4, there are two other pedagogical features from Table 3.2 which deserve mention. Exclusive use of the SL by the teacher, a typical but not defining feature of this multidimensional project-based approach, also distinguished Teachers 1 and 2 from Teachers 3 and 4. Similarly, if one combines the percentage of activities in which students either chose or negotiated activities with the teacher, one discovers that this occurred 28% of the time in Teacher 1's classes, about 10% of the time in Teacher 2's classes but almost never in either Teacher 3's or Teacher 4's classes. The possible impact of these factors on students' outcomes is discussed below in interpreting the test scores and questionnaire data.

4.1.2. Test Scores

The results presented in Table 3.7 suggest that several differences existed among the four classes on pre-tests of general French proficiency. A majority of these differences were in favor of Classes 1 and 2 as compared to Classes 3 and 4. It is unfortunately difficult to explain these differences. When I discovered that the classes were not initially comparable in terms of language proficiency, I asked students to complete a short survey in an attempt to investigate possible differences among the classes in terms of teaching approach to which the students had been exposed in grades 7 and 8 (see Appendix F). Students were asked to choose a series of indicators, based on their memory, which would best describe the pedagogical approach of their core French classes in these grades. No identifiable differences

emerged. It is quite possible that the indicators chosen were too general and/or vague. For example, it became clear to me following the administration of the post-questionnaire, in which students were asked to describe the activities during the second semester of grade nine using similar indicators as above, that what I meant by a "project" was not understood uniformly by the students in Classes 3 and 4. I also checked to see if differences emerged in students' overall academic ability or socio-economic background, across classes, which might help explain the differences on the pre-tests of general French proficiency. Although these data are somewhat incomplete and based on teachers' reports, no significant differences were identified. It is most probable that there are many factors which affect the pre-test scores. Nevertheless, this discussion underlines the importance of statistical analyses (i.e., ANCOVA) which adjust subsequent scores for these initial pre-test differences.

When ANCOVAs were conducted on both post-test and achievement test scores, the students from the multidimensional project-based classes scored better than the students from the less-multidimensional classes on many test measures. Considering principles of language testing, especially in terms of the purpose of achievement and proficiency tests as well as content validity (see, e.g., Harley et al., 1988), it is not surprising that more differences emerged on the achievement tests which were directly related to the objectives and activities of the thematic unit implemented by all teachers during my study. As Davies (1990), among others,

suggests, achievement tests are designed to assess specific learning at the end of a period of learning (such as a teaching unit) or school year. The content and skills assessed in an achievement test are "a sample of what has been in the syllabus during the time under scrutiny" (p.20). Davies (1990) suggests that proficiency tests are concerned with what has been learned but in a more indirect way: "it establishes generalizations on the basis of typical syllabuses" (p.20). A proficiency test is more related to predicting language performance on some future or general language task or activity. We also know from other research studies (e.g., Lapkin, Hart & Harley, 1998; Turnbull, Lapkin, Hart & Swain, 1998) that proficiency tests similar to those used in my study are not sensitive to increased instructional time and pedagogical differences. The achievement test results, compared to the results of the general French proficiency tests, confirm that achievement tests were best suited for the purposes of my study. On the post-tests of general French proficiency, no differences emerged among the classes on any of the oral tests (except that students from Class 1 performed significantly better than students from Class 2 on Part 1 of the Oral test; this was principally focused on pronunciation skills which were not systematically addressed by any of the teachers).³⁴ However, students from the multidimensional project-based classes significantly outperformed students from the less-

³⁴ During informal discussions following my observations, all 4 teachers confirmed that they spent little time addressing pronunciation. Furthermore, no explicit attention is given to pronunciation in any of the grade 9 teaching modules prescribed in P.E.I.

multidimensional classes on all speaking measures on the achievement tests which tested the specific content and skills developed during the observation period.

Educators who are opposed or resistant to not only the multidimensional project-based approach, but also to communicative language teaching in general, often express a concern that insufficient emphasis is placed on grammar. For example, Hart et al. (1996) report that between 40% and 60% (depending on the level taught) of core French teachers surveyed in Alberta believed that the emphasis on grammar is insufficient in the new multidimensional project-based core French programs they had been asked to implement. Similarly, many immersion research studies have attributed students' non-native like production skills to a lack of form-focused instruction in the content-based immersion pedagogy (e.g., Harley, 1988, 1993; Lyster, 1987). Harley et al. (1990) report that much of the grammar teaching they observed in immersion classes was unconnected to the content teaching. They argue that more emphasis is needed on relating language forms (grammar) to their meaningful use in communicative content-based contexts. In my study, the teachers did not ignore the language syllabus: 22% and 26% of the observed activities in Classes 1 and 2, respectively, were language-related and connected to the needs created by the final project. Furthermore, when one analyzes the scores on tests which are integrative in nature but which also require analytical skills and language knowledge to complete (dictée in the general proficiency test package; cloze test in

the achievement package), students from the multidimensional project-based classes outperformed students from the less-multidimensional classes (in which 36% and 46% of activities were related to the language syllabus, respectively). This suggests that multidimensional project-based teaching, with a contextualized and balanced focus on form, may lead to grammatical accuracy as well as fluency in the target language.

When one interprets the test scores (achievement and proficiency) in terms of skill area, students from all classes performed quite well on tests of listening comprehension. This is consistent with what some researchers suggest about first and second language development in general: receptive skills like listening and reading tend to develop before productive skills, possibly due to a silent period of processing input (Krashen, 1981). These results are also consistent with observational results in Tables 3.5 and 3.6 above: Listening was consistently the primary focus in all classes in the study.

It is not surprising that results on reading tests are quite low for all classes because this skill was a low priority in all classes, be it as a primary or secondary focus.³⁵ It is therefore not surprising that few differences emerged among the classes on the general proficiency reading tests (except Reading Test Part 3 in favor of the multidimensional project-based classes). In the achievement test package, reading

³⁵ See the description of the MOLT observation scheme above in Chapter 2 for a definition of primary and secondary focus.

was assessed in more integrated reading and writing tasks. Students from the multidimensional project-based classes outperformed students from the less-multidimensional classes on the reading/writing total score and the integrative cloze test measures. In tasks which assessed only reading skills (the matching and multiple choice measures in the achievement test package), no differences were found among the classes.

Although speaking was observed to be the primary focus in a small percentage of Classes 1, 2, and 4, speaking was a secondary focus for at least a third of the time in all classes; this undoubtedly explains, in part, why students from all schools did relatively well on oral production tasks in both the general proficiency and achievement test packages. However, the reasons students from the multidimensional project-based classes outperformed students from the less-multidimensional classes on the oral production tasks in the achievement test is likely related to other factors which are explored below in the discussion (Section 4.1.4).

It is somewhat puzzling that no significant differences emerged between the multidimensional project-based classes and the less-multidimensional classes on the culture tasks included in the achievement test package (see Table 3.9 above). One could argue that this reflects the observed lack of attention given to culture activities in all four classes. If this were the explanation, students in Class 4 should have outperformed the others, which is not the case (Teacher 4 devoted 16% of his class

time to culture activities as opposed to 2.8% by Teacher 1 and 0% by both Teacher 2 and Teacher 3). Significant differences did emerge between Classes 1 and 2, in favor of Class 1. This may be explained by Teacher 2's unfortunate and somewhat prolonged absence during the study. In an informal discussion near the end of the study, he indicated that, in order to make up time, the culture activities were either done quickly and superficially or eliminated all together.

One other explanation for the lack of overall differences among the classes on the culture tests is the nature of the tests themselves, or the scoring methods I used. As researchers like Lessard-Clouston (1992) attest, assessing cultural knowledge and skills is complex and requires further research attention.

4.1.3. Questionnaire Results

Relatively few significant differences among the four classes materialized in the questionnaire data, especially at the end of the academic year (post-questionnaire). Some exceptions include student self assessments, strategy use, attitudes towards core French and motivations.

Near the end of grade 9, significantly more students from the multidimensional project-based classes assessed their French skills more positively than did students in the less-multidimensional classes on two communicative situations: understanding a job ad and writing a letter to a friend. These differences are difficult to explain because these tasks are not related to the unit I observed on fashion and advertising.

However, understanding a job ad may be linked to activities from a unit on part-time work and careers that is prescribed by the P.E.I. Ministry of Education for grade 9. Unfortunately, I have no data to confirm this speculation. Similarly, significantly more students from the multidimensional project-based classes than the less-multidimensional classes reported using communication and learning strategies considered useful in the research literature (e.g., Chamot, Keatley, Barnhardt, El-Dinary, Nagano & Newman, 1996; Rubin, 1994; Thompson & Rubin, 1996). For example, more multidimensional project-based students than less-multidimensional students reported switching temporarily to English to maintain the conversation when speaking French. In addition, more students from the multidimensional project-based classes than the less-multidimensional classes reported that they asked a friend for help when writing and they also asked their teacher to read their written work.³⁶ Such strategies would fall under the general language education syllabus; a small percentage of this type of activity was recorded during the observation period (see Table 3.4 above). It is therefore difficult to explain why more multidimensional project-based students, than less-multidimensional students, reported using more of these learning and communication strategies.

Results from Table 3.11 above suggest that students from a less-

³⁶ Nation (1993) would argue that it is not surprising that the students from the multidimensional project-based classes used some strategies more frequently because their French skills were also stronger. Nation (1993) reports a significant correlation between strategy use and SL skills.

multidimensional approach, which is not project-based, are just as satisfied with their program as their counterparts from a multidimensional project-based class: a large majority of students in all classes were either satisfied or very satisfied with their grade 9 French class. On the one hand, however, it could be argued that comparing student satisfaction among these four classes is questionable. Students' points of reference may be quite different; students from the less-multidimensional classes may not know anything else. On the other hand, it could also be argued that one may not know the alternatives and still be satisfied. In the case of the less-multidimensional students, the findings clearly indicate that they were satisfied with what they knew, that is, their core French classes in grade 9. It is interesting to note, however, that significantly more students from the multidimensional project-based classes than the less-multidimensional classes did report that French was their favorite subject.

It is also surprising that more differences did not emerge among the classes in terms of motivation for learning French. This is surprising because teachers following a multidimensional project-based approach generally believe that this pedagogy improves student motivation (Lewis, Pynchworthy-Lake, Sotiriadis, personal communications; May, 1996). However, it is important to note that more students from one of the multidimensional project-based classes (Class 2), than all other classes, reported the intention to continue studying French in high school. These findings are good indicators of student motivation. For example, Durward

(1983), Heffernan (1981) and Ullmann, Geva & MacKay (1985) link enrolment in optional core French programs to student motivation and positive attitudes towards French language and culture. Unfortunately, the data cannot really explain this difference. It could be due to what I referred to above in Chapter 3 as Teacher 2's nurturing, caring attitude towards his students.

When it came to studying French in grade 10, significantly more students from Class 2 also reported that they had registered for grade 10 French. An intriguing shift from pre- to post-questionnaire was noted above in Chapter 3 in the students' desire to continue studying French in high school in Classes 1 and 2. On the pre-questionnaire, 62% of students in Class 1 and 52% in Class 2 indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that they would continue studying French in high school. On the post-questionnaire, administered in both of these classes after they had registered for their grade 10 courses, fewer students in Class 1 (50%) and more students in Class 2 (81%) indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that they would continue studying French in high school. As indicated in Chapter 3, the decrease in Class 1 is undoubtedly related to the fact that these students had already registered for their grade 10 courses, including French. Therefore, their response to the general question about continuing French in high school was most certainly influenced by having already made this decision. Furthermore, students' course selection at the secondary and post-secondary level is affected by many factors. We

know from research in French immersion (Wesche, Morrison, Pawley, & Ready, 1990; Hart & Lapkin, 1990; Turnbull, 1990) that even though students may report a desire to continue studying French, they frequently do not, for many reasons. For example, courses perceived as easier or more important (e.g., sciences, maths) often take precedence.

4.1.4. General Discussion

Admittedly, "method comparison" research is complex. Identifying the source of outcome differences, with certainty, is impossible, especially with a small case study of four teacher participants. It is too simplistic to conclude that the multidimensional project-based approach was *the* cause for the statistical differences which emerged on test scores and in the questionnaire data.

Teachers' uses of French is one confounding factor whose influence cannot be ignored. Teacher 2 was observed using French exclusively in class 89% of the time, and Teacher 1 used the target language exclusively 54% of the observed time. This contrasts greatly with the 28% and 9% observed for Teacher 3 and Teacher 4, respectively. The impact of teacher's uses of the target language on student outcomes has been documented in at least five other studies. In a study of American college and university students, Carroll, Clark, Edwards and Handrick (1967) concluded that teacher use of the target language was one variable which resulted in higher student proficiency in that language. Similarly, in a study Carroll directed (see Carroll, 1975)

under the auspices of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, he examined the role of a number of factors in determining the level of achievement in French attained by students in eight non-French speaking countries in foreign language programs with short daily periods of instruction. Whereas Carroll's conclusions indicate that the amount of instructional time was the principal factor determining the proficiency attained by the students, teacher proficiency in and use of the target language were also important factors influencing student SL proficiency. Wolf's (1977) analysis of the United States' data from the same study revealed similar results: the percentage of classroom activities in French was positively related to student achievement in French whereas the frequency of speaking English in class had a negative influence on students' French achievement (based on regression analysis of teacher variables and students' scores on tests of reading and listening comprehension). Burstall (1968, 1970) and Burstall, Jamieson, Cohen and Hargreaves (1974) report that primary school students in England and Wales who had been taught exclusively in French received higher ratings by school inspectors on tests of oral fluency in French than students from classes in which translation and explanations in L1 were common.

Though teachers' uses of the target language are not unique to a multidimensional project-based approach, it is evidently typical of the multidimensional project-based teachers in this study (Teachers 1 and 2).

Furthermore, use of the target language is an important aspect of the pedagogy promoted by the authors of the NCFS (e.g., Tremblay et al., 1990). Hence, although teachers' use of French does weaken the conclusions I can draw about the impact of the multidimensional project-based approach on students' test and questionnaire results, it does underline the importance of teachers' use of the SL in core French pedagogy. Furthermore, Teacher 1 and especially Teacher 2 demonstrated that it is possible to use the target language almost exclusively in core French to the benefit of students' achievement.

The degree to which the teachers used French exclusively may be linked to their proficiency in the target language and therefore it could be argued that this is also a confounding factor. A study completed in Alberta (Hart et al., 1996) suggests that a large majority of teachers believe that the multidimensional project-based approach in core French requires teachers to have higher proficiency in French than the former more grammar-based approach. About three-quarters of the participants in their study indicated that the new core French program requires either a somewhat or much higher level of proficiency in French for teachers than the old program. In my study, both Teachers 3 and 4, who made much less use of French than Teachers 1 and 2 when I observed their teaching, assessed their skills in French less positively than the multidimensional project-based teachers did. However, there is evidence to suggest that French skills do not distinguish Teachers 1 and 2 from Teachers 3 and

4. I would like to suggest that Teacher 4's skills in French were not as weak as he reported. In fact, although no official testing of teachers' French proficiency was permitted by school board officials, as indicated in Chapter 2, I believe that Teacher 4's French skills were the best of all four teacher participants (based on conversations with him in French and the class time I observed when he did teach in French). Furthermore, he reported that although English was his first language, French was also spoken at home during his childhood; this was not the case for the other three teachers. I believe that this contact with French during his childhood had a positive influence on his skills in this language.

Students' involvement in curriculum decisions may be another confounding factor which deserves discussion. Although students in this study were involved in curriculum decisions quite infrequently overall, they did either choose or negotiate their classroom activities about a third of the time in Class 1 and about 10% of the time in Class 2. This contrasts notably with 0.4% and 0% of the time in Classes 3 and 4, respectively. Researchers in experiential education (Carver, 1996; Luckmann, 1996) argue that students of all ages should be active, responsible and accountable "agents" in their learning, often determining what and how they learn. This is reminiscent of Dewey's (1897, 1938) and Schwab's (1962) ideas of the student as the creative learner actively involved in curriculum decisions (see also Breen, 1983, 1989; Dickinson, 1987; Holec, 1981, 1985, 1987). Delay (1996) argues that

constructivist learning theory (e.g., von Glaserfeld, 1995) is an appropriate framework to understand experiential education. Delay (1996), like the author of the general language education syllabus of the NCFE (Hébert, 1990), suggests that effective pedagogy allows students to take ultimate responsibility for their learning. The teacher is a facilitator who assists, guides and negotiates learning objectives and processes with learners. Sheckley & Weil (1994) report on more than 130 research studies, conducted with students of all ages in many different contexts, which link experiential learning in which students play an active role in curriculum decisions to "better recall of material over time and improvements in student performance" (p.10). Although none of the studies Sheckley & Weil (1994) examined were done in second or foreign language contexts, we must consider that student involvement in curriculum decisions is possibly linked to the superior outcomes of the multidimensional project-based students in this study.

Finally, a more detailed analysis of the observation data in Table 3.4 above reveals that both Teachers 1 and 2 integrated their communicative-experiential project-based activities with another syllabus during the same activity or episode -- mostly the language syllabus -- much more frequently (31.5% and 13% respectively) than either Teachers 3 or 4 (0% in both cases).³⁷ This is also a possible explanation for the multidimensional project-based students' superior performance on many tests.

³⁷ Nine percent of Teacher 3's and 3% of Teacher 4's communicative activities (unrelated to a project) were integrated with language syllabus activities.

For example, I observed an activity in Class 1 which focussed on two objectives during the same episode: While the students were expressing their opinions on different fashion trends, the teacher asked his students to focus deliberately on the choice and conjugation of the appropriate verbs for this communicative and experiential task during the same episode (e.g., *aimer, préférer, détester*). Teacher 3 approached these two objectives separately: first in an episode in which the students learned about verb choice and conjugation, then followed by an episode in which the students expressed their opinions on fashion trends without either teacher or students deliberately focusing on form. A dual focus on form and meaning, like the episode in Teacher 1's class described immediately above, is similar to what Harley et al. (1990:20) suggest should happen more often in SL teaching, after having observed pedagogical practices in core and immersion French classes. Similarly, Swain (1996) argues that focusing on form while doing meaningful content or thematic-based tasks can help students develop SL fluency and accuracy.

4.2. Shortcomings and Limitations

Analyzing any implemented research project will undoubtedly reveal shortcomings which indicate directions for future research. Similarly, such limitations may restrict the validity and generalizability of the findings. The shortcomings and limitations of the current study are discussed in terms of its design and the instruments used.

4.2.1. The Case study design

The case study approach, by its nature, limits the generalizability of the findings. Ideally a future study would include at least 15 teachers so that more robust statistical procedures, such as regression analyses, could be used legitimately to assess the impact of teacher factors, like teaching approach, teachers' uses of French, and students' input in curriculum decisions, on student outcomes. The findings from this study, combined with other case studies or experiments conducted in the future, could lead to more distinct conclusions.

It would be important to improve procedures for selection of teacher participants for future studies. I had recruited volunteers at a province-wide professional development workshop in P.E.I. when they were also briefed on the objectives and methodology for the study. The original plan was to create a short-list of six teachers from whom four final participants would be selected. Initial observations in these six teachers' classes were to ensure that those selected reflected both multidimensional project-based and unidimensional teaching approaches. Unfortunately, two of the six original volunteers withdrew from the study in September, 1996, for various reasons. Fortunately for my study, the four teacher participants reflected varying degrees of "multidimensionality" in their pedagogical approach. However, as noted above, none of them was completely unidimensional. Although no such teacher may exist, a pre-selection period, from a well defined

initial, large sample of teachers, would help ensure that the most multidimensional project-based and the most unidimensional teachers are selected. In addition, this pre-selection period would help ensure that the participants selected have similar proficiency in French. Teachers whose amount of use of French in class is similar could also be selected. It would be more probable to meet these requirements in a jurisdiction in which the pool of core French teachers is larger than it was in the present study. An experimental design may also be an effective way to control confounding factors and answer unresolved questions about the influence of teaching approach on student outcomes.

4.2.2. Instruments

The content validity of the tests selected and developed may be of some concern. First of all, the general French proficiency tests were developed and field-tested for grade 8 students who had been exposed to approximately 600-800 hours of core French instruction. The grade 9 students in P.E.I. had been exposed to a maximum of 540 hours of core French instruction. Secondly, these tests were developed in 1987-88 and their content validity may be questioned in terms of reflecting the multidimensional project-based curriculum as proposed in the NCFS (given that they were developed before the publication of the final NCFS report). Consequently, as indicated above in Chapter 2, in response to concern for content validity expressed by ministry officials in P.E.I., some of the tests were adapted to

make them more reflective of the core French programs currently in use in P.E.I.

I believe that the use of the achievement tests, directly related to the objectives and activities of the thematic project-based module used by all teachers during the observation period of the current study, should compensate for concern about the content validity of the general proficiency tests. However, it may be argued that there are also problems with these tests because they are not tailored to reflect different activities from each of the four classes (although I do not believe that any of the tests favored or disadvantaged any of the classes). A more systematic validation, given adequate time and resources, would verify the content and construct validity of the achievement tests.

It may also be argued that the timing of the post-tests of general French proficiency (near the end of academic year as opposed to immediately following the observation period) may be a limitation of the study. The hypothesis here is that more statistically significant differences among the classes may have emerged if the post-tests had been administered in December, 1996, after the observation period. However, it could also be argued that doing the general tests of French proficiency near the end of the academic year should have allowed the students to do better because they had more time and exposure to French which might allow the students to improve their SL skills, especially because the proficiency tests were not linked in any way to the classroom activities during the observation period. Moreover, it would

have been difficult to find the time in December to administer both the achievement and the post-tests of general French proficiency.

Although the MOLT observation scheme did allow me to describe the details of each teacher's pedagogical approach at a level with which I am satisfied, the observation scheme is not flawless. First, as Allen et al. (1987) indicated with respect to the COLT observation scheme, the MOLT had to be complemented with field notes to capture details in the classroom which are not included within it. For example, I noted instances when translation from French to English was used as a teaching strategy in each of the classes and instances where students were off task. Second, the MOLT used in this study was implemented as Spada & Fröhlich (1995) recommend for Part A of COLT, that is in real-time during classroom activity. As Zoutou & Mitchell (1995) point out, real-time coding limits one's ability to assess a teacher's pedagogical approach on a micro level (discourse and interactional analyses). Moreover, the quality of student-student and student-teacher discourse was not analyzed using the MOLT. A future study might consider more qualitative analysis of student and teacher discourse, using transcriptions of tape- and/or video-recorded classroom activity. This might prove especially useful in a replication of this study, in terms of assessing students' and teachers' use of English and French.

4.3. Implications for SL Curriculum Theory and Practice

Theoretically, my research addresses the issue of second language learning and

the conditions that support and enhance it. Practically, my project provides insights into the delivery of core French programs in one Canadian province.

The results reinforce the near-consensus in the field that SL learning is more effective when the curriculum is centered around meaningful content rather than an exclusive focus on language forms. The results also relate to Dewey's (1897, 1937) notions of the value of curricula which draw on the real-life interests and capacities of the learners. Further, although this research is not a direct examination of issues related to the focus-on-form debates in the field, the results do suggest that a multidimensional project-based curriculum provides a framework in which a focus on form can be authentically integrated with a motivating and interesting communicative and experiential focus.

As indicated above, the findings from this study are also arguably relevant to the recent debates in the field concerning the effectiveness of task-based syllabuses (see e.g., Long, 1994; Long & Crookes, 1992; Nunan, 1988, 1994; Sheen, 1994a, 1994b; Skehan, 1996; Skehan & Foster, 1997). To support this claim, the definitions of both task and project must be examined. Prabhu (1987) was one of the first researchers to define *task* formally in terms of SL curriculum within his research on the Bangalore Communicational Teaching Project in India between 1979 and 1984:

An activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process. (Prabhu, 1987, p.24).

These tasks included opinion-gap, information gap and reasoning-gap activities, which were meaning-based, as well as quite analytic-based tasks.

Richards, Platt and Platt (1992) indicate that a task is "an activity which is designed to help achieve a particular learning goal" (p.373). They suggest that the following dimensions of task-based learning must be considered: 1) goals of the task; 2) the procedures used to complete it; 3) the order or location of it within the overall curriculum; 4) the amount of time it takes; 5) the outcome or results of the task; 6) assessment of success of the task; 7) the materials and resources needed to complete it; 8) the language students and teachers use to complete the task. Richards et al. (1992) also indicate that school curricula are sometimes described as a collection of tasks. In fact, the multidimensional module *La Mode et la publicité* used in this study is indeed a series of language tasks which were directly (and sometimes indirectly) related to the completion of the final project; each task prepared the students to complete the final project at the end of the unit.

The organization of the multidimensional module also corresponds closely to definitions of *project* by Fried-Booth (1986), Legutke and Thomas (1991) and Tremblay et al. (1990), which are centered around the completion of a series of tasks culminating in a final project (although Fried-Booth's work implies that many of the tasks are completed outside the classroom, which was not the case in the multidimensional project-based module in my study). Fried-Booth (1986) suggests

that development of language skills and knowledge are not imposed by the teacher or a curriculum policy but arise out of the authentic communicative needs created by the project. This may involve tasks which focus principally on meaning, some of which focus both on meaning and form, but also some tasks which require students to focus on language forms so that students may use these forms to complete their project (for a discussion of the distinction between *focus on form* vs. a *focus on forms*, see Long, 1991). As Skehan (1996) suggests, implementing task-based SL curricula should involve decisions relating not only to task choice but also to the way in which attention to language form and forms is directed. Although I did not set out originally to examine the effectiveness of task-based or project-based SL curricula, I suggest that the central role played by the project in my study underlines its relevance to this discussion in the field. It is obvious though that this question deserves future research attention.

Finally, I must consider the influence of the results from this study on the continuing implementation of the multidimensional project-based curriculum in core French. My study is the first study of which I am aware that examines how the multidimensional project-based approach influences student outcomes in French. Recent occasions on which I have presented my study (Turnbull, 1997a, 1997b) impress upon me that educators in the field are indeed hungry for empirical evidence which supports curriculum reform in core French and the endless time and effort

which have been dedicated to materials development and teacher inservice. In fact, I am hopeful that my findings will be "heard," at least, because core French educators want to hear them. However, it is important that my findings be put clearly into perspective such that their generalizability and the limitations of the study are not misrepresented.

4.4. A Return to the Research Questions

In this section, I will respond to the two research questions posed above in Chapter 1:

1- Does a core French teaching approach based on a multidimensional project-based curriculum lead to higher language proficiency and achievement than one which is principally focused unidimensionally on grammar teaching?

2- Does a core French teaching approach based on a multidimensional project-based curriculum lead to more satisfactory outcomes with respect to the attitudinal, cultural and general language education objectives of core French as compared to one which is principally focused unidimensionally on grammar teaching?

This study suggests that multidimensional project-based teaching in core French (Stern 1982, 1983b; NCFS, 1990) is an effective pedagogical approach to realize the linguistic and communicative objectives of core French. Test scores suggest that students from the multidimensional project-based core French classes in this study were more proficient and achieved better test results in French than

students from the less-multidimensional classes. Similarly, questionnaire data suggest that a multidimensional project-based core French program may lead to more satisfactory outcomes with respect to the general language education objectives for this program (indicated by students' report of use of learning and communication strategies). However, there is no evidence from this study to suggest that multidimensional project-based core French teaching necessarily leads to more satisfactory outcomes in terms of the attitudinal and cultural objectives for the program. Readers must consider the following cautionary note regarding the generalizability of the findings from my study: this case study of four teachers and their students is exploratory in nature and no causal relationship between teaching approach and student outcomes can be proven.

Although I cannot conclude with certainty that teaching approach is the main cause of superior test performance and more positive questionnaire results by the students from the multidimensional project-based classes, this study represents a first step in the investigation of multidimensional project-based classrooms with respect to L2 and affective outcomes. The results are also encouraging for those who have worked on the implementation of this approach by creating curriculum materials and conducting inservice for teachers.

4.5 Directions for Future Research and Concluding Remarks

Further studies, be it other case studies or classroom-based experiments, are

needed so that sufficient data are available to investigate the relative influence of teaching approach on student outcomes, as compared to other factors like SL use by teachers and student input in curriculum decisions. Although a case-study design limits the generalizability of results, it allows for more in-depth analysis of classroom practices. Sufficient data may in fact be most effectively and realistically collected by multiple case studies using the same design and data collection instruments in different core French settings. An experimental classroom-based design would help control for teacher variables such as language proficiency and SL use in the classroom. Continued examination of the effectiveness of the multidimensional project-based curriculum in core French may also contribute to debates on task- and project-based language teaching.

Future studies may also investigate how culture is integrated into SL teaching using the multidimensional project-based curriculum as a planning framework for pedagogical materials. Moreover, research is needed to examine effective means of assessing cultural knowledge and skills.

Finally, future studies of the multidimensional project-based approach for teaching core French will contribute to effective implementation of this approach at the classroom level. This will contribute to the improvement of core French teaching in Canada and will hopefully establish it as a viable option to immersion so that core French graduates can contribute constructively, along with immersion graduates, to the multilingual nature of this country and help contribute to harmony between the people of French and English Canada.

References

- Alderson, C. (1992). Guidelines for the evaluation of language education. In C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 274-304). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alderson, C., & Beretta, A. (Eds.). (1992). *Evaluating second language education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Allal, L. (1991). *Vers une pratique de l'évaluation formative*. Bruxelles: De Boeck-Wesmael.
- Allen, P. (1983). A three-level curriculum model for second language education. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 40, 23-43.
- Allen, P., Carroll, S., Burtis, J., & Gaudino, V. (1987). The core French observation study. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of bilingual proficiency: Final report. Vol.II: Classroom proficiency* (pp.56-189). Toronto: Modern Language Centre, OISE.
- Allen, P., Fröhlich, M., & Spada, N. (1984). The communicative orientation of second language teaching: An observation scheme. In J. Handscombe, R.A. Orem, & B.P. Taylor (Eds.), *On TESOL '83: The Question of Control* (pp. 231-254). Washington, DC: TESOL.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation process. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 80, 260-267.
- Artigal, J.M. (1997). The Catalan immersion program. In K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 133-150). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barik, H.C., & Swain, M. (1975). Three-year evaluation of a large scale early grade French immersion program: The Ottawa study. *Language Learning*, 25, 1-30.
- Behan, L., Turnbull, M., & Spek, J. (1997). The proficiency gap in late immersion: Language use in collaborative tasks. *Le Journal de l'Immersion*, 20, 41-44.
- Beretta, A. (1992). Evaluation of language education. In C. Alderson & A. Beretta (Eds.), *Evaluating second language education* (pp. 5-24). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Berry-Bravo, J. (1993). Teaching the art of circumlocution. *Hispania*, 76, 371-377.

Bialystok, E., & Fröhlich, M. (1977). Aspects of second language learning in classroom setting. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 13, 1-26.

Blumenfeld, P.C., Soloway, E., Marx, R.W., Krajcik, J.S., Guzdial, M., & Palincsar, A. (1991). Motivating project-based learning: Sustaining the doing, supporting the learning. *Educational Psychologist*, 26, 369-398.

Boucher, A-M., & Ladouceur, M. (1988). *Communication plus 1*. Montréal: Éditions CEC.

Boyle, O., & Peregoy, S. (1990). Literacy scaffolds: Strategies for first and second language readers and writers. *Reading Teacher*, 44, 194-200.

Breen, M. (1983). How would we recognise the communicative classroom? In B. Coffey (Ed.), *Teacher training and the curriculum* (pp. 132-154). London: British Council.

Breen, M. (1989). The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 187-206). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Breen, M., & Candlin, C. (1980). The essentials of a communicative curriculum in language teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 89-112.

Breen, M., & Mann, S.J. (1997). Shooting arrows at the sun: Perspectives on a pedagogy for autonomy. In P. Benson & P. Voller (Eds.), *Autonomy and independence in language learning* (pp. 132-149). London: Longman.

Brooks, F., & Donato, R. (1994). Vygotskian approaches to understanding foreign language learner discourse during communicative tasks. *Hispania*, 77, 262-274.

Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brumfit, C. (Ed.). (1984). *General English syllabus design* (ELT Documents 118). Oxford: Pergamon.

Burstall, C. (1968). *French from eight: A national experiment*. Windsor, Berks: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Burstall, C. (1970). *French in the primary school: Attitudes and achievement*. Windsor, Berks: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Burstall, C., Jamieson, M., Cohen, S., & Hargreaves, M. (1974). *Primary French in the balance*. Windsor, Berks: National Foundation for Educational Research.

Calman, R. (1988). *Core French program review, Grades 3-8: Technical report*. North York, Ontario, Canada: North York Board of Education.

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: Empirical studies* (pp. 283-325). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Canale, M. (1983). From communicative competence to communicative language pedagogy. In J.C. Richards & R.W. Schmidt (Eds.), *Language and communication* (pp. 2-28). London: Longman.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communication approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*, 1-47.

Carroll, J.B. (1975). *The teaching of French as a foreign language in 8 countries*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Tryckeri AB.

Carroll, J.B., Clark, J.L.D., Edwards, T.M., & Handrick, F.A. (1967). *The foreign language attainments of language majors in the senior years: A survey conducted in US colleges and universities*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carter, G. (1985). *The circus: Project book*. Bath, England: Bell School (mimeo).

Carter, G., & Thomas, H. (1986). "Dear brown eyes:" Experiential learning in a project-oriented approach. *ELT Journal, 40*, 196-204.

Carver, R. (1996). Theory for practice: A framework for thinking about experiential education. *Journal of Experiential Education, 19*, 8-13.

Cashman, D. (1988). *Strategies for survival, communication and growth in a communicative-experiential classroom at the junior high level: A monumental undertaking*. Unpublished manuscript, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada.

CASLT (1994). *National core French study: A model for implementation*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Chamot, A.U., Keatley, C., Barnhardt, S., El-Binary, P., Nagano, K., & Newman, C. (1996). *Learning strategies in elementary language immersion programs: Final report* (Language Research Reports). Georgetown University: Washington, DC.

- Chomsky, N. (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Clandinin, D.J., & Connelly, F.M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P.W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum: A project of the American Educational Research Association* (pp.363-401). New York: MacMillan.
- Collins, L. M. (1996). Is reliability obsolete? A commentary on "are simple gain scores obsolete?" *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 20, 289-92.
- Connelly, M.F. and D.J. Clandinin. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners*. Toronto: OISE Press.
- Council of Europe (1981). *Modern languages* (Report presented by CDCC Project Group 4 with a résumé by J. L. M. Trim, Project Adviser). Strasbourg, France: Council for Cultural Co-operation of the Council of Europe.
- Cumming, A. (1987). What is second-language program evaluation? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 43, 678-700.
- Davies, A. (1990). *Principles of language testing*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.
- Debyser, V. (1981). La didactique de la culture. In J.-C. Beacco & S. Lieutaud (Eds.), *Moeurs et mythes: Lecture des civilisations et documents authentiques écrits* (pp. 1-33). Paris: Hachette-Larousse.
- De Courcy, M. (1997). Benowa High: A decade of French immersion in Australia. In K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 44-62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DeLay, R. (1996). Forming knowledge: Constructivist learning and experiential education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 19, 76-81.
- Dewey, J. (1897). My pedagogic creed. *School Journal*, 27, 77-80.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Collier MacMillan.
- Dickinson, L. (1987). *Self-instruction in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dodson, C.J. (1976). *Foreign language teaching and bilingualism: Bilingualism and British education: The dimensions of diversity* (CILT Reports and Papers 14, pp. 78-86). London: Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research.

Duplantie, M. (1986). La notion d'authenticité dans les pratiques communicatives. In A.-M. Boucher, M. Duplantie & R. LeBlanc (Eds.), *Propos sur la pédagogie de la communication en langues secondes* (pp. 86-99). Montréal: Éditions CEC.

Duplantie, M. (1995). *Teacher development and the NCFS*. Paper given at the annual conference of the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

Durward, M.L. (1983). *Articulation, attitude and achievement: A study of the elementary and secondary French second language programs*. Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Edelhoff, C., & Liebau, E. (Eds.). (1988). *Über die grenze. Praktisches lernen im fremdsprachlichen unterricht*. Belz, Germany: Weinham.

Eisner, E.W. (1984). Can educational research inform educational practice? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 65, 447-52.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ervin-Tripp, S. (1982). *Activity structure as scaffolding for children's second language learning* (Sociolinguistic working paper 100). Austin, TX: Southwest Education Development Lab.

Fetterman, D.M. (1988). Qualitative approaches to evaluating education. *Educational Research*, 17, 17-23.

Foley, K.S., Harley, B., & d'Anglejan, A. (1987). *Research in core French: An annotated bibliography*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Foley, K.S., Harley, B., & d'Anglejan, A. (1988). Research in core French: A bibliographic review. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 44, 593-618.

Freeman, D., & Richards, J. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of second language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 193-216.

Fried-Booth, D. (1982). Project work with advanced classes. *ELT Journal*, 36, 98-103.

Fried-Booth, D. (1986). *Project work*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fröhlich, M., Spada, N., & Allen, P. (1987). Differences in the communicative orientation of L2 classrooms. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 27-57.

Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C., & Brunet, G.R. (1977). Intensive second language study: Effects on attitudes, motivation and French achievement. *Language Learning*, 27, 243-261.

Genesee, F. (1981). A comparison of early and late second language learning. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 13, 115-128.

Genesee, F. (1987). *Learning through two languages: Studies of immersion and bilingual education*. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Genesee, F., & Hamayan, J. (1994). Classroom-based assessment. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp. 212-240). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grittner, F.M. (1977). *Teaching foreign languages*. New York: Harper and Row.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hanna, G., Smith, A.H., McLean, L.D., & Stern, H.H. (1980). *Contact and communication: An evaluation of bilingual student exchange programs*. Toronto: Modern Language Centre, OISE.

Harley, B. (1988). Effects of instruction on SLA: Issues and evidence. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 9, 165-178.

Harley, B. (1989). Functional grammar in French immersion: A classroom experiment. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 331-359.

Harley, B. (1993). Instructional strategies and second language acquisition in early French immersion. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 245-259.

Harley, B., & Lapkin, S., Scane, J., & Hart, D. (1988). *Testing outcomes in core French: The development of communicative instruments for curriculum evaluation and research* (Final report for the Ontario Ministry of Education). Toronto: Modern Language Centre, OISE.

Harley, B., d'Anglejan, A., & Shapson, S. (1990). *National core French study -The evaluation syllabus*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Harley, B., Allen, P., Cummins, J., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1990). *The development of second language proficiency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hart, D., & Lapkin, S. (1990). *French immersion at the secondary/post-secondary interface* (Final report, Ontario Ministry of Education). Toronto: Modern Language Centre, OISE.

Hart, D., Lapkin, S., & Harley, B. (1996). *From the teachers' viewpoint: Implementing Alberta Education's new FSL program* (Final report). Toronto: Modern Language Centre, OISE-UT.

Hawkins, E.W. (1981). *Modern languages in the curriculum*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hawkins, E.W. (1984). *Awareness of language: An introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hébert, Y. (1990). *Syllabus formation langagière générale*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Heffernan, P. (1981). *A study of the reasons for students' continuing or dropping FSL in the high schools of the Port au Port Roman Catholic School Board-Newfoundland*. Unpublished master's thesis, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Holec, H. (1981). *Autonomy and foreign language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Holec, H. (1985). On autonomy: Some elementary concepts. In P. Riley (Ed.), *Discourse and learning* (pp. 173-190). London: Longman.

Holec, H. (1987). The learner as manager: Managing learning or managing to learn? In A. Wenden & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner strategies in language learning* (pp. 145-158). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Humphreys, L.G. (1996). Linear dependence on gain scores in their components imposes constraints on their use and interpretation: Comment on "are simple gain scores obsolete?" *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 20, 293-94.

Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269-293). Hammondsworth: Penguin.

Jean, G. (1992). *Entre amis 3*. Toronto: Prentice Hall.

Johnson, D. (1992). *Approaches to research in second language learning*. New York: Longman.

Johnson, D. (1994). Interaction strategies for second language learning. In F. Genesee (Ed.), *Educating second language children: The whole child, the whole curriculum, the whole community* (pp.183-211). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, J., & Milne, L. (1995). Scaffolding second language discourse with teacher controlled multimedia. *Foreign Language Annals*, 28, 315-329.

Johnson, K. (1997). The Hong Kong education system: Late immersion under stress. In K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 171-189). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K., & Swain, M. (Eds.). (1997). *Immersion education: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kagan, S. (Ed.). (1986). Cooperative learning and sociocultural factors in schooling. In California State Department of Education. *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling language minority students* (pp. 143-186). Los Angeles: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Kagan, S., & Widaman, Keith F. (1987). Cooperativeness and achievement: Interaction of student cooperativeness with cooperative versus competitive classroom organization. *Journal of School Psychology*, 25, 355-65.

Keeton, M.T., (Ed.). (1994). *Perspectives on experiential learning: Prelude to a global conversation about learning*. Chicago: Winthrop Marketing.

Keeton, M.T. & Tate, P.J. (1978). *Learning by experience-What, why, how*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

King, N. (1994). Recontextualizing the curriculum. *Theory into practice*, 25, 36-40.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1994). Using collaborative language production tasks to promote students' language awareness. *Language Awareness*, 3, 73-93.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1997). From semantic to syntactic processing: How can we promote it in the immersion classroom? In K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 284-310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S. (1984). Immersion: Why it works and what it has taught us. *Language and Society*, 12, 61-64.

Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach*. New York: Pergamon Press.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Lambert, W.E. & Gardner, R.C. (1972). *Attitudes and motivation in second language learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Lapkin, S. (Ed.). (1998). *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lapkin, S., Hart, D., & Harley, B. (1998). A case-study of compact core French models. In S. Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies* (pp. 3-31). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Lapkin, S., Harley, B., & Hart, D. (1995). *Revitalizing core French: The Carleton case study* (Report to the Carleton Board of Education and Canadian Heritage). Toronto: Modern Language Centre, OISE.

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., with Shapson, S. (1990). French immersion research agenda for the 90s. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 638-674.

LeBlanc, C., Courtel, C. & Trescases, P. (1990). *National core French study - Syllabus culture*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

LeBlanc, R. (1990). *National core French study - A synthesis*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Legutke, M. (1984). Project airport, Part 1. *Modern English Teacher*, 11, 10-14.

Legutke, M. (1988). *Lebendiger Englischunterricht: Kommunikative aufgaben und projekte*. Kamp, Germany: Bochum.

Legutke, M., & Thomas, H. (1991). *Process and experience in the language classroom*. London: Longman.

Lessard-Clouston, M. (1992). Assessing culture learning: Issues and suggestions. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 48, 326-241.

Lewis, C.C. (1995). "A little off balance": *Exploring teachers' experiences with a communicative-experiential curriculum in French as a second language through teacher inquiry*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Lewis, C.C. (1998). "A little off balance": Exploring teachers' knowledge about a communicative-experiential curriculum in French as a second language. In S. Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies* (pp. 237-256). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, D. Coste, R. Ginsberg & C. Kramersch (Eds.), *Foreign language research in cross-cultural perspective* (pp. 39-52). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Long, M. (1994). On the advocacy of the task-based syllabus. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 782-795.

Long, M., & Crookes, G. (1991). Three approaches to task-based syllabus design. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26, 27-55.

Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-227.

Luckmann, C. (1996). Defining experiential education. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 19, 6-7.

Lussier, D. (1991). *L'évaluation selon une démarche communicative-expérientielle*. Montréal, Qc: Centre Éducatif et Culturel.

Lussier, D., & Turner, C. (1995). *Évaluer les apprentissages dans une approche communicative*. Montréal, Qc: Centre Éducatif et Culturel.

Lynch, B. (1996). *Language program evaluation: Theory and practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyster, R. (1987). Speaking immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 43, 701-717.

Lyster, R. (1993). *The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of sociolinguistic competence: An experimental study in French immersion classrooms at the grade eight level*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Lyster, R. (1994a). The effect of functional-analytic teaching on aspects of French immersion students' sociolinguistic competence. *Applied Linguistics*, 15, 263-87.

Lyster, R. (1994b). La négociation de la forme: stratégie analytique en classe d'immersion. *Canadian Modern Language Review*. 50, 446-465.

Lyster, R. (1998a). Negotiation of form, recasts and explicit correction in relation to error types and learner repair in immersion classrooms. *Language Learning*, 48, 183-218.

Lyster, R. (1998b). Recasts, repetition and ambiguity in L2 classroom discourse. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 20, 51-81.

Lyster, R., & Ranta, L. (1997). Corrective feedback and learner uptake: Negotiation of form in communicative classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 19, 37-66.

Marrin-McConnell, M.I. (1978). *Norm and variation in language: Implications for second language teaching with reference to the teaching of French in Ontario*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

McGroarty, M. (1993). Cooperative learning and second language acquisition. In D. Holt (Ed.), *Cooperative learning: A response to linguistic and cultural diversity* (pp.19-46). Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Met, M., & Lorenz, E.B. (1997). Lessons from U.S. immersion programs: Two decades of experience. In K. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International perspectives* (pp. 243-265). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ministère de l'Éducation, l'Île-du-Prince-Édouard. (1996). *La Mode et la publicité*. Charlottetown, PEI.

Moirand, S. (1982). *Enseigner à communiquer en langue étrangère*. Paris: Hachette.

Moskowitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the foreign language class: A sourcebook of humanistic techniques*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Naiman, N., Fröhlich, M., Stern, H.H., & Todesco, A. (1978). *The good language learner*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Nation, P. (1993). Vocabulary size, growth and use. In R. Schreuder & B. Weltens (Eds.), *The bilingual lexicon* (pp. 115-134). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

New Brunswick Department of Education. (1979). *Base year study of the second language competencies of grade 12 students*. Fredericton: Evaluation Branch, The New Brunswick Department of Education.

Nolen, S.B. (1988). Reasons for studying: Motivational orientations and study strategies. *Cognition and Instruction*, 5, 269-287.

Nunan, D. (1988). *Syllabus design*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Nunan, D. (1994). A reader reacts: Commentary on Ron Sheen's "A critical analysis of the advocacy of the task-based syllabus." *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 781-782.

Omaggio, A.C. (1986). *Teaching languages in context: Proficiency-oriented instruction*. Boston, MA.: Heinle and Heinle.

Ontario Ministry of Education. (1980). *Ontario assessment instrument pool: French as a second language, junior and intermediate divisions*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House.

Painchaud, G. (1990). *National core French study - Language syllabus*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Pawley, C., & Bonyun, R. (1981). *French listening comprehension of students in core programs, grades 4 to 8* (French working paper No. 138). Ottawa: Research Centre, Ottawa Board of Education.

Petronio, G. (1985). Tours of the community as part of the conversation class. *Foreign Language Annals*, 18, 157-159.

Pico, E. (1990). *Issues of reliability and validity of the partial dictation test as a measure of listening comprehension*. Paper presented at the 9th World Congress of Applied Linguistics, Casandra-Halkidiki, Greece.

Pineo, P.C., Porter, J., & McRoberts, H.A. (1977). The 1971 census and the socioeconomic classification of occupations. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 14, 91-102.

Pokay, P., & Blumenfeld, P.C. (1990). Predicting achievement early and late in the semester: The role of motivation and the use of learning strategies. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82, 41-50.

Poyen, J. (1990). The national core French study. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 47, 20-31.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Public Services Commission of Canada. (1972). *Dialogue Canada*. Ottawa: Language Bureau.

Richards, J., Platt, J., & Platt, H. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics*. Essex, England: Longman.

Rinvolutri, R. (1984). *Grammar games: Cognitive, affective and drama activities for EFL students*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rivers, W. (1981). *Teaching foreign language skills*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rogers, C.R. (1969). *Freedom to learn*. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing.

Rounds, P. (1996). The classroom-based researcher as fieldworker: Strangers in a strange land. In J. Schachter & S. Gass (Eds.), *Second language classroom research* (pp. 45-60). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Rubin, J. (1994). A review of second language listening comprehension research. *Modern Language Journal*, 78, 199-221.

Sanaoui, R. (1992). *Vocabulary learning and teaching in French as a second language classrooms*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Schiffler, L. (1980). *Interaktiver fremdsprachenunterricht*. Stuttgart, Germany: Klett.

Schumann, J.H. (1978). The acculturation model for second language acquisition. In R.C. Gingsras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 27-50). Arlington, VA.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Schwab, J.J. (1962). The teaching of science as enquiry. In J.J. Schwab & P. Brandwein (Eds.), *The teaching of science* (pp. 3-103). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Seelye, N. (1985). *Teaching culture*. Lincolnwood, IL: National Textbook Co.

Shapson, S. (1990). An agenda for evaluating core French. In B. Harley, A. d'Anglejan & S. Shapson (Eds.), *National core French study: The evaluation syllabus* (pp. 58-72). Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Shapson, S., Kaufman, D., & Durward, L. (1978). *B.C. French study: An evaluation of elementary French programs in British Columbia*. Burnaby, B.C.: Simon Fraser University Press.

Sheckley, B.G., & Weil, S.W. (1994). Using experience to enhance learning: Perspectives and questions - Introduction. In M. Keeton (Ed.), *Perspectives on experiential learning: Prelude to a global conversation about learning* (pp. 7-12). Chicago, IL: The International Experiential Learning Conference.

Sheen, R. (1994a). The author responds. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 790-795.

Sheen, R. (1994b). A critical analysis of the advocacy of the task-based syllabus. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 127-151.

Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics*, 17, 38-62.

Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1997). Task type and task processing conditions as influences on foreign language performance. *Language Teaching Research*, 1, 185-211.

Spada, N., & Fröhlich, M. (1995). *Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications*. Sydney, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarrie University.

Spada, N., & Lightbown, P.M. (1993). Instruction and the development of questions in L2 classrooms. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 15, 205-224.

Spada, N., Ranta, L., & Lightbown, P. (1996). Working with teachers in second language acquisition research. In J. Schachter & S. Gass (Eds.), *Second language classroom research* (pp. 31-44). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Statistics Canada (1981). *Standard occupational classification*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Stennett, R.G., & Isaacs, L.M. (1979). *Elementary French program evaluation: Impact of increased time for French on achievement in English and mathematics*. London, Ontario: The Board of Education for the City of London.

Stern, H.H. (1970). *Perspectives on second language teaching*. Toronto: OISE Press.

Stern, H.H. (1974). Directions in language teaching theory and research. In J. Qvistgard, H. Schwarz & H. Spang-Hanssen (Eds.), *Applied linguistics: Problems and solutions* (pp.61-108). Heidelberg, Germany: Julius Groos Verlag.

Stern, H.H. (1980). Some approaches to communicative language teaching in Canada. In K.E. Müller (Ed.), *The foreign language syllabus and communicative approaches to teaching: Proceedings of a European-American seminar*, [Special issue] *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 3, 57-63.

Stern, H.H. (1982). French core programs across Canada: How can we improve them? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 39, 34-47.

Stern, H.H. (1983a). *Fundamental concepts of language teaching*. London: Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H. (1983b). Toward a multidimensional foreign language curriculum. In R.G. Mead (Ed.), *Foreign languages: Key links in the chain of learning* (pp. 120-146). Middlebury, VT: Northeast Conference.

Stern, H.H. (1985). Movements, projects and core French today. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 39, 34-47.

Stern, H.H. (1990). Analysis and experience as variables in second language pedagogy. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins & M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 93-109). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stern, H.H. (1992). P. Allen & B. Harley (Eds.), *Issues and options in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stern, H.H., Ullmann, R., Balchunas, M., Hanna, G., Scheiderman, E., & Argue, V. (1980). *Module making: A study in the development and evaluation of learning materials for French as a second language*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Stern, H.H., Swain, M., McLean, L.D., Friedman, R.J., Harley, B., & Lapkin, S. (1976). *Three approaches to teaching French*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Education.

Stevens, J. (1992). *Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-254). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just reading and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 50, 158-164.

Swain, M. (1995a). *Classroom-based SLA research as a basis for pedagogical application*. Paper presented at the Second Language Research Forum, Cornell University.

Swain, M. (1995b). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.), *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honor of H.G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1996). Integrating language and content in immersion classrooms: Research perspectives. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52, 529-48.

Swain, M. (1997). Collaborative dialogue: It's contribution to L2 learning. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, 34, 115-132.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1982). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 16, 271-391.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (in press). Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *Modern Language Journal*.

Swain, M., Lapkin, S., & Barik, H.C. (1976). The cloze test as a measure of second language proficiency. *Working Papers on Bilingualism*, 11, 32-42.

Tabachnick, B., & Fidell, L. (1989). *Using multivariate statistics*. New York: Harper & Row Publishers.

Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 29, 331-342.

Tonnes-Schnier, F., & Scheibner-Herzig, G. (1988). Measuring communicative effectiveness through dictation. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 26, 35-43.

Tremblay, R. (1989). *Plan de perfectionnement en français langue seconde: Compréhension orale*. Montréal: Éditions CEC.

Tremblay, R., Duplantie, M., & Huot, D. (1990). *National core French study: Communicative-experiential syllabus*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Turnbull, M. (1990). *PEI study of French immersion students at the secondary/post-secondary interface*. Charlottetown, PEI, Report to the University of Prince Edward Island.

Turnbull, M. (1996). Love, sex and union: A multidimensional module. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52, 498-504.

Turnbull, M. (1997a). *Multiplions les dimensions: l'approche communicative-expérientielle...comment marche-t-elle?* Paper presented at the annual core French PD Day, Charlottetown, PEI.

Turnbull, M. (1997b). *Multiplying the dimensions: communicative-experiential teaching in core French...how's it going?* Paper presented at the annual conference of the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, Montreal, QC.

Turnbull, M., Lapkin, S., Hart, D., & Swain, M. (1998). Time on task and immersion graduates' French proficiency. In S. Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies* (pp. 32-56). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Turner, J. (Ed.). (1987). *It's hero time: Project book*. Bath, England: Bell School (mimeo).

Ullmann, R., Geva, E., & MacKay, L. (1985). *A descriptive study of core French programs: Factors affecting declining enrolment at the secondary level*. Toronto: OISE.

Valdes, J.M. (1986). *Culture bound: Bridging the gap in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vandergrift, L. (1992). *The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alberta, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Vandergrift, L. (1998). Constructing meaning in second language listening: Evidence from protocols. In S Lapkin (Ed.), *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies* (pp. 89-119). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Verdelhan-Bourgade, Verdelhan & Dominique (1982). *Sans frontières 1*. Paris: Clé International.

Von Glaserfeld, E. (1995). *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. Bristol, UK: Falmer Press.

Vygotsky, L.S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wells, G. (1981). *Learning through interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wertsch, J.V. (1985). *Culture, communication and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wesche, M., Morrison, F., Pawley, C., & Ready, D. (1990). French immersion: Post-secondary consequences for individuals and universities. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 430-451.

Westbury, I., & Wilkof, N. (Eds.). (1978). *Science, curriculum and liberal education by Joseph Schwab*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D.A. (1980). The linguistic and situational content of the common core in a unit/credit system. In J.L.M. Trim, R. Richterich, J.A. Van Ek & D.A. Wilkins (Eds.), *Systems development in adult language learning: A European unit/credit system for modern language learning by adults* (pp. 129-146). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilkins, D.A. (1981). Communicative language teaching: Some misconceptions and some proposals. *Bulletin of the CAAL, Proceedings of the 12th annual symposium*, 95-106.

Wolf, R. M. (1977). *Achievement in America: National report of the United States for the International Educational Achievement project*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Wurdinger, S. (1996). The theory and pedagogy of experiential education: A critical look at teaching practices. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 19, 60-61.

Young, D. J. (1987). The relationship between a communicative competence oriented dictation and ACTFL's oral proficiency interview. *Hispania*, 70, 643-649.

Zoutou, V., & Mitchell, R. (1995). Communicative language teaching in Greek high schools. In N. Spada & M. Fröhlich (Eds.), *Communicative Orientation of Language Teaching observation scheme: Coding conventions and applications* (pp. 132-138). Sydney, Australia: National Centre for English Language Teaching and Research, Macquarrie University.

APPENDIX A
TEACHER RECRUITMENT SURVEY

Core French Research Project

Miles Turnbull
 Ph.D. Student
 Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
 Toronto, Ontario
 416-922-7680 (phone/fax)
 email: mturnbull@oise.on.ca

The information from this survey will help recruit participants for a research project on core French. This research project is one of the requirements for a doctoral degree in second language curriculum.

NB. All information will remain completely confidential and will be used and seen by the researcher only.

Name _____

School _____

Phone _____ (School) _____ (Home)

FAX (where applicable) _____ (School) _____ (Home)

Email (where applicable) _____

• Please circle the grades you are presently teaching core French: 7 8 9

• Please circle the grades you expect to be teaching core French next year:

7 8 9 don't know yet

• Would you consider participating in the research project described to you today?

Yes Maybe Definitely not

Please note that your participation in this study would remain confidential. The researcher would not disclose any details of the observations or testing done in your classes. Your identity, as well as the location of your school, would be protected in all subsequent publication of the research results.

Tell me a bit about your teaching in core French!

Please circle the response which best describes your teaching in core French

- Do your students work on projects in your classes?

YES NO SOMETIMES (please circle one)

- Approximately what percentage of your classes is devoted to grammar and vocabulary exercises?

- Approximately what percentage of your classes is conducted in French? _____

- Have you worked with the grade 7 and 8 thematic modules developed by the PEI Department of Education? YES NO (please circle one)

- If Yes, how satisfied are you with the teaching approach?

- a) Very satisfied
- b) Satisfied
- c) Not satisfied

- Are you presently piloting the grade 9 modules? YES NO (please circle one)

- How often do your students work in pairs or small groups?

- a) Frequently
- b) Sometimes
- c) Never

- Do you include cultural activities in your classes?

- a) Frequently
- b) Sometimes
- c) Never

- Do you ask students to evaluate themselves?

- a) Frequently
- b) Sometimes
- c) Never

- Which statement best describes how you assess your students?

- a) Using mostly pencil and paper tests
- b) Using a variety of assessment methods

APPENDIX B
TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE

Core French study - Teacher questionnaire

The responses given in this questionnaire will be seen by Miles Turnbull and his thesis committee members only. You will not be identified in any way in the final report or in any publication.

Name _____

1. For how many years have you been teaching? ___ years
2. For how many years have you taught core French? ___ years
3. Do you currently teach other subjects besides core French? ___ yes ___ no
4. Is there a French immersion program at your school?
___ yes ___ no
5. Have you ever taught in a French immersion program? ___ yes ___ no

If Yes:

When did you last teach in immersion? 19__ - 19__

At what grade level(s) was this? _____

For how many years have you taught in French immersion? _____

6. In what year did you receive your teacher certification? _____

7. In which division(s) and/or subjects were you initially certified?

Primary (K-3) _____ Intermediate (7-9) _____

Junior (4-6) _____ Senior (10-12) _____

Subject area(s) _____ (if applicable)

8. Did you receive specialist training for FSL during your initial certification?

___ yes ___ no

9. Did you receive specialist training for teaching FSL after your initial certification?

___ yes ___ no

10. Did you study French at university?

___ Yes, as a major

___ Yes, as a minor

___ No

___ I attended a francophone or bilingual university

11. Did you learn French as a child at home? ___ yes ___ no
If no, what is your first language? _____

12. Have you ever lived for more than three months in a setting where you had to use French to do most everyday activities? ___ yes ___ no

13. How easy would it be for you to do each of the following activities in French compared to English?

Scale: 5- No more difficult in French

1- Much more difficult in French

- Telephone a travel agent for ski trip information. 5 4 3 2 1
- Participate in a meeting on a school topic. 5 4 3 2 1
- Chat with strangers in a movie lineup. 5 4 3 2 1
- Read a newsletter on topics in education. 5 4 3 2 1
- Read a novel. 5 4 3 2 1
- Write a letter of complaint to a store. 5 4 3 2 1
- Write a memo to a school official on a school issue. 5 4 3 2 1

14. Do you think that the new core French program requires higher, lower or about the same level of French proficiency for teachers as the old program?

- ___ much higher
- ___ somewhat higher
- ___ about the same
- ___ somewhat lower
- ___ much lower

15. How confident are you that your French proficiency skills are adequate to meet the demands of the new FSL program?

- ___ very confident
- ___ somewhat confident
- ___ not very confident

16. How much have you changed the way you teach since the new FSL program was introduced?

- ___ a great deal
- ___ a moderate amount
- ___ somewhat
- ___ very little
- ___ not at all

17. How much have you changed the content you teach since the new FSL program was introduced?

- a great deal
- a moderate amount
- somewhat
- very little
- not at all

18. How much have you changed the way you evaluate students since the new FSL program was introduced?

- a great deal
- a moderate amount
- somewhat
- very little
- not at all

19. How much have you changed your expectations of what students should be able to do in French since the new FSL program was introduced?

- a great deal
- a moderate amount
- somewhat
- very little
- not at all

MERCI BEAUCOUP!!

APPENDIX C

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRES (PRE AND POST)

Core French Study

This questionnaire is part of a study on core French. The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather information about participants' language background and views on language learning and culture. **Your answers will be strictly confidential. No one will see your completed questionnaire except the researcher. Results will be reported for groups, never for individuals or in a way which would allow individuals to be identified.**

Name _____

School _____

A. Your Family and Home Background

1. Does anyone in your household **now** understand **French**?

Mother yes ____ no ____
 Father yes ____ no ____
 Other yes ____ no ____

2. How does their French compare to yours?

	Better	About the same	Worse
Mother			
Father			
Other			

3. Do your parents or guardians encourage you to learn French? Yes No Sometimes

4. Do **you** understand a language other than English or French?

yes ____ no ____

IF YES, What language(s)? _____

IF YES, how do your skills in this language compare to your French language skills? (If you understand more than one language other than English and French, think here about the one you know best.)

-better than my French ____
 -about the same ____
 -worse than my French ____

5. How often, if at all, is a language other than English used in your household?

	Never	Hardly Ever	Sometimes	About half the time	Most or all of the time
French					
Other					

B. Your education

1. Please check every grade you were in a French immersion program.

kindergarten grade 5
 grade 1 grade 6
 grade 2 grade 7
 grade 3 grade 8
 grade 4

2. Please check the grade when you started core French.

kindergarten grade 5
 grade 1 grade 6
 grade 2 grade 7
 grade 3 grade 8
 grade 4

C. Using French now and in the future.

1. Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below by checking the box that best matches your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't say
I have learned as much French as I need for my purposes					
Knowing French will give me an edge in any career I choose					
I want to continue studying French in high school					

continued on next page....

Question 1 continued: Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below by checking the box that best matches your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't say
In using French, the important thing is what you say not how you say it					
I wouldn't know the right style to speak to French teenagers					
I feel it reflects badly on me if I mispronounce words or make grammar mistakes when I talk French					
I am learning French because I like languages					
I am learning French because I want to know French speaking people					
I am learning French because I want to travel to French speaking places					
French is one of my favorite subjects					

Please explain your opinions if you wish:

2. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in speaking French.

- ___ Abandon what you want to say and move on to something else or let someone else speak
- ___ Switch temporarily to English and then continue in French
- ___ Abandon temporarily what you want to say and ask for help in English
- ___ Abandon temporarily what you want to say and ask for help in French
- ___ Make a guess at the French words you need and continue in French
- ___ Rephrase in French what you want to say and continue in French

3. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in reading French.

- Use the context to get the general overall meaning
- Use word friends (words that look alike in English and French) to understand
- Abandon reading when you don't understand
- Look up every word you don't understand in a dictionary
- Look in a dictionary for the words that are necessary to understand the general overall meaning

4. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in understanding spoken French.

- Use the context to understand
- Listen for words that sound like English words
- Ask the other person to repeat or speak more slowly
- Ask the other person questions when you don't understand
- Give up trying and tune out

5. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in writing in French.

- Write a rough copy and revise it
- Ask your teacher for help
- Ask a friend for help
- Ask your teacher to read what you've written
- Ask a friend to read what you've written
- Use a dictionary to find a word you don't know
- Change topic
- Consult a grammar book

6. Please indicate how useful (if at all) you find the following strategies for learning French:

	Very useful	Useful	Not at all useful	Can't say
Keeping a vocabulary list				
Evaluating your own learning				
Evaluating the performance of your peers				
Taking notes				
Using a dictionary				
Translating into English				
Learning about how the French language works				
Comparing how English and French work				
Thinking about what you might hear or read before listening or reading something designed for French speakers				
Asking someone to repeat or to explain something				

C. Your French classes

Please indicate how useful you find each of the following activities for learning French:

	Very useful	Useful	Not at all useful	Can't say
Working on projects				
Learning vocabulary				
Learning about French grammar				
Doing pronunciation exercises				
Doing oral presentations in French				
Writing in French				
Listening to videos in French				
Working in groups				
Reading in French				
Doing grammar exercises				
Learning about the culture of French speaking people				

Please explain your opinions if you wish:

D. Your Own Use of French

1. Have you ever **lived in** a place where French was the language used for everyday activities (eg. shopping, going to the cinema etc) ?

yes _____ no _____

2. Compared to other students in your class:	Below Average	Average	Above Average
2a) how well are you doing in learning French	1	2	3
2b) how well are you doing in school in general?	1	2	3

3. How much do you think you have improved in each of the following, if at all, since beginning to learn French?

	Improved a great deal	Improved somewhat	No improvement	Don't know
Your ability to understand spoken French				
Your speaking ability in French				
Your reading ability in French				
Your writing ability in French				
Your self-confidence in speaking French				
Your motivation to learn				
Your understanding of youth cultures in other places where French is spoken				
Your knowledge of the society and politics of French speaking communities				
Your ability to anticipate the meaning of what you read or hear in French even if you don't understand every word				

4. Imagine yourself in each of the following situations. How easy would it be for you to do each task **IN FRENCH, COMPARED TO ENGLISH?**

	Just as easy	A little more difficult	Much more difficult	Probably couldn't do it
Read a menu in French				
Understand an ad for a job in French				
Understand a commercial on TV in French				
Understand a film in French				
Write a letter to a friend in French				
Write an essay about the environment in French				
Conduct an interview in French with a French-speaking person				
Do an oral presentation on the environment in French				
Participate in a group discussion entirely in French				
Create an ad for Levi Jeans in French				

5. Please indicate how recently (if at all) you have done each of the following IN FRENCH.

	Within the past week	Within the past month	Within the past 6 months	Within the past year or more	Never
Talked with friends between classes or at lunch in French					
Used French on the telephone					
Had a casual conversation in French with someone whose first language is French					
Written a friendly letter in French					
Written a formal letter in French					
Watched a French TV program outside school or school work					
Read a French newspaper or magazine					
Seen a French movie (on TV or at a cinema) outside school or school work					
Read a French book outside school or school work					
Spent a week or more in a place where you had to use French in everyday activities					

6. Please rank your skills in French from 1 to 4 (strongest to weakest)

- Listening ___
- Reading ___
- Speaking ___
- Writing ___

E. Language and culture

1. Please evaluate your knowledge about the following:

	Very good	Good	Poor	Can't say
French speaking Acadians				
The French speaking areas in Canada				
The French speaking areas outside Canada				
Francophones in Western Canada				
Popular French singers in Canada				
Famous French speaking people in Canada				
The history of French speaking Canadians				
The eating habits of French speaking people in your area				
The jobs of young French speaking people				
Environmental concerns of French speaking people in Canada				
The different cultures in your community				
The different cultures in Canada				
Native people in Canada				

2. Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below by checking the box that best matches your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't say
It is important to learn about the culture of French speaking people in Canada					
It is important to learn about the multicultural nature of Canada					
Official bilingualism in Canada is a good policy					
Young people should learn a second language in school					
It is more difficult to be French speaking in Canada than English speaking					
I would like to learn another language in addition to French					

Please explain your opinions if you wish:

Thank you very much!

Core French Study - Questionnaire 2

This follow-up questionnaire is part of the same study on core French in which you have been participating this year. The purpose of this second questionnaire is to gather information about participants' views on language learning and culture near the end of grade 9 in French. **Your answers will be strictly confidential. No one will see your completed questionnaire except the researcher. Results will be reported for groups, never for individuals or in a way which would allow individuals to be identified.**

Name _____

School _____

A. Introduction

1. Please describe your satisfaction with your French classes this year (please check one only).

Very satisfied Satisfied Not very satisfied Very unsatisfied

2. Did your class complete a project related to Fashion and Advertising (example: a fashion show or a clothing ad)?

Yes No (please circle one)

If you answered Yes to Question 2, please continue to Question 3. If you answered No, please go to Question 5

3. Did you do present your project orally to the rest of your class?

Yes No (please circle one)

4. Did you prepare your project individually, with a partner or in groups?

Individually With a partner In groups (please circle one)

5. Do you plan to take French next year in grade 10? (please circle one)

- a) Yes, I have registered for grade 10 French
- b) Yes, but I haven't registered yet
- c) No
- d) I'm not sure

6. Did your class do the following themes this year?

Jobs and careers	Yes	No	
Outdoor activities	Yes	No	
The environment	Yes	No	
Francophones in Canada's West	Yes	No	

Please list any other themes your class has done this year:

B. Using French now and in the future.

1. Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below by checking the box that best matches your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't say
In using French, the important thing is what you say not how you say it					
I wouldn't know the right style to speak to French teenagers					
I feel it reflects badly on me if I mispronounce words or make grammar mistakes when I talk French					
I am learning French because I like languages					
I am learning French because I want to know French speaking people					
I am learning French because I want to travel to French speaking places					
French is one of my favorite subjects					
I have learned as much French as I need for my purposes					
Knowing French will give me an edge in any career I choose					
I want to continue studying French in high school					

2. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in speaking French.

- Abandon what you want to say and move on to something else or let someone else speak
- Switch temporarily to English and then continue in French
- Abandon temporarily what you want to say and ask for help in English
- Abandon temporarily what you want to say and ask for help in French
- Make a guess at the French words you need and continue in French
- Rephrase in French what you want to say and continue in French

3. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in reading French.

- Use the context to get the general overall meaning
- Use word friends (words that look alike in English and French) to understand
- Abandon reading when you don't understand
- Look up every word you don't understand in a dictionary
- Look in a dictionary for the words that are necessary to understand the general overall meaning

4. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in understanding spoken French.

- Use the context to understand
- Listen for words that sound like English words
- Ask the other person to repeat or speak more slowly
- Ask the other person questions when you don't understand
- Give up trying and tune out

5. Please check the strategies you use when you have problems in writing in French.

- Write a rough copy and revise it
- Ask your teacher for help
- Ask a friend for help
- Ask your teacher to read what you've written
- Ask a friend to read what you've written
- Use a dictionary to find a word you don't know
- Change topic
- Consult a grammar book

6. Please indicate how useful (if at all) you find the following strategies for learning French:

	Very useful	Useful	Not at all useful	Can't say
Keeping a vocabulary list				
Evaluating your own learning				
Evaluating the performance of your peers				
Taking notes				
Using a dictionary				
Translating into English				
Learning about how the French language works				
Comparing how English and French work				
Thinking about what you might hear or read before listening or reading something designed for French speakers				
Asking someone to repeat or to explain something				

C. Your French classes

Please indicate how useful you find each of the following activities for learning French:

	Very useful	Useful	Not at all useful	Can't say
Working on projects				
Learning vocabulary				
Learning about French grammar				
Doing pronunciation exercises				
Doing oral presentations in French				
Writing in French				
Listening to videos in French				
Working in groups				
Reading in French				
Doing grammar exercises				
Learning about the culture of French speaking people				

Please explain your opinions if you wish:

D. Your Own Use of French

1. Have you ever **lived** in a place where French was the language used for everyday activities (eg. shopping, going to the cinema etc) ?

yes ____ no ____

2. Compared to other students in your class:	Below Average	Average	Above Average
2a) how well are you doing in learning French	1	2	3
2b) how well are you doing in school in general?	1	2	3

3. How much do you think you have improved in each of the following, if at all, since beginning to learn French?

	Improved a great deal	Improved somewhat	No improvement	Don't know
Your ability to understand spoken French				
Your speaking ability in French				
Your reading ability in French				
Your writing ability in French				
Your self-confidence in speaking French				
Your motivation to learn				
Your understanding of youth cultures in other places where French is spoken				
Your knowledge of the society and politics of French speaking communities				
Your ability to anticipate the meaning of what you read or hear in French even if you don't understand every word				

3a. How much do you think you have improved in French this year (grade 9)?
(please circle one)

A lot Some Not much None at all Can't say

4. Imagine yourself in each of the following situations. How easy would it be for you to do each task **IN FRENCH, COMPARED TO ENGLISH?**

	Just as easy	A little more difficult	Much more difficult	Probably couldn't do it
Read a menu in French				
Understand an ad for a job in French				
Understand a commercial on TV in French				
Understand a film in French				
Write a letter to a friend in French				
Write an essay about the environment in French				
Conduct an interview in French with a French-speaking person				
Do an oral presentation on the environment in French				
Participate in a group discussion entirely in French				
Create an ad for Levi Jeans in French				

5. Please indicate how recently (if at all) you have done each of the following IN FRENCH.

	Within the past week	Within the past month	Within the past 6 months	Within the past year or more	Never
Talked with friends between classes or at lunch in French					
Used French on the telephone					
Had a casual conversation in French with someone whose first language is French					
Written a friendly letter in French					
Written a formal letter in French					
Watched a French TV program outside school or school work					
Read a French newspaper or magazine					
Seen a French movie (on TV or at a cinema) outside school or school work					
Read a French book outside school or school work					
Spent a week or more in a place where you had to use French in everyday activities					

6. Please rank your skills in French from 1 to 4 (strongest to weakest). Please give a different number to each skill.

Listening —
 Reading —
 Speaking —
 Writing —

E. Language and culture

1. Please evaluate your knowledge about the following:

	Very good	Good	Poor	Can't say
French speaking Acadians				
The French speaking areas in Canada				
The French speaking areas outside Canada				
Francophones in Western Canada				
Popular French singers in Canada				
Famous French speaking people in Canada				
The history of French speaking Canadians				
The eating habits of French speaking people in your area				
The jobs of young French speaking people				
Environmental concerns of French speaking people in Canada				
The different cultures in your community				
The different cultures in Canada				
Native people in Canada				

2. Please indicate how strongly you agree with the statements below by checking the box that best matches your opinion.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Can't say
It is important to learn about the culture of French speaking people in Canada					
It is important to learn about the multicultural nature of Canada					
Official bilingualism in Canada is a good policy					
Young people should learn a second language in school					
It is more difficult to be French speaking in Canada than English speaking					
I would like to learn another language in addition to French					

Please explain your opinions if you wish:

Thank you very much!

APPENDIX D
MOLT OBSERVATION SCHEME

APPENDIX E
QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Table 3.3.1.- Self-assessment of French skills: Pre-questionnaire

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N = 29	Class 2 N = 23	Class 3 N = 27	Class 4 N = 26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Reading a menu in French	Just as easy	14	9	4	-	.03
	A little more difficult	59	68	63	38.5	
	Much more difficult	21	18	11	23	
	Couldn't do it	7	4.5	22	38.5	
Understand a job ad in French	Just as easy	7	4.5	7	-	.13
	A little more difficult	41	41	22	19	
	Much more difficult	34.5	45.5	44	35	
	Couldn't do it	17	9	26	46	
Understand a TV commercial in French	Just as easy	21	22	22	11.5	.30
	A little more difficult	45	43.5	37	31	
	Much more difficult	28	30	15	31	
	Couldn't do it	7	4	26	27	
Understand a film in French	Just as easy	3	9	11	-	.08
	A little more difficult	31	43.5	41	19	
	Much more difficult	34.5	39	30	31	
	Couldn't do it	31	9	18.5	50	
Write a letter to a friend in French	Just as easy	24	4	4	8	.003
	A little more difficult	41	61	41	16	
	Much more difficult	28	22	22	28	
	Couldn't do it	7	13	33	48	
Write an essay about the environment in French	Just as easy	7	9	-	-	.004
	A little more difficult	17	22	15	4	
	Much more difficult	38	61	41	23	
	Couldn't do it	38	9	44	73	

Table 3.3.1.- Self-assessment of French skills: Pre-questionnaire (continued)

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Conduct an interview in French	Just as easy	7	30	-	-	.03
	A little more difficult	21	52	30	4	
	Much more difficult	45	17	37	38.5	
	Couldn't do it	28	-	33	58	
Do an oral presentation on the environment in French	Just as easy	10	13	-	8	.01
	A little more difficult	34.5	48	26	8	
	Much more difficult	34.5	26	48	31	
	Couldn't do it	21	13	26	54	
Participate in a group discussion entirely in French	Just as easy	14	13	-	8	.006
	A little more difficult	24	48	41	4	
	Much more difficult	38	26	26	31	
	Couldn't do it	24	13	33	58	
Create an ad for Levi jeans in French	Just as easy	21	17	7	4	.22
	A little more difficult	48	48	41	35	
	Much more difficult	10	26	26	23	
	Couldn't do it	21	9	26	38.5	

Table 3.3.2.- Self-assessment of French skills: Post-questionnaire

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=20	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Reading a menu in French	Just as easy	15	15	-	9	.35
	A little more difficult	58	60	56	55	
	Much more difficult	23	25	28	18	
	Couldn't do it	4	-	16	18	
Understand a job ad in French	Just as easy	8	-	-	5	.02
	A little more difficult	50	50	40	18	
	Much more difficult	42	50	36	50	
	Couldn't do it	-	-	24	27	
Understand a TV commercial in French	Just as easy	23	15	12	14	.11
	A little more difficult	31	45	64	50	
	Much more difficult	42	40	16	8	
	Couldn't do it	4	-	8	8	
Understand a film in French	Just as easy	12	5	4	5	.009
	A little more difficult	42	20	32	9	
	Much more difficult	31	70	44	36	
	Couldn't do it	15	5	20	50	
Write a letter to a friend in French	Just as easy	32	-	4	5	.001
	A little more difficult	32	55	36	18	
	Much more difficult	28	40	24	50	
	Couldn't do it	8	5	36	27	
Write an essay about the environment in French	Just as easy	12	-	8	5	.32
	A little more difficult	31	15	24	14	
	Much more difficult	42	60	36	36	
	Couldn't do it	15	25	32	45	

Table 3.3.2.- Self-assessment of French skills: Post-questionnaire (continued)

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=20	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Conduct an interview in French	Just as easy	12	-	4	-	.14
	A little more difficult	27	20	24	5	
	Much more difficult	38	35	36	41	
	Couldn't do it	23	30	36	55	
Do an oral presentation on the environment in French	Just as easy	12	5	-	5	.52
	A little more difficult	42	45	40	23	
	Much more difficult	38	35	40	45	
	Couldn't do it	8	15	20	27	
Participate in a group discussion entirely in French	Just as easy	12	-	8	-	.06
	A little more difficult	42	25	32	23	
	Much more difficult	23	65	28	36	
	Couldn't do it	23	10	32	41	
Create an ad for Levi jeans in French	Just as easy	15	5	20	18	.19
	A little more difficult	35	60	36	41	
	Much more difficult	42	30	16	27	
	Couldn't do it	8	5	28	14	

Table 3.3.3.: Self-assessment of Cultural knowledge: Pre-questionnaire

Knowledge area	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square sig. level (.05)
French speaking Acadians	Very good	3	-	11	-	.43
	Good	28	22	30	15	
	Poor	55	56.5	44	69	
	Can't say	14	22	15	15	
French areas in Canada	Very good	17	9	4	8	.19
	Good	48	52	63	35	
	Poor	31	17	18.5	42	
	Can't say	3	22	15	15	
French areas outside Canada	Very good	3	-	4	-	.27
	Good	34.5	13	33	19	
	Poor	52	56.5	44	42	
	Can't say	10	30	18.5	38.5	
Francophones in western Canada	Very good	3	-	7	-	.01
	Good	14	-	7	-	
	Poor	76	52	56	50	
	Can't say	7	48	30	50	
Popular singers	Very good	14	9	18.5	-	.03
	Good	17	22	26	8	
	Poor	62	52	48	54	
	Can't say	7	17	7	38.5	
Famous people	Very good	7	-	7	4	.43
	Good	21	23	30	11.5	
	Poor	59	70	44	54	
	Can't say	14	9	18.5	31	
History of French Canada	Very good	7	-	7	-	.13
	Good	45	30	30	23	
	Poor	34.5	52	59	46	
	Can't say	14	17	4	31	

Table 3.3.3.: Self-assessment of Cultural knowledge: Pre-questionnaire (continued)

Knowledge area	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Eating habits of local French people	Very good	7	-	-	-	.02
	Good	14	4	4	8	
	Poor	69	52	81.5	50	
	Can't say	10	43.5	15	42	
Jobs of young French people	Very good	7	-	4	-	.58
	Good	10	23	7	15	
	Poor	62	50	70	54	
	Can't say	21	27	18.5	31	
Environmental concerns of young French people	Very good	-	-	-	4	.19
	Good	14	13	15	4	
	Poor	69	43.5	70	56	
	Can't say	17	43.5	15	36	
Different cultures in your community	Very good	14	4.5	15	-	.004
	Good	38	23	37	11.5	
	Poor	48	36	27	50	
	Can't say	-	36	11	38.5	
Different cultures in Canada	Very good	10	9	15	-	.25
	Good	48	48	41	42	
	Poor	38	22	30	27	
	Can't say	3	22	15	31	
Natives people in Canada	Very good	7	9	4	8	.67
	Good	48	26	41	27	
	Poor	38	39	41	42	
	Can't say	7	26	15	23	

Table 3.3. - Self-assessment of Cultural knowledge: Post-questionnaire

Knowledge area	Scale %	Class 1 N=25	Class 2 N=20	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
French speaking Acadians	Very good	8	-	12	-	.40
	Good	16	25	28	18	
	Poor	68	65	40	68	
	Can't say	8	10	20	14	
French areas in Canada	Very good	-	10	16	-	.28
	Good	64	50	48	68	
	Poor	36	30	32	27	
	Can't say	-	10	4	5	
French areas outside Canada	Very good	4	-	8	-	.59
	Good	32	30	32	23	
	Poor	60	55	40	59	
	Can't say	4	15	20	18	
Francophones in western Canada	Very good	-	-	4	-	.58
	Good	8	-	12	4	
	Poor	76	75	68	64	
	Can't say	16	25	16	32	
Popular singers	Very good	16	5	12	-	.06
	Good	48	35	44	23	
	Poor	36	50	24	50	
	Can't say	-	10	20	27	
Famous people	Very good	-	-	12	-	.13
	Good	44	20	28	27	
	Poor	48	60	36	50	
	Can't say	8	20	24	23	
History of French Canada	Very good	12	10	16	5	.48
	Good	20	25	36	27	
	Poor	60	50	24	50	
	Can't say	8	15	24	18	

Table 3.3- Self-assessment of Cultural knowledge: Post-questionnaire (continued)

Knowledge area	Scale %	Class 1 N=25	Class 2 N=20	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Eating habits of local French people	Very good	4	5	4	5	.92
	Good	12	10	24	9	
	Poor	64	55	56	59	
	Can't say	20	30	16	27	
Jobs of young French people	Very good	4	5	4	-	.83
	Good	8	20	12	18	
	Poor	76	55	64	55.5	
	Can't say	12	20	20	27	
Environmental concerns of young French people	Very good	-	5	8	-	.64
	Good	24	5	12	14	
	Poor	48	60	56	59	
	Can't say	28	30	24	27	
Different cultures in your community	Very good	8	5	8	4	.87
	Good	40	55	46	32	
	Poor	40	25	25	46	
	Can't say	12	15	21	18	
Different cultures in Canada	Very good	12	5	20	-	.35
	Good	60	65	52	52	
	Poor	24	20	16	24	
	Can't say	4	10	12	24	
Natives people in Canada	Very good	12	5	12	5	.82
	Good	40	35	40	36	
	Poor	40	45	24	41	
	Can't say	8	15	24	18	

Table 3.3.5.: Improvement since starting French studies: Pre-questionnaire

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square (.05)
Listening	A great deal	55	74	37	8	.000
	Somewhat	38	26	52	58	
	No improvement	3	-	7	27	
	Don't know	3	-	4	8	
Speaking	A great deal	48	56.5	37	4	.002
	Somewhat	45	43.5	33	65	
	No improvement	7	-	22	23	
	Don't know	-	-	7	8	
Reading	A great deal	45	48	41	4	.007
	Somewhat	41	52	30	58	
	No improvement	10	-	22	31	
	Don't know	3	-	7	8	
Writing	A great deal	31	35	37	8	.09
	Somewhat	55	56.5	33	48	
	No improvement	10	4	22	32	
	Don't know	3	4	7	12	
Self-confidence while speaking French	A great deal	31	43.5	30	15	.05
	Somewhat	41	52	37	38.5	
	No improvement	28	4	22	42	
	Don't know	-	-	11	4	
Motivation to learn French	A great deal	10	43.5	18.5	8	.001
	Somewhat	55	56.5	37	35	
	No improvement	31	-	26	46	
	Don't know	3	-	18.5	11.5	

Table 3.3.5.: Improvement since starting French studies: Pre-questionnaire (continued)

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Understanding of francophone youth cultures	A great deal	7	4	4	4	.02
	Somewhat	28	52	30	4	
	No improvement	48	26	41	81	
	Don't know	17	17	26	11.5	
Knowledge of the society and politics of French speaking communities	A great deal	3	9	4	-	.06
	Somewhat	21	17	33	11.5	
	No improvement	62	43.5	30	77	
	Don't know	14	30	33	11.5	
Ability to anticipate meaning when reading or listening	A great deal	41	52	22	8	.007
	Somewhat	45	26	52	46	
	No improvement	7	4	15	35	
	Don't know	7	17	11	11.5	

Table 3.3.6.- Improvement since starting French studies: Post-questionnaire

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=20	Class 3 N=24	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square (.05)
Listening	A great deal	35	50	29	14	.08
	Somewhat	38	50	54	77	
	No improvement	23	-	13	5	
	Don't know	4	-	4	5	
Speaking	A great deal	27	40	21	14	.23
	Somewhat	58	60	67	59	
	No improvement	8	-	13	23	
	Don't know	8	-	-	5	
Reading	A great deal	27	30	17	18	.22
	Somewhat	38	60	67	86	
	No improvement	27	-	8	9	
	Don't know	8	10	8	5	
Writing	A great deal	27	25	33	14	.04
	Somewhat	38	70	38	41	
	No improvement	19	-	13	41	
	Don't know	15	5	17	5	
Self-confidence while speaking French	A great deal	8	30	21	18	.33
	Somewhat	50	55	54	41	
	No improvement	35	5	17	36	
	Don't know	8	10	8	5	
Motivation to learn French	A great deal	12	25	21	18	.37
	Somewhat	38	60	50	36	
	No improvement	42	10	17	32	
	Don't know	8	5	13	14	

Table 3.3.6.- Improvement since starting French studies: Post-questionnaire (continued)

Skill	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=20	Class 3 N=24	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Understanding of francophone youth cultures	A great deal	4	-	4	-	.43
	Somewhat	27	25	38	27	
	No improvement	58	45	42	68	
	Don't know	12	30	17	5	
Knowledge of the society and politics of French speaking communities	A great deal	4	-	8	-	.16
	Somewhat	23	5	29	23	
	No improvement	54	50	50	68	
	Don't know	19	45	21	9	
Ability to anticipate meaning when reading or listening	A great deal	23	20	25	9	.78
	Somewhat	50	65	50	59	
	No improvement	15	15	13	23	
	Don't know	12	-	13	9	

Table 3.3.7: Attitudes towards French language and culture: Pre-questionnaire

Attitude	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
It's important to learn about French culture	Strongly agree	-	9	7	-	.18
	Agree	65.5	70	48	50	
	Disagree	14	9	30	23	
	Strongly disagree	17	-	11	19	
	Can't say	3	13	4	8	
It's important to learn about multiculturalism in Canada	Strongly agree	7	17	11	-	.22
	Agree	62	48	44	61.5	
	Disagree	24	4	18.5	19	
	Strongly disagree	3	4	11	8	
	Can't say	3	26	15	11.5	
Official bilingualism is good	Strongly agree	24	13	15	4	.21
	Agree	38	43.5	44	38.5	
	Disagree	28	13	7	23	
	Strongly disagree	3	-	11	11.5	
	Can't say	7	31	22	23	
Learning a second language is good	Strongly agree	28	39	19	8	2
	Agree	45	52	42	42	
	Disagree	24	-	15	15	
	Strongly disagree	3	-	15	27	
	Can't say	-	9	8	8	
It's more difficult to be a French person in Canada than English	Strongly agree	14	22	33	31	.45
	Agree	38	35	37	42	
	Disagree	24	22	15	8	
	Strongly disagree	10	-	11	11.5	
	Can't say	14	22	4	8	

Table 3.3.7: Attitudes towards French language and culture: Pre-questionnaire (continued)

Attitude	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
I want to learn a third of fourth language	Strongly agree	21	22	26	8	.39
	Agree	38	31	33	31	
	Disagree	28	17	15	19	
	Strongly disagree	10	9	15	31	
	Can't say	3	22	11	11.5	
The important thing when speaking French is what you say not how you say it	Strongly agree	7	9	-	11.5	.60
	Agree	28	41	31	35	
	Disagree	38	18	31	31	
	Strongly disagree	7	4.5	15	-	
	Can't say	21	27	23	23	
I look bad if I make mistakes when speaking French	Strongly agree	-	9	7	-	.05
	Agree	21	22	33	15	
	Disagree	59	61	48	34.6	
	Strongly disagree	17	9	7	38.5	
	Can't say	3	-	4	11.5	
I wouldn't know the right style to speak to French teenagers	Strongly agree	10	4	15	23	.34
	Agree	55	48	59	34.6	
	Disagree	3	13	7	8	
	Strongly disagree	7	-	-	11.5	
	Can't say	24	35	18.5	23	

Table 3.3.8- Attitudes towards French language and culture: Post-questionnaire

Attitude	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=21	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
It's important to learn about French culture	Strongly agree	24	5	4	-	.05
	Agree	44	70	67	48	
	Disagree	12	5	8	24	
	Strongly disagree	16	10	4	24	
	Can't say	4	10	17	5	
It's important to learn about multiculturalism in Canada	Strongly agree	20	15	13	-	.78
	Agree	52	50	46	48	
	Disagree	12	15	21	24	
	Strongly disagree	4	-	8	10	
	Can't say	12	20	13	19	
Official bilingualism is good	Strongly agree	29	5	13	10	.03
	Agree	33	80	58	38	
	Disagree	21	5	-	24	
	Strongly disagree	4	-	8	14	
	Can't say	13	10	21	14	
Learning a second language is good	Strongly agree	44	30	17	10	.13
	Agree	44	60	52	43	
	Disagree	8	-	9	19	
	Strongly disagree	4	10	13	19	
	Can't say	-	-	9	10	

Table 3.3.8- Attitudes towards French language and culture: Post-questionnaire (continued)

Attitude	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=21	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
I want to learn a third of fourth language	Strongly agree	29	40	28	24	.64
	Agree	29	15	32	19	
	Disagree	17	25	8	19	
	Strongly disagree	13	-	16	24	
	Can't say	13	20	16	14	
The important thing when speaking French is what you say not how you say it	Strongly agree	15	-	12	5	.42
	Agree	46	43	44	59	
	Disagree	27	19	24	9	
	Strongly disagree	-	5	4	9	
	Can't say	12	33	16	18	
I look bad if I make mistakes when speaking French	Strongly agree	8	10	-	-	.51
	Agree	15	24	32	27	
	Disagree	58	48	48	41	
	Strongly disagree	19	19	12	27	
	Can't say	-	-	8	5	
I wouldn't know the right style to speak to French teenagers	Strongly agree	23	10	12	41	.26
	Agree	42	43	64	36	
	Disagree	19	24	12	5	
	Strongly disagree	4	5	-	-	
	Can't say	12	19	12	18	
It's more difficult to be a French person in Canada than English	Strongly agree	40	20	28	19	.73
	Agree	24	50	32	43	
	Disagree	16	20	12	19	
	Strongly disagree	4	-	8	10	
	Can't say	16	10	20	10	

Table 3.3.9.: Activity usefulness: Pre-questionnaire

Activity	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance (.05)
Doing projects	Very useful	34.5	39	22	27	.49
	Useful	48	56.5	52	38.5	
	Not useful	14	4	22	27	
	Can't say	3	-	4	8	
Learning vocabulary	Very useful	59	70	44	12	1
	Useful	34.5	31	48	72	
	Not useful	7	-	4	12	
	Can't say	-	-	4	4	
Learning grammar	Very useful	31	17	18.5	15	6
	Useful	48	78	44	42	
	Not useful	14	-	22	35	
	Can't say	7	4	15	8	
Pronunciation exercises	Very useful	21	31	26	23	.18
	Useful	62	52	48	40	
	Not useful	17	9	18.5	30	
	Can't say	-	9	7	7	
Oral presentations	Very useful	24	56.5	22	4	.003
	Useful	48	31	41	46	
	Not useful	24	9	26	23	
	Can't say	3	4	11	27	
Writing in French	Very useful	21	35	22	19	.14
	Useful	52	56.5	56	38.5	
	Not useful	21	9	22	23	
	Can't say	7	-	-	19	

Table 3.3.9. Activity usefulness: Pre-questionnaire (continued)

Activity	Scale %	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Listening to videos	Very useful	10	31	52	8	.000
	Useful	34.5	52	33	15	
	Not useful	45	13	11	69	
	Can't say	10	4	4	8	
Group work	Very useful	52	39	37	23	.22
	Useful	38	56.5	37	65	
	Not useful	7	-	18.5	8	
	Can't say	3	4	7	4	
Reading in French	Very useful	28	43.5	15	8	.07
	Useful	41	48	65	54	
	Not useful	24	4	19	31	
	Can't say	7	4	-	8	
Doing grammar exercises	Very useful	10	13	11.5	15	.006
	Useful	59	61	35	23	
	Not useful	24	4	35	58	
	Can't say	7	22	19	4	
Culture activities	Very useful	7	8	11	-	.59
	Useful	14	31	26	23	
	Not useful	59	48	52	69	
	Can't say	21	13	11	8	

Table 3.3.10.- Activity usefulness: Post-questionnaire

Activity	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=21	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square (.05)
Doing projects	Very useful	46	40	16	23	.11
	Useful	46	45	64	45	
	Not useful	4	15	16	14	
	Can't say	4	-	4	18	
Learning vocabulary	Very useful	46	45	36	18	.06
	Useful	50	55	48	50	
	Not useful	-	-	16	23	
	Can't say	4	-	-	9	
Learning grammar	Very useful	23	15	16	9	.43
	Useful	35	65	48	50	
	Not useful	27	-	16	23	
	Can't say	15	20	20	18	
Pronunciation exercises	Very useful	23	10	28	9	.19
	Useful	50	75	32	55	
	Not useful	12	-	24	18	
	Can't say	15	15	16	18	
Oral presentations	Very useful	23	45	12	9	.04
	Useful	38	50	68	55	
	Not useful	27	5	12	32	
	Can't say	12	-	8	5	
Writing in French	Very useful	27	30	24	18	.32
	Useful	35	65	52	64	
	Not useful	27	5	12	9	
	Can't say	12	-	12	9	

Table 3.3.10.- Activity usefulness: Post-questionnaire (continued)

Activity	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=21	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Listening to videos	Very useful	23	15	8	9	.10
	Useful	15	35	60	32	
	Not useful	50	30	24	50	
	Can't say	12	20	8	9	
Group work	Very useful	62	35	24	32	.09
	Useful	31	45	68	64	
	Not useful	4	15	8	-	
	Can't say	4	5	-	5	
Reading in French	Very useful	27	15	8	23	.09
	Useful	31	75	64	64	
	Not useful	27	10	20	5	
	Can't say	15	-	8	9	
Grammar exercises	Very useful	8	15	20	14	.13
	Useful	35	70	44	36	
	Not useful	38	5	32	41	
	Can't say	19	10	4	9	
Culture activities	Very useful	8	5	12	-	.09
	Useful	15	40	32	14	
	Not useful	58	35	32	77	
	Can't say	19	20	24	9	

Table 3.3.11.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Speaking (pre-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square level of significance (.05)
Abandon and move on	28	22	44	23	.25
Switch to English temporarily and continue in French	65.5	65	63	35	.07
Ask for help in English	48	61	70	46	.24
Ask for help in French	48	56.5	30	31	.14
Guess French words	55	65	67	69	.71
Rephrase what you want to say	38	48	26	4	.004

Table 3.3.12.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Listening (pre-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Use context	28	43.5	26	11.5	.09
Listen for cognates	72	87	67	69	.39
Ask speaker to repeat or slow down	62	78	63	46	.15
Ask speaker questions	65.5	74	59	54	.50
Give up and tune out	17	4	30	38.5	.03

Table 3.3.13.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Reading (pre-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Use context	48	52	59	23	.05
Use cognates	41	78	56	73	.02
Abandon reading	34.5	9	26	31	.17
Look up every word in a dictionary	21	35	26	19	.58
Look up the necessary words in a dictionary	62	78	59	27	.003

Table 3.3.14.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Writing (pre-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Write a rough copy and revise	31	56.5	44	24	.09
Ask teacher for help	86	83	78	80	.87
Ask a friend for help	76	91	63	68	.12
Ask teacher to read your writing	59	56.5	41	20	.02
Ask a friend to read your writing	31	48	41	16	.10
Use a dictionary to find a word	76	91	85	56	.02
Change topic	7	0	11	16	.24
Consult a grammar book	24	26	18.5	16	.80

Table 3.3.15.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Speaking (post-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Abandon and move on	31	19	20	32	.64
Switch to English temporarily and continue in French	69	71	36	45	.03
Ask for help in English	46	57	48	45	.86
Ask for help in French	27	57	44	5	.002
Guess French words	62	71	52	73	.42
Rephrase what you want to say	38	29	36	23	.64

Table 3.3.16.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Listening (post-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Use context	31	48	52	9	.01
Listen for cognates	81	95	72	68	.13
Ask speaker to repeat or slow down	73	52	52	55	.37
Ask speaker questions	50	67	60	23	.02
Give up and tune out	23	14	16	36	.28

Table 3.3.17.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Reading (post-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Use context	58	86	64	23	.000
Use cognates	81	86	60	64	.14
Abandon reading	23	5	36	27	.91
Look up every word in a dictionary	15	14	24	14	.75
Look up the necessary words in a dictionary	58	78	60	41	.24

Table 3.3.18.- % students indicating strategy use by school: Writing (post-questionnaire)

Strategy	Class 1 N=29	Class 2 N=23	Class 3 N=27	Class 4 N=26	Chi-square significance level (.05)
Write a rough copy and revise	65	52	44	9	.001
Ask teacher for help	85	81	68	68	.41
Ask a friend for help	85	95	64	59	.01
Ask teacher to read your writing	65	62	24	23	.001
Ask a friend to read your writing	27	67	52	5	.000
Use a dictionary to find a word	88	86	72	68	.24
Change topic	15	0	8	18	.20
Consult a grammar book	19	29	28	14	.57

Table 3.3.19: Motivations for learning French; Pre-questionnaire

Motivation	Scale	Class 1 N=29 %	Class 2 N=23 %	Class 3 N=27 %	Class 4 N=26 %	Chi-square significance level (.05)
I like languages	Strongly agree	10	9	18.5	-	.13
	Agree	41	26	22	19	
	Disagree	24	48	37	38.5	
	Strongly disagree	17	-	15	27	
	Can't say	7	17	7	15	
French will give me a career edge	Strongly agree	32	48	41	19	.55
	Agree	39	35	37	31	
	Disagree	7	-	7	11.5	
	Strongly disagree	4	-	4	8	
	Can't say	18	17	11	31	
I want to know French people	Strongly agree	-	-	4	4	.11
	Agree	17	39	11	8	
	Disagree	52	52	59	42	
	Strongly disagree	21	-	18.5	31	
	Can't say	10	9	7	15	
I want to travel to francophone areas	Strongly agree	7	13	-	4	.31
	Agree	24	39	33	15	
	Disagree	41	35	41	38.5	
	Strongly disagree	14	-	18.5	27	
	Can't say	14	13	7	15	
French is my favorite subject	Strongly agree	7	13	11	4	.001
	Agree	41	48	7	4	
	Disagree	28	31	37	27	
	Strongly disagree	17	4	41	54	
	Can't say	7	4	4	11.5	

Table 3.3.20.- Motivations for learning French: Post-questionnaire

Motivation	Scale %	Class 1 N=26	Class 2 N=21	Class 3 N=25	Class 4 N=22	Chi-square (.05)
I like languages	Strongly agree	15	10	12	-	.23
	Agree	35	48	48	18	
	Disagree	27	24	16	55	
	Strongly disagree	19	10	20	23	
	Can't say	4	10	4	5	
French will give me a career edge	Strongly agree	35	48	36	32	.14
	Agree	42	43	44	32	
	Disagree	15	-	4	18	
	Strongly disagree	8	-	12	18	
	Can't say	-	10	4	-	
I want to know French people	Strongly agree	-	-	8	-	.07
	Agree	19	24	28	5	
	Disagree	46	62	28	68	
	Strongly disagree	23	-	20	23	
	Can't say	12	14	16	5	
I want to travel to francophone areas	Strongly agree	12	19	4	5	.08
	Agree	19	29	32	14	
	Disagree	38	29	28	50	
	Strongly disagree	23	-	24	32	
	Can't say	8	24	12	-	
French is my favorite subject	Strongly agree	4	14	-	5	.04
	Agree	38	57	12	14	
	Disagree	12	24	36	41	
	Strongly disagree	38	14	40	41	
	Can't say	8	5	12	-	

APPENDIX F
STUDENT SURVEY OF GRADE 7 & 8 CORE FRENCH

French in the past two years

Please answer the following questions about your French classes in grades 7 and 8, to the best of your ability and memory. The responses will remain completely confidential.

Name _____ School _____

Grade 7

1. Your teacher was _____ (please put last name)

2. Please indicate if you did the following themes:

Food	Yes	No
Friends	Yes	No
Shopping	Yes	No
Travel	Yes	No
Acadians	Yes	No

3. How often did your teachers give you handouts to put in a duotang?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

4. Did you do projects? Yes No

5. Did you present your projects to other students? Yes No

6. Did you use a book called *Vive le Français*? Yes No
If yes, how often?

Always Often Sometimes Not often

7. How often did you have grammar lessons?

Every class Quite often Sometimes Rarely Never

8. Did you translate vocabulary or reading texts? A lot Some Not much

9. How much French did the teacher speak in class? A lot Some Not much

10. How much English did the teacher speak in class? A lot Some Not much

11. How often did you work in groups?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

12. How often did you talk about French people in Acadia/Québec/France or elsewhere in the world?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

13. How often did you speak French in grade 7 French?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

Grade 8

1. Your teacher was _____ (please put last name)

2. Please indicate if you did the following themes:

Physical exercise	Yes	No
Ethnic diversity	Yes	No
Artistic creations	Yes	No
Clubs and associations	Yes	No
French people in Quebec	Yes	No

3. How often did your teachers give you handouts to put in a duotang?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

4. Did you do projects? Yes No

5. Did you present your projects to other students? Yes No

6. Did you use a book called *Vive le Français*? Yes No
If yes, how often?

Always Often Sometimes Not often

7. How often did you have grammar lessons?

Every class Quite often Sometimes Rarely Never

8. Did you translate vocabulary or reading texts? A lot Some Not much

9. How much French did the teacher speak in class? A lot Some Not much

10. How much English did the teacher speak in class? A lot Some Not much

11. How often did you work in groups?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

12. How often did you talk about French people in Acadia/Québec/France or elsewhere in the world?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never

13. How often did you speak French in grade 8 French?

Always Often Sometimes Not often Never