Exploring the use of student perspectives to inform topics in teacher education

Katy Arnett
St. Mary's College of Maryland

As FSL teacher educators look to respond to teachers' concerns about the increasingly diverse student population in K-12 settings, empirical research may not always hold the answers — simply because there has not been much research on the topic. In an attempt to at least identify issues worthy of such empirical consideration and discussion within teacher education programs, this article explores the views of seven Grade 8 core French students who were members of an effective inclusive classroom. Drawing on the individual and focus group interview data from a larger case study of their teacher's classroom, this article will identify two key themes that the students described as instrumental in the teacher's attempts to be an effective, inclusive core French teacher. It is the goal of this article that these themes will help inform the decisions FSL teacher educators make about this topic within their programs.

Bien que les formateurs des professeurs de français langue seconde (FLS) cherchent une réponse appropriée aux inquiétudes des professeurs concernant la diversité des élèves inclus, la manque de recherche empirique empêche leur quête. Dans un effort d'au moins identifier les sujets pertinents à cette question de l'inclusion effective pour les programmes de formation, cet article fournit un survol des perspectives de sept élèves inscrits dans une classe de Français Cadre inclusive, qui était le sujet d'une étude de cas plus large. S'inspirant des données tirées de leurs entrevues individuelles et en groupe, cet article identifiera deux thèmes identifiés par les élèves comme essentiels pour le prof qui cherche à créer cet environnement inclusif. Il est le but de cet article que ces thèmes influencent les décisions prises par les formateurs en ce qui concerne le traitement de ce sujet dans leurs programmes.

Introduction

Traditionally, teacher educators look to current classroom teachers to help identify topics, teaching strategies, and curricular issues that should be addressed within teacher education programs (DeSimone and Parmar, 2006; Nevin, Cohen, Salazar and Marshall, 2007). The rationale for such a practice is largely intuitive. Teacher educators tailor their programs to consider the

Address for correspondence: Department of Educational Studies, St. Mary's College of Maryland, 18952 E. Fisher Road, St. Mary's City, MD 20686 USA.
E-mail: kearnett@smcm.edu.

issues that current teachers believe they lack the knowledge and skill set to solve, in hopes that the new graduates will thus be in a better position to solve those problems once they enter the profession. Within the realm of French as a Second Language (FSL) education, that pressing issue appears to be how to effectively teach a highly diverse student population (Lapkin, MacFarlane and Vandergrift, 2006).

This article draws on data from seven individual student interviews and one focus group interview of those seven students from a larger case study of a Grade 8 core French teacher's inclusive classroom in Ontario (Arnett, 2004). The article will provide a preliminary sense of what students believe makes (or does not make) an FSL classroom effective and inclusive. Though this data set is indeed small and limited, increasing value is being placed upon student input as a source for learning about the teaching process (Fitch, 2003; Smith and Gorard, 2006; Swaminathan, 2004). In addition, given the controversial nature of inclusive education within a second language context, an exploratory consideration of the issue, such as the one offered here, is critical for structuring discussions about the issue until more empirical research is conducted.

Inclusive and effective teaching

The term *inclusive* (and its derivatives) has multiple interpretations and modifications. This article is framed through the lens of generative inclusion, which Pugach (1995) defined as the converse of additive inclusion. In models of additive inclusion, students with special learning needs are integrated into the regular education classroom, and their learning needs are addressed through specific adaptations of teaching strategies, pedagogical resources, or both (Pugach, 1995, p. 216). The generative model of inclusion is thus more of a large-scale approach to inclusion, meaning that the teacher designs and implements differentiated instruction that is applicable to as wide a range of student needs and learning styles as possible (Pugach, 1995; Tomlinson, 2003, 2004). In recent years, this model has been touted under the name *universal design* (UD). Within special and regular education, UD refers to instruction that proactively considers and accounts for the spectrum of student needs in the classroom. Instead of implementing reactive adaptation strategies to include students with special learning needs, teachers draw on pedagogical practices that are known to be effective for most, if not all, learners in a classroom (Council for Exceptional Children, 2005). In many circumstances, such an approach is also known as good teaching or effective teaching (Ares and Gorrell, 2002; Brophy and Good, 1986; Englert, Tarrant and Mariage, 1992; Larrivee, 1981).

Teachers who have been identified as effective typically excel in four areas of classroom organization and instruction: classroom management, time management, management of student work, and lesson format (Englert *et al*.,

1992). Further, effective teachers model desired behaviour, demonstrate new concepts and materials, vary their teaching styles and practices, and monitor student progress in such a way as to appeal to a large number of students in as short a time as possible (Brophy, 1983; Englert and Palsincar, 1991; Rosenshine and Stevens, 1986). In the context of English language learners who were having problems in the classroom, Gersten and Baker (2000, p. 454) found five features of effective instruction:

- (a) developing students' vocabulary,
- (b) using visual supports to depict and reinforce conceptual understanding,
- (c) using peer collaboration and cooperation,
- (d) strategic use of the students' first language (when the teacher shared that language), and
- (e) balancing the linguistic and cognitive demands of tasks.

The current notion of effectiveness in core French can be traced to the findings of the National Core French Study (NCFS; LeBlanc, 1990; Turnbull, 1999). The NCFS (LeBlanc, 1990) recommended that school boards across Canada implement curricula that were congruent with Stern's (1982) multidimensional, communicative approach to language teaching, in which the target language was in constant use. The long-held practices of verb drills, translations, and random vocabulary lists were to be replaced by activities designed to stimulate more contextualized and authentic language use; school boards across Canada moved to implement the NCFS recommendations during much of the 1990s (Turnbull, 1999).

An increasing body of research is considering students' perceptions of the teaching and learning experience (e.g., Fitch, 2003; Smith and Gorard, 2006; Swaminathan, 2004). Klingner and Vaughn's (1999) meta-analysis found that most students not only recognized that they learned in different ways and at different rates, but also felt that teachers should use strategies that respected all students' needs. Vaughn, Schumm, Klingner, and Saumell (1995) found that middle-school students — the age group targeted in this study — preferred instructional strategies that increased student interest in the task and content; these strategies are typically associated with positive reinforcement and a match between student needs and current interests. The students also reported preferring homogeneous peer work, because many of the underperforming learners were afraid that heterogeneous groups would cause the more successful students to resent their presence.

Methodology

The larger case study that provided the data examined in this paper took place over the course of eight weeks near the end of the 2002–2003 school year, in the classroom of a core French teacher in suburban Ontario. The teacher, known as Julie in the larger study, is in this paper referred to by the students as Madame. The purpose of the broader study was to identify the beliefs and practices of a core French teacher and how these beliefs and practices corresponded to known conceptions of effective inclusive and second language teaching, as well as student perceptions of how the teacher's pedagogy met student needs. There were four primary data sources: classroom observations that were guided by an observation protocol, pre- and post-observation teacher semistructured interviews, semistructured individual and focus group student interviews (held during the observation period and postobservation), and a document analysis of the materials provided to the students during the observation period. The data informing this article are drawn solely from the student interviews, and additional details about this process follow. Again, such a small corpus of data emphasizes the exploratory nature of this topic.

For the purpose of this article, it is important to acknowledge that the students' teacher believed that rather than being two separate entities, inclusive teaching and effective second language teaching were highly compatible constructs. The teacher's approach to teaching was congruent with Pugach's (1995) model of generative inclusion and is important for understanding the vantage point from which the students discussed her teaching.

The students

The seven students who were interviewed individually and as a focus group were members of a 29-student class that the teacher had identified as her most academically diverse. In this class of 14 boys and 15 girls, the majority of students were either first- or second-generation immigrants from regions in South Asia, and 19 students spoke at least one language other than English. The course curriculum was communicative, and in line with the provincial goals and expectations for Grade 8 core French.

As one of the goals of the broader study was to determine student perceptions of the effectiveness of the teacher's pedagogy in addressing student needs, it was important to have as many learning needs as possible represented in the interviews. When the study began, Julie identified to me the students who were receiving special education services or who were considered at-risk learners for a variety of reasons (e.g., language background, behaviour, possible learning disability). For the student interviews, I selected seven students who seemed to represent a wide spectrum of student needs. Five of these students either had or were in the process of receiving an Individualized

Table 1: Student participants

Student name	IEP? If yes, nature of need	First language	Other issues of relevance
Sam	Yes; gifted	Hindi	Schooling in India was in English
Kaitlyn	Yes; math-based and writing difficulties	Bengali	Enrolled in French immersion until Grade 5
Nathalie	No	English	Not very motivated to study French
Casey	Yes; auditory processing and writing	English	Already exempted from high school core French requirement
Alyssa	Yes; physical (Spina Bifida)	Punjabi	IEP did not address any academic issues
Alex	In process; suspected language-based difficulties	Urdu	Already exempted from high school core French requirement
Sarah	No	English	Considered all-around "typical" student

Education Program (IEP), which is a document that designates a child as needing special education services; the IEP outlines the student's unique needs and abilities, suggested teaching practices and resources, and assessment procedures (Lerner, 2000; Ontario Ministry of Education, 2000). Table 1 provides an overview of the seven students and their learning profiles.

Data collection and analysis

The student interviews began a third of the way into the study, during the observation period. By the time the observations were complete, I had completed all of the individual student interviews. These approximately half-hour sessions were held during open slots in the students' schedules. I used a semistructured interview protocol to inquire about students' perceptions of their own learning styles, of effective and ineffective classroom practices in French, and of their interactions in the classroom (see Appendix A for the Individual Student Interview Questions). For the seven students, the individual interviews yielded approximately 200 minutes of data. The focus group interview (Appendix B) was held at the very end of the study, following the observations and the last teacher interview, and yielded 90 minutes of data. This interview explored themes that had emerged during the individual interviews, with the students' perceptions of Julie's teaching strategies (in comparison with those of previous core French teachers) being the primary focus.

The data from these interviews were analyzed using an open-coding method advocated by Strauss and Corbin (1990). Through repeated readings of the interviews, various themes began to emerge from the data. These themes were

eventually coded into various categories and subcategories, including the following: positively perceived teaching practices, negatively perceived teaching practices, positively perceived teacher traits, negatively perceived teacher traits, conceptions of language study, and perceptions of student success. This method also facilitates the examination of assumptions and hypotheses the researcher may bring to the process (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Because this data was drawn from a larger case study, the use of grounded theory is helpful in ensuring that rather than making sweeping generalizations about the issues under study, this study highlights issues worthy of further exploration and consideration.

Results

This section will focus on two prevalent themes that spanned the six coding categories articulated above: (a) the teacher's use of the target language, and (b) peer support and collaboration. Gersten and Baker (2000) identified both as components of effective instruction for English language learners struggling with the second language acquisition process.

The teacher's use of French

The results of the larger study revealed that Julie used French more than 93% of the observed time (Arnett, 2004). Julie's use of French was certainly in line with the provincial expectations (Ontario Ministry of Education, 1998); however, there is sometimes doubt about the appropriateness of such frequent use of the target language in an inclusive FL/SL classroom (Calman and Daniel, 1998). I was therefore curious about the students' reactions to Julie's near-exclusive use of the target language.

During the individual interviews, the subject of Julie's language use patterns was not a specific line of inquiry. However, when I spoke with Casey, there were a few references to Julie's speaking habits. When I asked Casey to describe her current achievement in the class, she actually framed her response in relation to Julie's use of the target language (Table 2).

Table 2: Excerpt IS4-A

IS4-A1	X:	How would you describe your achievement in the class?
IS4-A2	C:	Hmm, they're better than they were last year. It helps that
IS4-A3		Madame speaks in French. The other teacher didn't.

Individual student interview with Casey, lines 107–109.

By offering Julie's use of the target language as a reason for her improvement, Casey dispelled one of the common concerns about including students with language-based learning difficulties in FSL settings — that teachers will

need to use more English with the students. In Casey's view, she was able to get more out of the class because Julie used French so much in her teaching. Sparks, Ganschow, Pohlman, Skinner, and Artzer (1992) contended that in inclusive FL/SL classrooms, increasing target language use is more appropriate than using more of the students' L1 for clarifying confusion related to delays in cognitive processing for students with language-based learning difficulties. In other words, because of the slower speed at which such students process language, they may mismatch the L1 with the L2 and generate more confusion.

On the other hand, Nathalie expressed a desire for Julie to use more English. It has been argued that the students' first language (or in this case, shared school language) can be a valuable teaching tool in the FL/SL classroom because it can expeditiously resolve confusion (Cook, 2001). As indicated in Table 3, that appears to be the reason for Nathalie's suggestion, but there also is somewhat of a caveat.

Table 3: Excerpt IS3-A

IS3-A1	X:	And during these exchanges that you have with Madame
IS3-A2		when she, when you start in French, finish in English and she
IS3-A3		responds back in French, how does that work for you in terms of
IS3-A4		understanding and being able to use French in communicating?
IS3-A5	Nathalie:	Well, it doesn't really help me. I don't really get it though, but
IS3-A6		it just couldn't, it just doesn't work for me when she talks back in
IS3-A7		French. I'll try to make sense of it, but um, I just don't get it.
IS3-A8	X:	So what would work for you?
IS3-A9	Nathalie:	Well, if she would answer back in English and then she would
IS3-A10		say like, "Next time, if you have the same question, this is how I
IS3-A11		would answer it by using this in French

Individual student interview 3, lines 129–139

Nathalie thinks that Julie's use of English should be accompanied by direct instruction in the desired phrase in French. The teacher should not switch freely between the languages, but instead deliberately indicate which English utterances correlate to which French phrases. Given this suggestion and the needs of students like Casey, it seems that teacher educators should advocate for only the judicious or strategic use of English in an inclusive core French classroom; French should be used for the majority of all interactions (Gersten and Baker, 2000; Turnbull, 2001).

Sarah's comments offer some insight into ways of increasing the students' comprehension of the teacher's target language use. When I asked Sarah to describe how she understood French, she responded, "I can understand it really well because she, because the way that she gestures and like, the expression on her face and then, like, the visuals too" (IS7 Individual interview, lines 67–68).

Table 4: Excerpt FG-B

FG-B1	X:	How has her language use made an impact on your learning?
FG-B2	Sam:	Because if she talks in French, we're going to catch it.
FG-B3	Nathalie:	Like she makes us feel as if we're in an all-French
FG-B4		environment.
FG-B5	Sam:	Yeah. Immersion. We're in French immersion, that's how she
FG-B6		makes us feel.
FG-B7	Kaitlyn:	Like, you see how she writes "la chaise" on a chair, and like —
FG-B8	Sam:	Yeah, she actually marks chairs you know, "la chaise" and then if
FG-B9		there's a desk, she'll put "pupitre."
FG-B10	Nathalie:	She marks like the smallest things, like the sharpener, the
		walls, the ceiling.
FG-B11	Sam:	Exactly. That helps. I mean, every time you walk around, you
FG-B12		look at things. I mean, even if you don't want to read them, you're
FG-B13		reading them, and getting them in your brain, right? So, the next
FG-B14		time you're doing something with that word, you automatically
FG-B15		know it. I mean, even if you didn't pay attention, you're still
FG-B16		looking at it every day, so that helps.

Focus group interview, lines 488–500

Such supports have been deemed useful for interpreting language (e.g., Brown, 2001; Shrum and Glisan, 2005; Turnbull, 2001).

Whereas a tangent in the focus group interview revealed the students' perception that Julie spoke French "99.9% of the time," evidence of other ways in which the students increased their understanding of French was found later in the same interview. This line of questioning came to focus more on the other ways Julie added to their knowledge of French (Table 4).

The language-rich environment described in this excerpt is commonly suggested to future teachers as a way of providing additional target language input (e.g., Brown, 2001; Shrum and Glisan, 2005), and FSL teacher educators should ensure that this issue is also addressed in discussions of the teacher's target language use. Further, Sam's comments about the importance of salient, though indirect, input in increasing target language use should serve as a reminder to future teachers that language learning does not occur only as a result of teacher-led instruction (Krashen and Terrell, 1983).

Peer Support/Collaboration

Because of self-esteem issues, the use of peer collaboration is not always viewed as effective or necessarily inclusive for all students (Hurst, 1996; Lerner, 2000; Vaughn *et al*., 1995). Casey expressed reluctance to ask questions about content in front of the class because she "[was] um afraid that the other kids would make fun of [her] and [her] silly mistakes" (IS4, line 5), but when she

was stuck, she would "usually ask a friend behind [her], like Kaitlyn since she had, she's an IEP student too, so [they could] relate to each other" (IS4, lines 133–135). Casey's statement is only partially congruent with Vaughn *et al.* (1995), in that although Casey and Kaitlyn both were receiving special education support, in terms of their performance in class Kaitlyn was several levels ahead of Casey. Such disparity in student proficiency has not been found to be highly effective for second language learning within a peer group (DiCamilla and Antón, 1997; Storch, 2001), but because both of the girls indicated that they felt their roles in these interactions were appropriate and helpful to the situation, perhaps the shared experience as students with IEPs was more critical in creating an effective partnership.

The other students appeared to hold mostly favourable views of their ability to ask their peers for help whenever they became confused or stuck during an activity. Sam appeared to associate working with peers as a means of negotiating more challenging tasks, and he seemed to believe that such support facilitated understanding of the material (Table 5).

Table 5: Excerpt FG-C

FG-C1	Sam:	And then, [a previous teacher] she used to like, do these freaky
FG-C2		kind of activities. Like she never used to put it as partners or
FG-C3		anything. It was all individual, even though it's like the hardest
FG-C4		thing, like how Madame puts us in partners when it's harder, she
FG-C5		would never let us go into partners. She would always prefer us
FG-C6		like doing uh, all our stuff alone. Like she never did group work
FG-C7		with us.

Focus group interview, lines 130–134

The growing body of research on the impact of collaboration in the second language classroom has reported similar benefits on the learning process, particularly when students are working with more complex material (e.g., Antón and DiCamilla, 1998; Swain and Lapkin, 1998, 2000), though the differences in the proficiency levels within the pair may impact the overall success of the collaboration (Storch, 2001, 2002). The students were often free to work with whomever they chose, and it is uncertain how this fluidity may have impacted their proficiency. Yet, when I later asked the students about their thoughts on their ability to consult neighbours during class, they discussed various ways in which they believed it helped (Table 6).

Kaitlyn felt that deliberate pairings of students could be useful, but only if the students felt comfortable with each other; this supports the contention of Lerner (2000), but also reinforces what Casey mentioned earlier during her individual interview. However, Nathalie seemed to favour less-structured peer collaboration as a primary means of scaffolding, because the additional input

Table 6: Excerpt FG-D

FG-D1	X:	What do you guys think about being able to talk to your
FG-D2		neighbours if you have a question about an activity?
FG-D3	Sarah:	Oh, that's helpful.
FG-D4	X:	How is that helpful?
FG-D5	Sarah:	Because you have somebody else.
FG-D6	Kaitlyn:	Yeah, like sometimes she pairs up people purposely, like if, like
FG-D7		if there's one of us who knows a bit more and feels comfortable
FG-D8		with working with someone, like she'll pair us up to help. In the
FG-D9		beginning of the year, I was like Jack's partner for most of the
FG-D10		time.
FG-D11	Nathalie:	What she does is find someone who has a different learning
FG-D12		style and who understands things, um, more or maybe less than
FG-D13		you, so you can each, each of you can help each other understand
FG-D14		with your own learning styles. Well, you get someone else's help
FG-D15		even if like, you, even if you're having someone's help, you're
FG-D16		busy, and then you're not gonna be stuck on that question because
FG-D17		you can get help.
FG-D18	Sarah:	Because she knows everyone has different learning styles, you
FG-D19		can take examples from like everybody about how to do
FG-D20		something, and then see which one helps you the best.

Focus group interview, lines 824–842

could prevent a student from staying stuck at a certain point on the assignment (Wood, Bruner and Ross, 1976). Sarah simply appreciated having another "head" to use to help solve a problem, echoing the basic notion that peer collaboration facilitates problem solving (Wood *et al.*, 1976).

It is also worth mentioning that this excerpt raised the issue of Julie's awareness of the students' learning styles. Clearly, the students believed that Julie knew who they were as learners. Getting to know one's students is one of the most common recommendations in any pedagogical manual (e.g., Orlich, 2006; Shrum and Glisan, 2005) and the mantra of many teacher education programs; this excerpt underscores how easily students can recognize a teacher who is unaware of their learning needs.

The teacher's commitment to peer collaboration was also evidenced in an after-school learning opportunity the students mentioned during the focus group interview (Table 7). Though organized by Julie, the program relied heavily on the students' involvement as tutors; Julie's role appeared to be secondary to that of the students. This notion of the teacher as facilitator is certainly not new to education; most teacher education programs advocate this "guide on the side" approach (Woolfolk, 2006). Further, such student ownership in the language learning process has been shown to have favourable influence on

Table 7: Focus group interview, excerpt 4

FG-D1	Sam:	Like what she also does is that she, like, on Monday after
FG-D2		school, she has French tutors and stuff [bell rings, student pauses].
FG-D3		I've never gone there, but I do know people that go there.
FG-D4	Kaitlyn:	Like, I used to tutor down there and I did Grade um, 7 tutoring?
FG-D5	Sam:	And I think Nathalie used to go there, right?
FG-D6	Nathalie:	Yeah.
FG-D7	Sam:	And now, on all of her projects, she gets four pluses.
FG-D8	Kaitlyn:	Yeah, because there is this kid, besides like that, um, I tutored
FG-D9		him one day, and then, uh, like I tutored him because he had some
FG-D10		big French test the next day, and I tutored him so good that he got
FG-D11		like perfect on it, and I was like "Yeah!"
FG-D12	Sam:	And then like, Madame, when you're tutoring right, she doesn't like
FG-D13		make herself tutor. She finds students like Kaitlyn and Nathalie,
FG-D14		you can say, those who are good in French, to tutor the kids so that
FG-D15		they feel comfortable and then if the tutors themselves
FG-D16		have a question, then she can answer them, not also only in French,
FG-D17		but she, she does really help people try to get them to learn
FG-D18		French.

student motivation and overall success in the classroom (Dörnyei, 2005; Graham, 2005; Shrum and Glisan, 2005; Sparks and Ganschow, 1999).

In university contexts, peer-tutoring programs involving students with learning disabilities studying FL/SL have been shown to have a favourable impact on the included students' proficiency and self-esteem (Saenz, Fuchs and Fuchs, 2005; Wright, Cavanaugh, Sainato and Heward, 1995). However, because there is no further data about the program mentioned by the students, it is not possible to claim similar successes, in spite of the positive reviews by Sam and Kaitlyn.

There was one final facet to the peer support and collaboration element in the classroom, and again, Julie figured prominently. During all of the individual interviews and again in the focus group interview, the students discussed how much they appreciated that the teacher was always willing and happy to answer questions or offer other assistance. Of all the excerpts from the interviews that addressed this issue, an excerpt (Table 8) from the early stages of the focus group interview appears to convey the significance of teacher access on the students' learning.

Judging from the students' comments, it appears that they believe that Julie was somewhat of a peer to them, as evidenced by Sarah's reference to her as a good friend. This was not the first time that Julie was described in this manner; Sam made a similar comment earlier in this interview, and Kaitlyn and Casey both mentioned this in their individual interviews. The students felt that they could approach her about anything, and more importantly, it appears that

Table 8: Focus group interview, excerpt E

FG-E1	X:	Can you tell me how this year in French compares to last year?
FG-E2	Sarah	Well, this year, French is like, it's like so much more exciting and
FG-E3		you're like, you're like actually wanting to learn because you see
FG-E4		Madame, she's always there. She's always the one that shows you
FG-E5		vocabulary. She's like, if you have your hand up, she'll be there.
FG-E6	Sam:	Exactly.
FG-E7	Sarah	She'll be there in a second and she'll answer your question, and
FG-E8		she'll like tell you what you need, like help you out through the
FG-E9		year. She's actually like, she's also like a good friend, too. If
FG-E10		you're like, if you get to know her, she's like a good friend. This
FG-E11		year in French was really good for me because she helped me. I
FG-E12		got lots of support.
FG-E13	X:	Alex, I saw your hand go up.
FG-E14	Alex:	Yeah. I really learned a lot. I learned like a lot, and uh, I know
FG-E15		how to speak a little bit more French, right, this year. And I was
FG-E16		helped.

Focus group interview, lines 270–281

they trusted her to give them the right kind of support for their needs. When students trust their teacher and believe that the teacher is genuinely willing to provide them with guidance, students are more likely to become engaged in the classroom and take risks with their learning (Jordan and Stanovich, 2004; Marzano, 1993). Such a positive rapport is particularly critical for students with learning disabilities and other exceptional needs, as they often have challenges with self-esteem and building positive relationships (Kirk, Gallagher, Anastasiow and Coleman, 2006).

Conclusion

Even within this small case study, it appears that the findings related to the two predominant themes corroborate earlier assertions and findings regarding the nature of effective inclusive teaching in a second language setting (Englert *et al*., 1992; Gersten and Baker, 2000; Hurst, 1996; Sparks *et al*., 1992). Further, the fact that the students themselves did not see much of a distinction between inclusive teaching and effective teaching within core French provides somewhat of an implicit argument for the compatibility of the two constructs. It would be interesting to find out whether such trends continued in a larger corpus of data — particularly one that included teachers who have not been identified as effective inclusive educators — to see if the issues raised in this exploratory consideration have the potential to be more far-reaching.

In describing Julie's generative approach to pedagogy, the students were able to pinpoint specific aspects of her teaching (i.e., use of the target language, gestures, expressions, fluid use of peer collaboration, peer tutoring, and accessibility to students) that they believed contributed to their success. To underscore the true effectiveness of these strategies, further research on inclusive FSL classrooms should endeavour to find correspondences between inclusive teaching practices and actual gains in the language.

Although Casey's and Nathalie's remarks demonstrated that not all of Julie's teaching practices were met with unanimous support, this exploratory consideration of this limited corpus appears to demonstrate that a core French teacher can meet the demands created by a highly diverse student population within a communicative curriculum. Further, as none of the reported practices are seemingly atypical of those suggested in many methods books (e.g., Brown, 2001; Shrum and Glisan, 2005), these findings are of significance to teacher educators. Amengual-Pizarro (2007) discovered that preservice candidates' perceptions of their ability to implement the communicative approach depended, in part, on their perceptions of the effectiveness and ease of use of the methodology; therefore, it becomes imperative that FSL teacher educators model and clearly convey how the practices outlined in this article could be implemented in core French programs. As Nevin *et al*. (2007) pointed out, teacher education programs must do more to address inclusive pedagogy within their programs, and although this study lacks the empirical emphasis they requested, it nonetheless identifies starting points for such efforts.

References

Amengual-Pizarro, M. 2007. How to respond to the demands set by the communicative approach? New challenges second language (L2) teachers face in the classroom. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30, pp. 63–73.

Antón, M. and F.J. DiCamilla. 1998. Socio-cognitive functions of L1 collaborative interaction in the L2 classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 54, pp. 314–342

Ares, N. and J. Gorrell. 2002. Middle school students' understanding of meaningful learning and engaging classroom activities. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, 16, pp. 263–277.

Arnett, K. 2004. Effective teaching and adaptive instruction in core French: A case study of a Grade 8 class in Ontario. Doctoral dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.

Brophy, J.E. 1983. Classroom organization and management. *Elementary School Journal*, 83, pp. 254–285.

Brophy, J.E. and T.L. Good. 1986. Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M.C. Whitrock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: Macmillan, pp. 328–375.

Brown, H.D. 2001. *Teaching by principles. An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. 2nd ed. Boston: Longman.

Calman, R. and I. Daniel. 1998. A board's eye view of core French: The North York Board of Education. In S. Lapkin (ed.), *French second language education in Canada: Empirical studies*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, pp. 281–323.

Cook, V. 2001. Using the first language in the classroom. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, pp. 402–423.

Council for Exceptional Children. 2005. *Universal design for learning: A guide for teachers and education professionals*. Alexandria, VA: Council for Exceptional Children.

DeSimone, J.R. and R.S. Parmar. 2006. Middle school mathematics teachers' beliefs about inclusion of students with learning disabilities. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 21, pp. 98–110.

DiCamilla, F.J. and M. Antón. 1997. The function of repetition in the collaborative discourse of L2 learners. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53, pp. 609–633.

Dörnyei, Z. 2005. *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Englert, C.S. and A.S. Palsincar. 1991. Reconsidering instructional research in literacy from a sociocultural perspective. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 6, pp. 225–229.

Englert, C.S., K.L. Tarrant and T.V. Mariage. 1992. Defining and redefining instructional practices in special education: Perspectives on good teaching. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 15, 62–86.

Fitch, F. 2003. Inclusion, exclusion, and ideology: Special education students' changing sense of self. *Urban Review*, 35, pp. 233–252.

Gersten, R. and S. Baker. 2000. What we know about effective instructional practices for English language learners. *Exceptional Children*, 66, pp. 454–470.

Graham, S. 2005. A study of students' metacognitive beliefs about foreign language study and their impact on learning. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39, pp. 296–309.

Hurst, D. 1996. Teaching Spanish to students with different learning styles: Evolution of a philosophy. *Hispania*, 76, pp. 123–125.

Jordan, A. and P. Stanovich. 2004. The beliefs and practices of Canadian teachers about including students with special needs in their regular elementary classrooms. *Exceptionality Education Canada*, 14, pp. 25–46.

Kirk, S.E., J.J. Gallagher, N.J. Anastasiow and M.R. Coleman. 2006. *Educating exceptional children*. 11th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Klingner, J.K. and S. Vaughn. 1999. Students' perceptions of instruction in inclusion classrooms: Implications for students with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 66, pp. 23–37.

Krashen, S.D. and T. Terrell. 1983. *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. San Francisco: Alemany Press.

Lapkin, S., A. MacFarlane and L. Vandergrift. 2006. Teaching FSL in Canada: Teacher's perspectives. Plenary session presented at Congrès 2006 of the ACPI (Association canadienne des professeurs d'immersion), the ACPLS (Association canadienne des

professeurs de langues secondes), and the APFS (Association des professeurs de français de la Saskatchewan). Saskatoon, Saskatchewan.

Larrivee, B. 1981. Effect of inservice training intensity on teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming. *Exceptional Children*, 48, pp. 34–39.

LeBlanc, R. 1990. *National Core French Study: A synthesis*. Ottawa: Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers.

Lerner, J. 2000. *Learning disabilities: Theories, diagnosis, and correction*. 8th ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Marzano, R.J. 1993. *A different kind of classroom*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Nevin, A., J. Cohen, L. Salazar and D. Marshall. 2007. *Student teacher perspectives on inclusive education*. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. New York.

Ontario Ministry of Education. 1998. *French as a second language: Core French: The Ontario Curriculum grades 4-8*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario Ministry of Education. 2000. *Individual education plans: Standards for development, program planning, and implementation*. Toronto: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Orlich, D.C. (ed.). 2006. *Teaching strategies: A guide to effective instruction*. 8th ed. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Pugach, M.C. 1995. On the failure of the imagination in inclusive schools. *Journal of Special Education*, 22, pp. 197–203.

Rosenshine, B. and R. Stevens. 1986. Teaching functions. In M. Wittock (ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching*. 3rd ed. New York: Macmillan, pp. 376–391.

Saenz, L.M., L.S. Fuchs and D. Fuchs. 2005. Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children*, 71, pp. 231–248.

Shrum, J.L. and E.W. Glisan. 2005. *Teacher's handbook: Contextualized language instruction*. 3rd ed. New York: Thomson Heinle.

Smith, E. and S. Gorard. 2006. Pupils' views on equity in schools. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative Education*, 36, pp. 46–56.

Sparks, R. and L. Ganschow. 1999. Native language skills, foreign language aptitude, and anxiety about foreign language learning. In D.I. Young (ed.), *Affect in foreign language and second language learning: A practical guide to creating a low anxiety classroom atmosphere*. New York: McGraw, pp. 169–190.

Sparks, R., L. Ganschow, J. Pohlman, S. Skinner and M. Artzer. 1992. The effects of multisensory structured instruction on native language and foreign language aptitude skills of at-risk high-school foreign language learners. *Annals of Dyslexia*, 42, pp. 25–53.

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

Storch, N. 2001. How collaborative is pair work? ESL tertiary students composing in pairs. *Language Teaching Research*, 5, pp. 29–53.

Storch, N. 2002. Patterns of interaction in ESL pair work. *Language Learning*, 52, pp. 119–158.

Strauss, A. and J. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swain, M. and S. Lapkin. 1998. Interaction and second language learning: Two adolescent French immersion students working together. *The Modern Language Journal*, 83, pp. 320–328.

Swain, M. and S. Lapkin. 2000. Task-based second language learning: The uses of the first language. *Language Teaching Research*, 4, pp. 251–274.

Swaminathan, R. 2004. "It's my place": Student perspectives on urban school effectiveness. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 15, pp. 33–63.

Tomlinson, C.A. 2003. *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom: Strategies and tools for responsive teaching*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tomlinson, C.A. 2004. The Möbius effect: Addressing learner variance in schools. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37, pp. 516–524.

Turnbull, M. 1999. Multidimensional project-based second language teaching: Observations of four grade 9 core French teachers. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56, pp. 7–30.

Turnbull, M. 2001. There is a role for the L1 in second and foreign language teaching, but ... *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 57, pp. 531–540.

Vaughn, S., J.S. Schumm, J. Klingner and L. Saumell. 1995. Students' views of instructional practices: Implications for inclusion. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, 18, pp. 236–248.

Wood, D., J.S. Bruner and G. Ross. 1976. The role of tutoring in problem-solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 17, pp. 89–100.

Woolfolk, A. 2006. *Educational Psychology*. 10th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Wright, J.E., R.A. Cavanaugh, D. Sainato and W.L. Heward. 1995. Somos todos ayudantes y estudiantes: A demonstration of a class-wide peer tutoring program in a modified Spanish class for secondary students identified as learning disabled or academically at-risk. *Education and Treatment of Children*, 18, pp. 33–52.

Appendix A:
Individual Student Interview

1. Why are you studying French? Do you plan to continue with French after grade 9 ? Why or why not?
2. How do you feel about learning French? In relation to your other courses, where would you place French in the favorite-least favorite continuum? Why?
3. What do you enjoy the most about French class? Why?
4. What do you enjoy the least about French class? Why?
5. How would you describe your learning style? What sort of activities or resources do you think help you learn best? What sort of activities or resources do you think help you learn the least?
6. What do you think of the textbook that is used in this class? Is it appropriate for your level of French?
7. How would you describe your achievement in the class? How do you feel about your level of achievement?
8. How would you describe your understanding and ability to communicate in French? How do you feel about your communication abilities?
9. How do you feel about being in an inclusive class? How do you think this affects your learning? Is there another environment in which you think you would learn more?

Appendix B:
Focus Group Interview

First of all, the purpose of this interview is to do some follow-up with you about what you have each said to me in the individual interviews and what I observed in class so that I can get a better sense of each of your roles in the classroom. To make it easier for me to review this interview later, I ask that before you speak, you identify yourselves. What is said in this room stays in this room and if you do not feel comfortable answering any question, you may say so.

1. Just to make sure that I have everything right, would you please tell me again which languages you can speak? If English is not your first language, would you please tell me when you started learning it?
2. When did you start studying French in core French?
3. Prior to this year, would you please describe what your other core French classes were like?
    a. What was the language use like?
    b. What sorts of activities were used in the class?
    c. What activities or resources were particularly helpful for you?
    d. What strategies did the teachers use, you feel, to help you understand?

e. What was your vocabulary like?

4. How is this year different from your previous years of French study?
   a. Language use?
   b. Activities? Projects? Evaluations? (Different tests)
   c. Strategies that the teacher used?
   d. Skills you developed in class?
   e. Skills that were highly emphasized (i.e., listening, speaking, reading, writing)?
   f. Vocabulary use and study?
5. What about this year had the most influence on your learning?
   a. Specific teaching strategies?
   b. Certain activity types (collaborative, independent, etc)?
   c. Language use?
   d. Classroom atmosphere?
   e. Projects? Tests? Quizzes?
6. How would you describe your improvement from the beginning of this year to the end of this year?
   a. 4 skill areas
   b. Vocabulary recognition and use
   c. Comfort with using French
   d. Pronunciation in French
7. Do you think the teacher did special things that helped you or any other members of the class understand material with which you/they were struggling?
   a. If so, how do these strategies compare to other strategies that teachers in your other courses use?
   b. How do you become aware that she is using a strategy ?
   c. What made these strategies special for you?
   d. What about these strategies helps you understand the material better?
8. What do you see your role as being in the French classroom? What is the role of the teacher?
9. For those of you with an IEP, do you think Mme. is aware of what your IEP says about how you learn best?
   a. How do you know this?
   b. Have you ever spoken with Mme. directly about your learning needs and goals in the class?
      [i.] If so, how did the topic come up? When?

10. Now I'm going to mention several teaching strategies that I saw her use in class. However, before I do, are there some teaching strategies that you felt were a regular part of her teaching that come to mind right away? Would you please tell me what you thought of this strategy and how it impacted your learning?
    a. Repeating what she said
    b. Repeating what she said in a simpler language
    c. Using English to clarify key words
    d. Using gestures
    e. Using voice intonation to draw attention to key words
    f. Writing on the board with large script
    g. Allowing you to work in pairs
    h. Allowing you to use your book on a quiz
    i. Allowing you to consult neighbors during assignments
    j. Giving directions in steps
    k. Giving you an example of how she wants something done
    l. Reminding you of how much time you had left to complete an assignment
    m. Giving you positive reinforcement
    n. Pre-teaching you vocabulary (before Rocher Perce)
    o. Give you prompts when you're stuck while you're speaking French
    p. Having a peer correct your work
    q. Correcting your own work