

THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION
OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT:
PERCEPTIONS OF FSL TEACHERS

by

PATRICIA GRACE LAMARRE

B.A., Université du Québec, 1985

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTERS OF ARTS

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
(Department of Language Education)

We accept this thesis as conforming to the
required standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

October, 1988

© Patricia Grace Lamarre, 1988

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the head of my department or by his or her representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of Language Education (Modern Languages)

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada

Date October 12, 1988

ABSTRACT

Two developmental theories propose guidelines for professional development programs. The basic assumption shared by both these theories is that teachers' preferences will vary between individuals and that this variation reflects different stages of teachers' development. Teachers at lower levels of development (either professional or conceptual) will prefer highly structured programs that focus on "concrete" concerns, with little interaction between peers. Teachers at higher levels of development will prefer loosely structured programs, with more teacher interaction, autonomy, and discussion of theoretical problems underlying "concrete" issues.

This study investigated: 1) FSL teachers' preferences for decision-making roles and for content in professional development programs; 2) FSL teacher characteristics possibly influencing teachers' preferences for professional development.

Teachers' preferences were measured using an instrument developed by the researcher. The survey consisted of two parts:

- 1) A section on teachers' characteristics, providing a profile of the teacher's background and current professional development opportunities;
- 2) A questionnaire on teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development programs.

The survey was answered by 132 teachers from 12 school districts in British Columbia (12.2% of all French teachers in British Columbia).

The findings showed that respondents would like to actively participate in professional development programs. Teachers' preferences for structure and content were varied. This supports one basic assumption of developmental approaches: that the learning environment and material of professional development programs should be designed to meet the varied needs of teachers.

Teachers did not express a preference for lower level content and a directive structure of professional development. While professional development programs should address the varied needs of participating teachers, it should not be aimed primarily at lower levels of development, as can be assumed from the findings of developmental research.

When teachers' characteristics were examined as possible factors influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content, no significant differences were observed between teacher characteristics and their preferences for content. Significant differences were observed between teacher characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure (decision-making roles). Two teacher characteristics showed significance:

- 1) Grade level taught by FSL teachers and their preference for structure in the presentation of professional development content. A significant number of elementary school teachers preferred to leave responsibility for presentation with a supervisor. A significant number of secondary teachers preferred a collaborative structure.
- 2) Significant differences were observed between teachers' current professional development opportunities and their preferences for decision-making roles in a professional development structure. A significant number of teachers that had previously had responsibility for decision-making expressed a preference for a non-directive structure. Teachers that had never had responsibility preferred to leave decision-making to a supervisor.

From these results, it can be concluded that teacher characteristics might be influencing teachers' preferences and should be taken into account by organizers of professional development. The responsibility experienced by teachers in their current professional development activities would appear to be a factor influencing their preferences for future responsibility. The importance of environment in stimulating growth would appear to be a factor deserving the consideration of both practitioners intending to adopt a developmental approach and researchers in this area.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	viii
GLOSSARY OF TERMS.....	xi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	xiv

CHAPTER ONE: NATURE OF THE STUDY

Professional Development: Issues and Prescriptions.....	1
Developmental Theory as a Professional Development Framework	10
Second Language Teaching: Issues and Trends.....	15
Core French Programs in Canada.....	19
Professional Development of Second Language Teachers....	22
General Statement of the Problem.....	32
Theoretical and Practical Value of the Study.....	34
Purpose of the Study.....	36
Research Questions.....	37

CHAPTER TWO: RELATED RESEARCH

Intent of Developmental Theory.....	39
Developmental Approaches and Their Link to Education....	40
The Adult Learner.....	46
Developmental Theories and Teacher Education.....	49
Conceptual Systems Theory.....	51

	Page
Stages of Concern Theory.....	60
Limitations of Developmental Theories.....	62
Summary of Review.....	65
 CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	
Instrument Design.....	69
Pilot Testing of Survey Instrument.....	80
Population, Sampling and Data Collection Procedures.....	83
Analysis Procedures.....	87
Response Rates.....	88
Representativeness of the Sample.....	90
Limitations of the Study.....	91
 CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS OF THE STUDY	
Description of Teacher Characteristics.....	93
Teachers' Preferences for Structure and Content.....	102
Discussion of Governance Variables.....	108
Discussion of Relevance Variables.....	118
Summary of Descriptive Analysis of Findings.....	120
Teacher Characteristics and Teachers' Preferences.....	122
Discussion of Analysis of Bi-variate Analysis.....	150
 CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS	
Summary of Research Problem and Research Methodology....	155
Summary of Findings and Conclusions.....	158

	Page
Implications of Study on Practice.....	165
Implications for Further Research.....	169
 BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	 172
 APPENDICES:	
Appendix A: Pilot tested questionnaires.....	184
Appendix B: Post-pilot test survey.....	194
Appendix C: Letter to coordinators	195
Appendix D: Covering letter.....	197
Appendix E: Questionnaire.....	198
Appendix F: Approval from the Screening Committee for Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects....	 205

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. Description of Developmental Stages and their Implications for Learning.....	58
2. Distribution of Questionnaires.....	86
3. Response Rates.....	89
4. Comparison of CASLT Sample and Sample of Study.....	90
PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS	
5. Gender and Age.....	94
6. Language Background.....	95
7. Academic Degree and FSL Specialization.....	96
8. Teaching Level.....	97
9. Teaching Experience.....	97
10. Contact with Other FSL Teachers.....	98
11. Professional Development Opportunities.....	99
12. Current Structure for Needs Identification.....	100
13. Current Structure for Initiation and Coordination.....	101
14. Desire to Participate in Professional Development.....	101
PREFERENCES FOR STRUCTURE	
15. Needs Identification.....	105
16. Choosing the Priorities of Needs.....	105
17. Coordination of Professional Development.....	106
18. Presentation during Professional Development.....	107

TABLE	Page
19. Coaching.....	107
20. Evaluation.....	108
21. Governance Variables.....	110
22. Summary of Teachers' Preferences for Structure.....	113

PREFERENCES FOR CONTENT

23. Goals and Content.....	115
24. Number of Options.....	116
25. Transfer of Content.....	117
26. Groups Addressed.....	118
27. Relevance Variables Using Developmental Scale.....	119

BI-VARIATE ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' CHARACTERISTICS AND TEACHERS' PREFERENCES

28. Grade Level by Preference for Presentation.....	127
29. Past Grade Level by Preference for Presentation.....	129
30. Availability of Activities by Preference for Coaching...	131
31. Availability of Activities by Preference for Evaluation.	133
32. Frequency of PD Activities by Preference for Coaching...	134
33. Current Needs Identification by Preference for Coaching.	135
34. Current Needs Identification by Preference for Evaluation.....	136
35. Current Initiation of PD by Preference for Choosing the Priority of Needs.....	138
36. Current Initiation of PD by Preference for Coordination.....	140

TABLE	Page
37. Current Initiation of PD by Preference for Presentation.....	141
38. Current Initiation of PD by Preference for Coaching.....	142
39. Current Responsibility for Coordination by Preference for Choosing the Priority of Needs.....	144
40. Current Responsibility for Coordination by Preference for Coordination.....	146
41. Current Responsibility for Coordination by Preference for Presentation.....	147
42. Current Responsibility for Coordination by Preference for Coaching.....	148
43. Attendance at Activities by Preferences for Choosing the Priority of Needs.....	149
44. Summary of Results of Bi-variate Analysis of Teacher Characteristics and Governance Variables.....	152

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

Adult development: "Physiological, psychological, and sociological growth or maturation occurring throughout an adult's lifetime." (Eric, p.5)

Adult education: "Providing or coordinating purposeful learning activities for adults." (Eric, p.6)

Cognitive development: "Increasing complexity of awareness, including perceiving, conceiving, reasoning, and judging, through adaptation to the environment and assimilation of information." (Eric, p. 37)

Conceptual Systems theory: A developmental theory based on how teachers as adults move through different stages of conceptual development towards conceptual "maturity".

Core French teachers: Teachers of French as a Second Language. French Immersion and French as a First Language teachers are excluded from this category. In British Columbia, Core French teachers are often referred to as FSL teachers.

Design: "The process of conceiving and selecting the structure, elements, arrangement, materials, steps or procedures of some activity or thing." (Eric, p.62)

Development: "Progression from earlier to later stages of growth or organization ... includes gradual realization of potential, usually compared by advances in size, complexity, efficiency, etc." (Eric, p.62)

Developmental program: "Programs promoting gradual growth of persons or systems through progressive advances in size, complexity, capacity or efficiency." (Eric, p.62)

Developmental stages: "Natural or common divisions of the human developmental process, characterized by types of behaviour (as in the oral stage), by biological properties or manifestations (as in the embryonic stage), or by mental processes (as in Piaget's concrete operations' stage)." (Eric, p.63)

Evaluation: "Appraising or judging persons, organizations or things in relation to stated objectives, standards or criteria." (Eric, p.84)

Instructional methods: "Ways of presenting instructional materials or conducting instructional activities." (Eric, p.120)

Planning: "The process of determining objectives and the means (activities, procedures, resources, etc.) of attaining them." (Eric, p.180)

Professional development: "Activities to enhance professional career growth." (Eric, p.187)

Stages of Concern theory: A developmental theory based on how teachers' concerns and attitudes change as they acquire professional experience (professional maturity).

ABBREVIATIONS

PD: Professional development

FSL: French as a Second Language

CASLT: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to the members of my committee for their help and consideration. I would like to thank Dr. Frank Echols for his valuable advice on what to do and what not to do in survey research, and also for his help with statistical analysis; Dr. Nick Ardanaz for his sound advice coming from years of experience in the school system; Dr. Peter Grimmett for his expertise in teacher education and developmental theory. I would especially like to thank my advisor, Dr. Robert Roy, for his help, encouragement, patience and sense of humour, all of which were truly appreciated.

I would also like to express my thanks to my friends and fellow graduate students, who have helped and encouraged me all through the preparation of this study: Monique, Daniel, Carol, Isgo, Sylvie and Ginette.

A final word of thanks must go to the coordinators and teachers that contributed their time and energy to the study.

CHAPTER ONE

NATURE OF THE STUDY

Professional Development: Issues and Prescriptions

Up until quite recently, most of the energy and effort in teacher education has been directed towards the pre-service education of teachers. Perhaps due to the low turn-over rate of teachers in the schools, this emphasis has shifted and the importance of professional development is increasingly recognized.

A stable teaching staff must rely on its opportunities for professional development to keep abreast of changes in educational theory. With radical changes in the theories of second language learning and teaching and major curriculum renewal projects being undertaken in every province, the importance of professional development programs for French as a Second Language (FSL) teachers cannot be overlooked.

Professional development is a vast, diverse and complex area of teacher education. It has many forms and purposes and is affected by many internal and external factors. Despite this diversity, there is growing agreement on its importance as "the single most crucial factor to educational change" (Fullan, 1982). Not only does the teaching force depend on professional development to keep abreast of change, but educational change

itself depends on the existing teaching force and teachers' opportunities for development and growth (Fullan, 1981).

The importance accorded professional development in implementing educational change is, as stated above, relatively recent. Educational reform has traditionally focused on either the pupil or on new curriculum materials. Teachers have usually been the forgotten component in the educational triangle. Educational reform either attempted to build teacher-proof materials or provided teachers with brief information sessions and occasionally with low-level skill training. The teacher as the pivot of educational change is a concept that has been too long ignored.

The list of studies documenting the complexity of educational change has grown (Rogers and Schoemaker, 1971; Berman and McLaughlin, 1975; Emrick, Peterson, and Argarwala, Rogers, 1977; Fullan and Pomfret, 1977; Hall and Loucks, 1977). One of the factors emerging from these studies is the importance of the teachers' role in the change process. Research shows that plans for change are not likely to be implemented if the teacher is not actively involved in these plans (Bentzen et al., 1974; Schaffarzick, 1976; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978; Tyler, 1983). Fullan claims that "a radical restructuring of the role of the user and a complete reversal of the direction of influence in the

process of change are required if effective innovations are to occur" (Fullan, 1972, p.1).

It is increasingly recognized that many of the difficulties in implementing curricular innovations could be avoided, if the process of change within the teacher is considered. "The main problem appears to be that curriculum change usually necessitates certain organizational changes, particularly changes in the role and role relationships of those organizational members most directly involved in putting the innovation into practice" (Fullan and Pomfret, 1977, p.337).

In approaching professional development and curriculum implementation, two different sets of needs can be addressed: the needs of individual teachers and the needs of an educational institution or system. It goes without saying that the educational institution and its goals are vital and basic elements when designing a professional development program. To be successful, however, both institutional and individual needs should be addressed:

"Staff development and organizational development are a gestalt of school improvement; both are necessary for maximum growth and effective change." (Dillon-Peterson, 1982, p.2-3)

The position behind this paper is a belief that any effort to implement change within an educational system should focus primarily on the individual teacher.

A review of the literature (Lamarre, 1986), conducted for the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) task force on teacher education and professional development, revealed that there is a great deal of agreement as to what ails professional development and on certain prescriptions for future professional development. It is symptomatic of the field that the greater part of the literature is devoted to what is wrong and very little to what is right.

Joyce, Howey and Yarger (1976) conducted a massive review of inservice teacher education. The study, which is still frequently cited, examined interview data from more than 1000 people involved in some way with professional development. It also reviewed over 2000 volumes, 600 journal articles and major position papers. The over-all picture provided by these multiple sources was negative; one of frustration, dissatisfaction and failure. Less extensive reviews of the literature, conducted since then, have not yielded a brighter picture.

It would appear that researchers and practitioners have come to nearly unanimous agreement as to the prescriptions for professional development. Three major points of general agreement can be summed up as follows.

The first general point of agreement is that inservice

teacher education needs a theoretical framework. For too long, professional development has been subject to ad hoc systems of planning and conceptualization. Professional development is guided at best by fragmented, unevaluated and non-cumulative experience. (Fullan, 1981; Fullan, 1982; Gleave, 1983)

The second point of general agreement is that teachers should be more actively involved in planning, determining and organizing programs, in presenting content, in the evaluation of professional development programs and their impact. (Arends, Hersch and Turner, 1978; Berman and Friedwitzer, 1981; Burrello and Orbaugh, 1982; Inservice Education, 1983; Melvin, 1974; Smith, 1983.)

There is a call for a new pattern in the organization of professional development programs based on a "consumer" model. This model involves the consumer of professional development, the teacher, in the planning, decision-making, delivery and evaluation of programs (Yarger, Howey and Joyce, 1980). A 1980 research analysis brief prepared by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management concludes that research points to "a need for more (teacher) participation in choosing and running staff development programs".

Active teacher involvement in shaping the content and structure of programs is one of the most cited guidelines for

effective professional development. Virtually every meta-analysis of research stresses the importance of involving teachers in planning, choosing, and evaluating professional development activities (Fullan, 1981; Gleave, 1983; King et al., 1977; Korinek and Schmid, 1985; Rubin, 1981; Wood et al., 1982).

The literature shows a clear link between successful programs and collaborative design, delivery and evaluation. (Gleave, 1981; Burello and Orbaugh, 1982; Friedberg, Buckley and Townsend, unpublished manuscript; Loucks and Zigarmi, 1981). The Rand Change Agent Study (Berman and McLaughlin, 1975) found that it did not matter who initiated a program, what mattered was how planning was carried out. Collaborative planning in which teachers and administrators had equal input was more successful than either planning by teachers alone or planning by administrators alone.

Rubin (1978) offers an explanation for the success of collaborative programs. In his opinion, many teachers have had unsatisfactory experiences with inservice activities. Rubin believes that teachers' incentive to improve is greatly strengthened when they can participate in the determination, initiation and organization of their own professional development. This opinion is shared by Ryor and his colleagues:

"Teachers who know the most about their own needs have had too little to say about it ... What we need is a cooperative process of school improvement in which teachers are full partners in decision-making." (Ryor et al., 1979, p.14)

It is also the opinion of Tyler:

"By being one of the responsible participants in identifying educational problems, selecting or devising strategies for their attack, identifying the new attitudes, knowledge and skills required to carry out strategies, and selecting or designing possible means for acquiring them, teachers develop the necessary background for not only broadening their range of choices, but for making more informed choices." (Tyler in Rubin, 1978, p.149)

Teacher involvement is deemed important for two reasons: 1) Programs designed by teachers are likely to be structured around their own concerns; 2) A teacher who has been actively involved in planning a program is likely to have a greater sense of ownership and will work to make it successful.

The third point of general agreement is that professional development should focus on the teacher on the job (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Bush, 1984; Griffin, 1982; Joyce and Showers, 1980; Lawrence, 1974; Little, 1984; Nicholson, Joyce, Parker and Waterman, 1976; National Institute of Education, 1980; Wood and Thompson, 1980) and on teacher's needs (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Lawrence, 1974; McLaughlin and Marsh, 1978; Nicholson, Joyce, Parker and Waterman, 1976; National Institute of Education, 1980; Wade, 1984-85; Wood and Thompson, 1980).

It is argued that for schools to change the individuals within them must change (Halls and Loucks, 1978). For change to take place in the individual, the content and type of professional development activity must be deemed relevant by the

teacher. The importance of recognizing teachers' perceptions of needs has often been stated (Whitehead, 1949; Coombs, 1978; Hunter, 1985; Knowles, 1980; Lambert, 1985; Mitchell, 1968; Rutherford and Weaver, 1974; Weber, 1974).

To summarize, the three major points of agreement found in the literature on professional development are

- 1) the need for a theoretical framework;
- 2) active involvement of teachers in their own professional development;
- 3) content that is focused on the teacher on the job and on teacher concerns.

Of these three major points of agreement, the need for a theoretical framework can be thought of as fundamental. A theoretical framework for professional development, by its very nature, should encompass various dimensions of teacher education. The other two points of agreement (teacher involvement in decision-making and content focused on teachers' concerns) can be thought of as two of the many dimensions of professional development. At the present time, they are considered vital and important dimensions. It can be expected that any theoretical framework currently being proposed will address these two dimensions.

Teacher participation can be defined as the dimension of

governance: who makes the decisions and takes on the responsibility for organizing programs. Content focused on teachers' concerns can be defined loosely as the dimension of relevance. Relevance refers here to content and mode of presentation that **teachers** consider to be worthwhile and are willing to accept and respond to.

It would appear to be universally agreed that enthusiasm for professional development (PD) programs has been lacking partly due to disagreement over program control and partly due to a perceived lack of relevance in programs.

Bivert (1982) stated "that participation (in planning) results in greater perceived relevance of the educational content, a more favorable attitude toward learning, a stronger commitment to the program and a greater likelihood that an individual's learning objectives will be met."

Relevance, seen in this light, can be considered as secondary to governance. If teachers are responsible for planning and choosing content and its form of presentation, they have the potential to choose what they consider "relevant".

The importance accorded these two dimensions is reflected in the theoretical frameworks currently being put forward.

Developmental Theory as a Professional Development Framework

Developmental theory is one type of framework presently being discussed. An important feature of a developmental framework is that it takes into account two of the most cited prescriptions found in the literature: the dimensions of governance (active teacher involvement in decision-making), and the dimension of relevance (content and type of activity). Another important aspect of developmental theory is that it sees professional development as a process taking place over an extended period of time. This answers another severe criticism of current professional development programs; the prevalence and failure of one-shot PD sessions.

Because it addresses these current concerns, it is likely that developmental theory will play an influential role in the coming decade. It can also be said that developmental approaches to teacher education follow a larger educational movement, the shift toward learner-centered, process-oriented instruction.

In professional development, "developmental approach" is an umbrella term covering three different trends and areas of research which have distinctly different roots. It is used in reference to

- Teacher centers (resource centers where teachers can go for help from other teachers or to find and design materials);
- The study of teachers as developing professionals whose

concerns change as they move through their professional lives (Fuller's work on "Stages of Concern", Fuller, 1970);

- The study of teachers as adult learners, moving through different stages of conceptual development (Hunt's work on "Conceptual Systems Development", Hunt, 1974).

Teacher centers, though they have an underlying philosophy, have no clear theoretical foundation. For this reason, teachers centers were not investigated for the preparation of this study. Stages of Concern theory and Conceptual Systems theory, however, were drawn upon to provide a theoretical base for the study. They will be discussed in depth in Chapter Two.

Stages of Concern theory and Conceptual Systems theory have vastly different backgrounds and goals for teacher education and spring from different areas of research. Despite this, they share many basic assumptions. Both theories

- 1) consider the teacher as an individual, and professional development as dependent on change within the individual;
- 2) argue that effective, professional development should be directed at the individual within the group;
- 3) are based on the assumption that individuals have different needs and that these needs change;
- 4) are based on a theory of development, with the assumption of a hierarchical scale of stages and an end state (in both cases the end state is "maturity");

- 5) see teachers as being at different points on a developmental scale, varying in their degree of self-directedness, ability and desire to work collaboratively, and in competence to deal with conceptual problems and universal principles as well as practical concerns;
- 6) believe that teachers' concerns and teachers' preferences for decision-making roles are directly related to the teacher's stage of development (whether professional or conceptual);
- 7) set forward a framework and guidelines for a professional development program which are sensitive to individual differences;
- 8) see development as interactive (Lewin's theory that behaviour = person + environment);
- 9) take into consideration the two dimensions of professional development most often cited as needing attention: governance and relevance.

Not only do these two theories have an end state of "maturity" in common, the actual descriptions of this end state have many similarities. Stages of Concern theory builds on the assumption that a teacher must move through a number of levels of development before becoming a "mature" teacher. The theory of Conceptual Systems is based on the assumption that an adult must move through a number of stages before becoming a "mature" adult. The mature person or teacher, described in both theories, is

someone who is responsible, autonomous, yet at the same time, able to interact with others.

Both theories propose similar guidelines and a similar framework for professional development. Both approaches see the immature teacher or adult as someone who will require a structured learning environment and who will feel little need for responsibility and interaction with others. Teachers at low levels of development can be expected to prefer a rigid directive form of professional development. They will function best in a highly structured professional development program organized by a supervisor or a specialist. They will be primarily interested in very "practical", concrete classroom-oriented content. They do not like being offered alternative ways of teaching, but want "one good way". They prefer to rely on the expertise of an authority rather than on the expertise of other teachers. There is very little desire for group interaction.

As teachers move up the scale of development, they will prefer less directive professional development (PD) programs that are semi-structured. They will desire a more collegial and collaborative organization, where supervisors work with teachers, offering information and support. Content can be more varied and there is more interest in group problem solving and peer learning.

Teachers arriving at the higher stages of development will prefer and benefit from a loosely structured form of professional development (PD) with little supervision and direction. They will prefer more self-direction and responsibility, involvement, collaboration and sharing of ideas with colleagues. They will also have more interest in the theories of instruction.

Research in developmental theory has provided increasing evidence that a large percentage of adults (teachers included) have not completed the transition from lower level stages of conceptual development to higher levels of development (Kuhn, Langer, Kohlberg and Haan, 1971; Neimark, 1975; Tomlinson-Keasey, 1972).

Research on the developmental stages of teachers indicates that most teachers are at the lower levels of a developmental scale (Harvey et al., 1968; Murphy and Brown, 1970). When the results of this research are applied to developmental frameworks, it can be expected that most teachers, being at lower levels of conceptual development, will prefer a directive structure for programs and "concrete" practical content.

Research has concentrated on teachers in general. At the present time, there has been little effort to apply developmental theories to specific contexts such as the continuing education of second language teachers.

Second Language Teaching: Issues and Trends

As stated at the beginning of this chapter, the second language teaching profession is in the midst of change and reorientation, upheaval and adjustment. Major changes in the theoretical foundation of language instruction are reflected in changes being made to second language programs, curriculum and materials.

Traditionally, language instruction has always followed the movement of theoretical linguistics. In the forties, fifties and sixties, the major emphasis was on structural linguistics: the study of the relationship of the components of language. This emphasis resulted in a structural approach to language teaching. Since the late sixties, theoretical linguistics has shifted its attention to the communicative properties of language and the importance of social context. This has resulted in language instruction adopting communicative approaches to language teaching.

Krashen's distinction (1981) between language learning (conscious attention to language forms) and language acquisition (subconscious attention to functions) has further intensified a long-term debate in applied linguistics: how to reconcile formal and natural approaches to language learning. A formal or rational approach attempts to introduce order and reason to the basically

disordered nature of spoken language. It focuses on structure, rules and the components of language. A natural approach attempts to emulate, in the classroom setting, aspects found in the natural or non-teaching setting.

At the present time, "communicative approach" is used to cover the spectrum of teaching styles found between the two poles, formal and natural. As Massey writes:

"There is no unified theory of a communicative approach, but basically it can be classified into strong and weak versions. The strong version has communicative interaction at the heart of the curriculum, while the weak version still preserves a structural core curriculum, and when, the learner knows the language, promotes activities that will engage the student in communicative interaction." (Massey, 1985, p.269)

It is difficult to determine what goes on in the classroom simply by asking teachers to describe what they do. There is, as yet, very little research on what teachers really do in the classroom. What they label "communicative" could vary according to the version of the communicative approach to which they adhere.

What research does exist would seem to indicate a pattern that is not necessarily "strongly" communicative. Fanselow (1978) showed that the second language classroom is ruled by the teacher, who dominates questions, determines responses and provides most of the reactions in the classroom. Long and Sato (1983) found that the nature of question-and-answer pattern in

the second language classroom did not resemble question and answers in natural settings, even though teachers claimed to be using a communicative approach. Frohlich, Spada and Allen (1985) found that the focus of the second language classroom, even when declared communicative, was on grammar and vocabulary. They characterized the typical classroom in the following way:

"Second language classrooms are typically based on a rather high degree of teacher control. Learners rarely initiate discourse; they are seldom asked questions to which the teacher does not already have the answer, are expected to produce specific language forms and are not often given the opportunity to exchange information with interlocutors in a natural manner." (1985, p.49)

A study of Core French classrooms conducted by Ullmann and Geva (1984) found the same situation in the FSL classroom. From observations made at the primary, junior and intermediate level, they concluded that Core French programs, like other second language classrooms, tend to be primarily formal in nature.

Worldwide, the movement of language teaching is towards truly communicative approaches. New curriculum and programs based on a "strong" communicative approach bring new methods, new materials and more importantly, new roles for the second language teacher and learner. It can be predicted that this movement will bring in the coming years, a period of upheaval and adjustment.

Professional development is an important and vital element in encouraging the shift from traditional, structural approaches

to natural, learner-centered communicative approaches. For FSL in Canada, Fullan's caution can only be underlined: educational change, now more than ever before, is dependent on the existing teaching force and teachers' opportunities for professional development.

As stated above, the term "communicative" itself is ambiguous, and requires clarification before it can be adopted as a curriculum goal. This need for clarification led H.H. Stern to define and describe a "multi-dimensional curriculum".

Stern defines this diversified curriculum (1984) as consisting of four components or "syllabuses":

- 1) A language syllabus - with a stronger notional-functional component (focus on language forms used in certain functions, acts, or rules of conversation)
- 2) A cultural syllabus which would be more elaborate than the now customary occasional cultural tidbits
- 3) A syllabus of communicative activities which would bring an immersion-type language experience component into the core program
- 4) A general language education syllabus, which would aim at creating among students a certain linguistic awareness through dealing with questions of language, culture, communities, and language learning in general

Stern emphasized that these four syllabuses must not be thought of as four separate areas handled independently of each other; they should be closely integrated into one another. Stern proposed this syllabus for all second language classrooms (1984). An attempt at actually implementing a multi-dimensional curriculum is presently taking place in the FSL classroom in Canada.

Core French Programs in Canada

French as a second language (FSL) has been treated as a core subject in both elementary and secondary curriculum since the fifties. When it was first introduced to the elementary curriculum, it was hoped that it would contribute to the development of bilingualism. These high hopes were not to be met. Parents' dissatisfaction with FSL programs eventually lead to the creation of French Immersion programs. By the late seventies, French Immersion had proved itself a practical and successful way for anglophones to learn French.

French Immersion remains, however, an alternative program: an option available only to a minority of school children. Approximately 90% of the students who study French in Canada, do so in FSL classrooms (Yalden, 1981). For these students, FSL/Core French programs are the only means available for learning French.

Over time, Core French has undergone various measures of improvement. Stern (1985) summarizes these measures:

- 1) Getting an earlier start at learning French. Parent groups advocated that FSL be moved down from secondary to elementary, from grades 6 and 7 to kindergarten and grade one.
- 2) Increased time allocations. The Gillin Report (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1974) has been influential well beyond Ontario. The Gillin report advocated a more realistic approach to the time needed for learning a language. It suggested that 1,200 hours of school time, regardless of the distribution over school years, was needed to attain a basic level of proficiency. This time allowance has been widely adopted across the country.
- 3) Recruiting specialist French teachers and providing opportunities for training and professional development in Core French.
- 4) Improvement of teaching materials. A variety of French courses and supplementary materials reflect newer principles of course design.
- 5) Renewal of the Core French curriculum. Many new curriculum guides have been developed since the late seventies or early eighties. These curriculum guides emphasize communication or communicative competence as a goal and strive in different ways to achieve this goal.

In spite of these efforts, there is still a general feeling of discontent with Core French programs, expressed by administrators, parents, teachers and students alike. The success of immersion programs has added weight to the need felt to improve FSL. Stewart Goodings, of Canadian Parents for French, compared French Immersion and Core French programs:

"In terms of Core French, or French as a subject, I am less optimistic. Far fewer children are studying French at the secondary level than ten years ago, and the programs at the elementary level appear to be very uneven. These programs seem to be eliminated whenever budget restraint is imposed. Much remains to be done to ensure top quality basic French programs all over Canada." (Goodings, 1984, p.2)

This concern is shared by FSL teachers themselves. In the 1986 Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) national survey, in response to an open-ended question, many FSL teachers voiced their desire to improve FSL teaching by drawing on the Immersion experience.

The biggest challenge at the present time is the shift from traditional structural approaches to language teaching to newer approaches. As Carmella Hohwy, president for the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) in 1984, wrote:

"L'enseignement du français langue seconde est constamment remis en question. Bien que les programmes se soient améliorés, il reste beaucoup à faire. Ces dernières années les méthodes d'enseignement de français langue seconde ont délaissé les méthodes traditionnelles pour tenter différentes méthodes où l'oral prime." (Hohwy, 1984. p.3)

The Commission of the Canadian Teachers' Federation, after a study of FSL across Canada (1982), concluded that decisive

improvements were needed nation-wide, and pleaded for a more comprehensive effort, including a research program. This plea was answered by the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) which proposed a National Core French Study.

The National Core French Study has two goals:

- 1) Mobilization of existing resources by identifying and coordinating the different efforts made across the country
- 2) Innovation of the Core French curriculum

The National Core French Study, therefore, represents a nation-wide thrust to rethink FSL curriculum. The Study was undertaken on the conviction that Core French programs in Canada needed to be strengthened if they were to satisfy the expectations of the Canadian population.

The main intent of the Study is to investigate Stern's multi-dimensional curriculum and its implementation in schools across Canada. The FSL teacher is recognized as the pivot of educational change. David Stern wrote:

"Teachers are a key factor in any change or renewal of the teaching of French as a second language. ... If this project is to make an impact here and now, it is the practising teachers who are in the schools at present who should be brought into the process of renewal and who should be invited to participate." (Stern, 1986, p.i)

Professional Development of Second Language Teachers

There is a great deal of research to be done yet in the area of professional development for second language teachers. This

area has not received the breadth of attention that general inservice has received.

There is really very little information on the professional development of FSL teachers and on their needs. Very few professional development models have been proposed for FSL teachers, though it would appear that certain guidelines are being handed along in an informal fashion from one French coordinator to another. Carrière (1980) describes just such a set of guidelines found in the school districts of rural British Columbia. The informal model that he describes meets two specific needs for professional development. Carrière's model targets

1. The non-specialist classroom teacher who is able to teach elementary school FSL programs
2. Small school districts

Carrière states that there is little information specific to the professional development of non-specialist classroom teachers of FSL. He estimates that in British Columbia 62% of all teachers of elementary French fall into this category. Carrière sees this as a real dilemma. With the growing popularity of French programs, it can be expected that more districts will be implementing programs and more teachers will need FSL inservice training.

Carrière also underlines the problems encountered by small school districts in providing for the continuing education of the FSL teaching staff. Small school districts can draw on very few resource people, have limited financial resources and none of the courses available to urban dwellers. Of all school districts in British Columbia, 57% can be definitely categorized as small school districts, another 17% could fall into this category.

As the problem of inservice "training" of non-specialized teachers is an offshoot of program implementation, there is a lot of importance accorded to pre-program and pre-professional development groundwork. The model itself is structured around a "Year One", first year of an elementary school FSL program. The three main aims of the proposed professional development model for "Year One" are

1. To provide the non-specialist teacher with the basic skills needed to conduct an elementary program in French as a second language
2. To implement the curriculum guide and approved program
3. To foster a desire in teachers to further improve oral French skills and/or language teaching skills by voluntarily undertaking one or more follow-up activities (summer school)

The model is broken into three components: a linguistic component, a pedagogical component and a cultural component.

As can be seen by both the aims and the components suggested by this model, the professional development of FSL teachers has certain characteristics which distinguish it from more general professional development models. The professional development of FSL teachers is very closely tied to expanding programs and program implementation. Teachers not only need to keep abreast of changes in the theory and practice of language instruction, some may have to be introduced to this field. Teachers might need to improve their French language skills, as well as learn more about French Canadian culture. These are not the types of problem likely to be encountered by teachers in other subject areas. It can be hypothesized that these characteristics will affect a teacher's concerns and preferences for responsibility.

Another model for the professional development of FSL teachers was described by Bilinki et al. (1986). This model was used in Manitoba in a province-wide attempt to change the orientation of FSL teaching. It attempted to organize simultaneously the professional development of teachers and curriculum implementation.

In Manitoba, new FSL curricula and materials required a transition from teacher-directed approaches to a student-centered approach. It was felt that, for these new programs to be effective, FSL teachers in the school system needed to understand the underlying principles of the communicative approach, acquire

new teaching skills and accept a redefinition of their roles as teachers. A flexible format for professional development was chosen.

It was also strongly felt that teachers should actively participate in the planning and organization of sessions. An important element in this program was that professional development took place at regular intervals during the first year of implementation, rather than prior to implementation. These sessions provided support and assistance to the teachers when they needed them most and were based on questions that teachers raised as they worked with the new curriculum. After one year of implementation, changes were made to the curriculum based on teachers' comments and experience.

As can be seen, the professional development model proposed for FSL teachers addresses a teaching context specific to FSL. However, what also can be seen in Bilinki's model is a concern with issues that have been brought up in more general teacher education: the importance of a professional development program that allows for teacher participation and provides content that reflects teachers' concerns.

Though there is more literature available on the professional development of second language teachers than there is on that of FSL teachers, there is not a wealth of information.

Few meta-analyses of surveys and studies were found. There were very few lists of prescriptions and guidelines for the future, although some recommendations for the professional development of second language teachers have been proposed. These recommendations, as well as criticisms of existing professional development programs, echo what is being said about professional development in general.

The professional development programs presently available to the second language teacher, with a few notable exceptions, have received the same type of criticism aimed at general professional development programs: "Many of the programs developed tend to be developer-rationalized rather than trainee-need responsive. Few programs connect classroom reality to inservice training.... Foreign language teacher education for beginning or experienced teachers tends to be university dominated and initiated. Foreign language teachers rarely initiate the design of their own programs." (Goddu, 1976)

Janice Yalden (1983) wrote that professional development should be made more systematic; providing opportunities to attain higher levels of ability and competence and replacing the incoherent set of workshops without theme or overall purpose now prevalent. It is felt that the implementation of programs based on the communicative approach should rely on planned professional development (Bergeron, 1986; Bilinki et al., 1986) and it should

focus on the individual teacher:

"Inset (inservice education for teachers) needs to begin from the present knowledge, attitudes, objectives and methods of its participants." (Candlin, 1983, p.83)

The three major concerns of general research are repeated once again in the context of second language teaching. These are

- 1) the need for a theoretical framework;
- 2) the need for greater teacher involvement in decision-making and design;
- 3) the need for content based on teachers' concerns.

Referring to the National Core French Study, Stern wrote: "The multi-dimensional curriculum makes new demands on foreign language teachers which in the long run have implications for university courses and language teacher education, and in the immediate future are best met by active teacher involvement and in-service programs." (Stern, 1985)

A multi-dimensional curriculum with a strong communicative component and a learner-centered approach to language teaching leads to many changes as to what is taught and how it is taught. For new programs and materials to be successful, teachers need to understand the linguistic theories underlying the approach. They also need to acquire new teaching skills. But most of all, they will need to acquire a new perception of the student's role and of their own role. A truly communicative approach to

language teaching requires that teachers make a shift from teacher-directed approaches to student-centered approaches (Bergeron, 1986; Edelhoff, in Alatis et al., 1983).

Professional development will need to provide not only knowledge and skills, but also to bring about a change in teacher attitudes. Attitude change, as was shown by the research work of Korinek and Schmid (1985), is the most difficult of goals for professional development. It is also not the type of goal likely to be reached through one-shot PD sessions. Attitude change requires time.

Janice Valden (1983), in a description of training needs in the 1980's, wrote that as the context of teaching languages has changed, so should teacher education goals and objectives. Among the new skills required of FSL teachers, are the following:

- 1) The ability to meet individual and group needs in terms of content
- 2) The ability to provide learner-centered instruction

It would seem logical that if that is what is expected of teachers, it should also be what is expected of those responsible for providing the continuing education of teachers. Professional development for FSL teachers should meet individual and group needs. It should also focus on the learner, in this case, the FSL teacher.

Implications of a Developmental Approach

A developmental approach to the professional development of second language teachers has, in many ways, much to offer. Recognizing that not all teachers have the same perception of participation in professional development, nor the same type of concerns will result in a different approach to professional development. A professional development structure, that recognizes that teachers are not a homogeneous group, will necessarily attempt to provide a learning environment sensitive to these differences. This is what developmental theory has to offer professional development.

There are some aspects of developmental theory that should be treated with caution. There is a danger of categorizing teachers, and of categorizing them incorrectly through judgments made about their preferences for governance and content. There is also a danger that a developmental approach will be adopted in a situation that requires more immediate and pragmatic action. Teachers might have preferences for their learning environment that are not related to their stage of development but to more concrete factors, such as isolation, lack of specialized training in FSL and lack of confidence in their linguistic skills.

FSL teachers in a given school district range from the non-qualified elementary classroom teacher called upon to teach FSL without the necessary linguistic or teaching skills, to the

highly qualified specialist who wishes to keep abreast of theory and practice. FSL teachers are often isolated both from a French-speaking milieu and from other FSL teachers. They may or may not feel confident in their linguistic skills and in their FSL training and competence as teachers. These factors may weigh heavily in teachers' perceptions of the type of learning environment that they need, and on their current concerns.

Each teaching context has its own particular characteristics. In the case of FSL, it can be argued that the context is even more complex for one major reason. Many teachers are teaching in a language that is not their mother tongue (69.9% according to the CASLT national survey, 1986).

It could be extremely inappropriate to rely on a developmental description of stages as the major factor influencing choices. We should hesitate before adopting one of the basic assumptions of stage development theory, namely, that how complexly a person thinks or feels is governed by his/her stage of development.

Keeping in mind the recency of developmental theory for adults, it is important that each teaching context be examined before any generalizations are made. The characteristics of the actual FSL teaching context need to be studied before wholeheartedly adopting developmental theory.

Stern and Keiser (1975) reviewed the relationship between successful change attempts and teacher characteristics and concluded that demographic teacher variables were not good predictors of successful change. Even if demographic variables are not what determines the success of a program, they could influence how teachers perceive their needs and role in programs. They could be an indirect influence on the success or failure of (even the best) programs.

General Statement of the Problem

While there is general agreement that teachers, as professionals and adults must be involved in the planning, design, delivery and evaluation of professional development, there is no clear agreement on how teachers should be involved and to what degree. Teachers themselves have rarely been given the opportunity to express their perception of their role in the organization of professional development.

There is also general agreement that professional development must be relevant, addressing teachers' concerns and presented in a mode to which teachers will respond. There is, however, little information as to how teachers' needs and concerns can be met. There is also very little information on how teachers themselves perceive content needs.

While there is still very little information available on teachers' preferences in general, we know even less about how second language teachers perceive their role in professional development; and the situation worsens when the perceptions of Core French teachers are considered. Do FSL teachers wish to be actively involved in decision-making? In what phases? To what degree? What affects their preferences?

The assumptions of two developmental theories have been applied to professional development. They have provided a theoretical framework as well as guidelines for the organization and content of programs. The basic assumption of both these theories is that within a group of teachers are individual teachers at various stages of development. These stages determine

- a teacher's preferences for involvement in decision-making;
- the content and form of instruction that a teacher will consider relevant and will therefore be more willing to accept and respond to.

The suggestion made by current research is that teachers are at different stages of conceptual development and at different stages in their professional lives. Are these stages, in effect, reflected in the preferences of FSL teachers? Are they the only factors influencing how teachers perceive their professional development needs? Or are there other teacher characteristics

specific to the FSL teaching context influencing teachers' preferences, such as isolation from other FSL teachers, lack of confidence in linguistic competence and their current opportunities for professional development.

Theoretical and Practical Value of the Study

Research in teacher education has shifted its focus. This can be seen in the heightened interest in the professional development of teachers and the recognition of the importance of the teacher in implementing educational change. Competency-based teacher training has been displaced as the focal point for research.

There are two new trends of research: 1) research which views the teacher as central to educational change, and 2) research into the development of teachers in their adult and professional lives. This type of research has been conducted at a general level. There is, as yet, very little information on how these theories apply to subject-specific areas, such as second language teaching. It is important to examine these broad theoretical structures in specific contexts. The assumptions of developmental theory concerning professional development need to be examined in real situations.

With current changes in second language teaching practice and theory, the need for more information on the professional development of FSL teachers is evident. If new second language teaching approaches are to be adopted within schools, many teachers will need to adjust how they perceive their roles as teachers. As change is dependent on existing staff, the adoption of new attitudes and a new approach to language teaching will necessarily rely on effective professional development. More information on teachers' perceptions would be of use to those responsible for the organization of professional development (administrators and teachers alike).

It is also quite possible that certain teacher characteristics, particular to FSL teaching, might influence teachers' preferences. If this is so, then these characteristics would need to be considered in any approach to professional development, "developmental" or other. As has been previously stated, the context of FSL teaching in Canada has particular characteristics that are distinctly its own. More information on how these variables affect teachers' perceptions and choices would be valuable on the theoretical, as well as, on the practical level.

A study which investigates teachers' preferences for supervisory support, decision-making roles and program content may assist all those involved in the professional development of

FSL teachers in making the implementation of change a smoother process.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is two-fold. It intends to examine

- 1) FSL teachers' preferences for decision-making roles (the planning, design, delivery and evaluation of professional development) and their preferences for content and form of instruction of professional development programs.
- 2) Teacher characteristics, particular to FSL teaching, that might influence teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

If there is variation among teachers' preferences for the structure and content of professional development, this will support a basic and fundamental assumption of developmental theory. This is that teachers need to be considered as a group of people with different learning styles and concerns. While this might not be an unexpected finding, recognition of such an assumption has yet to be reflected in the actual organization of professional development programs.

Research in Conceptual Systems theory showed that the majority of teachers, like the majority of adults, are at lower levels of conceptual development. When these findings are applied to proposed developmental frameworks for professional

development, it can be expected that the majority of teachers will prefer concrete content and little responsibility for decision-making.

If the study shows that the majority of respondents prefer a directive structure and concrete and practical content in their professional development programs, this will support this expectation.

If significant differences can be seen between teacher characteristics specific to the FSL teaching context and teachers' preferences for professional development structure and content, this will indicate that factors other than developmental level may be influencing teachers' preferences. These factors will have to be considered by developmental theories applied to the FSL teaching context and by future research in this area.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The study will pose the following research questions:

- 1) Do teachers have varied preferences for decision-making roles in professional development? Do the majority prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making with a supervisory figure?
- 2) Do teachers have varied preferences for content and type of activity in professional development programs? Do the

majority prefer "practical" concrete content?

- 3) Are there teacher characteristics, specific to the FSL teaching context, that are possibly influencing teachers' preferences?

The study will examine this last research question by testing the following hypothesis:

There will be no significant differences observed between teacher characteristics and teacher preferences for structure and content in professional development.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study is to examine teachers' preferences for decision-making roles and content in professional development programs. Two developmental theories that have been applied to teacher education provided a framework for designing a research instrument. This chapter provides an overview of developmental theory, its background and its link to education. It also presents a summary of Stages of Concern theory and Conceptual Systems theory, two developmental theories that propose professional development environments and content within a developmental approach.

Intent of Developmental Theory

The intent of developmental theory is to provide a framework for understanding human growth. There is no one developmental theory capable of encompassing the complexity of human growth. As Norman Sprinthall writes:

"A single human being is and always will be more complex than any single theory (or even, a grand and possibly synergistic grouping of multiple theories) would lead one to believe. However, we feel that it is possible to at least gain on the problem (and the paradox) of human understanding by employing a variety of developmental perspectives." (Sprinthall, 1982, pp.1-2).

In a developmentalist attempt to understand human growth, a series of theories and perspectives must be used. It is common

practice among developmental theorists to look to each other for confirmation and validation.

Developmental Approaches and Their Link to Education

"...the aim of education is development of individuals to the utmost of their potentialities." (Dewey, 1934)

Sprinthall justifies the relationship between developmental psychology and education by drawing on Dewey, who he claims was the very first developmentalist. Dewey proposed that children, far from being miniature versions of adults, were moving through stages of development. Each stage of this development is unique and defines how thought is organized and meaning negotiated. The stage of development of the child or adolescent will determine what and how that child will learn. The second part of Dewey's proposal was that development, while occurring within the individual, was dependent on that person's interaction with the environment. Growth, according to Dewey, does not take place automatically. Without stimulation from the environment, growth ceases and stabilizes prematurely. From a developmental point of view, an individual's growth depends upon the general educational experience available to him.

In his essay "The Need for a Philosophy of Education", Dewey unknowingly predicted the two major preoccupations of future developmental theorists: 1) to arrive at a description of stages of development, 2) in order to provide learning experiences and

materials that are appropriate to that stage and which will promote further growth. Dewey wrote:

"What then is education when we find satisfactory specimens of it in existence? In the first place, it is a process of development of growth and it is the process, and not merely the result that is important.... an educated person is the person who has the power to go on and get more education."
(Dewey, 1934)

The next section provides an over-view of four developmental theories. Descriptions of these theories are drawn from Sprinthall and Mosher's summary of developmental theory (Sprinthall and Mosher, 1983).

Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development. Without a doubt, Piaget has been the developmental theorist to influence education most. His theory of cognitive development defines stages of cognition related to the biological age of the child or adolescent. Basically, stage of cognition describes how the individual will think and learn at different stages of childhood. In Piagetian theory, it is assumed that formal operational thought is attained by the end of adolescence and that no further changes in cognitive development occur in adulthood. For years the study of human development focused on the development of children. It is only more recently that development in adult life has been recognized and studied.

Kohlberg's Theory of Moral Development. Kohlberg, unlike Piaget, built a theoretical framework that encompasses adult cognitive development. Kohlberg's work, based on a series of

field interviews, investigated how people actually think about problems of social justice. His study revealed that the process of making judgments formed a developmental sequence of six stages. This sequence of stage growth parallels Piaget's findings.

Kohlberg's theory is that all human beings do think about questions of social justice. The ways that people think about them, however, forms a sequence of distinctly and qualitatively different stages of moral judgment. Following Piaget, Kohlberg described the mechanism of change in terms of accommodation, assimilation and equilibration. In each of these processes, change is the result of interaction between the individual and the environment. The individual is an active agent in both the motivation and the direction of change. The environment provides situations that either support or inhibit change.

Kohlberg's theory of moral development is often cited in developmental approaches to teacher education.

Loevinger's Theory of Ego Development. Loevinger's theory is also based on a series of field interviews. Her theory (1976) proposes a framework for understanding the stages of ego development. "Ego" refers to the part of human personality that acts as an executive: ego coordinates, chooses, selects and directs a person's activities.

Loevinger's theory states that at different stages of development, the ego functions in distinctly different ways. As in all developmental theories, there is the notion of hierarchy and of qualitatively different stages, based on a succession of turning points that include aspects of thought, character development, interpersonal relations and self-understanding. The higher stages are characterized by more complex ego functioning (ie. more aspects of a situation are taken into consideration, a broader vision and understanding, greater tolerance and the ability to handle more alternatives). It is important to note the overlap between Kohlberg's and Loevinger's theories. The lower stages of both of these are characterized by conformity and a desire to respect the norm, at least superficially. As mentioned previously, overlap between theories is a common occurrence and is considered a form of corroboration.

Selman's Theory of Interpersonal Development. Selman is the first of the developmental theorists to view the interpersonal domain through a developmental perspective. Selman reasoned that if people process in stage and sequence the way they think of a) time, space and causality; and of b) ethical and social justice; and of c) the self and ego domains, then it would seem logical that people also move in developmental stages and sequence in the way they think about and act in interpersonal relationships. Selman defined a five-stage sequence to understand how an individual functions in an interpersonal world.

As in other developmental theories, interpersonal theory is based on a hierarchy of development. The individual progresses from concrete to abstract, from ego-centricity to greater flexibility. Greater awareness of others, greater tolerance for multiple perspectives and alternatives are traits of higher stages of development. The link between interpersonal and cognitive development has been shown in research (Flavell et al., 1968; Kuhn et al., 1971; Selman, 1971; Tomlinson-Keasey and Keasey, 1974).

As can be seen in these four descriptions of developmental theory, the notion of cognitive development has evolved since Piaget's work and is now understood as including the development of the ego, the conceptual, the moral and the interpersonal. There is also increasing evidence that a large percentage of adults (teachers included) have not completed the transition from concrete (logical operations) to formal operational thought (propositional thinking) (Tomlinson-Keasey, 1972; Kuhn, Langer, Kohlberg and Haan, 1971; Neimark, 1975). Piaget described this transition as ending at the end of adolescence.

Chickering (1974) divided development theorists into two groups: developmental age theorists and developmental stage theorists. Age theorists direct their work at identifying concerns, problems and tasks that are common to individuals at

various times in their lives; and why these concerns, etc., are prominent at one time of life rather than another. Stage theorists focus on distinct or qualitative differences in the structure of thinking and acting at different stages of development that are not linked to age. These structures of thought provide insight into what information an individual will use, how information is used and the type of interaction to be expected.

Stage theorists have in common a view of adult development as a definite progression from concrete, undifferentiating, simple structured individuals to more abstract, complex structured, autonomous, and yet interdependent individuals.

The presupposition of all stage development theories remains that how complexly a person thinks or feels is governed by his/her stage of development. Development in all cases is believed to be spurred from within, but also to rely on stimulus provided by the environment (Lewin's formula: behaviour = personality + environment).

The influence of developmental theories on our philosophy of education for children is strong and clearly recognized. From Dewey, who was the first to propose that if we know something about what development is, then we will know something about what education ought to be, developmental theorists have kept their

link to education. The influence of developmental theory on the education of adults has only just begun to be felt.

The Adult Learner

There exists a great deal of theory and research on the normal development of the child, and on adult pathology. But until recently, there was very little research or even interest in the cognitive development of normal adults. Adult learners resemble child learners in one important and often forgotten way: Within any group of adult learners will be found different learning styles. Adults, just like children, will react differently to educational environments, preferring various levels of structure, content and task complexity, attention to personal needs, feedback about performance, and risk-taking.

A description of the adult learner (Thompson, 1984)) provides the following list of characteristics which confirm many of the statements made by developmental theorists:

- Adults have a need to be self-directed. They prefer to be involved in selection of objectives, content, activities and assessment techniques. (Brundage and MacKeracher, 1980, p.26; Keirnes-Young, 1981; Wood and Thompson, 1980; Young, 1979)
- Adults come to any learning experience with a wide range of previous experiences, knowledge, skills, interests and competence. Individualization is important for adults as

well as children. (Brundage and MacKeracher, 1980, p.32; Keirnes and Young, 1981; Wood and Thompson, 1980)

- Adults will learn, retain and use what they perceive to be relevant to their personal and professional needs. This means that learning should be practical and directed toward real problems. (Brundage and MacKeracher, 1980; Keirnes-Young, 1981; Wood and Thompson, 1980; Young, 1979)
- Adults need collegiality rather than criticism from their inservice leaders. Adult learning is enhanced by a supportive climate and by behaviors that demonstrate respect, trust and concern for the learner. (Arends, 1980; Arends, Hersh and Turner, 1978; Brundage and MacKeracher, 1980, p.26; Keirnes-Young, 1981; Wood and Thompson, 1980; Young, 1979)
- Adult learning is ego-involved. Learning a new skill, technique or concept may promote a positive or negative view of self. Adults are more concerned with whether they are changing in the direction of their own idealized self-concept than with whether they are meeting objectives established by others. (Brundage and MacKeracher, 1980, p. 24; Wood and Thompson, 1980)
- Adults will resist situations which they believe are an attack on their competence. They tend to reject prescriptions by others for their learning, especially when what is described is viewed as an attack on what they are presently doing. (Wood and Thompson, 1980)

- Adults have a need to integrate their present learning with past experiences. They tend to modify, transform and reintegrate existing meaning, values, strategies and skills rather than accumulate new learning as in childhood. (Brundage and MacKeracher, 1980, p.32-32; Young, 1979, p.11)

Many of these basic assumptions on the adult learner are also found in developmental theories. However, developmental theories do not set out one list of characteristics for all adult learners. They see the adult learner as being at different points on a developmental scale. The different developmental stages of adults will be reflected in what they expect from a learning environment and in how they will react.

It has only very recently been proposed that developmental theories might have something to offer adult education and teacher education. These theories deserve consideration and close examination by all those involved with teacher education for the following theoretical assumptions:

- 1) Change occurs in the individual.
- 2) Not all individuals will have the same needs nor react in the same way to a professional development experience.
- 3) For change to occur, the individual must encounter educational experiences that both stimulate and promote growth and are appropriate to the current level of development.

- 4) This type of change (developmental) will not occur in a brief educational session, but will take place over an extended period of time.

These assumptions give weight to developmental models of teacher education in that they answer and match many of the prescriptions and observations found in the general literature of professional development. However, in any attempt to apply developmental theory, it should be remembered that the notion of "adult learner" goes back barely two decades and can only provide a tentative foundation.

The next part of this chapter will examine developmental theories proposed specifically for the professional development of teachers.

Developmental Theories and Teacher Education

As Feiman and Floden noted in their summary on teacher development (1981), the term "development" has only recently entered the vocabulary of teacher educators. This marks a decided shift from the rhetoric of competency-based training so popular just a short time ago. Competency-based training reflected another school of psychological thought, that of behaviorism. Feidman and Floden (1981) wrote that: "the change to a developmental perspective in teacher education may be partly a response to the treatment of teachers as passive recipients of

professional knowledge and the denial of individual differences among teachers."

This awareness of the individual teacher would seem to be characteristic of a general trend. Devon Griffith (1980) for the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education wrote that: "Inservice programs that fail to address the intellectual and emotional needs of teachers who participate in them.... programs that fail to recognize the differing needs of teachers at different stages in their careers...may actually undermine themselves and prove a squandering of precious staff development funds." Griffith also summarized current research and trends in the following statement: "As developmental theorists learn more about adults unique and ever-changing needs, a trend has emerged toward applying growing understanding of adult development to adult education."

In a report from the Adult Learning Potential Institute (1980), we find: "Thus far we have overlooked the obvious - that inservice participants are truly adult learners, whose adult learning patterns continue to change throughout their lifespan.... (adult) learners are consistently approached as a homogeneous group in which each member is expected to participate and respond in like fashion... this occurs even though the activity design, may, in and of itself, be creative."

The flurry of interest in teacher development makes the situation unclear. To what does teacher development refer? The literature on teacher development encompasses a variety of quite different concepts, all of which have strong commonalities. Developmental approaches to teacher education cover three quite different trends:

- 1) The goals and framework of teacher centers;
- 2) The work done by Frances Fuller on the changing concerns and characteristics of teachers at different stages of their professional lives;
- 3) The application of theories of adult development to teacher education (Hunt and others).

The next part of this chapter will look at Conceptual Systems Theory and Stages of Concern Theory.

Conceptual Systems Theory

Conceptual Systems is based on two theories of stage development. It integrates the concepts of both interpersonal maturity and information processing. It is a personality theory that parallels in some ways the theories of Loevinger (1976) and Kohlberg (1979). It focuses on individual differences in social cognition within a developmental framework.

In their initial work, Harvey, Hunt and Schroeder (1961) proposed that individual differences among adults were a function

of one's conceptual system. They described Conceptual Systems Theory as "how an individual learns to adapt to his interpersonal environment, how such a pattern of adaptation affects his reactions to contemporaneous events and how such patterns of conceptual organization may be modified" (1961, p.8). A conceptual system represents a structure or organization of concepts which work together.

From the original definition of Conceptual Systems theory in 1961, considerable research has been conducted (Hunt and Sullivan, 1974; Schroeder, Driver and Steufert, 1967; Steufert and Steufert, 1978). It should also be noted that there are different derivatives of conceptual systems theory; major differences are due to the emphasis given to motivation as opposed to conceptual complexity.

Most of the research work has been carried out in an interactionist mode, following Lewin's formulation that behaviour is a function of an interaction between personality and environment. Personality is viewed "as an interactive function of the person's level of personality development and the environmental conditions to be encountered."

Like all developmental theories, it is essentially a typology. The developmental sequence of the theory can be described by distinct characteristics for each stage or

conceptual level and for the conceptual work required for transition to the next level to occur. Optimal development is assumed to occur when the environmental conditions facilitate the conceptual work necessary for the person's conceptual growth. Development moves from a concrete to an abstract conceptual system as the ability to differentiate and integrate information is increased.

Conceptual Systems theory has been applied to teacher education by various teams (Hunt and Joyce, 1967; Murphy and Brown, 1970; Rathbone, 1970). Work has been done in this area at the University of Minnesota, (Norman Sprinthall and his colleagues) and at OISE (David Hunt and his associates).

According to Bents and Howey (1981), the most comprehensive set of studies regarding adult teachers has been undertaken by David Hunt and his associates at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. Through research conducted in classrooms, Hunt has found that teachers at more advanced conceptual levels were more effective classroom teachers in the following ways: They were able to function in the classroom at higher levels, demonstrated a more adaptive teaching style and were more flexible and tolerant. They were also more responsive to individual differences and were able to employ a variety of teaching strategies. They were less directive and authoritarian. They provided a wide and varied learning environment for their

students. For these reasons, they were rated as effective teachers. Stated simply, teachers at higher stages of development functioned in the classroom at a more complex level.

Hunt describes development in terms of increasing complexity in handling information and increasing self-responsibility. He describes human development as a continuum of increasing flexibility and integrative power. He writes:

"Persons low in CL (conceptual level) are less capable of generating their own concepts, considering their own alternatives, and directing their own learning. As CL increases the person becomes more capable of generating his own concepts, better able to consider alternatives, and more self-responsible." (Hunt, 1974)

Sullivan, Hunt's colleague, extended the theoretical framework of Conceptual Systems theory. She demonstrated that conceptual development was matched by ego state development (Loevinger) and moral-ethical stage (Kohlberg). This made Hunt's framework more comprehensive and inclusive. Sullivan drew on Dewey's notion of a whole person processing experience through a variety of overlapping developmental domains.

The secondary concern of the work done in this area is the same secondary concern found in all developmental theories. Given a person at this stage of development, which educational approach will be more effective for a given objective? After defining a typology, the next attempt is to coordinate person and environment. This can be evidenced by the work Hunt did in

designing "Matching models for teaching". Matching models for teaching describe a variety of learning environments that differ 1) in structure and task complexity, and 2) that are appropriate in meeting the needs of the teacher, and 3) in encouraging growth from the current stage of development to the next level.

Hunt's work revealed that teachers who were at lower stages of conceptual development functioned best in a more structured environment. Those at more abstract levels can function effectively in either high or low structured environments. It is important to note that while they are able to function in either type of structure, these individuals function best in a less structured environment. The prescription for professional development derived from these studies is the following: a professional development program must design appropriate and efficacious learning environments for teachers that take into consideration that some individuals will function better in a highly structured environment and other individuals will learn best in a loosely structured environment.

Hunt underlines another point to be taken into account by professional development organizers. He emphasizes that adult development is continuous. While an individual might be functioning best in one type of environment at the current time, this should not be considered a permanent trait. It is a current preferred mode of functioning. He writes:

"In CL (Conceptual Level) theory, learning style is not regarded as fixed, but is a developmental goal; ie., although in the short run, a low CL student may require a highly structured environment, such structure should be gradually reduced so that he can develop a more self-responsible learning style." (Hunt, 1974, p.20)

Conceptual Systems Theory views adult development as a progression through four identifiable levels. At Level One, the individual is undifferentiating and tied to social norms while processing information in a relatively simple manner. By Level Four, individuals are characterized as autonomous and self-reliant.

Conceptual Systems theory was directly applied to teaching behaviours by Murphy and Brown (1970). They provide the following descriptions: Teachers in Stage 1 have a tendency to view the world in an overly simplistic, either/or, black/white way; believe strongly in rules and roles; and view authority as the highest good, regarding all questions as having one answer. They thus tend to discourage divergent thinking and to reward conformity and rote learning. Stage 2 teachers are characterized by conflict between compliance and opposition, are low in self-esteem and high in alienation and cynicism, and are inconsistent and uncertain when functioning in a manner similar to Stage 1 teachers. Stage 3 teachers, with strong outward emphases on friendship and dependence on the standards of others show high affiliative needs based on mutuality and group consensus rather than rules. Their need to control others through dependency may

be disguised under the desire to help others. Being more abstract in functioning than Stage 1 or 2 teachers, however, Stage 3 teachers do encourage more pupil self-expression. Stage 4 teachers being the most abstract, open-minded, stress tolerant, and creative, regard knowledge as tentative rather than absolute and are able to consider situations from other points of view. Thus, stage 4 teachers, being cognitively complex themselves, tend to encourage more complex functioning in their students.

There is now a small body of research on how teachers at different cognitive and interpersonal levels of development react and are affected by professional development programs. Teachers at different levels will not only have different teaching styles, but these teaching styles will be reflected in how they react to a professional development program and what they will consider relevant. They will process the information provided in a professional development program differently. Some will look at problems from one view point while others will be able to see multiple viewpoints. Both Salyvchvin (1972) and Bents (1978) reported that when two different kinds of information were presented to low conceptual level teachers, they were most affected by what they experienced first.

The following figure examines the characteristics of teachers at different stages of development and the implications for conducting professional development sessions. It draws on

the work of Joyce (1980) and Bents and Howey (1981) and their interpretation of Santmire (1979).

Table 1
Description of Developmental Stages
and their Implications for Training

Stage One

Learners have a right/wrong orientation to situations. There is only one way, their way, to view the world. Only when learners perceive that what they are doing is not working do they see a need for new knowledge. Information that does not fit the learner's current belief system is adapted to fit categories rather than create new ones. These learners prefer hierarchical relationships. Practical concerns about what to do in specific situations (how would team learning work in my second grade classroom?) are the major focus of this type of learner.

The learning environment must be highly structured. Presentation of practical information should emphasize 1) what to do, 2) how to do it, and 3) circumstances in which it should be done. Discussions should include practical examples and applications rather than theory or generalizations. Follow-up assistance needs to be directive. Learners at this stage benefit from a supervisor who is willing to tell them what to do and how to do it.

Stage Two

Learners at this stage begin to break away from strict rules and beliefs. They ask more questions and are more willing to express their points of view. They exhibit interest in principles and issues and desire to develop their own applications or adaptations of principles. Learners at this stage of development often resist control by authority.

The training environment needs to provide choices in content and its presentation. Specific applications of ideas become a secondary focus rather than central to the presentation. Discussions that include various points of view relative to the issue should be concluded with a rationale of why the views are held. Follow-up assistance should be collaborative, allowing learners to express their opinions and suggest alternative actions.

Stage Three

Learners at stage three recognize that they have a variety of alternatives and can choose the one that best fits the situation. They are able to accommodate contradictory information by balancing or connecting differing ideas.

Learners should be given opportunities to participate in the planning and delivery of staff development programs. Training should include discussions that allow learners to share their view points and experiences so that colleagues may learn from each other. In this way learners are able to develop broader more comprehensive perspectives. Follow-up assistance should be collaborative or non-directive. These learners benefit from active participation in identifying relevant issues and possible an environment that allows them to work easily and comfortably in a variety of ways. They should select and pursue topics of personal interest. Opportunities for critical and creative thinking should be available. Follow-up assistance should be non-directive, allowing these learners to design their own targets and standards for achieving their goals.

Stage Four

Learners are able to synthesize information and create additional categories to accommodate new information. They approach problems and situations in a systematic fashion, which enables them to quickly review alternatives in order to make them effective, spontaneous decisions.

These learners need an environment that allows them to work easily and comfortably in a variety of ways. They should select and pursue topics of personal interest. Opportunities for critical and creative thinking should be available. Follow-up assistance should be non-directive, allowing these learners to design their own targets and standards for achieving their goals.

According to developmental theorists, if we can match professional development programs to individual needs and learning styles, we have the potential of not only making programs more effective, but teachers more effective. Santmire (1979) writes: "The possibility that development continues in the adult years means that staff development programs may be playing a role, not only in teaching new content and new skills, but also in the development of the individual in more fundamental ways as well." (1979)

Hunt and Sullivan (1974) proposed a model that matched

developmental level to training environments. The intention was to satisfy and facilitate the requisites of that stage and therefore promote transition to the next stage. In brief, we find the same prescription: Less developmentally mature individuals will profit more from highly structured environments and more developmentally mature individuals will profit in either high or low structured environments.

Stages of Concern Theory

This approach originated in the work done by Frances Fuller at the University of Texas. It was further explored and extended by her colleagues at the Research and Development Institute for Teacher Education. Gene Hall is a well-known proponent of this theory with his adaptation of Stages of Concern theory to innovations. Stages of Concern has been expanded to such an extent that it is sometimes called "Teacher Career Development" which takes into account many external factors not broached by the original theory.

The original hypothesis for Stages of Concern theory was formulated by Frances Fuller in the sixties. From observations she was making as a teacher educator, Fuller (1969) proposed a tentative theory: Teachers concerns change as they gain experience. These concerns are marked by distinct developmental stages. Stages of Concern theory, as understood by Fuller, refers to a cluster of concerns or preoccupations which seem to

unfold in a particular sequence over the course of a teacher's career.

Her first model had only two stages and was based on a self-other dichotomy. After ten years of research, Fuller made this into a three stage model. In both models teachers concerns move from self concerns to student concerns. The three-stage model consisted of

- 1) A survival stage: (self) teachers are concerned with their own adequacy.
- 2) A mastery stage: (self as teacher) teachers concentrate on performance or the situation at hand.
- 3) An impact stage: (students) teachers are well established in school routine and can move their interest to become consequence-oriented and concerned about their impact upon students.

This model was further elaborated and another category of concerns added: pre-teaching concerns (self as student teacher).

Fuller drew on Marlow's Hierarchy of Needs to validate her theory. In one of her early writings (1969), she wrote: "Early concerns can be thought of as more potent security needs and later concerns as task-centered and self-actualizing needs which appear only after the prepotent security needs have been satisfied." (Fuller, Beck and Brown, 1969, p.5). This was to become the building stone for her approach to teacher concerns:

Lower stage concerns must be resolved before the teacher will move on to higher stage concerns.

Fuller's first commitment was to teacher education and to making the education that student teachers received more relevant. By making the content of teacher education more congruent with teachers' concerns, Fuller believed that motivation for learning would be increased and teachers would be more satisfied with their professional preparation and able to move more quickly into the next level of concerns. Underlying this theory is a basic belief that teachers that are concerned about their impact on students are better teachers. Like other developmental theories, Stages of Concern theory is built on a hierarchy, ending with the attainment of "maturity". Maturity, in this case, is reflected in teachers' concerns for students and the impact of their teaching on students' learning.

Limitations of Developmental Theory

As was previously stated, developmental approaches are characterized by

- 1) a focus on an end-state (maturity);
- 2) the assumption that all individuals go through the same sequence of changes leading to the end-state;
- 3) the assumption that these changes are self-directed.

These characteristics have been severely criticized. Floden

and Feiman (1981) provide a strong description of the weaknesses of developmental theories. Their comprehensive overview of developmental theory is drawn upon in the following section.

The desired result of a developmental approach is to work toward a theory of change. All developmental approaches have two preoccupations:

- 1) To provide a description of the sequence of change leading to an end state. This description often takes the form of a description of stage, culminating in "maturity". Description of each stage includes only those aspects of the individual that are seen as leading to the characteristics in the description of maturity.
- 2) To provide a description of the process or mechanism by which change is brought about. This description attempts to explain how an individual moves from one stage to the next, or progresses through a sequence of change.

The three primary characteristics of developmental theory will now be discussed briefly.

End State. The end state is the primary aspect of developmental approaches. It is from this description of an end-state that a description of stages is made possible. The end state is essentially a description of maturity, a description that has been criticized by some as being highly subjective.

Changes and characteristics are considered as they relate to the end state. Other changes or characteristics not related to the end state are not considered. Any further change and development in the individual, beyond the end state, are beyond the scope of a developmental approach.

Researchers and practitioners using a developmental theory need to consider that the theory being investigated can only consider a small part of development. It should also be remembered that the description of the end state is very subjective, provided by one researcher or team of researchers. The description of the end state and stages is constrained, however, by empirical evidence.

Invariant Sequence. The assumption about the way in which an individual reaches an end state, is also the decision of the researcher. The description of the sequence of change rests on the decision about what to include in the description of the end state. Stage descriptions are usually constructed using empirical evidence, but decisions are still made on which empirical evidence will be described. They are all aimed at finding a sequence of similarities culminating in the end state; necessarily excluding changes prior to maturity that differ across individuals. Invariance of developmental changes implies that they can be seen as progressive. Individuals must pass through each stage before the end state is reached.

Invariant sequence is an aspect of developmental theory under criticism. It is suggested that not all individuals necessarily progress through this sequence.

Mechanisms of Change. Movement through a sequence of change is considered to be self-directed. The definition of self-direction varies. However, all agree that change is not imposed from outside; simple, externally determined change is not consistent with developmental approaches. But the outside environment does have a role. Change is determined by the individual and by an environment that stimulates and supports change. It is by no means clear what kind of environment brings about developmental change. Developmental theory is weak at describing mechanisms for change and therefore, cannot provide clear implications for action.

Summary of Review

From a review of the literature on professional development and curriculum implementation, a distinct trend towards a more teacher-centered approach was seen. Developmental theories, with their emphasis on the individual teacher, have the potential of providing a theoretical foundation for a teacher-centered approach.

As previously stated, the two main objectives of developmental theory are

- 1) to arrive at a description of stages of development
- 2) in order to provide learning experiences and materials appropriate to that stage and which will promote further growth.

At the present time, the biggest contribution of developmental theory has been through its description of stages. A description of the sequence of change may provide a way of categorizing teachers and of knowing how teachers are going to change. Categorization is helpful in predicting the effects of various alternative instructional strategies, and the sequencing of instruction. Knowing a teacher's stage doesn't clearly indicate what to do, but it does have the potential of telling you something about possible effects of various interventions.

This categorization of teachers is also the greatest danger of developmental theories. Categorization and judgment are extremely delicate areas, and can be misused and misinterpreted easily. Developmental theorists are sensitive to the danger of categorizing a person as being at a lower stage of development and offer the following caution:

"A developmental theory enables the teacher educator to see teachers at lower stages of development in a new light. Rather than evaluating a teachers' characteristics in terms of their present worth, these attributes can be seen as steps towards the end state." (Floden and Feiman, 1981)

Whether or not it is possible to bring about developmental change within a teacher education program is still a subject open

to discussion. There is also a need for research linking teacher effectiveness to teachers' stage of development. It must be remembered that the value attached to the end state is arbitrary. It will need to be justified from beyond the theory. Any organization or institution adopting a developmental approach must take into consideration that these theories are new and need to be further tested.

What developmental does have to offer that is extremely valuable is a view of the teacher as an individual, an individual adult and an individual professional who is not locked permanently into one learning or teaching style. It might seem simplistic to propose that the organizers of professional development recognize that the group of teachers that they are approaching are anything but a homogeneous group, but recognition of the individual differences of teachers would change how professional development is organized and presented. The one very positive aspect of developmental theory is that:

"It switches emphasis from teaching to learning, a switch that may be a valuable change in current teacher education practice, with it's over-emphasis on skills-training."
(Floden and Feiman, 1981, p.24)

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

The previous chapters discussed current issues in professional development. Two developmental theories that propose a framework for the professional development of teachers were presented. Their potential in providing a theoretical foundation for the continuing education of FSL teachers was discussed.

The study investigates the different preferences of FSL teachers as to the structure and content of professional development programs. It uses the guidelines for professional development set forth by developmental theories as a foundation for the study and for the construction of a survey instrument. The study also investigates teacher characteristics, other than stage of development, possibly influencing teachers' preferences.

Chapter Three describes variable selection, the population and sampling procedures, instrument design, pilot testing, data collection and analysis procedures. It describes how a questionnaire was constructed by drawing on specific prescriptions for professional development proposed by developmental theory. Response rate and the representativeness of the study are discussed, as are the limitations.

Instrument Design

A survey instrument was designed to gather data for the study. The questionnaire consisted of two sections:

- **Part A** served to collect information on respondents and on their opportunities for professional development within their school districts.
- **Part B** collected information on teachers' preferences for the structural organization and content of professional development.

To construct Part A of the questionnaire, other surveys of FSL teachers were examined. In the spring of 1986, the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT) sent out a questionnaire on professional development to over two hundred FSL teachers across the country. The CASLT survey provided criteria for both the selection of teacher characteristics and for the construction of specific items on professional development.

The first part of the survey instrument used in this study was designed to collect data from each respondent on the following thirteen teacher characteristics that proved to be important in studying FSL teachers in the CASLT survey:

- 1) Years of teaching experience
- 2) Grade levels taught
- 3) Contact with other FSL teachers
- 4) Gender
- 5) Age

- 6) First language
- 7) Language of community
- 8) Language of schooling
- 9) Academic background
- 10) FSL training
- 11) Subjects taught
- 12) Actual PD activities available
- 13) Desire to participate in PD activities

Part B of the instrument, a questionnaire on teachers' preferences for structure and content, was based on the literature on professional development. It was constructed using the framework and guidelines for professional development proposed by developmental theories.

The study was built on two developmental theories:

- 1) Stages of Concern in a teacher's professional career (Fuller, 1969; Hall, 1973). The basic assumption of this theory is that teachers' concerns change as they gain teaching experience.
- 2) Conceptual Systems development (Hunt, 1961). The basic assumption is that teachers are at different levels of conceptual development and that this affects how teachers react to the learning environment and content of professional development programs.

These two developmental theories, specific to teacher education, suggest that teachers will prefer different structural organization, from highly structured to loosely structured programs. It is also suggested that teachers will have different concerns, which will be reflected in the type of content they consider relevant. These differences are linked to teachers' different conceptual levels and stages of career experience.

This study proposes that while developmental approaches are correct in supposing that teachers have different preferences as to the structural organization and content of professional development, there might be factors other than developmental stages involved in determining these preferences. It is also the intention of the study to examine an assumption of Conceptual Systems theory, that the majority of teachers are at lower levels of development and will prefer a directive structure and practical and concrete content in their professional development programs.

The second part of the questionnaire collected information on teachers' preferences for the structural organization and content of professional development. From the literature on professional development, eleven basic elements of professional development were identified:

- 1) Identification of the PD needs of FSL teachers
- 2) Assigning priority to PD needs

- 3) Coordination of PD activities
- 4) Primary goal of PD program
- 5) Presentation of PD sessions
- 6) Content of PD programs
- 7) Number of teaching options presented during a PD session
- 8) Transfer of PD content
- 9) Groups addressed by a PD program
- 10) Coaching during a PD program
- 11) Evaluation of a PD program

In the bi-variate analysis of data, these eleven variables will be treated as dependent variables and the teacher characteristics will be treated as independent variables.

All of the eleven dependent variables fall under the two dimensions of professional development discussed in Chapter 1 of this study: the dimension of governance (decision-making) and the dimension of relevance (content and type of professional development activity).

The following variables cluster under the dimension of governance. They reflect components of professional development that involve decision-making and responsibility:

- Identification of needs (item B of questionnaire)
- Assigning priority of needs (item C of questionnaire)
- Coordination of PD activities (item D of questionnaire)

- Presentation during PD sessions (item F of questionnaire)
- Coaching (item K of questionnaire)
- Evaluation (item L of questionnaire)

The following variables cluster under the dimension of relevance. These components are linked to content and type of PD activities.

- Goals (item E of questionnaire)
- Content (item G of questionnaire)
- Number of options presented (item H of questionnaire)
- Transfer of content (item I of questionnaire)
- Groups addressed (item J of questionnaire)

Variables clustered under governance collected information on the degree of responsibility teachers would like to assume in decision-making. Each item was presented with three different decision-making roles. These three options reflect a hierarchy of roles suggested by both Conceptual Systems Theory and Stages of Concern theory. Both these theories suggest that teachers at lower stages of development (Stage One in both Conceptual Systems and in Stages of Concern) will prefer to leave the responsibility for organizing professional development with a supervisor or "expert". As teachers move up the scale of development, it is suggested that they will wish to have a greater responsibility in organizing professional development. The basic hypothesis of the two theories is that the mature teacher and adult desires a large

share of the responsibility in organizing his/her learning environment. Glickman (1981) identified three distinct supervisory orientations: directive, collaborative and non-directive.

Using this same hierarchy of development (from little responsibility and self-directedness to increasing responsibility and self-directedness), all governance variables presented the following three options. For the component of professional development under discussion, teachers were asked whether they felt responsibility should lie with

- 1) Supervisors (directive)
- 2) Teachers and supervisors working in concert (collaborative)
- 3) Teachers, with support and information from their supervisors (non-directive)

The order of presentation of the three options was scrambled throughout the questionnaire to avoid creating a bias (see pilot testing, this chapter). A multiple choice format was chosen rather than a Likhert Scale. The intent of the study was to examine what decision-making structure respondents would prefer. Multiple choice provided the appropriate format for collecting this information.

The following questions on decision-making roles were generated (items labels from questionnaire):

B. Who should identify the PD needs of FSL teachers?

- C. Who should choose which of these identified needs are to be addressed in a PD program for FSL teachers?
- D. Who should be responsible for the coordination (planning, organization) of PD activities for FSL teachers?
- F. Who should be responsible for presentation during a PD session?
- K. In the implementation of new curriculum, new materials or a new approach (e.g.: communicative approach), whom would you prefer to be coached by?
- L. Who should be responsible for the evaluation of a PD program for FSL teachers?

Items clustered under the dimension of relevance collected information on teachers' preferences for content and type of PD activity. Unlike governance variables, these items do not have one common set of options. For each element of professional development under discussion, a separate group of possible options were offered. There is, however, a hierarchy built into each set of options. These options reflect prescriptions for professional development put forward by both the theory of Conceptual Systems and the theory of Stages of Concern.

Goals and Content. (Items E and G) The options offered under the goals and content of professional development reflect a hypothesis from the theory of Stages of Concern. This hypothesis states that teachers at the beginning of their teaching careers

are primarily concerned with "survival", in other words, with becoming familiar with program materials and curriculum requirements. As teachers move beyond this stage, they become interested in improving their teaching skills. Only after teachers have mastered these first two stages will they become interested in the impact of their teaching on students and on better understanding how each individual student learns. Teachers at Stage One have very little concern with the theories of teaching and learning.

This assumption provided the following scale for item E (primary goal of PD) and item G (content of PD):

- Stage 1) Teachers at this stage will be most interested in content that provides information on materials, resources and curricula.
- Stage 2) Teachers will prefer content that will help them improve their teaching skills.
- Stage 3) Teachers at Stage 3 will prefer content that will help them explore the impact of their teaching on students. Theoretical issues underlying teaching and learning will be of interest.

The items generated from this developmental prescription for PD are the following:

- E. What should be the primary goal of a PD program for FSL teachers?

1. To provide me with information on materials, resources and curricula
 2. To improve the impact of my teaching on students
 3. To improve my skills as a teacher
- G. What should be the content of a PD program for FSL teachers?
1. Information on curricula, materials and resources followed by examples
 2. Exploration of the impact of teaching on students (evaluation of performance and competence, changes needed to improve student outcomes)
 3. Discussion focused on situations and teaching tasks encountered in the classroom (organizing, grouping, management)
- (Please note that the hierarchy of options has been scrambled.)

It can be noted that there is an overlap between the two theories. Conceptual Systems theory states that teachers at low levels of conceptual development have little use for theory and have primarily practical concerns in terms of classroom needs. (Santmire, 1979).

Number of Options. (item H) Conceptual Systems hypothesizes that teachers at lower stages of development will have some difficulty in differentiating information. When two kinds of

information are presented to low conceptual level teachers, they are most affected by what they are presented first. They find it difficult to look at alternatives, to choose and sort information (Bents, 1978; Sayachvin, 1972). It is considered a characteristic of teachers at higher stages of conceptual development to be able to identify alternatives suited to specific situations (Schroder, Driver and Stenfert, 1967; Schroder, 1971).

It was beyond the scope of this survey instrument to measure how teachers deal with more than one alternative in a program. It was, however, possible to ask teachers how many alternative ways to teach a language skill or structure they felt should be presented in a session. The following two options were generated:

- 1) There is one way to teach a skill or structure
- 2) There are many possible ways to teach a skill or a structure

This developmental assumption is reflected in item H:

H. How many options should be presented in a PD session?

1. A number of alternative ways to teach a language skill or structure
2. One way to teach a language skill or structure

Transfer. (item I) In Stages of Concern theory, Fuller defines the first level of teacher concerns as survival concerns. Teachers feel the need for immediate practical content in their

professional development programs. As teachers gain experience and confidence, they may become interested in exploring the theoretical issues underlying classroom situations. These are considered higher level concerns. In Conceptual Systems theory, teachers at lower levels of development are believed to prefer concrete and immediately practical content, as they have not yet attained conceptual development stages that allow for abstraction.

Based on these assumptions, teachers were asked to identify their preferences for the scope of content presented during a PD session in Item I of the questionnaire.

- I. PD programs should offer information and content on second language teaching:
1. If it is immediately applicable to the classroom
 2. Even if it is not immediately applicable to the classroom.

Groups Addressed. (item J) Item J of the questionnaire asked teachers to identify their preferences in regard to the groups addressed by a program. In Stages of Concern theory, it is hypothesized that as teachers develop they feel the need to exchange ideas with more experienced teachers as well as share feelings with peers (Katz in Floden and Feiman, 1981). In Conceptual Systems theory, it is stated that, as teachers develop, they become more interested in what can be gained from group discussion and problem solving (Santmire, 1979). These

assumptions generated the following item:

- J. Which FSL groups should be addressed by a PD program?
1. Different groups of FSL teachers (beginning and experienced teachers, teachers from different grade levels)
 2. Specific groups with common needs (PD for beginning teachers, PD for teachers from one grade level)

Coaching. (item K) The increasing ability to learn from one's peers develops into the ability to handle team teaching and peer coaching (Santmire, 1979). Teachers preferences for coaching are collected in item K.

- K. In the implementation of a new curriculum, new materials or a new approach (e.g.: communicative approach), who would you prefer to be coached by (observation and feedback)?
1. A supervisor
 2. Other FSL teachers and a supervisor
 3. Other FSL teachers

It is important to note that the hierarchy of preferences underlying both theories were scrambled for each component to avoid bias. For data compilation, responses were recoded and rank-ordered for ordinal analysis.

Pilot Testing of Survey Instrument

The questionnaire was pilot tested in three different forms. The intent of the pilot tests was

- to improve wording;
- to check for bias;
- to check for ambiguous items;
- to receive feedback on the salience of the study.

The questionnaire was first pilot tested with a group of secondary FSL teachers. Teachers were asked to answer the survey and a post-survey questionnaire (see Appendices A and B). The researcher was present to answer questions and to respond to a group discussion of the survey instrument.

From the first pilot test, a revised questionnaire was constructed that kept all the variables of the original questionnaire. The questionnaire was redesigned for efficiency and ease of response. Items that lead to confusion or that were ambiguous were rewritten.

From the post-survey feedback, it became clear that teachers were able to identify the different roles for teachers and supervisors (governance variables) offered throughout the questionnaire. No bias for any one role was felt to be built into the questionnaire.

The questionnaire was pilot tested again in two different formats: One format offered a Likhert Scale for each option presented; the other format offered a multiple choice for each

item. Multiple choice was chosen as the more suitable format for the purposes of this study. Use of a Likhert scale confounded the findings and did not provide the necessary data since teachers did not have to make a choice as to which option they preferred. When asked to indicate a preference from the three, teachers had to spend more time considering their answers and preference.

The questionnaire was pilot tested with both elementary and secondary FSL teachers, and with both student teachers and experienced teachers. It was submitted to the Research Evaluation Office of the Vancouver School Board. This office provided both valuable editing information and feedback from a professional development specialist.

The final version of the survey instrument was considerably shorter in length, avoided words that might create a bias (such as effective, practical, etc.) and contained all of the variables of the original version. In its final format, it uses a standardized multiple choice questionnaire with some simple supply questions in the teacher characteristic section only (e.g. teachers were asked how much time was spent teaching FSL a week, no set categories were provided). A copy of the final questionnaire can be found in Appendix E.

Population, Sampling and Data Collection Procedures

Population. The study was aimed at one specific target population: FSL teachers (full FSL teaching load and partial FSL teaching load) in the public school system of British Columbia, including both elementary and secondary school teachers. French Immersion teachers and teachers of French as a First Language were excluded from the target population. All teachers of French at the post-secondary level were also excluded, as were teachers who were not currently teaching. The preferences and points of view of supervisors were not explored by the present study.

Data Collection. It proved impossible to locate a list of FSL teachers in British Columbia, however, an up-to-date list of French coordinators and contact people in the different school districts of British Columbia was available. The following procedure was used:

1. The questionnaire was submitted for ethical review by the Screening Committee for Research and Other Studies Involving Human Subjects (UBC) and received approval.
2. Personalized covering letters, introducing the study to coordinators and contact people, were prepared. The letter invited contact people to participate in the study and clearly defined the terms of participation.

Participating coordinators were asked

- to sign and return the consent form enclosed with the letter;

- to indicate on the consent form the total number of FSL teachers at the elementary level and the secondary level in their school district;

- to distribute the questionnaires to these FSL teachers (the researcher would send the appropriate number of questionnaires by return post); (see Appendix C for a copy of the covering letter to coordinators and a copy of the consent form).

3. Questionnaires were designed to be self-administered (no designated time or place). Coordinators were responsible for the distribution of the questionnaire, not for explaining the purpose of the study, nor for the collection of the completed questionnaires. Each questionnaire had a covering letter to teachers and a stamped and addressed return envelope (see Appendix D for a copy of the covering letter to teachers).

4. In early June 1987, coordinators and contact people were sent a copy of the covering letter, a questionnaire and a consent form.

5. As consent forms were returned, packages with the

appropriate number of questionnaires were prepared and sent back to the school district contact person.

6. The cut-off number for the amount of questionnaires to be sent out was four hundred and fifty. Once the cut-off number had been attained, school districts that expressed an interest in the study were sent a letter explaining that the questionnaire had been distributed in sufficient number and thanking them for their consideration.
7. Twelve school districts participated in the study. The sample was stratified so that two major groups of teachers would be reached: elementary and secondary FSL teachers. The twelve school boards chosen allowed for this stratification. Roughly a fifth of the questionnaires were sent to teachers outside of the Lower Mainland, the main urban area of the province.

Description of Sample. A sample of FSL teachers in the province of British Columbia was obtained through the participation in the study of French coordinators and contact persons. Within the participating school districts, questionnaires were distributed to all FSL teachers. Four hundred and sixty four questionnaires were distributed in the

twelve school districts. The table on the following page shows the distribution of questionnaires to school boards.

As will be seen in the table, 223 elementary FSL teachers and 241 secondary FSL teachers were sent questionnaires. I t should be noted that there are 1031 French teachers (both FSL and French Immersion) in the province (Ministry of Education statistics for the school year 1987-88. The exact number of FSL teachers in the province has not been identified by the Ministry.

Table 2

Distribution of Questionnaires Sent Out

<u>School district</u>	<u>Elementary teachers</u>	<u>Secondary teachers</u>
Coquitlam	50	25
Prince George	---	34
Greater Victoria	100	154
Delta	---	40
Richmond	40	20
Trail	20	5
North Thompson	---	2
Central Okanagan	---	34
Saanich	23	17
Duncan	---	12
New Westminster	---	4
Arrowlake	---	12
Total:	223	241

Analysis Procedures

Certain items on the questionnaire (those using supply format) were hand-coded directly on the questionnaire itself. The coding for all the questionnaires was rechecked. Scrambled items were re-coded to reflect the theoretical hierarchy upon which they were based. The information from both sections of the questionnaire were transferred into a data base on the UBC Mainframe computer system. Dependent and independent variables were identified and appropriate statistical measures chosen.

All analyses were completed on the Mainframe computer of the UBC computer centre, using subprogrammes from the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX), version release 2.0 (under MTS), 1986.

Two types of analysis were chosen to meet the two objectives of the study. Descriptive uni-variate analysis was used to collect information for the following research questions:

- 1) Do teachers have varied preferences for decision-making roles in professional development? Do the majority of teachers prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making with a supervisory figure?
- 2) Do teachers have varied preferences for content and type of activity in professional development programs? Do the majority prefer practical, concrete content?

Bi-variate analysis (cross-tabulation and use of the chi-square) was used to examine the third research question:

- 3) Are there characteristics, specific to the FSL teaching context, possibly influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development programs?

This third research question was examined through a test of the following hypothesis:

There will be no significant differences observed between teacher characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

Response Rates

Of 461 questionnaires sent out, 132 were returned (slightly less than a third). Due to the procedures used, it is impossible to identify how many of the 450 questionnaires sent out actually reached teachers in the school.

This low return rate is probably due to the send-out date which was very late in the school year. Enough questionnaires were returned to provide data for the study. However, the low return rate is a limitation of the study and will be discussed in this chapter under the heading "representativeness of sample", before proceeding to the interpretation of findings.

In 1987-88, there were 1081 French teachers in the province of British Columbia (B.C. Ministry of Education). This number includes both French Immersion and FSL teachers. The response rate for this survey was 132 questionnaires, which means that 12.2% of all French teachers in the province of British Columbia answered the survey. Though it cannot be calculated, the percentage rate of responses for only FSL teachers would be much higher (a conservative estimate would be 18.0%). This is considered a large percentage of the total population, which increases the representativeness of the sample.

Table 3
Response Rate by School District

<u>School District</u>	<u>Number of Returned Questionnaires</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
Coquitlam	25	19.2%
Richmond	14	10.7%
Trail	10	7.6%
New Westminster	2	1.5%
Saanich	19	14.6%
Prince George	11	8.4%
Victoria	17	13.0%
Central Okanagan	9	6.9%
Arrow Lake	4	3.0%
Delta	8	6.1%
Missing information	11	8.4%
Total:	130 respondents	

Table 3 presented information on the distribution of responses. The number of returned questionnaires from each school board was presented, followed by what this number represents as a percentage of all returned questionnaires.

Representativeness of Sample

The sample of respondents appears to be representative of the Canadian population of FSL teachers. Wherever possible, the sample population that responded to this questionnaire was compared to the sample population described in the CASLT national survey (1986).

Table 4

Comparison of the Sample to the CASLT Sample

<u>Language Background</u>	<u>Sample Reached By this Study</u>	<u>CASLT Sample</u>
English	65.4%	69.9%
French	20.8%	21.8%
Other	13.1%	8.3%

Academic Degree

No degree	8.5%	6.3%
Bachelors degree	73.8%	76.5%
Masters degree	17.7%	17.6%

As can be seen by comparing the language background and academic background of the two samples, the sample reached by this study is representative of the national population of FSL

teachers. For these two variables, the sample is within 3 percentage points of national data in four out of six cases.

Limitations of the Study

The procedures used to collect data for the study could have been improved. The procedures used to reach FSL teachers made follow-up to the survey extremely difficult. Questionnaires were therefore sent out only once. Follow-up would have required identifying teachers. This would have improved the response rate of the survey, but diminished its validity. Teachers that responded to the survey did so as unidentified respondents. It can be argued that anonymity allowed for a greater degree of honesty in their responses.

The late send-out date is probably partly responsible for the low return-rate. The political climate at the time should also be considered as a factor (impending teacher strike). Follow-up becomes virtually impossible when a questionnaire is sent out so late in the school year. The mobility of the FSL teaching population would change the sample reached in June from the sample reached in September.

The low return rate and the lack of follow-up procedures pose limitations to the study that could have been avoided by

- 1) sending out questionnaires at an earlier date;

- 2) asking coordinators to participate in follow-up procedures and building this step into data collection procedure.

The study also could have been improved by building in a means of checking non-respondents for possible bias.

One of the limitations inherent to a survey instrument is that it collects information on what respondents say they would prefer. Further research that examines how teachers actually react within professional development programs will be needed before more conclusive statements can be made on developmental approaches to teacher education.

In the actual design of the instrument, no attempt was made to link teachers' stage of development with their expressed preferences for structure and content. From the results of this study, it will not be possible to make statements on the developmental levels of FSL teachers. The study does not test developmental theory. It examines guidelines for professional development proposed by developmental theory. From the results of the study, statements can be made on whether the findings support these guidelines.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Chapter Four presents the findings of the data compiled from a survey instrument sent to a sample of FSL teachers. The data collected by the survey provided a profile of respondents and a description of their preferences for the structure and content of professional development. Bi-variate analysis of this data examined teacher characteristics possibly influencing teachers' preferences for professional development.

Description Of Teacher Characteristics

Part A of the survey instrument gathered information on the characteristics of FSL teachers in British Columbia and their opportunities for professional development. This information provided a description of the respondents and their teaching situation. It also allowed for the identification and categorization of teacher characteristics. These categories were used in bi-variate analysis to examine teacher characteristics possibly influencing teachers' preferences for professional development. Information was collected on the following characteristics:

- 1) Years of teaching experience
- 2) Grade levels taught
- 3) Contact with other FSL teachers
- 4) Gender
- 5) Age

- 6) First language
- 7) Language of community
- 8) Language of schooling
- 9) Academic background
- 10) FSL training
- 11) Subjects taught
- 12) Current professional development activities
- 13) Desire to participate in professional development activities

In general, all items of the survey were answered by the respondents. In the tables that follow, the percentages presented exclude missing responses. The number of valid cases for each item will be reported (n=). A total of 130 questionnaires were retained for analysis.

Information on the characteristics of respondents will be presented first in table form, followed by a brief discussion. Characteristics have been grouped to allow for discussion.

Gender and Age

Table 5
Gender and Age of Respondents

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Gender</u> (n=126)		
Female	90	71.4%
Male	36	28.6%

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Age</u> (n=127)		
20 to 39 years old	69	56.6%
40 years old or more	53	43.4%

As can be seen in the table, the majority of respondents are female. The majority of respondents were between 20 and 39 years old.

Language Background

Table 6
Language Background of Respondents

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>First Language</u> (n=130)		
English	85	65.4%
French	18	13.1%
Other	27	20.8%

<u>Language of Community</u> (n= 130)		
English	90	69.2%
French	31	23.8%
Other	9	6.9%

<u>Language of Schooling</u> (n=130)		
English	94	72.3%
French	5	3.8%
English and French	24	18.5%
Other	7	5.3%

The majority of respondents spoke English as a first language (65.4%). Only 13.1% of respondents spoke French as a first language. A considerable number of teachers spoke a language other than French or English as a first language (20.8%). This supports the literature on the professional development of French as a Second Language teachers, which states that the majority of teachers are teaching in their second language.

Though French was not necessarily the first language, 23.8% of FSL teachers had previously lived in a community where French was spoken. The majority had received their schooling in English (72.3%). Very few had received their schooling only in French (3.8%), but 18.5% had received part of their schooling in the two official languages.

Academic Background and Teaching Experience

Table 7
Academic Degree And FSL Specialization

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Academic Degree</u> (n=130)		
No degree	11	8.5%
Bachelors degree	96	73.8%
Masters degree	23	17.7%
<u>FSL Specialization</u> (n=129)		
FSL	48	37.2%
FSL/French Immersion	15	11.7%
FSL/other subjects	65	50.4%

Of the respondents, most hold bachelor degrees (73.8%). Some (17.7%) hold a masters degree (M.A. or M.Ed.). A small percentage (8.5%) hold no university degree. Of respondents, 37.2% are teaching only FSL and 61.1% are teaching FSL and other subjects.

Table 8
Teaching Level

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Teaching Level</u> (n=126)		
Elementary	55	44.4%
Secondary	69	55.6%

Of the respondents, 44.4% teach at the elementary level and 55.6% at the secondary level.

Table 9
Teaching Experience

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>General Teaching Experience</u> (n=130)		
1 to 10 years	54	41.5%
11 to 20 years	57	43.9%
21 or more years	19	14.6%
 <u>FSL Teaching Experience</u> (n=128)		
1 to 10 years	90	70.3%
11 to 20 years	26	20.3%
21 or more years	14	9.4%

The majority of respondents (64.6%) have between 1 and 20 years of general teaching experience and 70.3% have between 1 and 10 years of experience teaching FSL. This would seem to indicate that teachers have more general teaching experience than FSL teaching experience. It should be noted that some teachers have become FSL teachers at the request of their school boards.

Contact with other FSL Teachers

Table 10
Contact with other FSL teachers

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Contact with Elementary</u> <u>FSL Teachers within School Board</u> (n=119)		
1 to 30 FSL teachers	81	68.1%
31 or more FSL teachers	38	31.9%
<u>Contact with Secondary</u> <u>FSL Teachers within School Board</u> (n=118)		
1 to 30 FSL teachers	58	49.2%
31 or more FSL teachers	60	50.8%
<u>Number of FSL Teachers</u> <u>Within the School</u> (n=127)		
1 or 2 FSL teachers	57	44.9%
3 FSL teachers	26	20.5%
4 FSL teachers	26	20.5%
5 or more FSL teachers	21	14.2%

Secondary teachers would appear to have a greater possibility of contact with other FSL teachers within their own school districts than would elementary FSL teachers. A large group (44.9%) of FSL teachers (both elementary and secondary) work by themselves or with one other FSL teacher within their own school.

Current Professional Development Activities

Table 11
Professional Development Opportunities

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Opportunities for Professional Development</u> (n=128)		
Yes	103	80.5%
No	25	19.5%
<u>Groups Addressed by Programs</u> (n=120)		
FSL teachers	86	71.7%
FSL and Immersion	34	28.3%
<u>PD Frequency</u> (n=118)		
Once or twice a year	69	58.5%
3/4 times a year	24	20.3%
More than 5 times	25	21.2%
<u>PD Attendance</u> (n=124)		
Optional/Encouraged	118	95.2%
Monitored	6	4.8%

Of the respondents, 80.5% currently have opportunities for professional development within their school districts. How professional development is offered varies within each school district. Generally, there is some form of professional development specifically for FSL teachers (71.7%) or for FSL teachers and French Immersion teachers (28.3%). The frequency of activities also varies from school to school. Professional development activities for FSL teachers generally occur once or twice a year (58.5%), though some schools offer more than four PD activities for FSL teachers within the school year (21.2%). In general, attendance at professional development activities is optional or encouraged (95.2%). It is rarely monitored (4.8%).

Table 12
Needs Identification

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Needs Identification</u> (n=114)		
Assessed needs	4	3.5%
Assumed needs	38	33.3%
Expressed needs	36	31.6%
Combination	36	31.6%

Formal assessment of needs would appear to be a rare occurrence (3.5%), however, expressed needs were often the basis for professional development activities (31.6%). In one third of cases, teachers' needs were assumed by a supervisory official (33.3%).

Table 13
Initiation of Activities

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Initiation of PD Activities</u> (n=119)		
Supervisor	73	60.3%
Teachers and supervisor	28	23.1%
Teachers	16	13.2%
<u>Coordination of PD Activities</u> (n=119)		
Supervisor	63	52.1%
Teachers and supervisor	36	29.8%
Teachers	20	16.6%

In general, professional development is initiated by a supervisor (60.3%). There were a few cases of collaborative initiation (23.1%) and of teacher-initiated professional development (13.2%). Professional development is usually coordinated by a supervisory figure (52.1%), though there is an important number of cases of collaborative coordination (29.8%) and teacher-directed coordination (16.6%).

Participation in Professional Development

Table 14
Desire to Participate in PD

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Desire to participate</u> (n=129)		
Yes	117	90.7%
No	12	9.3%

Of the respondents, a vast majority indicated a desire to participate in professional development activities for FSL teachers (90.7%). This supports the general literature on professional development, which states that teachers wish to actively participate in professional development programs.

Description of Teachers' Preferences for Structure and Content

Part B of the survey collected data on teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development. There were 11 variables in part B of the survey. As explained in Chapter Three, items were constructed to reflect guidelines for professional development put forward by developmental theories. These 11 variables fall into two clusters: governance (6 variables) and relevance (5 variables).

Governance variables examine the following decision-making roles:

- 1) Needs identification
- 2) Establishing the priority of needs
- 3) Responsibility for coordination
- 4) Presentation during PD activities
- 5) Coaching
- 6) Evaluation

Relevance variables examine the content and type of professional development activities preferred by FSL teachers.

They examine the following:

- 1) Primary goal for professional development
- 2) Content
- 3) Number of options per session
- 4) Transfer of content
- 5) Groups addressed by a session

Information will be presented by grouping the findings under these two headings: governance and relevance variables.

Descriptive analysis of this part of the survey provides information for the following research questions:

- 1) Do teachers have varied preferences for decision-making roles in professional development? Do the majority of teachers prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making with a supervisory figure?
- 2) Do teachers have varied preferences for content and type of activity in their professional development? Do the majority of teachers prefer practical, concrete content?

Descriptive Analysis of Governance Variables

Examination of the descriptive data on governance variables provided information for the first research question:

- 1) Do teachers have varied preferences for decision-making roles in professional development? Do the majority of teachers prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making with a supervisory figure?

For all governance variables, three possible structures for decision-making were presented:

- 1) A directive structure (supervisor is responsible for decision-making)
- 2) A collaborative structure (supervisors and teachers share responsibility)
- 3) A non-directive structure (teachers are largely responsible for decision-making)

This scale reflects prescriptions for professional development based on developmental theory. The basic assumption of these guidelines is that teachers at lower levels of development will prefer a directive PD structure, as they view authority as the highest good. Teachers at higher levels will prefer a non-directive structure. Research in developmental theory showed that the majority of teachers are at lower stages of development, therefore, it can be expected that the majority of teachers should prefer a directive structure.

Information on six decision-making roles was collected. For each of these roles, teachers were asked to indicate whether they would prefer to let responsibility lie with a supervisor, whether they would prefer to make decisions in collaboration with a supervisor, or whether they would prefer to be responsible for decisions while receiving support and information from a supervisor. The findings for these six variables follows.

Needs Identification

Table 15
Preferences for Needs Identification

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=125)		
Directive	11	8.8%
Collaborative	72	57.6%
Non-directive	42	33.6%

When asked who should identify the professional development needs of FSL teachers, the majority of respondents opted for a collaborative form of needs identification (57.6%). Some teachers preferred that a supervisory authority (8.8%) identify needs and a considerable group opted for teacher-autonomy (33.6%) in the identification of needs.

Priority of Needs

Table 16
Preferences for Choosing the Priority of Needs

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=127)		
Directive	7	5.5%
Collaborative	79	62.2%
Non-directive	4	32.3%

When asked who should choose which of the identified needs should be addressed in a professional development program,

respondents again opted in majority for a collaborative structure (62.2%). There are teachers, however, who preferred that a supervisory authority make the decision (5.5%) and a considerable group which preferred a teacher-directed structure (32.3%).

Coordination

Table 17
Preferences for Coordination of PD

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=127)		
Directive	48	37.8%
Collaborative	67	52.8%
Non-directive	12	9.4%

More than half of the respondents indicated that they would prefer that coordination of PD activities be organized within a collaborative structure (52.8%). However, a large group of respondents felt that responsibility should lie with a supervisor (37.8%). Only a few felt that teachers, with support and information from their supervisors, should assume responsibility for coordination (9.4%).

The response to this variable differs from other governance variables. It is the one variable where teachers opted in considerable number for a directive structure.

Presentation

Table 18
Preferences for Presentation during PD

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=125)		
Directive	15	12.0%
Collaborative	70	56.0%
Non-directive	40	32.0%

When asked who should be responsible for presentation in professional development, the majority of respondents (56.0%) chose a collaborative structure. A small group (12.0%) felt that the responsibility should lie with a supervisor and 32.0% felt that teachers should be responsible for presentation.

Coaching

Table 19
Preferences for Coaching

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=128)		
Directive	21	16.4%
Collaborative	72	56.3%
Non-directive	35	27.3%

The majority of respondents expressed a preference for a collaborative form of coaching (56.3%). A group representing 16.4% of respondents preferred that a supervisor be responsible

for coaching and 27.3% preferred that teachers assume responsibility.

Evaluation

Table 20
Preferences for Evaluation

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=129)		
Directive	2	1.6%
Collaborative	60	46.5%
Non-directive	67	51.9%

In the case of evaluation, more than half of the respondents felt that teachers should be responsible for evaluating professional development programs (51.9%). Nearly all of the remaining respondents (46.5%) opted for a collaborative structure and only 1.6% felt that supervisors should be responsible for evaluating professional development programs and their impact. It is the only variable for which the majority of respondents chose a non-directive structure over a collaborative structure.

Discussion of Governance Variables

As can be seen by the responses, respondents in general would clearly prefer a collaborative structure for decision-making in professional development programs. This supports what is generally being said in the literature on the professional development of teachers. It would indicate that FSL teachers,

like teachers in general, would prefer an active role in the design and organization of their own continuing education.

What the data also shows is that not all teachers would prefer the same degree of responsibility in decision-making. Some teachers would prefer a collaborative structure and others a teacher-directed structure, still others would prefer to let responsibility lie with the supervisor.

The variation found within teachers' preferences for decision-making roles supports the guidelines for professional development proposed by developmental theory. Teachers do not share the same need for responsibility in decision-making. Developmental theory also states that teachers are, in general, at lower stages of development. When this assumption is applied to professional development, it can be assumed that the majority of teachers will prefer a directive structure of professional development. The findings of this survey do not support this assumption. For all decision-making roles, the majority of respondents chose a collaborative structure and a considerable number chose a non-directive structure.

If collaborative and non-directive structures are considered together, it becomes quite clear where the preferences of teachers lie in regard to decision-making roles. The following table collapses the options "collaboration" and "non-direction". These are treated simply as a preference for involvement in

decision-making and compared to the option "directive" which is now labeled "non-involvement".

Table 21
Governance Variables

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Needs Identification</u>		
(n=125)		
Teacher Non-involvement	11	8.8%
Teacher Involvement	114	91.2%
<u>Priority of Needs</u>		
(n=127)		
Teacher Non-involvement	7	5.5%
Teacher Involvement	120	94.5%
<u>Coordination</u>		
(n=127)		
Teacher Non-involvement	48	37.8%
Teacher Involvement	79	62.2%
<u>Presentation</u>		
(n=125)		
Teacher Non-involvement	15	12.0%
Teacher Involvement	110	88.0%
<u>Coaching</u>		
(n=128)		
Teacher Non-involvement	21	16.4%
Teacher Involvement	107	83.6%
<u>Evaluation</u>		
(n=129)		
Teacher Non-involvement	2	1.6%
Teacher Involvement	127	98.4%

In Table 21, it can be seen that teachers feel strongly that they can assume some degree of responsibility in the following decision-making roles:

- 1) Evaluation (98.4%)
- 2) Choosing the priority of needs (94.5%)
- 3) Needs identification (91.2%)
- 4) Presentation (88.0%)
- 5) Coaching (83.8%)
- 6) Coordination (62.2%)

Evaluation was definitely one decision-making role that teachers felt they could assume. Almost all of the respondents (98.4%) opted for a collaborative or non-directive structure. Only 1.6% opted for a directive structure.

Coordination was the one aspect of professional development that respondents seemed the least willing to assume. Of the respondents, 37.8% preferred non-involvement in coordination. This was the only variable for which a large group of teachers indicated a preference for a directive structure. Teachers seem to desire some degree of responsibility in different decision-making aspects of professional development. There seems to be less willingness to accept responsibility for the actual management of programs.

It should be stressed that for governance variables, approximately half of the respondents indicated that they preferred collaborative structures. Another finding from this part of the study should also be underlined, a considerable number of teachers did chose a non-directive structure. Roughly a third of respondents chose non-direction for the following variables:

- 1) Needs Identification (33.6%)
- 2) Choosing the priority of needs (32.2%)
- 3) Presentation (32.0%)
- 4) Coaching (27.3%).

Very few respondents chose a directive structure. If responsibility for coordination is excluded, the percentage of respondents that chose a directive structure lies between 1.6% and 16.4% for remaining variables:

- | | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| 1) Needs Identification | 8.8% |
| 2) Priority of Needs | 5.5% |
| 3) Presentation | 12.0% |
| 4) Coaching | 16.4% |
| 5) Evaluation | 1.6% |

The distribution of teachers' preferences for decision-making roles across the six variables can be found in the following table, which serves as a summary of the data.

Table 22
Summary of Teachers' Preferences for Structure
Distribution across Variables

	<u>Preferences for Structure</u>		
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-directive
<u>Decision-making Roles</u>			
Needs Identification	8.8%	57.6%	33.6%
Priority of Needs	5.5%	62.2%	32.3%
Coordination	37.8%	52.8%	9.4%
Presentation	12.0%	56.0%	32.0%
Coaching	16.4%	56.3%	27.3%
Evaluation	1.6%	46.5%	51.9%

Descriptive Analysis of Relevance Variables

Descriptive analysis of relevance variables provided information for the examination of the following research question:

- 2) Do teachers have varied preferences for content and type of activity in professional development programs?
Do the majority prefer "practical" concrete content?

For each item collecting information on relevance variables, options were presented which respected a hierarchy of concerns defined by developmental theories. A basic assumption of developmental theory is that not all teachers have the same concerns. When developmental theories are applied to professional development, the following guideline is suggested:

professional development will need to take into account that a teachers' concerns will be reflected in the content that he/she will consider relevant.

Research in Conceptual Systems theory showed that the majority of teachers are at lower levels of conceptual development. When this assumption is carried over and applied to professional development, it can be expected that the majority of teachers will prefer content that is "practical" and concrete, addressing lower level concerns.

The variables examined in this section are goals, content, number of options offered in a session, transfer of content and groups addressed by a professional development program.

Goals and Content.

Item E collected information on teachers' preferences as to the primary goal of a professional development program and Item G as to the content of a program. Teachers had a choice of three options that were the same for both of these two items. These options reflected respectively

- 1) survival concerns;
- 2) teacher tasks concerns;
- 3) student impact concerns.

Please note that the actual wording of these two items was designed so as to avoid bias.

Table 23
Goals and Content

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Goals</u>		
(n=114)		
Survival	38	33.3%
Teacher Task	36	31.6%
Student Impact	40	35.1%
<u>Content</u>		
(n=97)		
Survival	40	41.2%
Teacher Task	21	21.6%
Student Impact	36	37.1%

As can be seen in Table 23, there is no one clear category of concerns evident in teachers' responses. When asked what the goal of PD should be, responses were fairly evenly distributed across the three options. When asked what the content should be, there was a shift downward from teacher-task concerns to survival concerns.

Number of Options

Developmental theory states that when teachers at lower stages of development are presented with more than one alternative for teaching a skill, they will be most influenced by the alternative that is presented first. Developmental theory

hypothesizes that teachers at lower levels of development will prefer to be taught one good "authorized" way to teach. Teachers were asked to indicate a preference for sessions that presented one way or a number of ways to teach a language skill or structure.

Table 24
Number of Options

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Number of Options</u>		
(n=128)		
One Way	4	3.1%
Alternatives	124	96.9%

The responses to this item were nearly unanimous: 96.9% of respondents indicated that they would prefer that a number of alternative ways to teach a skill or structure be presented during a professional development session. This variable will not be discussed further in the study. It is felt that a bias was carried in the wording of this item. It is the only item to receive only one category of response.

Transfer of Content

Developmental theory hypothesizes that teachers at lower stages of development will prefer content that is immediately applicable to the classroom.

Table 25
Transfer of Content

	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
<u>Transfer of Content</u>		
(n=129)		
Immediately Applicable	55	42.6%
Not Immediately Applicable	74	57.4%

Teachers were asked whether they would prefer that the information and content of programs be immediately applicable to the classroom. Of the respondents, 42.6% indicated that they would prefer information and content that is immediately applicable. The majority (57.4%) indicated that this was not a necessity.

Groups Addressed by Professional Development

Developmental theory builds on the assumption that higher stages of development are characterized by greater flexibility and desire to interact and learn from others. Based on this assumption, the following guideline is suggested for professional development: teachers at lower levels of development will feel little need for group interaction and peer learning. As teachers move up the developmental scale, they will feel the need for more interaction with peers.

Table 26
Groups Addressed by PD

<u>Groups Addressed</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
(n=125)		
Similar Groups	68	54.4%
Different Groups	124	45.6%

When asked which FSL groups should be addressed in a program, answers were again divided. The majority (52.4%) felt that professional development should address specific groups with common needs while 45.6% felt that it should address mixed groups.

Discussion of Relevance Variables

For the following discussion, the variable "number of options presented in a session" has been discarded. There is a possibility that the wording of the item created a bias, resulting in the nearly unanimous choice of one option by respondents.

There remain four variables for discussion:

- 1) goals
- 2) content
- 3) transferability of content
- 4) groups addressed by a professional development session

The different options presented for these variables reflect a hierarchy of concerns proposed by developmental theorists. From the descriptive analysis of responses, it can be seen that teachers did not express a clear preference for either low level or high level content. What can be observed is a roughly even distribution across options. Table 27 presents an overview of findings for this section, using only percentages.

Table 27
Relevance Variables Using Developmental Scale

<u>Goals</u>		<u>Transferability of Content</u>	
Level 1:	33.3%	Low Level:	42.6%
Level 2:	31.6%	High Level:	57.4%
Level 3:	35.1%		

<u>Content</u>		<u>Groups Addressed</u>	
Level 1:	41.2%	Low Level:	54.4%
Level 2:	21.6%	High Level:	45.6%
Level 3:	37.1%		

(N.B. Level One concerns are lower level concerns, Level Three concerns are higher level concerns.)

These findings support a basic assumption of developmental theories, that teachers, being at different stages of development, have different concerns that will be reflected in what they will consider relevant within a professional

development structure and how they will prefer content to be presented.

Research in Conceptual Systems theory showed that the majority of teachers are at lower levels of development. If this finding is applied to professional development, it can be expected that the majority of teachers will prefer content and professional development activities that will reflect these lower levels of development. The information from this study does not support this assumption. While there is variation in the type of activity and content that teachers would prefer, the responses are spread across options and are not concentrated in options linked to lower level concerns.

Summary of Descriptive Analysis of Findings

Descriptive analysis of the data provided a profile of teacher characteristics. This allowed for a comparison between the sample that responded to this survey and the sample reached by the larger national survey (Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, 1986). This descriptive information will also be used in the next step in analysis: the bi-variate analysis of teacher characteristics and teacher preferences for structure and content in professional development.

Descriptive analysis provided information for the following research questions:

- 1) Do teachers have varied preferences for decision-making roles in professional development programs? Do the majority of teachers prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making with a supervisory figure?
- 2) Do teachers have varied preferences for content and type of activity in professional development programs? Do the majority prefer "practical" concrete content?

Analysis of governance variables answered the first research question. It showed that teachers do have different preferences for decision-making roles. However, the majority (usually over 50%), would prefer a collaborative structure, with responsibility for decision-making shared between teachers and a supervisor. Roughly a third of respondents chose a non-directive structure, with teachers assuming responsibility for decision-making. A small group of respondents chose a directive structure, which let responsibility for decision-making lie with a supervisor.

This finding supports one guideline for professional development suggested by developmental theory: a professional development structure needs to be built on the recognition that teachers have different preferences for responsibility in decision-making. It does not support another assumption namely; that the majority of teachers, being at lower levels of development, will prefer a directive structure.

Analysis of relevance variables answered the second research question. It showed that teachers do have different preferences as to the content and type of activities in a professional development program. The findings showed that some teachers would prefer content directed at lower level concerns, while others would prefer content directed at higher level concerns. Preferences for different types of content and activities were scattered across options. The majority of teachers did not choose lower level content and presentation options.

This finding supports a guideline for professional development suggested by developmental theory. The content and type of activity of professional development programs will need to be built on the recognition that teachers have different concerns. These concerns will affect what they consider worthwhile and appropriate. It does not support the assumption that teachers, being at lower levels of conceptual development, will prefer content that is concrete and immediately applicable, addressed to lower level concerns.

Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Preferences

The second purpose of the study was to explore the possibility that certain teacher characteristics, specific to the FSL teaching context, might be influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

Developmental theory builds on the assumption that teachers' preferences are dictated by their current level of development. The following research question was posed:

- 3) Are there characteristics, specific to the FSL teaching context, possibly influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development programs?

This research question was examined through a test of the following hypothesis:

There will be no significant differences observed between teachers' characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

Procedure

The following procedure was used to test this hypothesis. Teachers were divided into categories according to thirteen teacher characteristics. Information on these thirteen characteristics was collected through Part A of the questionnaire. Part B collected information on teachers' preferences for structure and content through questions on eleven variables. Each of the thirteen teacher characteristics were analyzed with the eleven variables on structure and content. Bi-variate analysis showing significance were then further examined through a test of expected frequencies. Contingency tables and the chi-square of significance were used to measure significant differences between categories. For a list of teacher

characteristics and structure and content variables, please see Chapter Three.

The following working hypotheses were formulated:

- 1) No significant differences will be observed between teachers' preferences for decision-making (governance) in a professional development program (responsibility in needs identification, in choosing which of the identified needs should be addressed in a program, in coordination, in choosing presentation activities, in coaching and evaluation) and teacher characteristics specific to FSL teachers (years of experience, grade levels taught, contact with other FSL teachers, gender, age, first language, language of community, language of schooling, academic background, specific FSL training, specific teaching task, and current PD opportunities).
- 2) No significant differences will be observed between teachers' preferences for content in professional development programs (goals, content, number of options presented in a session, transferability of content, and groups addressed) and teacher characteristics specific to FSL teachers (years of experience, grade levels taught, contact with other FSL teachers, gender, age, first language, language of community, language of schooling, academic background, specific FSL training, specific

teaching task, and current professional development opportunities).

Results of Bi-variate Analysis

The following null hypotheses were not sustained by the study:

No significant differences were observed between teachers' preferences for content in professional development and teacher characteristics.

No significant differences were observed between teachers' preferences for structure in professional development and the following teacher characteristics:

- 1) Years of teaching experience (general and FSL)
- 2) Contact with other FSL teachers
- 3) Gender
- 4) Age
- 5) First language
- 6) Language of community
- 7) Language of schooling
- 8) Academic background
- 9) FSL training
- 10) FSL specialization
- 11) Desire to participate in professional development

Bi-variate analysis showed no significant differences

between teachers' preferences and 11 of the 13 teacher characteristics identified. Two teacher characteristics did show significant differences:

- 1) Grade level taught (elementary or secondary)
- 2) Current professional development activities

These will be discussed in the next section.

Information on bi-variate analysis will be presented throughout this section. Teachers' preferences for professional development are shown in the row. Categories according to teacher characteristics are shown in the column. In each of the cells, the actual number of respondents will be indicated, as well as the number that was statistically expected. The Chi-Square of significance is presented at the bottom of the table. The information presented in the tables shows how the respondents were divided into categories and how these different categories responded to the options presented to them for decision-making.

Grade Level

The characteristic "grade level" refers to whether the respondent is an elementary or secondary FSL teacher. When teachers were divided into categories using this characteristic, a significant difference was observed between elementary and secondary teachers and their preferences for one decision-making variable, presentation. No significant differences were observed between grade level and other governance variables.

Table 28 presents the results of the bi-variate analysis of the characteristic "teaching level" and the governance variable "presentation". In this case, two categories of respondents were identified: elementary and secondary teachers. The first number to appear in each cell of this contingency table represents the actual number of respondents in this category to have chosen that governance option (count). The number presented directly below this, is the number that was statistically expected to choose this option (expected value). Examination of the differences between actual frequency (count) and expected frequency (expected value) allows for a deeper understanding of the Chi-square of significance.

Table 28
Grade Level by Preferences for Presentation

(Count) (Expected Value)	<u>Preferences for Presentation</u>			Row
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Total
<u>Grade Level</u>				
Elementary	12 6.8	25 30.5	18 17.7	55 45.5%
Secondary	3 8.2	42 36.5	21 21.3	66 54.5%
Column Total	15 12.4%	67 55.4%	39 32.2%	121 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
9.01874	2	0.0110		
Number of Missing Observations = 9				

The Chi-Square of significance for this analysis is 0.0110. When a breakdown of responses is examined, it can be seen that elementary teachers indicated a significant preference for a directive structure for presentation in professional development. It was statistically expected that 6.8 would prefer a directive structure. The actual count is 12. It was expected that 30.5 elementary teachers would prefer a collaborative structure. In actual fact, only 25 teachers chose this option.

The table also shows that secondary teachers expressed a significant preference for a collaborative structure. It was expected that 36.5 secondary teachers would choose this option. The actual frequency was 42. It was expected that 8.2 secondary teachers would choose a directive structure. Only 3 respondents chose this option.

This data seems to indicate that for the variable "presentation", elementary teachers feel a greater need for a directive structure than do secondary teachers.

When grade level taught in the past was used to create categories, a very similar finding was produced (Table 29). It should be noted that, as in the previous analysis, the only variable to show significance is presentation.

Table 29
Past Grade Level by Preference for Presentation

(Count) (Expected Value)	<u>Preference for Presentation</u>			Row
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Total
<u>Past Grade Level</u>				
	9	22	12	43
Elementary	5.1	24.8	13.2	50.6%
<hr/>				
	1	27	14	42
Secondary	4.9	24.2	12.8	49.4%
<hr/>				
Column	10	49	26	85
Total	11.8%	57.6%	30.6%	100.0%

<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>
-------------------	-------------	---------------------

7.05326	2	0.0294
---------	---	--------

Number of Missing Observations = 45

The teacher characteristic "past grade level" was used to establish categories. Differences were observed between teachers who had previously taught at the elementary level and teachers who had previously taught at the secondary level. The only variable to show significance was presentation.

As in the previous finding, elementary teachers indicated a preference for a directive structure in numbers higher than were statistically expected (Expected frequency: 5.1, Actual count: 9). It was expected that 4.9 secondary teachers would choose a directive structure. Only 1 respondent chose this option.

These results corroborate the previous finding. The findings for both "grade level presently teaching" and "grade level taught

in past" would seem to indicate that elementary FSL teachers have a greater need for a directive structure of presentation than do secondary FSL teachers. It should be remembered, however, that the majority of elementary teachers indicated a preference for a collaborative structure of presentation.

Current Professional Development Activities

The results of the survey showed significance for one other teacher characteristic, teachers' current professional development. Data on current professional development activities was collected through six items:

- 1) Availability of PD activities
- 2) Groups currently addressed by PD activities
- 3) Responsibility for initiation of activities
- 4) Responsibility for coordination of activities
- 5) Frequency of PD activities
- 6) Attendance at PD activities

Significance was found for five of these six items when they were analyzed with teachers' preferences for structure. Of these 6 items, the item "groups addressed by PD activities" did not show any significant differences between categories. There were no significant differences observed between respondents whose professional development activities were addressed only to FSL teachers, and respondents whose activities were addressed to FSL and Immersion teachers.

The five remaining items to show significance when analyzed with governance variables will now be discussed.

Availability of Activities

Teachers were asked if there were professional development activities available to them within their school boards. Information from this item allowed for the division of teachers into two categories: teachers with PD opportunities, teachers without PD opportunities. Two governance variables showed significance through bi-variate analysis: coaching and evaluation. Tables 30 and 31 provide information on the distribution of teachers' preferences for coaching and evaluation according to the characteristic "availability of professional development activities".

Table 30
Availability of PD Activities by Preferences for Coaching

<u>Preferences for Coaching</u>				
(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Availability of PD Activities</u>				
Yes	18 16.8	60 56.1	23 28.1	101 80.2%
No	3 4.2	10 13.9	12 6.9	25 19.8%
Column Total	21 16.7%	70 55.6%	35 27.8%	126 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
6.35738	2	0.0416		

Number of Missing Observations = 4

From Table 30, it can be seen that a significant number of teachers, who presently have PD opportunities, preferred a non-directive structure for coaching in numbers that were lower than expected (Expected frequency: 28.1, Actual count: 23). A significant number of teachers, who have no opportunities for professional development, chose a non-directive structure for coaching (Expected frequency: 6.9, Actual count: 12).

Teachers, without professional development activities would appear to be more willing to assume responsibility for coaching, than teachers with professional development opportunities.

The only other variable to show significance with this characteristic was evaluation. The next table (Table 31) shows the results of bi-variate analysis of the teacher characteristic "availability of activities" and the governance variable "evaluation".

As can be seen in Table 31, teachers, who do not have opportunities for professional development, opted in significant number for a non-directive structure for evaluation (Expected frequency: 13, Actual count: 18). Teachers, who do have opportunities, chose a collaborative structure over a non-directive structure in significant number (Expected frequency: 47.4, Actual count: 53).

Table 31
Availability of Activities by Preferences for Evaluation

<u>Preference for Evaluation</u>				
(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Availability of Activities</u>				
Yes	1 1.6	53 47.4	48 53.0	102 80.3%
No	1 .4	6 11.6	18 13.0	25 19.7%
Column Total	2 1.6%	59 46.5%	66 52.0%	127 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u> 6.94496	<u>D.F.</u> 2	<u>Significance</u> 0.0310		

Number of Missing Observations = 3

These two findings would seem to indicate that teachers who have no professional development activities are more willing to accept responsibility for coaching and for evaluation, than teachers who have a professional development infrastructure.

Frequency of PD Activities

The next teacher characteristic to show significance was the variable "frequency of PD activities". This variable divided teachers into categories according to the frequency of activities within a school year. Two categories were identified: teachers with one or two PD activities a year, teachers with 3 or more activities a year. One governance variable showed significance: coaching. Table 32 presents the results of analysis of the variables "frequency of PD activities" and "coaching".

Table 32
Frequency of PD Activities by Preferences for Coaching

<u>(Count)</u> <u>(Expected Value)</u>	<u>Preferences for Coaching</u>			<u>Row</u> <u>Total</u>
	<u>Directive</u>	<u>Collaborative</u>	<u>Non-Directive</u>	
<u>Frequency of</u> <u>PD Activities</u>				
1 -2 Year	12 12.3	32 37.6	23 17.0	67 58.8%
3 or More/Years	9 8.7	32 26.4	6 12.0	47 41.2%
Column Total	21 18.4%	64 56.1%	29 25.4%	114 100.0%

<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>
7.10397	2	0.0287

Number of Missing Observations = 16

Teachers, who have more than three PD activities a year, chose a collaborative structure for coaching in numbers lower than were statistically expected (Expected frequency: 26.4, Actual count: 23). Teachers, who have only one or two activities a year, chose a non-directive structure in numbers greater than expected (Expected frequency: 17.0, Actual count: 32). This finding seems to corroborate the previous finding. Teachers, with little or no PD opportunities, would appear to be more willing to accept responsibility for coaching in a PD structure than teachers who have more frequent PD activities.

Current Needs Identification

Information on the current identification of needs in

professional development activities allowed for the division of respondents into two categories: teachers whose professional development needs are assumed and teachers whose professional development needs are expressed. Bi-variate analysis of this teacher characteristic and governance variables showed significance for two variables: coaching and evaluation.

Table 33 presents information on teachers' preferences for coaching.

Table 33
Current Needs Identification by Preferences for Coaching

<u>Preferences for Coaching</u>				
(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Needs Identification</u>				
Assumed Needs	6 6.2	14 19.5	17 11.3	37 51.4%
Expressed Needs	6 5.8	24 18.5	5 10.7	35 48.6%
Column Total	12 16.7%	38 52.8%	22 30.6%	72 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
9.12852	2	0.0104		

Number of Missing Observations = 58

Teachers, who currently express their needs in a PD structure, chose a collaborative structure for coaching in numbers greater than were statistically expected (Expected frequency: 18.5, Actual count: 24). Teachers, whose PD needs are

assumed, chose a non-directive structure in numbers that were statistically significant (Expected frequency: 11.3, Actual count: 17).

From this finding, it would appear that a significant number of teachers, who do not have a say in identifying their PD needs, would prefer more responsibility in this aspect of professional development.

Table 34 examines the same teacher characteristic, "current identification of needs", and the variable "evaluation".

Table 34
Current Needs Identification by Preferences for Evaluation

<u>Preferences for Evaluation</u>				
(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Needs Identification</u>				
Assumed Needs	0 .5	10 14.6	28 22.9	38 52.1%
Expressed Needs	1 .5	18 13.4	16 21.1	35 47.9%
Column Total	1 1.4%	28 38.4%	44 60.3%	73 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
6.44604	2	0.0398		

Number of Missing Observations = 57

Teachers, who currently express their professional development needs, chose a collaborative structure for evaluation in significant numbers (Expected frequency: 13.4, Actual count: 18). Teachers, whose needs are assumed, chose a non-directive structure in numbers that were significant (Expected frequency: 22.9, Actual count: 28).

This finding is consistent with the previous finding. Teachers, whose needs are assumed, have indicated a preference for more responsibility in certain aspects of their professional development. Teachers, whose PD needs are expressed, indicated a stronger preference for a collaborative structure.

Initiation of Current PD Activities

Information on the teacher characteristic "initiation of current PD activities" allowed for the creation of three categories of respondents:

- 1) teachers whose supervisor initiates professional development activities
- 2) teachers who work collaboratively with supervisors in initiating professional development activities
- 3) teachers who assume responsibility for initiating professional development activities

The results of bi-variate analysis showed significance for this characteristic and four governance variables. These four

variables were

- 1) choosing the priority of needs;
- 2) coordination;
- 3) presentation;
- 4) coaching.

The following tables present information on the teacher characteristic "current initiation of professional development activities" and these four variables. Table 35 presents information on "current initiation of PD" and teachers' preferences for choosing the priority of needs.

Table 35
Current Initiation by Preferences for Choosing
Priority of Needs

Preferences for Choosing Priority of Needs

(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Initiation Of PD Activities</u>				
Supervisor	3 3.7	49 44.8	19 22.4	71 62.3%
Teachers & Super	3 1.4	18 17.1	6 8.5	27 23.7%
Teachers	0 .8	5 10.1	11 5.1	16 14.0%
Column Total	6 5.3%	72 63.2%	36 31.6%	114 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
14.03025	4	0.0072		

Number of Missing Observations = 16

Teachers, who are currently involved in the initiation of their own professional development, expressed a preference for a non-directive structure in significant numbers (Expected frequency: 5.1, Actual count: 11). Teachers, whose professional development is initiated by a supervisor, chose a non-directive structure in numbers that were lower than expected (Expected frequency: 22.4, Actual count: 19). They chose a collaborative structure in numbers that were significant (Expected frequency: 44.8, Actual count: 49). This finding would seem to indicate that teachers, whose professional development is initiated by a supervisor, would prefer a collaborative structure and that teachers, who have had responsibility for initiating their own professional development, would prefer a non-directive structure.

Table 36 examines the same teacher characteristic "current initiation of activities" and the governance variable "coordination".

In Table 36, it can be seen that teachers, currently responsible for the initiation of their own professional development, chose a non-directive structure for coordination in numbers that were significant (Expected frequency: 1.5, Actual count: 5). They chose a directive structure for coordination in numbers lower than were expected (Expected frequency: 5.9, Actual count: 2).

Table 36
Current Initiation by Preferences for Coordination

(Count) (Expected Value)	<u>Preferences for Coordination</u>			Row Total
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	
<u>Current Initiation Of Activities</u>				
Supervisor	28 26.2	39 38.0	4 6.9	71 62.3%
Teachers & Super	12 9.9	13 14.4	2 2.6	27 23.7%
Teachers	2 5.9	9 8.6	5 1.5	16 14.0%
Column Total	42 36.8%	61 53.5%	11 9.6%	114 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
12.38485	4	0.0147		

Number of Missing Observations = 16

This finding would seem to indicate that teachers, who already have responsibility, for initiating their professional development activities, would prefer responsibility for coordination.

Table 37 presents information on the teacher characteristic "current initiation of activities" and the governance variable "presentation".

Table 37
Current Initiation of PD by Preferences for Presentation

(Count) (Expected Value)	<u>Preferences for Presentation</u>			Row Total
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	
<u>Current Initiation Of Activities</u>				
Supervisor	10 8.9	40 40.1	22 22.9	72 63.7%
Teachers & Super	4 3.2	18 14.5	4 8.3	26 23.0%
Teachers	0 1.9	5 8.4	10 4.8	15 13.3%
Column Total	14 12.4%	63 55.8%	36 31.9%	113 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
12.33518	4	0.0150		
Number of Missing Observations = 17				

Teachers, currently responsible for the initiation of their own professional development, again chose, in significant number, a non-directive structure (Expected frequency: 4.8, Actual count: 10). This finding is consistent with previous findings.

Table 38 table will look at the same teacher characteristic and teachers' preferences for coaching.

In Table 38 it can be seen that, teachers, currently responsible for the initiation of their own professional development, chose a non-directive structure for coaching in numbers that were significant (Expected frequency: 4.2, Actual

count: 8). Teachers, whose professional development is initiated by a supervisor, chose a structure that is directive in significant numbers (Expected frequency:11.9, Actual count: 17).

Table 38
Current Initiation of PD by Preferences for Coaching

<u>Preferences for Coaching</u>				
(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Initiation Of Activities</u>				
Supervisor	17 11.9	40 41.3	15 18.8	72 62.6%
Teachers & Super	2 4.5	18 15.5	7 7.0	27 23.5%
Teachers	0 2.6	8 9.2	8 4.2	16 13.9%
Column Total	19 16.5%	66 57.4%	30 26.1%	115 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
11.05989	4	0.0259		

Number of Missing Observations = 15

This finding is consistent with previous findings.

A trend can be seen across the bi-variate analysis of the teacher characteristic "current responsibility for initiation of professional development activities" and governance variables. Four variables showed significance. For all four of these variables, it was seen that a significant number of teachers, who

have responsibility for initiating their own professional development, preferred a non-directive structure of professional development. For two variables, it was seen that a significant number of teachers, whose professional development is initiated by a supervisor, chose a directive structure. This finding will be further discussed at the end of this section.

Current Responsibility for Coordination

The information collected for the teacher characteristic "current responsibility for coordination" allowed for the creation of three categories. Teachers whose current professional development activities were coordinated

- 1) by supervisors;
- 2) by teachers and supervisors;
- 3) by teachers themselves.

Four governance variables showed significant differences between categories. These were

- 1) choosing the priority of needs;
- 2) coordination;
- 3) presentation;
- 4) coaching.

Table 39 presents the results of bi-variate analysis of "current degree of responsibility in coordination" and teachers' preferences for the variable "choosing the priority of needs".

Table 39
Responsibility for Coordination by Preferences for
Choosing Priority of Needs

(Count) (Expected Value)	<u>Preferences for Choosing Priority of Needs</u>			Row Total
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	
<u>Current Responsibility For Coordination</u>				
Supervisor	5	45	11	20
	3.2	38.4	19.5	52.6%
Teachers with Super Guidance	1	19	15	35
	1.8	22.0	11.2	30.2%
Teachers	0	9	11	20
	1.0	12.6	6.4	17.2%
Column Total	6	73	37	116
	5.2%	62.9%	31.9%	100.0%

Chi-Square D.F. Significance

13.39315 4 0.0095

Number of Missing Observations = 14

A significant number of teachers, who already have responsibility for coordination of their professional development activities, chose a non-directive structure for prioritizing professional development needs (Expected frequency: 6.4, Actual count: 11). A significant number of teachers, who have worked collaboratively with a supervisor in coordinating professional development, also chose a non-directive structure (Expected frequency: 11.2, Actual count: 15). Teachers, whose professional development is coordinated by a supervisor, chose a directive structure in greater numbers than were statistically expected (Expected frequency: 3.2, Actual count: 5). These teachers also

chose a non-directive structure in numbers lower than expected (Expected frequency: 19.5, Actual count: 11).

This finding would seem to indicate a link between teachers' previous degree of responsibility in professional development and their preferences for structure in choosing the priority of professional development needs.

Table 40 presents results of the analysis of the same teacher characteristic and the governance variable: coordination.

As can be seen in Table 40, teachers, who already have responsibility for coordination of their professional development activities, chose a non-directive structure for coordination in significant number (Expected frequency: 2.1, Actual count: 8). Teachers, who have worked collaboratively with a supervisor, chose a collaborative structure in greater numbers than were statistically expected (Expected frequency: 18.7, Actual count: 23). Teachers, whose professional development is coordinated by a supervisor, chose a directive structure in greater numbers than were statistically expected (Expected frequency: 22.1, Actual count: 32). These teachers chose a non-directive structure in numbers lower than were expected (Expected frequency: 6.3, Actual count: 1).

Table 40
Responsibility for Coordination by Preferences for Coordination
Preferences for Coordination

(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Responsibility For Coordination</u>				
Supervisor	32 22.1	28 32.6	1 6.3	61 52.6%
Teachers with Super Guidance	9 12.7	23 18.7	3 3.6	35 30.2%
Teachers	1 7.2	11 10.7	8 2.1	20 17.2%
Column Total	42 36.2%	62 53.4%	12 10.3%	116 100.0%

Chi-Square D.F. Significance

34.11545 4 0.0000

Number of Missing Observations = 14

This finding is consistent with other findings, which seem to indicate that current degree of responsibility in professional development is a factor possibly influencing teachers' preferences for structure.

Table 41 presents the results of analysis of the same teacher characteristic and preferences for presentation.

Teachers, who already have responsibility for coordination of their professional development activities, chose a non-directive structure of coordination in numbers that were significant (Expected frequency: 5.8, Actual count: 10).

Teachers, whose professional development activities are coordinated by a supervisor, chose a directive structure in greater numbers than were expected (Expected frequency: 7.4, Actual count: 12). This finding is consistent with previous findings for analysis of teachers' degree of responsibility in coordination of current professional development activities and their preferences for structure.

Table 41
Responsibility for Coordination by Preferences for Presentation

<u>Preferences for Presentation</u>				
(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Responsibility For Coordination</u>				
Supervisor	12 7.4	31 33.2	17 19.5	60 52.6%
Teachers with Super Guidance	2 4.4	24 19.9	10 11.7	36 31.6%
Teachers	0 2.2	8 9.9	10 5.8	18 15.8%
Column Total	14 12.3%	63 55.3%	37 32.5%	114 100.0%
<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>		
11.33261	4	0.0231		

Number of Missing Observations = 16

Table 42 looks at this same teacher characteristic and the governance variable: coordination.

Table 42
Responsibility for Coordination by Preferences for Coaching

Preferences for Coaching

(Count) (Expected Value)	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Row Total
<u>Current Responsibility For Coordination</u>				
Supervisor	15 10.9	38 34.4	8 15.6	36 52.1%
Teachers with Super Guidance	6 6.5	20 20.3	10 9.2	36 30.8%
Teachers	0 3.6	8 11.3	12 5.1	20 17.1%
Column Total	21 17.9%	66 56.4%	30 25.6%	117 100.0%

Chi-Square D.F. Significance

19.46085 4 0.0006

Number of Missing Observations = 13

Teachers, who already have responsibility for coordination of their professional development activities, chose a non-directive structure for coaching in significant number (Expected frequency: 5.1, Actual count: 12). Teachers, whose activities are coordinated by a supervisor, chose a directive structure in significant number (Expected frequency: 10.9, Actual count: 15).

This finding is consistent with previous findings on teachers' current degree of responsibility in coordination and their preferences for structure in professional development.

Attendance at PD Activities

Information collected on the teacher characteristic "PD attendance" allowed for the creation of three categories: teachers whose attendance at activities is optional, teachers whose attendance at activities is encouraged, and teachers whose attendance at activities is monitored. One governance variable showed significant differences between categories: choosing the priority of professional development needs.

Table 43 presents the results of the analysis of the teacher characteristic "attendance at current PD activities" and the governance variable "choosing the priority of needs".

Table 43
Attendance at Activities by Preferences for Choosing Priorities

(Count) (Expected Value)	<u>Preferences for Choosing Priorities</u>			Row
	Directive	Collaborative	Non-Directive	Total
<u>Attendance at Activities</u>				
	4	23	20	47
Optional	2.1	29.1	15.8	42.7%
	0	41	16	57
Encouraged	2.6	35.2	19.2	51.8%
	1	4	1	6
Monitored	.3	3.7	2.0	5.5%
Column	5	68	37	110
Total	4.5%	61.8%	33.6%	100.0%

<u>Chi-Square</u>	<u>D.F.</u>	<u>Significance</u>
10,53297	4	0.0323

Number of Missing Observations = 20

Teachers, whose attendance at activities is optional, preferred a non-directive structure for prioritizing needs in numbers that were significant (Expected frequency: 15.8, Actual count: 20). This finding will not be kept for further discussion. It is felt that there are too many small cells in this contingency table. Five out of nine cells have a minimum expected frequency of less than five, producing results that could be affected.

Discussion of Analysis of Teacher Characteristics And Teacher Preferences for Structure and Content

The second purpose of the study was to examine teacher characteristics possibly influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content. It was hypothesized that:

There will be no significant differences observed between teacher characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

From the results of the study, this null hypothesis cannot be rejected when teachers' preferences for content are tested. There were no significant differences observed between teachers' characteristics and their preferences for content in professional development.

When teachers' preferences for structure in professional development were analyzed with teacher characteristics, two characteristics showed significance. These were "level taught by

teachers" and "current professional development activities". While the null hypothesis stated above cannot be rejected for eleven of the thirteen teacher characteristics identified by this study, it can be rejected for the characteristics "level taught" and "current professional development activities".

"Level taught" refers to whether respondents teach FSL at the elementary or the secondary level. Information was collected on the level teachers were presently teaching and the level they have taught in the past. Of the eleven governance and relevance variables analyzed through this teacher characteristic, only one variable showed significant differences between categories. This was presentation. It would appear that elementary teachers feel a greater need for a directive structure of presentation than do secondary teachers. It should be noted, however, that the majority of both elementary and secondary teachers chose a collaborative structure of presentation.

The other characteristic to show significance was "current professional development activities". This characteristic actually groups together six different aspects of professional development. All six of these aspects showed significant differences between categories established through this characteristic and teachers' preferences for structure. Table 44 presents an overview of teacher characteristics showing significance through bi-variate analysis with teachers'

preferences for structure. (Teacher characteristics are presented in the first column. Governance variables showing significance when analyzed with this teacher characteristic are presented in the second column.)

Table 44

Summary of Results of Bi-variate Analysis

<u>Teacher Characteristics</u>	<u>Governance Variables</u>
1) Level Taught	Presentation
2) Current Professional Development	
Availability of Activities	Coaching Evaluation
Frequency of Activities	Coaching
Identification of Needs	Coaching Evaluation
Initiation of Activities	Priority of Needs Presentation Coordination Coaching
Responsibility for Coordination	Priority of Needs Coordination Presentation Coaching
Attendance at Activities	Priority of Needs

To summarize the findings of this section, it was found that:

1) A significant number of elementary teachers preferred a directive structure of presentation. A significant number of secondary teachers preferred a collaborative structure. This finding was consistent when grade level presently teaching and grade level taught in the past were examined.

2) The results of analysis of current professional development revealed two patterns. A significant number of teachers, who have little or no professional development activities, indicated a preference for a non-directive structure for some aspects of professional development. This was observed in the case of teachers with no professional development activities: a significant number preferred a non-directive structure for coaching and evaluation. It was also observed in the case of teachers with only one or two professional development activities a year: a significant number preferred a non-directive structure for coaching.

The other pattern to be revealed shows a possible link between teachers' current degree of responsibility in professional development activities and preferences for structure. Three characteristics collected information on teachers' current degree of responsibility:

- 1) Identification of professional development needs
- 2) Initiation of professional development activities
- 3) Coordination of professional development activities

Three possible roles in current professional development were used to create categories. These were

- 1) responsibility lies with a supervisor;
- 2) responsibility is shared between a supervisor and teachers;
- 3) responsibility lies with teachers.

It would appear that a significant number of teachers that already have a high degree of responsibility for their current professional development would prefer a non-directive structure. Teachers with a low degree of responsibility in their current professional development would appear to prefer a directive structure.

Other teacher characteristics did not show significant differences between categories. This does not eliminate the possibility that they are indirectly influencing teachers choices. This will be discussed in the following chapter, as will be the implications of the results of bi-variate analysis and descriptive analysis.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

Chapter Five will present a brief overview of the research problem and methodology. A summary of findings will then be presented, followed by the conclusions drawn from the findings, and their implications for theory and practice.

Research Problem and Research Methods

Two theories propose a developmental framework for teacher education. Conceptual Systems theory proposes that individual differences among adults are a function of one's conceptual system. Development, within this theory, is described in terms of increasing complexity in handling information and increasing self-responsibility (Hunt, 1974). Stages of Concern theory is based on the assumption that teachers' concerns change as they acquire experience (Fuller, 1970).

Both theories describe lower levels of development as being characterized by "practical", concrete concerns and a need for direction from a supervisory figure. Higher levels of development are characterized by greater self-responsibility and more complex concerns. It is hypothesized that teachers' levels of development will be reflected in the content that they consider relevant and in their need for responsibility. Guidelines and a framework for teacher education have been

proposed using these assumptions from developmental theory as a foundation (Santmire, 1979).

It is suggested that professional development programs need to provide a range of learning environments and a range of content and activities that will accommodate the developmental levels of participating teachers. Professional development programs should provide a highly structured learning environment with practical content for teachers at lower levels of development. The learning environment should be loosely structured with more complex content for teachers at higher levels. Suggestions are given for the content and learning environment for the four levels of development.

Research on Conceptual Systems theory has shown that the majority of teachers are at lower levels of conceptual development. When this finding is applied to the professional development guidelines suggested by Santmire, it can be expected that the majority of teachers will prefer a directive structure of professional development and content that addresses practical concrete concerns.

Based on the guidelines for professional development (proposed by interpretations of developmental theories), a survey instrument was designed to collect information on FSL (French as a Second Language) teachers' preferences for structure and

content in professional development. The first purpose of the study was to examine how FSL teachers perceived structure and content in professional development. The following research questions were posed:

- 1) Do teachers have varied preferences for decision-making roles in professional development? Do the majority of FSL teachers prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making with a supervisory figure?
- 2) Do teachers have varied preferences for content and type of professional development activity? Do the majority prefer practical concrete content?

The framework for professional development proposed by developmental theory is based on the assumption that teachers' preferences for responsibility and content are dictated by their level of development. The intent of this study was to examine teacher characteristics, other than their developmental level, possibly influencing teachers' preferences. The following research question was posed:

- 3) Are there teacher characteristics, specific to the FSL teaching context, that are possibly influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development programs?

This research question was examined through a test of the following hypothesis:

There will be no significant differences observed between teacher characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

To examine these research questions, data was collected from a survey instrument. One hundred and thirty two teachers from twelve school districts in British Columbia responded to the survey.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Teachers' Preferences for Structure

To collect information on teachers' preferences for structure in professional development, six variables examining decision-making roles were identified. For each of these six variables, teachers were asked to indicate a preference for the following structures:

- 1) A directive structure (responsibility lies with a supervisor)
- 2) A collaborative structure (responsibility is shared between teachers and a supervisor)
- 3) A non-directive structure (teachers assume responsibility while receiving support and information from a supervisor)

The results of the study showed that not all teachers have the same preferences for responsibility in decision-making roles. However, for all six decision-making variables, the majority of

teachers preferred a collaborative structure (percentages ranged from 46.5% to 62.2% across the six variables).

For four of the six variables (needs identification, choosing the priority of needs, presentation and coaching), a pattern in teachers' preferences can be observed. Two variables do not fit into this pattern: coordination and evaluation.

Evaluation of the impact of professional development was one decision-making role that teachers felt they could assume. For this variable, a large percentage of teachers (51.9%) opted for a non-directive structure. Only 1.6% of respondents chose a directive structure for this variable.

Coordination was the one aspect of professional development that teachers seemed the least willing to assume. For this variable only, a large group indicated a preference for a directive structure (37.8%). Only 9.4% chose a non-directive structure.

If these two variables are excluded from interpretation, a clear pattern can be observed in the distribution of teachers' preferences. As previously stated, the majority of teachers prefer a collaborative structure (between 56.0% and 62.2% for the four remaining variables). Roughly a third of respondents preferred a non-directive structure (percentages ranged from

27.3% to 33.6%). Only a small group preferred a directive structure (percentages range from 5.5% to 16.4%).

The variation found in teachers' preferences for decision-making roles supports one of the guidelines for professional development proposed by developmental theory. A professional development program should be designed to allow for different degrees of responsibility in decision-making.

In a developmental framework for professional development, it is assumed that the majority of teachers will prefer a directive structure, leaving responsibility with a supervisor. The findings from this study do not support this assumption. For all decision-making roles, the majority of respondents indicated a preference for a collaborative structure.

To summarize, the findings showed that

- 1) teachers do have different preferences for decision-making roles;
- 2) teachers do not prefer to leave responsibility for decision-making to a supervisor. The majority indicated a preference for a collaborative structure.

Teachers' Preferences for Content

To collect information on teachers' preferences for content and types of activities in professional development, five

variables were identified. For each of these five variables, teachers were asked to indicate a preference for options which reflected lower level and higher level concerns. Four variables were kept for discussion. One variable was rejected because of a possible bias in the wording of the item.

The results of the study showed that teachers' preferences for content were distributed across options. Teachers did not express a clear preference for either low level or high level content.

This finding supports one guideline for professional development proposed by developmental theory. Teachers have different concerns that are reflected in what they consider relevant within a professional development program and how they will prefer content to be presented.

In a developmental framework for professional development, it is expected that the majority of teachers, being at lower levels of development, will prefer content and activities aimed at lower level concerns. This study does not support this assumption. While there is a variation in the content and type of activity that teachers prefer, responses were distributed across options and were not concentrated in options linked to lower level concerns.

To summarize, the study showed that

- 1) teachers do have different preferences for content and type of activity in a professional development program;
- 2) teachers did not indicate a preference for lower level content and presentation options.

Teacher Characteristics and Teachers Preferences

The second purpose of the study was to examine characteristics specific to the FSL teaching context that might be influencing teachers' preferences. The following hypothesis was tested:

There will be no significant differences observed between teachers' characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure and content in professional development.

The results of the study showed no significant differences between teachers' characteristics and teachers' preferences for content in professional development. The study did show significant differences between certain teacher characteristics and teachers' preferences for structure in professional development. Of thirteen teacher characteristics examined, two showed significant differences:

- 1) Grade level taught by FSL teachers (either elementary or secondary)
- 2) Current professional development opportunities

Grade Level

There were six decision-making variables in the study. Only one variable, presentation, showed significant differences when analyzed with the teacher characteristic "current teaching level". Elementary teachers indicated a significant preference for a directive structure. Secondary teachers indicated a significant preference for a collaborative structure. A very similar result was found when the teacher characteristic "level taught in the past" was examined.

It should be noted that some elementary FSL teachers are teaching French at the request of their school boards, with little or no specialized training. This might be the factor underlying this difference between elementary and secondary teachers.

It should also be noted that while an important number of elementary teachers preferred a directive structure of presentation, the majority preferred a collaborative structure. However, the need for a more directive structure of presentation for some elementary FSL teachers should be considered.

The teaching level of teachers did not seem to be a factor in any of the other variables analyzed.

Current Professional Development Activities

Six items collected data on teachers' current professional development activities. Five of these six items showed significant differences when analyzed with decision-making variables.

For ease of discussion, the characteristics of current professional development are divided into two groups:

- 1) Frequency of professional development activities
- 2) Degree of responsibility in current professional development

Frequency of Activities

The results of the study showed significant differences between teachers who have opportunities for professional development and teachers who have no opportunities. Two decision-making variables, coaching and evaluation, showed significance. For these two variables, teachers who have no professional development in their school districts, indicated a preference for a non-directive structure in numbers greater than were expected.

Significance was also found between the frequency of professional development activities and teachers' preferences for coaching. Teachers, who only have one or two professional activities a year, indicated a significant preference for a non-directive structure.

These findings suggest that teachers, who have little or no professional activities available to them in their school districts, would be willing to assume a greater degree of responsibility for some aspects of PD than teachers who have a professional development infrastructure.

Degree of Responsibility in Current Professional Development

Analysis of teachers' current degree of responsibility in professional development and their preferences for professional development yielded interesting findings. There would appear to be a link between these two variables. Teachers, who already have a high degree of responsibility, indicated a preference for non-directive structures of professional development. Teachers, who have a low degree of responsibility in their current activities, indicated a preference for directive structures of professional development. This finding was consistent over nine tests for significance.

It would appear that teachers that have had previous responsibility for decision-making in professional development preferred a non-directive structure in greater numbers than were statistically expected.

Implications of Study for Practice

The findings for this study support some of the assumptions of a developmental approach to professional development and not

others. Developmental theory assumes that teachers are at different developmental levels, and that this is reflected in their need for responsibility and in their capacity to handle complex information. In a description of implications for training, Santmire (1979) proposed a professional developmental framework that could accommodate the developmental levels of participating teachers by providing a range of learning environments and content. The results from this study would support such an approach to the professional development of FSL teachers.

Some research in developmental theory has shown that the majority of teachers are at lower conceptual levels. If this finding is applied to developmental frameworks for professional development, it could be expected that the majority of teachers would prefer a directive structure and practical content in their professional development programs. The results of this study do not support this assumption.

While a professional development structure should attempt to accommodate the needs of some teachers for more direction and the needs of other teachers for more autonomy and responsibility, the study showed that the majority of teachers prefer a collaborative structure of decision-making. This would appear to be the appropriate building stone for an approach to professional development.

The study did not support the assumption that the majority of teachers will prefer practical and concrete content. Teachers' preferences for content were divided between the different content options suggested. A professional development structure should accommodate teachers' needs for content. The findings do not indicate a need for a professional development structure that meets mainly lower level concerns.

It is important to recall that one of the primary objectives of developmental approaches to education is to encourage growth from an individual's current level of development to higher levels. Developmental theory is based on the notion that while growth is spurred from within, it relies on stimulus provided by the environment. It is believed that the learning environment can encourage or discourage growth. A developmental approach to teacher education is founded on these notions. Teachers' current level of development must be addressed, but at the same time, the learning environment and content should stimulate growth to the next level of development.

One finding from this study supports these developmental assumptions. When teacher characteristics were examined as factors possibly influencing teachers' preferences for structure and content, one category of characteristics showed significance: teachers' current professional development activities.

One of the conclusions drawn from this finding was that the degree of responsibility currently experienced by teachers would seem to influence their preferences for responsibility. A significant number of teachers, who have no responsibility for current professional development programs, chose a directive structure. A significant number of teachers who have a high degree of responsibility in current professional development programs chose a non-directive structure. This finding would support the developmental assumption that behaviour is the result of interaction between the individual and the environment.

While it is not possible to produce growth within the individual, it is possible to create a learning environment that stimulates growth. Giving teachers greater responsibility for decision-making in their own professional development would seem to be one way of stimulating growth.

The study also showed that a significant number of elementary teachers feel the need for a more directive structure of presentation. This supports an assumption of this study, that characteristics other than conceptual level may be influencing teachers' preferences. The confidence, or lack of confidence, of some FSL teachers in their linguistic competence or training should be taken into consideration by those organizing the professional development of elementary FSL teachers.

There is a risk inherent to the adoption of a developmental approach to professional development. When using a developmental framework to understand teachers' concerns and needs, it should be remembered that individuals are more complex than the descriptions provided by one or more developmental theories. Hunt's caution should be kept in mind at all times:

"Conceptual level as a single variable, provides an incomplete description of the individual and needs to be considered as one part of the whole (Hunt, 1983, p.8)".

Implication of the Study for Further Research

Previous research (Harvey et al., 1968, Murphy and Brown, 1970) reported that the majority of teachers were at the lower levels of conceptual development. It can be assumed from there that the majority of teachers will prefer a directive form of professional development and practical content. The findings from this study clearly did not support such an assumption. One recent study (Konke, 1983) showed that teachers express a strong degree of interest in assuming their professional growth. The study would support such a finding.

Another assumption that is sometimes found in developmental theory is that stage of development is the determining factor in teachers preferences for structure and content. This study cannot disprove this assumption but it has shown that further investigation of teacher characteristics is called for, before such a conclusion can be made. Teacher characteristics that

showed a significant relationship with teachers' preferences were the following:

- 1) Level taught
- 2) Current professional development activities

A pattern was found across items collecting data on teachers' current professional development activities and teachers' preferences for structure. The pattern was strong enough to indicate to both practitioners and researchers alike a need for further investigation. Teachers' environment within a professional development context needs to be explored and more research that looks specifically at Lewin's B-P-E formula (behaviour = function of the person and the environment) is called for.

These factors will require more precise research. Some of the assumptions of developmental theory should be treated with caution by practitioners until this research has lead to more conclusive statements.

From what has been learnt from this study, it can be concluded that further research into the application of developmental theories to teacher education would be useful. More research will be needed

- 1) in actual professional development contexts;
- 2) linking teachers' preferences for professional development

structure and content more clearly to teacher characteristics;

- 3) linking teachers' preferences for professional development to their stages of development, as defined by the developmental theories of Hunt, Hall and Fuller.

The effect of actual professional development context (environment) on stimulating the professional growth and developmental growth of teachers would seem the most promising area for further investigation. The importance of environment is the one variable to show a pattern of significant differences between groups of teachers.

The importance of further exploring teacher characteristics of the FSL teaching context is still felt to be valid. It should be remembered that developmental theory singles out certain characteristics of development and change, and ignores others. Its intention is to provide a means of better understanding human growth.

"The adoption of a developmental approach entails a particular strategy for selecting and describing focal changes. Thus it provides a way of isolating a few of the myriad changes that occur, presenting an incomplete picture of change that makes the isolated changes more comprehensible." (Floden and Feiman, 1981, p.5)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alatis, James E., Stern, H.H. and Strevens, Peter (eds.). Gurt'83: Applied Linguistics and the Preparation of Second Language Teachers: Towards a Rationale. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 1983.
- Andrews, Frank M., Klem, Laura, Davidson, Terrence N., O'Malley, Patrick and Rodgers, William L. A Guide For Selecting Statistical Techniques For Analyzing Social Science Data. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1981.
- Andrews, T.E. Editorial. CBTE Newsletter, February, 1983. p.8.
- Arends, Richard, Hersch, Richard, and Turner, Jack. Conditions for Promoting Effective Staff Development. Washington, D.C.: Eric Clearinghouse On Teacher Education, 1980.
- Arends, Richard. Concepts for Guiding Responsive Inservice Education in the Schools. (Responsive Inservice Education Series, Volume 2). Eugene, Or.: Teacher Corps Youth Advocacy Project, 1980.
- Bentzen, M.M. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principle. New York: McGraw Hill, 1974.
- Bergeron, Jocelyne. "Pour un plan cohérent de formation en cours de service." In Boucher, Anne-Marie, Duplantie Monique and Leblanc, Raymond (eds.). Propos sur la pédagogie de la communication en langues secondes. Qué.: Centre Educatif et Culturel et CEPCEL, 1986.
- Berman, Barbara and Friedewitzer, Fredda. "A Pragmatic Approach to Inservice Education." Action in Teacher Education, 3, 1, 1981. pp.51-58.
- Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. "Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change." Vol. Vlll: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Santa Monica, Calif.: The Rand Corporation, 1978.
- Bilenki, Judy, Carter, Jeff, Deniset, Rachel, Druwé, Simone, Fluette, Claire, Lentz, François, Maurice, Lucille, Rosset, Gilbert, Sotiriadis, Caterina et Toupin, Lynne. "Le renouveau curriculaire: vecteur pour la formation continue des enseignants." Contact. 5, 2, 1986. pp.8-10.
- Borg, Walter R. and Gall, Meredith D. Educational Research: An Introduction. (Fourth Edition) New York: Longman, 1983.

- Boyer, Joan and Booth, Joyce. "Preparation of Teachers of/in French at the University of Saskatchewan." Canadian Modern Language Review, 41, 5, 1985. pp. 917-927.
- Britten, Donald. "Teacher Training in ELT." Language Teaching, 18, (2 and 3), April and July, 1985.
- Brumfit, Christopher and Rossner, R. "The Decision Pyramid and Teacher Training for ELT." English Language Teaching Journal, 36, 4, July, 1982. pp.226-231.
- Brundage, Donald H. and MacKeracher, Dorothy. Adult Learning Principles and Their Application to Program Planning. Toronto, Ontario: Ministry of Education, 1980.
- Burden, Paul R. "Implications of Teacher Career Development: New Roles for Teachers, Administrators, and Professors." Paper presented at the National Summer Workshop of the Association of Teacher Educators, Slippery Rock, Pa., August, 1982. 12p. (ED 223 609)
- Burrello, Leonard C. and Orbaugh, Tim. "Reducing the Discrepancy between the Known and the Unknown." Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 6, February, 1982. pp.385-388.
- Caldwell, Sarah D. and Marshall, Jon C. "Staff Development - Four Approaches Described, Assessed for Practitioner, Theoretician." NAASP Bulletin, 66, 51, February, 1982. pp.25-35.
- Calvé, Pierre. "Les programmes de base: des principes a la réalité." Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. pp. 263-287.
- Carrière, Raymond E. A Second Language Inservice Model for Small School Districts. Vancouver, B.C.: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1980.
- CASLT National Survey of the Professional Development of Core French Teachers. Mimeographed report, Dr.R.Roy, Language Education, University of British Columbia, 1987.
- Chickering, A.K. "The Educational Needs of New Learners: Implications for Liberal Arts Colleges." Paper presented at the East Central Colleges Consortium Conference on the New Learners, December, 1974.
- Christensen, Judith et al. Stages of Teachers' Careers: Implications for Professional Development. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, February, 1983. (ED 227 054)

- Clark, John L. "Curriculum Renewal in Second Language Learning: An Overview." Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. pp.342-360.
- Corrigan, D., Haberman, M., and Howey, K. Adult Learning and Development: Implications for Inservice Teacher Education. Paris: Centre for Educational Research and Innovation (Project on Inservice Education and Training for Teachers), 1979.
- Dewey, J. Experience and Education. New York: Collier, 1963.
- Dillon-Peterson, Betty (ed.). Staff Development/Organizational Development. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.
- Edelfelt, R.A. Inservice Education: Criteria for and Examples of Local Programs. Bellingham, Western Washington University, 1977.
- Edelfelt, R.A. In-service Teacher Education: Sources in the ERIC System. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse On Teacher Education, 1975.
- Elifson, Kirk W., Punyon Richard P. and Haber, Audrey. Fundamentals of Social Statistics. Don Mills, Ont.: Addison Wesley, 1982.
- Emrick, John A. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network: Study Design and Analysis Plan. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (Department of Health, Education and Welfare), 1976. (ED 152 808)
- Ewert, D.M. "Involving Adult Learners in Program Planning." In Merriam, S.B. (ed.). New Directions for Continuing Education linking Philosophy and Practice. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., 1982.
- Feiman, Sharon and Floden, Robert E. "A Consumer's Guide to Teacher Development." East Lansing: Michigan Institute for Research on Teaching (College of Education, Michigan State University), July, 1981. 36p. (ED 207 970)
- Floden, Robert E. and Feiman, Sharon. "A Developmental Approach to the Study of Teacher Change: What's to be Gained?" East Lansing: Michigan Institute for Research on Teaching (Michigan State University), February, 1981. 32p. (ED 204 342)

- Freiberg, H. Jerome, Buckley, Pamela, K. and Townsend, Karen S. (n.d.) "Does Inservice Make a Difference?" Unpublished manuscript.
- Fullan, M. The Meaning of Educational Change. Toronto, Ont.: OISE Press, 1982.
- Fullan, M. CERI Project on the Inservice Education and Training (INSET) for Teachers. Area 2: The Canadian Experience. Paris: Centre for Educational REsearch and Innovation, 1981.
- Fullan, M. "Overview of the Innovative Process and the User." Interchange, 3, 2-3, 1972. p.1-68.
- Fullan, M. School-focused In-Service Education in Canada. Toronto, Ont.: Prepared for CERI (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation) OECD Project on Inservice Education for Teachers. 1979.
- Fullan M. and Pomfret, A. "Research on Curriculum and Instruction Implementation." Review of Research, 47, 1, Winter, 1977. pp.335-397.
- Fuller, F.F. "Concerns of Teachers: A Developmental Conceptualization." American Educational Research Journal, 6, 2, 1969. pp.207-226.
- Gleave, Doug. Staff Development Propositions. Saskatoon, Sask.: Saskatoon Board of Education, 1981.
- Glickman, Carl. Developmental Supervision: Alternative Practices for Helping Teachers to Improve Instruction. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.
- Goddu, Roland. "Pursuing Continuing Education as a Foreign Language Teacher: An Overview." In Jarvis, Gilbert (Ed.). An Integrative Approach to Foreign Language Teaching: Choosing Among the Options. The ACTFL Review of Foreign Language Education, Vol.8. Skokie, Ill.: National Textbook Co., 1976.
- Griffin, Gary A. Staff Development. Paper presented for the NIE Teaching Synthesis Conference. Airlie House, Va., 1982.
- Hall, G. and Loucks, S. "Innovations Configurations: Analyzing the Adaptations of Innovations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, 1978.
- Harvey, O.J. Hunt, D.E. and Schroder, H.M. Conceptual Systems and Personality Organization. New York: John Wiley, 1961.

- Heffernan, Peter J. "A French Inservice Program for Regular Elementary Classroom Teachers." Newfoundland Teachers Association Journal, 68, 2, 1978-79. pp.31-33.
- Howey, Kenneth and Joyce, Bruce. "A Data Base for Future Directions in Inservice Education." Theory Into Practice, 27, 3, 1978. pp.206-211.
- Hunt, D.E. and Joyce, B.R. "Teacher Trainee Personality and Initial Teaching Style." American Educational Research Journal, 4, 1967. pp.253-259.
- Hunt, D. and Sullivan, E. Between Psychology and Education. Hinsdale, Ill.: Dryden, 1974.
- Hutson, Harry M. "Inservice Best Practices: The Learnings of General Education." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 14, 2, 1981. pp.1-10.
- Hamburger, V. "The Concept of 'Development' in Biology." In D.B. Harris (Ed.) The Concept of Development: An Issue in the Study of Human Behaviour. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.
- Hamlyn, D.W. "The Concept of Development." Proceedings of the Philosophy of Education Society of Great Britain, 9, 1975. pp.26-39.
- Haroutinian, S. "Piaget: Adaptation and Equilibration." Harvard Educational Review, 49, 1979. pp.93-100.
- Hunt, David E. "A Conceptual Level Matching Model For Coordinating Learner Characteristics with Educational Approaches." Interchange, 1, 3, 1970. pp.68-82.
- Hunt, David E., Joyce, Bruce K., Greenwood, JoAnn, Noy, E. Joyce, Reid, Roma, and Weil, Marsha. "Student Conceptual Level and Models of Teaching: Theoretical and Empirical Coordination of Two Models." Interchange, 5, 3, 1974. pp.19-30.
- Hunt, D. and Sullivan, E. Between Psychology and Education. New York: Dryden Press, 1974.
- Inservice Education. Practical Applications of Research: Newsletter of Phi Delta Kappa's Center on Evaluation, Development, and Research, 5, 3, March, 1983. pp.1-4.
- Joliffe, F. R. Survey Design and Analysis. New York: Ellis Horwood, 1986.

- Joyce, B. In-service: New Perspectives on an Old Term. Paper presented at a conference held at Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, B.C., 1979.
- Joyce, Bruce R., Brown, Clark C. and Peck, Lucy (Eds.). An Excursion into the Nature of Teaching and Training. New York: Longman Inc., 1981.
- Joyce, Bruce, Hersch, Richard, and McKibbin, M. The Structure of School Improvement. New York: Longman, 1983.
- Joyce, B., Howey K., and Yarger, S. Issues to Face. Report One: In Service Teacher Education. Palo Alto, California: Education Research and Development Center, 1976.
- Joyce, Bruce and Showers, Beverly. "Improving Inservice Training; The Messages of Research." Educational Research, 37, 5, February, 1984. pp.379-384.
- Keirnes-Young, Barbara. Staff Development: A Position Paper. Eugene, Or.: Eugene School District 4J, 1981.
- Keirnes-Young, Barbara. In-Service Education. Presentation at Curriculum and Instruction Review, Fort San, Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan, June, 1983.
- Klopf, G. Needs of Adult Learners. Position Paper, 1979.
- Knowles, M. The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species. Houston: Gulf, 1978.
- Korinek, Lore and Schmid, Rex. "Inservice Types and Best Practices." Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18, 2, 1985.
- Krashen, Stephen D. Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. New York: Pergamon Institute of English Press, 1982.
- Kohlberg, L. "The Claim to Moral Adequacy of a Highest Stage of Moral Judgement." Journal of Philosophy, 70, 1973. pp.630-646.
- Kohlberg, L. "Moral development, Ego Development, and Psychoeducational Practices." In G.D. Miller (Ed.) Developmental Theory and its Application in Guidance Programs: Systemic Efforts to Promote Personal Growth. Special Issue Pupil Personnel Services Journal, 6, 1, 1977.

- Kohlberg, L. "Stage and Sequence: The Cognitive-Developmental Approach to Socialization." In D.A. Goslin (Ed.) Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.
- Kohlberg L. and Mayer R. "Development as the Aim of Education." Harvard Educational Review, 42, 1972. pp.449-496.
- Kuhn, D. "The Application of Piaget's Theory of Cognitive Development to Education." Harvard Educational Review, 49, 1979. pp.340-360.
- Kuhn, D., Langer J., Kohlberg, L., and Haan N. The Development of Formal Operational Thought: Its Relation to Moral Judgment. Unpublished Mimeograph Cambridge, 1971.
- Lai, Calvin. UBC SPSSX: Statistical Package for Social Sciences Extended Version 2.0 (MTS). Vancouver: University of British Columbia, 1986.
- Lamarre, Patricia. Professional Development of Core French Teachers. National Core French Study. (ACPLS/CASLT). Winnipeg: Manitoba, 1986.
- Lawrence, Gordon. "Patterns of Effective Inservice Education: A State of The Art Summary of Research on Materials and Procedures for Changing Teachers Behaviors in Inservice Education." Tallahassee, Fl.: Florida State Department of Education, (ERIC Document ED 176 424)
- Lazuruk, Wally. "Considerations for Implementing Effective Core French Programs." Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. pp. 452-462.
- Leblanc, Clarence. "The Core French Program: Proposals for Change." Education Canada, 24, 2, 1984. pp.5-11.
- Lewin, K. A Dynamic Theory of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill 1935.
- Loevinger, J. Ego Development. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Loucks, Susan F. and Zigarmi, Patricia. "Effective Staff Development." Educational Considerations, 8, 2, Winter, 1981. pp.4-8.
- Lyons, Carol A. and Languis, Marlin L. "Cognitive Science and Teacher Education." Theory Into Practice, 24, 4, 1985. pp. 127-130.
- Massey, Michael. "Directions in ESL Curriculum." Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. pp. 263-270.

- McDowell, Sterling. "Professional Development in Canada." Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 1983. pp.32-38.
- McLaughlin, Milbrey and Marsh, David D. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record, 80, 1, September, 1978. pp.69-94.
- Miller, Alan. "Conceptual Matching Models and Interactional Research in Education." Review of Educational Research, 51, 1, 1981. pp. 33-84.
- Mohan, Marilyn E. An Overview of In-service Education and Training of Teachers (INSET) in the Provinces of Canada. Toronto: Council of Ministers of Education, 1982.
- Murphy, Patricia D. and Marjorie M. Brown "Conceptual Systems and Teaching Styles." American Educational Research Journal, 7, 4, 1970. pp.529-540.
- Nagel, E. "Determinism and Development." In D.B.Harris (ed.), The Concept of Development: An Issue in the Study of Human Behaviour. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.
- National Education Association Research Division, Inservice Education of Teachers: Research Summary 1966-S1. (ERIC Document ED 022 728)
- Neimark, E.D. "Intellectual Development During Adolescence." In F.D.Horowitz, Review of Child Development Research, 4, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Nicholson, Alexander M., Joyce, Bruce R., Parker, Donald W. and Waterman, Floyd T. The Literature on Inservice Teacher Education: An Analytical Review. (ISTE Report 111) Washington, D.C.: National Centre for Educational Statistics and Teacher Corps, 1976. (ERIC Document ED129 734)
- Oja, S.N. and Sprinthall N.A. "Psychological and Moral Development for Teachers: Can you Teach Old Dogs New Tricks?" In N.A. Sprinthall and R.L. Mosher (Eds.) Value Development as the Aim of Education. New York: Character Research Press, 1978.
- Olson, W.C. "Developmental Theory in Education." In D.B. Harris (Ed.) The Concept of Development: An Issue in the Study of Human Behaviour. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957.
- Orlich, Donald. "Some Considerations for Effective In-service Education." The Clearinghouse, 54, 5, 1983. pp.227-230.

- Piaget, Jean. Science of Education and the Psychology of the Child. New York: Viking, 1970.
- Poyen, Janet. "Core French Programs Across Canada: An Overview." Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. pp. 243-262.
- Rathbone, C. "Teachers' Information Handling Behaviour when Grouped with Students by Conceptual Level." Dissertation Abstracts International, 32, 1971. pp.798.
- Rubin, Louis. The Inservice Education of Teachers: Trends, Processes and Prescriptions. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.
- Russell, T.L. A Literature Survey on Teacher Education: Final Report on In-Service Teacher Education. Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University, 1986.
- Ryor, John, Shanker, Albert, Sandefin, J.T. "Three Perspectives on Inservice Education." 30, 1, 1979. pp.13
- Salyachvin, S. "Change in International Understanding as a Function of Perceived Similarity, Conceptual Level, and Primary Effect." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1972.
- Sanders, William B. and Piney, Thomas K. The Conduct of Social Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1985.
- Santmire, T.E. Developmental Differences in Adult Learners: Implications for Staff Development. Position paper, 1979.
- Sarason, Seymour. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1982.
- Sax, Gilbert. Empirical Foundations of Educational Research. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1968.
- Schaffarzick, J. "The Consideration of Curriculum at the Local Level." Dissertation Abstracts international, 36, 1976.
- Schroder, H.M. "Conceptual Complexity and Personality Organization." In H.M. Schroder and P. Suedfield (eds.) Personality Theory and Information Processing, New York: Ronald Press, 1971
- Schroder, H.M., Driver, M.J. and Steufert, S. Human Information Processing. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967
- Schutes, R.E. "Needed: A Theory of Teacher Education." In Texas Tech Journal of Education, 2, 1975. pp.94-101.

- Schmid, Rex and Korinek, Lori. "Three Models for the Presentation of Inservice Education." College Student Journal, 19, 2, 1985. pp. 167-178.
- Selman, R. "A Developmental Approach to Interpersonal and Moral Awareness in Young Children." in T. Hennessey (Ed.) Values and Moral Development. New York: Paulist Press, 1976. pp.142-166
- Shanker, Albert. "Teachers Must Take Charge." Educational Leadership, 44, 1, 1986. pp. 12-13.
- Sheaffer, Richard L., Mendenhall, William and Lyman, Ott. Elementary Survey Sampling. Boston: Duxbury Press, 1986.
- Sonquist, John A. and Dunkelberg, William C. Survey and Opinion Research. Procedures for Processing and Analysis. Toronto: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Spiker, C.S. "The Concept of Development: Relevant and Irrelevant Issues." Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 31, 1966. pp.40-54.
- Sprinthall, N.A. and Mosher, Ralph L. "John Dewey Revisited: A Framework for Developmental Education." In N.A. Sprinthall and R. Mosher (eds.) Value Development as the Aim for Education. Shenectady, N.Y.: Character Research Press, 1978.
- Stern, H.H. "Core and/or Immersion" Contact, 3, 3, 1984. pp.2-3.
- Stern, H.H. "Movements, Projects and Core French Today." Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. p.324-341.
- Strother, D.B. (Ed.) Practical Applications of Research: Inservice Education. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Center on Evaluation, Development and Research, March, 1983.
- Thompson, Loraine. Inservice Education: A Review of the Literature. The Saskatchewan Interagency Professional Development Committee, 1984.
- Thorndike, Robert M. Correlational Procedures for Research. New York: Gardner Press, 1978.
- Tomlinson-Keasey, C. "Formal Operations in Females From Eleven to Fifty-Four Years of Age." Developmental Psychology, 6, 1972
- Tomlinson-Keasey, C. and Keasey, C.B. "The Mediating Role of Cognitive Development in Moral Judgment". Child Development, 45, 1974. pp.291-299.

- Toulmin, S. "The Concept of 'Stages' in Psychological Development." In T. Michael (ed.) Cognitive Development and Epistemology. New York: Academic Press, 1971.
- Ullmann, Rebecca and Geva, Esther. "Expanding Our Evaluation Perspective: What Can Classroom Evaluation Tell Us About Core French Programs?" Canadian Modern Language Review, 42, 2, 1985. pp. 307-323.
- Ullmann, Rebecca and Stern, H.H. Core French Across Canada: A Selective Review of Recent Writings. Winnipeg, Manitoba: The Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers, 1985.
- Wade, Ruth K. "What makes a Difference in Inservice Teacher Education? A Meta-Analysis of Research." Educational Research, 42, 4, 1984-85. pp. 392-396.
- Watts, Heidi. "Starting Out, Moving On, Running Ahead or How Teacher Centers Can Attend to Stages in Teachers' Development." San Francisco, Calif.: Teachers Center Exchange. November, 1980. 13p. (ED 200 604)
- Wideen, Marvin F. and Andrews, Ian (eds.). Staff Development for School Improvement. New York: Falmer Press, 1987.
- Wilens, William W. and Kindsvalter, Richard, "Implications for Research for Effective Inservice Education." The Clearing House. 51, 8, April, 1978. pp. 392-396.
- Witkins, H.A. Personality through Perception. New York: Harper. 1953.
- Witte, Robert S. Statistics. (Second Edition). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1985.
- Wood, Fred H., Frank O. McQuarrie Jr. and Steven R. Thompson. "Practitioners and Professors Agree on Effective Staff Development." Educational Leadership, 40, October, 1982, pp. 28-31.
- Wood, Fred H. and Thompson, Steven, R. "Guidelines for Better Staff Development." Educational Leadership, 37, 5, February, 1980. pp. 374-378.
- Wood, Fred, H. Thompson, Steven and Russell F. "Designing Effective Staff Development Programs." in Betty Dillon-Peterson (Ed.) Staff Development/Organizational Development. Alexandria, VA.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1981.

- Yalden, Janice. "Training Needs in the '80's: The ESL Teacher in Canada." Canadian Modern Language Review, 40, 1, 1983. pp.19-22.
- Yarger, S.J. and Mertens S.K. "Testing the Waters of School-Based Teacher Education." in Corrigan D. and Howey K. (eds). Concepts to Guide the Teaching of Teachers of Teachers. Reston, Va.: Council for Exceptional Children, 1980.
- Yarger, S.J., Howey, K.R. and Joyce, B.R. Inservice Teacher Education. Palo Alto, Calif.: Booksend Laboratory, 1980.
- Young, Errol. "Inservice Education: A Guide to Effective Practice." Unpublished Manuscript, 1982.
- Yore, L.D. and others. "Multi-Agency Planning for Continuing Professional Education of Teachers." Report presented at CAUCE Annual Conference. Halifax, Nova Scotia: June, 1983. (ED 258 927)

APPENDIX A:
PILOT-TESTED QUESTIONNAIRES

"THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL
DEVELOPMENT: PERCEPTIONS OF FSL TEACHERS."

*****-

BY ANSWERING AND MAILING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE, IT IS UNDERSTOOD THAT YOU AGREE TO LET THE INFORMATION YOU HAVE PROVIDED HERE BE USED IN THE STUDY. PLEASE NOTE THAT YOUR CONFIDENTIALITY WILL BE RESPECTED. YOU ARE UNDER NO OBLIGATION TO GIVE YOUR NAME OR THE NAME OF YOUR SCHOOL.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE TO:

PATRICIA LAMARRE
PONDEROSA E

(A STAMPED AND ADDRESSED ENVELOPE HAS BEEN STAPLED TO THE BACK OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE)

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is a two-part questionnaire. The first part serves to collect demographic information. The second section is concerned with teachers' preferences for professional development.

ESTIMATED TIME TO ANSWER QUESTIONNAIRE: 15 - 20 MINUTES.

THANK YOU AGAIN FOR YOUR VALUED COOPERATION.

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

SECTION ONE: YEARS OF EXPERIENCE

(please answer both items)

1. I have been a teacher for _____ years.
2. I have been an FSL teacher for _____ years.

SECTION TWO: LEVEL TAUGHT

1. I am presently teaching FSL to grades:
(please circle all the grades that you are presently teaching)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
2. In the past, I have taught FSL to grades:
(please circle all the grades that you have taught in the past)
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12

SECTION THREE: SUBJECTS TAUGHT

(please circle one of the following)

I am currently teaching:

1. Only FSL.
2. FSL and French Immersion.
3. FSL and other subjects.
(please specify how much of your teaching time per week goes to FSL programs: _____ minutes per week)

SECTION FOUR: SCHOOL DISTRICT

(please circle one of the following)

I teach:

1. In the Vancouver area.
2. In the Victoria area.
3. Neither in the Vancouver area or the Victoria area.

SECTION FIVE: CONTACT WITH FSL TEACHERS
(please answer both items)

1. There are _____ FSL teachers (full time and part time) in the school where I teach.
2. I belong to _____ school district.
There are _____ FSL teachers in my school district.

SECTION SIX: AGE
(please circle one)

1. 20 to 29 years old
2. 30 to 39 years old
3. 40 to 49 years old
4. 50 to 59 years old
5. 60 +

SECTION SEVEN: GENDER
(please circle one)

1. Female
2. Male

SECTION EIGHT: ACADEMIC BACKGROUND
(please circle one)

1. No completed university degree.
2. B.A.
3. B.Sc.
4. B.Ed.
5. M.A.
6. M.Ed.
7. Ph.D.
8. Other (please specify): _____

SECTION NINE: B.C. CERTIFICATION
(please circle one)

I hold:

1. A B.C. standard teaching certificate
2. A B.C. professional teaching certificate

At the following level: (please circle one answer) 1 2 3 4 5 6
Other: (please specify) _____

SECTION TEN: FIRST LANGUAGE
(please circle one)

My first language is:

1. English
2. French
3. Other (please specify): _____

SECTION ELEVEN: SPECIALIZATION IN FRENCH
(please circle any of the following which are appropriate)

1. I attended a French language elementary school.
(please specify number of years: _____)
2. I attended a French language high school.
(please specify number of years: _____)
3. I was taught FSL in elementary school.
4. I was taught FSL in high school.
5. I took French at university.
(please specify number of courses: _____
type of program: _____
proportion of courses given in French: _____ %
courses for anglophones or francophones: _____)

SECTION TWELVE: SPECIALIZATION IN FSL
(please circle any of the following which are appropriate)

1. I have received specialized training in FSL methodology.
please specify number of courses: _____
2. I have not received specialized training in FSL methodology.

SECTION THIRTEEN: CURRENT PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

- A. Are there specific p.d. activities for FSL teachers available to you in your school or district?
1. No.
 2. Yes
- B. To whom are these p.d. activities primarily addressed?
1. FSL teachers from one grade level.
 2. FSL teachers from different grade levels.
 3. FSL teachers with similar needs (ie. beginning teachers).
 4. All FSL teachers (ie. beginning and experienced teachers).
 5. FSL and French Immersion teachers.
- C. What are the primary objectives pursued by these p.d. activities in FSL?
1. Transmission of new information.
 2. An introduction to new textbooks, new courses or new programs.
 3. The updating of teaching skills in FSL.
 4. The maintenance and upgrading of teachers' French language skills.
 5. The exploration of organizational skills, e.g. grouping.
 6. The sharing of teacher expertise
- D. How are p.d. needs identified?
1. Teachers' assessed needs.
 2. Teachers' assumed needs.
 3. Teachers' expressed needs.
- E. Who initiates the p.d. activities in FSL?
1. A supervisor (program superintendent, subject supervisor, coordinator, consultant, department head).

2. A group of classroom teachers.
3. A group of classroom teachers (self-directed).
4. An outside agent or agency (please specify): _____

F. With whom does the responsibility for co-ordinating (planning, organizing) the p.d. activities lie?

1. A committee of teachers under supervisory guidance.
2. A committee of teachers.
3. A classroom teacher (nominated).
4. A supervisory official.
5. An outside agent or agency (please specify): _____

G. How often do your p.d. activities in FSL take place?

1. Once a (school) year.
2. Twice a (school) year.
3. Three times a (school) year.
4. Four times a (school) year.
5. Five times a (school) year.
6. More than five times a (school) year (please specify): _____

H. Generally, when do p.d. activities in FSL take place?

1. During school hours.
2. After school.
3. During week-ends.
4. On official p.d. days.

I. How is teacher attendance at p.d. activities regarded?

1. Attendance is optional.
2. Attendance is encouraged.
3. Attendance is monitored.

PART B: TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING
PREFERENCES FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

While answering this questionnaire, please keep in mind that the professional development under discussion is:

- locally available, either school or district based. (professional development available at professional association conferences, or at universities is not included in this discussion)
- a long-term program, extending over the school year and including p.d. days with release time and p.d. given after class hours.
- only for FSL teachers who are in-service (presently teaching).

NOTE:

Supervisor in this questionnaire refers to any person or persons responsible at an administrative level for FSL programs and teachers: coordinators, consultants, staff development specialists, etc.

Professional development will be abbreviated to "p.d.".

INSTRUCTIONS: Please read each section carefully. Each section proposes different professional development structures and roles. Please choose the one item in the section which is closest to your own preference for professional development. There are no right or wrong answers. Indicate the way you really feel about each topic, not the way others feel or the way you think you should feel.

SECTION ONE: PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL/DISTRICT BASED P.D.

(Please circle one of the options)

1. I would like to participate in a school or district based professional development program for FSL teachers.
2. I don't feel the need for school or district based professional development for FSL teachers.
3. I don't feel the need for school or district based professional development for FSL teachers because I prefer to pursue my professional development through self-directed study.

SECTION TWO: WHO SHOULD IDENTIFY PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT NEEDS?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisors.
2. A supervisor (consultant, coordinator, subject supervisor, department head.)
3. Teachers and supervisors working in concert.
4. Supervisors should consult teachers through a questionnaire.

SECTION THREE: WHO SHOULD CHOOSE WHICH OF THE IDENTIFIED NEEDS SHOULD BE
ADDRESSED IN A P.D. PROGRAM?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisors.
2. Teachers and supervisors working in concert.
3. A supervisor.

SECTION FOUR: WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE COORDINATION (PLANNING,
ORGANIZING) OF P.D. PROGRAMS?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. The supervisor.
2. Teachers and their supervisor(s) working in concert.
3. Teachers, with information and support from their supervisor(s).

SECTION FIVE: WHAT SHOULD BE THE PRIMARY GOAL OF P.D. PROGRAMS?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. To help me as a teacher understand the theoretical reasons underlying teaching and learning that affect the way a student learns.
2. To provide me with practical information on existing curricula and materials.
3. To improve my skills as a teacher.

SECTION SIX: WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR PRESENTATION DURING P.D. PROGRAMS?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. Teachers and supervisors. (ie. occasionally the supervisors presents an information session or workshop, occasionally a teacher or group of teachers present -- or an agreement is reached as to guest specialists).
2. The supervisor (either presenting the sessions or inviting guest specialists).
3. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisors (either giving sessions themselves or inviting guest specialists or supervisors).

SECTION SEVEN: WHAT SHOULD BE THE CONTENT OF P.D. PROGRAMS?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. Discussion of situations and tasks that I encounter in my classroom.
2. Exploration of the consequences (both positive and negative) of teaching on the student.
3. Information on existing materials and curricula followed by practical examples relevant to my actual classroom situation.

SECTION EIGHT: HOW MANY OPTIONS SHOULD BE PRESENTED IN A P.D. PROGRAM?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. A number of alternative ways to teach a skill or a topic.
2. One way to teach a skill or a topic.

SECTION NINE: P.D. PROGRAMS SHOULD OFFER INFORMATION AND CONTENT:
(Please circle one of the options)

1. That is immediately applicable to my classroom.
2. On second language teaching and learning, even if this information is not immediately applicable to my classroom.

SECTION TEN: WHICH GROUPS SHOULD A P.D. PROGRAM ADDRESS?
(Please circle one of the options)

1. Different groups of teachers (ie. beginning and experienced teachers, teachers from different grade levels).
2. Specific groups with common needs. (ie. p.d. for beginning teachers, p.d. for teachers from same grade level).

SECTION ELEVEN: IN A P.D. PROGRAM WHICH SERVES TO INTRODUCE A NEW CURRICULUM, NEW MATERIAL OR A NEW APPROACH, WOULD YOU PREFER COACHING (OBSERVATION AND FEEDBACK):

(Please circle one option)

1. That was supportive.
2. That was both supportive and evaluative.
3. That was evaluative.

SECTION TWELVE: IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A NEW CURRICULUM, NEW MATERIALS OR A NEW TEACHING APPROACH , WHO WOULD YOU PREFER TO BE COACHED BY (OBSERVATION AND FEEDBACK)?

(Please circle one of the options)

1. Supervisor(s).
2. By both other teachers and a supervisor.
3. By other FSL teachers..

SECTION THIRTEEN: WHO SHOULD BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE EVALUATION OF P.D. PROGRAMS:

(Please circle one of the options)

1. Teachers and supervisors.
2. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisors.
3. Supervisors.

PLEASE RETURN THIS QUESTIONNAIRE AS SOON AS POSSIBLE TO:

PATRICIA LAMARRE
PONDEROSA E
LANGUAGE EDUCATION

A STAMPED AND ADDRESSED RETURN ENVELOPE HAS BEEN STAPLED TO THE BACK OF THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

APPENDIX B:
POST-PILOT TEST SURVEY

1. Was it clear throughout the questionnaire that the PD being discussed was:
 - only for FSL teachers?
 - part of a long term program (a school year)?
 - district or school based (not PD activities at a university or at a professional association conference?)
2. What do you think is the purpose of the study?
3. What are the different roles for supervisors and teachers being discussed?
4. What are the different models for organizing PD being discussed?
5. Did you get the feeling from the questionnaire that one model was better than another?
6. Does the survey instrument touch on elements of PD that you feel are important? Which ones?
7. Any comments on the questionnaire?
8. Any comments on professional development?

APPENDIX C:
LETTER TO COORDINATORS

Dear colleague,

You are invited to participate in a study on professional development entitled "The Structure and Organization of Professional Development: Perceptions of FSL Teachers". The study is concerned with investigating FSL teachers' perception of professional development and the demographic factors which influence these preferences.

At the present time, there is a great deal of research being conducted on professional development in general. There have been few studies on how these research findings relate to specific groups of teachers. We would sincerely appreciate having you, as an experienced FSL teacher, participate in the study, which hopes to provide direction for research and for the long-term planning of professional development programs for FSL teachers.

The study is being conducted by Patricia Lamarre, a graduate student in the Department of Language Education, at the University of British Columbia

If you agree to participate in the study, please fill in the two-part survey questionnaire included with this letter and mail it back in the stamped return envelope. We are highly appreciative of the time you will spend on the questionnaire (approximately 15 to 20 minutes). We would also welcome any additional comments that you might have concerning the organization and planning of professional development for FSL teachers.

Your confidentiality will be respected. You are under no obligation to give your name or the name of your school. The returned questionnaire will be given a code number which will serve to identify it during the compilation and analysis of the information. The questionnaires themselves will be destroyed once the final report of the study has been completed.

Thank you very much for your valued collaboration.
Yours sincerely,

Robert R. Roy, Ph.D.
Modern Language Education
Department of Language Education

Patricia Lamarre
Graduate student

The Structure and Organization of Professional Development:
Perceptions of FSL Teachers.

Consent Form

I agree to let Patricia Lamarre, a graduate student in the Department of Language Education, University of British Columbia, conduct a survey in the _____ school board. I understand that:

- this survey consists of a written questionnaire which participants may fill in at their convenience and mail back to the researcher
- the survey is addressed only to FSL teachers (elementary and secondary)
- teachers are under no obligation to participate in the study
- teachers are under no obligation to identify themselves or their schools and that confidentiality will be respected
- there are no costs involved, either to the teacher or the school board: stamped return envelopes will be included with all questionnaires.

Under the above conditions, I agree to participate in the study "The Structure and Organization of Professional Development: Perceptions of FSL teachers" by distributing the questionnaires to all FSL teachers in my district.

Signature: _____

School Board: _____

Date: _____

Number of FSL teachers/elementary: _____

Number of FSL teachers/secondary: _____

APPENDIX D:
COVERING LETTER.

Dear colleague,

You are invited to participate in a study on professional development entitled "The Structure and Organization of Professional Development: Perceptions of FSL Teachers". The study is concerned with investigating FSL teachers' perception of professional development and the demographic factors which influence their preferences.

At the present time, there is a great deal of research being conducted on professional development in general. There have been few studies on how these research findings relate to specific groups of teachers. We would sincerely appreciate having you, as an experienced FSL teacher, participate in the study, which hopes to provide direction for research and for the long-term planning of professional development programs for FSL teachers.

The study is being conducted by Patricia Lamarre, a graduate student in the Department of Language Education, at the University of British Columbia

If you agree to participate in the study, please fill in the two-part survey questionnaire included with this letter and mail it back in the stamped return envelope. We are highly appreciative of the time you will spend on the questionnaire (approximately 15 to 20 minutes). We would also welcome any additional comments that you might have concerning the organization and planning of professional development for FSL teachers.

Participation in this study is completely voluntary and will not affect your job or professional status in any way. Your confidentiality will be respected. You are under no obligation to give your name or the name of your school. The returned questionnaire will be given a code number which will serve to identify it during the compilation and analysis of the information. The questionnaires themselves will be destroyed once the final report of the study has been completed.

Thank you very much for your valued cooperation.

Yours sincerely,

Robert R. Roy, Ph.D.
Department of Language Education

Patricia Lamarre
Graduate student

APPENDIX E:
QUESTIONNAIRE

THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
PERCEPTIONS OF FSL TEACHERS

By answering and mailing this questionnaire, it is understood that you agree to let the information you have provided be used in the study.

Please return the questionnaire to:

Patricia Lamarre
Ponderosa E
2034 Lower Mall
University of British Columbia
V6Y 1Z5

Tel: 228-3745

A stamped and addressed return envelope has been stapled to the back of the questionnaire.

.....

PART A: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please answer ALL items.

- A. I have been a teacher for ____ years.
I have been a FSL teacher for ____ years.
- B. I am presently teaching FSL to grades:
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
In the past, I taught FSL to grades:
K 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12
- C. I teach for _____ school board.
In my school, there are _____ FSL teachers (full- time and part-time).

Please circle only ONE answer.

- D. Gender: 1. Female
2. Male
- E. Age: 1. 20 to 29
2. 30 to 39
3. 40 to 49
4. 50 to 59
5. 60 +

- F. First Language: 1. English
 2. French
 3. Other (Please specify): _____
- G. I was brought up in: 1. An English speaking community
 2. A French speaking community
 3. Both of the above
 4. None of the above
- H. Language of schooling: 1. English
 2. French
 3. Both of the above. (Please specify the number of years spent in each level and level of instruction): _____
- I. Academic background: 1. No completed university degree
 2. B.A.
 3. B.Ed.
 4. B.Sc.
 5. M.A.
 6. M.Ed.
- J. FSL teacher training: 1. I have not received specialized training in FSL methodology.
 2. I have received specialized training in FSL methodology. (Please specify): _____
- K. I presently teach: 1. Only FSL
 2. Only French Immersion
 3. FSL and French Immersion
 4. FSL and other subjects (Please specify): _____ minutes per week

Please circle ALL appropriate answers.

(Professional development will be abbreviated to PD)

- L. Are there specific PD activities for FSL teachers available to you in your school or district?
 1. Yes
 2. No

- M. In general, to whom are PD activities primarily addressed?
1. FSL teachers from one grade level
 2. FSL teachers from different grade levels
 3. FSL teachers with similar needs (eg.: beginning teachers)
 4. All FSL teachers
 5. FSL and French Immersion teachers
- N. In general, how are PD needs identified?
1. Teachers' assessed needs
 2. Teachers' assumed needs
 3. Teachers' expressed needs
- O. In general, who initiates PD activities?
1. A supervisor
 2. A group of classroom teachers and a supervisor
 3. A group of teachers (self-directed)
 4. An outside agent or agency (please specify): _____
- P. In general, with whom does the responsibility for coordinating (planning, organizing) the PD activities lie?
1. A committee of teachers under supervisory guidance
 2. A committee of teachers (self-directed)
 3. A classroom teacher (nominated)
 4. A supervisory official
 5. An outside agent or agency (please specify): _____
- Q. How often do your PD activities in FSL take place in a school year?
1. Once a school year
 2. Twice a school year
 3. Three times a school year
 4. Four times a school year
 5. More than four times a school year
- R. In general, how is teacher attendance at PD activities regarded?
1. Attendance is optional
 2. Attendance is encouraged
 3. Attendance is monitored

PART B: THE STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
PERCEPTIONS OF FSL TEACHERS

.....
Please note that the professional development under discussion is:

- only for FSL teachers
- locally available, either school or district based
- extends over a school year including professional development days with release time and the activities given after class hours

Definitions:

Professional development will be abbreviated to PD.

Supervisor refers to any person responsible at the administrative level for FSL programs and teachers: coordinators, consultants, department heads, subject supervisors, professional development specialists.

Instructions:

Please read each section carefully and choose the one option which is closest to your preference for professional development. There are no right or wrong answers.

.....

Please circle ONE option.

A. Participation in school or district based PD

1. I would like to participate in a school or district based PD program for FSL teachers.
2. I would not like to participate in a school or district based PD program for FSL teachers.
3. I would not like to participate in a school or district based PD program for FSL teachers because I prefer to pursue my professional development through self-directed studies.

B. Who should identify the PD needs of FSL teachers?

1. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisor(s)
2. A supervisor
3. Supervisors who have consulted teachers through a questionnaire

- C. Who should choose which of the identified needs are to be addressed in a PD program for FSL teachers?
1. Teachers with support and information from their supervisor(s)
 2. Teachers and their supervisor(s) working in concert
 3. Supervisor(s)
- D. Who should be responsible for the coordination (planing, organization) of PD activities for FSL teachers?
1. Supervisor(s)
 2. Teachers and their supervisor(s) working in concert
 3. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisor(s)
- E. What should be the primary goal of a PD program for FSL teachers?
1. To provide me with information on materials, resources and curricula
 2. To improve the impact of my teaching on students
 3. To improve my skills as a teacher
- F. Who should be responsible for presentation during a PD session?
1. Teachers and their supervisor(s) (occasionally the supervisor presents an information session or workshop, occasionally a teacher or group of teachers present, agreement is reached as to guest specialists)
 2. Supervisor(s) (either presenting the sessions or inviting guest specialists)
 3. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisor(s) (either giving sessions themselves or inviting guest specialists)

- G. What should be the content of a PD program for FSL teachers?
1. Information on curricula, materials and resources followed by examples
 2. Exploration of the impact of teaching on students (evaluation of students' performance and competence, changes needed to improve student outcomes)
 3. Discussion focused on situations and teaching tasks encountered in the classroom (organization, grouping, management)
- H. How many options should be presented in a PD session?
1. A number of alternative ways to teach a language skill or structure
 2. One way to teach a language skill or structure
- I. PD programs should offer information and content on second language teaching:
1. If it is immediately applicable to the classroom
 2. Even if it is not immediately applicable to the classroom
- J. Which FSL group should be addressed by a PD program?
1. Different groups of FSL teachers (beginning and experienced teachers, teachers from different grade levels)
 2. Specific groups with common needs (PD for beginning teachers, PD for teachers from one grade level)
- K. In the implementation of a new curriculum, new materials or a new approach (eg. a communicative approach), who would you prefer to be coached by (observation and feedback)?
1. A supervisor
 2. Other FSL teachers and a supervisor
 3. Other FSL teachers

L. Who should be responsible for the evaluation of a PD program for FSL teachers?

1. Teachers and their supervisor(s)
2. Teachers, with support and information from their supervisor(s)
3. Supervisor(s)

.....

Thank you for answering this survey.

Please return the questionnaire as soon as possible to:

Patricia Lamarre
Department of Language Education
University of British Columbia

A stamped and addressed return envelope has been stapled to the questionnaire.