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Abstract

This study examines French-as-a-second-language (FSL) learning in Canada through the lens of an educational publisher. The fields of language and policy planning, second language learning, and educational publishing provide a focus for the study. The principal purpose of this thesis is to identify key stakeholders in second language learning and to analyze the impact of their actions on the development of FSL resources in Canada. Through qualitative field research with representatives from significant Canadian publishing companies, this analysis of relationships and roles will assist future Canadian second language stakeholders in better understanding the impact of their decisions on the field of publishing, on educational resources, and ultimately, on FSL students in classrooms across the country.
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Chapter 1:  
Introduction  

Topic  
This study examines the field of educational publishing in Canada, with a focus on French-as-a-second-language (FSL) resources and the activities leading to their final publication. The term “educational resource” is used to describe textbooks and other learning materials, including educational multimedia and online products. Situating my study within the publishing domain will allow for an exploration of the relationships and roles between Canadian educational publishers and other key FSL stakeholders, which for this paper are defined as Canadian academic researchers and policy-makers.  

By further contextualizing my research within two significant events in the FSL field, I will have the opportunity to examine motivations, barriers, and implications of key stakeholders’ actions on both the publishing field and the broader topic of Canadian bilingualism. The two major, but very different, events that I selected: The National Core French Study, rooted in academic research, and which impacted Core French curricula across the country starting in the late 1980s and continuing right up to present day; and the 2003 Canadian federal Action Plan for Official Languages, also called The Next Act (Government of Canada, 2003) and more recently Road map (Government of Canada, 2008), which represents a political undertaking to improve second language programs across the country.  

Rationale  
During my twenty-five years of employment in the Canadian publishing industry, I have observed changes in federal and provincial political leadership and the resulting impact on educational resource development. My study explores how these factors of change affected the
educational field and publishing, with an objective to produce findings of interest to those who support and promote bilingualism efforts in this country.

As an editor, publisher, and author of second language educational materials, my experiences with resource development teams have been varied – with some projects achieving success as the direct result of leadership from an academic researcher, and others facing limitations due to a lack of exposure to the breadth of research available. This study will examine these scenarios to expose the long-term benefits of collaboration between publishers and academic researchers in their efforts to translate policy and communicate research to teachers and students.

Further, while the activities of academic researchers and policy-makers are widely documented through their final policy statements and academic publications, there is a pronounced gap in the literature addressing the challenges Canadian publishers face in the second language arena. By addressing this gap, I hope that other researchers will be inspired to explore these relationships further, through an alternate lens, to encourage collaboration and thereby enhance learning resources and bilingualism efforts in general.

Finally, as second language educators across the country prepare to review their provincial curricula, it is time to evaluate, and value, the trailblazing efforts undertaken in the past by our country’s prescient second language leaders.

*Why Focus on the Publishing Field?*

Educational publishing has experienced tremendous change over the past two decades. Long considered the most lucrative area in the publishing industry, the educational side of the Canadian publishing industry struggles in its attempt to address two potentially conflicting
missions - profitability and growth objectives in an era of changing technology, and a commitment to best practices in the preparation of Canadian youth for future success.

In my role as a freelance publisher, I interview teachers and educational administrators across the country to determine future needs for resources. Increasingly, educators are encouraging publishing companies to address professional development, e.g., instructional as well as technological advances, either through web sites or learning materials since school boards and Ministries of Education across the country, in a response to budget considerations, have opted for limiting funding to this area. Consequently, in addition to their influence on teachers and students through educational resources, Canadian publishers are positioned to play an even greater role in interpreting and communicating to teachers changes and advancements in educational content and instructional design. For these reasons alone, more than ever before, key stakeholders will be required to collaborate with one another.

An understanding of educational publishers’ history and operations, as well as their challenges, would appear therefore to be not only timely, but beneficial, to all education stakeholders, but particularly to policy-makers and researchers whose policies and research findings are translated and communicated to teachers and students through publishers’ educational resources.

**Why Focus on The National Core French Study and The 2003 Action Plan?**

In my opinion, The National Core French Study and The Action Plan constitute two critical events in the history of FSL learning in Canada. My examination of how these events were developed and launched will illustrate the ways in which key FSL stakeholders interrelate, and the resulting effect on the publishing field.
**The National Core French Study: Setting the scene.**

Prior to the 1980s, FSL learning materials were delivered in the format of a single textbook. Most FSL textbooks were printed in black and white only and focused primarily on grammar practice. By the early 1980s, FSL textbooks developed by one fairly small but innovative Canadian publisher were dominating the national marketplace. Although the focus continued to be on grammar, their introduction of full-colour illustrations and photos, as well as audio to reflect the audio-visual approach in second language learning, rapidly became the required format for all second language publishers at the time.

By the late 1980s, there was an increasing divide between Ontario and the other Canadian provinces, stemming from the influence of the National Core French Study. For second language publishers, this divide resulted in the need, which thus far has continued right up to this day, to develop two distinct FSL learning programs: one for Ontario, and a second for the rest of the country.

**The National Core French Study (1985-1989).**

According to information provided by the Canadian Association of Second Language Teachers (CASLT), the National Core French Study (NCFS) was a pan-Canadian project, set up by CASLT in 1985, to re-examine the teaching of Core French. The study’s three main objectives:

1. to examine Core French programs across the country;
2. to identify the strengths and weakness of these programs in order to improve them;
3. to compile and share ideas, experiments, and results of relevant research findings.

In 1985, results of initial research indicated that the emphasis in teaching was on linguistic elements of the French language, over communication. In response, a group of
prescient educators from all levels of education across the country proposed a national, multidimensional curriculum, with recommendations that reflected a broad approach to second language learning based on four major areas of concern, or syllabuses - communicative/experiential learning, culture, language, and general language education.

This multi-dimensional syllabus quickly influenced provincial guideline development in all provinces across Canada, with the exception of Ontario. By the early 1990s, there was a national groundswell to revise FSL curriculum consistent with NCFS recommendations. Since that time all provinces, except Ontario, have adopted curricula that are grounded in the principles and methodology of the NCFS. With a recent call in Ontario for the revision of FSL guidelines, there has been some discussion pertaining to the inclusion of some of the classic NCFS principles in the new curriculum slated for implementation in 2011. Should this occur, the NCFS will be reflected in Ontario policy more than 25 years after Dr. H. H. Stern, former director of the Modern Language Centre, Ontario Institute of Studies in Education, University of Toronto, spearheaded this major research project.

**The National Action Plan for Official Languages: Setting the scene.**

In response to the research conducted from 1963-1970 by the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism (RCBB, 1967), the Official Languages Act was passed in Canada in 1969. This law, considered the cornerstone of legislation for Official Bilingualism in Canada, gave English and French *equal* status in the Canadian confederation.

In 2003, one year before the 35th anniversary of the Official Languages Act, the Canadian federal government renewed its commitment to bilingualism and pledged over $750 million dollars, in its first five years, to the implementation of an Action Plan for Official Languages.
According to information provided by Canadian Heritage, the three considerations that led the Chretien government to develop the 2003 Action Plan for Official Languages were, “our past, our future, and the modernization of our policies” (Canadian Heritage, 2009). A formal commitment to the promotion of Canada’s two official languages came in the 2002 Speech from Throne, which pledged, among the many initiatives in the Action Plan, to double by 2013 the number of bilingual high school graduates in both of Canada’s official languages, from the current 24% to 50%. In addition, the plan announced the following education goals: to improve retention rates, to increase the quality of language instruction and language instructors, and to provide more exchange programs and bursaries. The plan concentrated on funding as well for community programs and for the Canadian federal public service.

When the Canadian federal government announced its Action Plan in 2003, I was employed with Oxford University Press as the Publisher and Senior Author of FSL programs. When I learned of this announcement in 2005, I was initially enthusiastic. However, my enthusiasm diminished as I became aware of the activities across the country and the limitations of the process, due to a lack of coordinated planning between the stakeholders. One example: in March 2006, while the critical academic research stage was in process, and three years after the Action Plan was announced, the Ontario government finally signed the Protocol Agreement. It was the last province to sign the official documents. In return, the province immediately received close to $30 million to be disbursed over four years in support of FSL programs. I was elated in spring 2006 to read the official Ontario Ministry letter stating that $7.8 million would be allocated immediately to school boards across the province. According to the letter, one focus of the funding would be Core French revival, coupled with encouragement to use funds for
purchase of high-quality resources, or to fund potential authors on sabbatical to develop new resources based on the latest research. My elation turned to disappointment with the announcement that the Ontario FSL curriculum review was slated to commence in 2009. All publishers knew that it would be futile to develop new resources prior to the 2009 curriculum review, and I observed with disappointment the many Ontario educators who were forced to make hasty decisions to spend their first phase of funding on either outdated resources, or resources that did not address the research in progress. Further, school boards were allowed very little time to prepare their proposals in order to obtain the funding, which in the end impacted negatively on each of the remaining phases of funding. I will be exploring more of the activities that led to the second phase of Action Plan in my literature review.

My selection of these two historical events as a context for this paper will provide the opportunity to identify roles and relationships between publishers and other key stakeholders, and establish potential comparative patterns, which will lead, I hope, to a better understanding of the evolving publishing process and the impact of research and policy on resource development.

**Research Questions**

While recognizing the broader topics of language policy and planning and Canadian bilingualism, this study will focus primarily on the context of educational publishing, and more specifically on two key FSL events, as well as some of the related actors. The primary goal will be to explore the publishing domain, and the relationships that impacted its products and activities during the time of The National Core French Study and The 2003 Action Plan for Official Languages.
Using the context of these two key events, one main research question addresses the goals of this study:

How do FSL educational publishers interrelate with academic researchers and policy and curriculum developers, and how do their relationships impact students, teachers, and Canadian bilingualism efforts in general?

Sub-questions of this primary question include:

1. Where is the publishing industry located within policy and curriculum development?

2. How do publishers collaborate with academic researchers prior to and during the publishing process of a resource?

3. How do the stakeholders communicate the results of their work to each other and to Canadians?

**Methodological Approach**

The research that informs my theoretical framework is situated within a qualitative, historical method, incorporating critical discourse analysis (CDA) as the analytical tool, and based on findings from Ely, Anzul, Freidman, and Garner (1991), Fairclough (1989, 1992, 1995), Wodak (2000) and Cooper (1989). I also draw on principles of the ethnographic approach (Hymes, 1962) to form my methodological framework. Through the use of thematic analysis at a macro level, together with dominant discourses at the micro level, I will identify and analyze the socio-cultural practice of educational publishing (Abodeeb-Gentile, 2008).

As in ethnography, my study examines human behaviour, and a focus on culture is integral to my analysis (Hymes, 1962). More specifically for this study, the key area of focus is on publishers and their setting, i.e., publishing companies, and accounts of what people do in
their setting, or did in the past, and the outcomes and meanings of their interactions. The focus is on the development of learning materials, and how and why things happen, and do not happen, and the interactions which accompany each stage. I will highlight how behaviours are socially organized through cultural values. To determine socio-cultural practice, I am interested in identifying group characteristics rather than individual characteristics (Watson-Gegeo, 1988).

The inclusion in this study of an overview of my own observations within the publishing setting over the past two decades serves as one of many techniques that I access in order to provide a thorough descriptive account of the socio-cultural practice of educational publishing, and its meanings and patterns. Further, the holistic elements of the ethnographic approach allow for an examination of both the institutional and societal pressures that impact the publishing world and ultimately the development of educational resources, all of which will lead to a better understanding of the publishing domain and its challenges.

As a researcher and publisher, my objective was to make use of an adapted ethnographic approach to reflect on my professional experiences, thereby contributing to the understanding of some of the broader issues that impact the field of education. This opportunity for critical reflection assisted me in maintaining my objectivity during the interviews and analysis of the data, and in distancing myself from my role as a member of the educational publishing field to draw on my beliefs that personal reflection is intrinsically tied to informed change (Abodeeb-Gentile, 2008).

One underlying goal of my framework was to determine the factors, both internally within the social and professional world of publishing, and externally with key stakeholders, that affect social interactions. Through this examination, I hope to advance an understanding of the impact of these factors on both the
1. *learning of a second language*, through an analysis of the evolution of educational resource development in response to changing instructional methods and policy, and

2. *actual use of language* itself through a critical discourse analysis of the collected data.

**Organization of the Thesis**

In the next chapter, I will present an analysis of relevant literature associated with language politics and policy planning, Canadian bilingualism, the Canadian media, and educational publishing. Additionally, I will include relevant literature associated with the National Core French Study and the 2003-2013 federal Action Plan. This will be followed in the next chapter with information about my methodological framework. I will then provide an overview of my personal experiences, during the past two decades, with the ever-evolving publishing process. In the final two chapters, I will present my analysis of the data collected and conclude with a commentary on the implications of stakeholder roles and relationships for publishers, their publishing process, teachers and students, and Canadian bilingualism in general.
Chapter 2:  
Conceptual Framework

*Literature Review*

*Language Planning and Policy*

When I began the exploration of literature for this study, I planned to investigate relationships between educational stakeholders and the impact of their actions on the development of resources. From the initial research, it became apparent that these stakeholder relationships happened within a larger context – language planning.

*The frameworks: Where do educational resources fit?*

Usually undertaken at the government level, “language planning” is a process that has as its goal to influence, and sometimes change, a society’s way of speaking (Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). It encompasses activities ranging from macro-level national government planning, to meso-level planning, down to local and individual, or micro-level planning (Haarmann, 1990, Haugen, 1983, Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005). Although sometimes used interchangeably with “language policy”, the two terms are distinct. Language policy refers to the ideas and beliefs, and rules and regulations, associated with the language practices of a community (Spolsky, 2004).

Some researchers, such as Jernuud (1993), Fishman (1991), and Neustupny (1987) have argued for an alternate term for language planning - “language management”, which allows for a focus on policy that is initiated from the bottom up, or at the micro level, as opposed to the more common top down, government-level initiation.

Although there is no general agreed-upon language planning framework, Baldauf (2008) identifies four common activity types among the researchers in language planning – status
planning (related to society), corpus planning (related to language), language-in-education planning or acquisition planning (related to language learning), and prestige planning (related to image). A comparison of the frameworks in which the range of language planning is detailed reveals that in Haugen’s (1983) corpus versus status planning model, the development of educational resources is placed within status planning, and called the “#3. Implementation” phase (see Table 1).

**Table 1**

*Haugen’s 1983 Model for Language Planning*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form (policy planning)</th>
<th>Function (language cultivation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Society (status planning)</td>
<td>1. Selection (decision procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. problem identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. allocation of norms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (corpus planning)</td>
<td>2. Codification (standardisation procedures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a. graphisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. grammatication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. lexication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly, Liddicoat (2005) connects the activity of educational resources development to status planning; but in Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2005), it is referenced within the “language-in education” stage (see Figure 1); while Cooper (1989) refers to this activity within “acquisition planning”.
Within the frameworks, the language-in-education, or acquisition planning, stage occurs at the micro level, where administrators and teachers in the role of decision makers determine who teaches what and in what manner. Their decisions and activities can either reinforce or undermine a national policy, forcing language planners to change or develop new policy, and thereby justifying the critical importance of this stage (Baldauf, 2005).

Kaplan and Baldauf (2005) identify seven interrelated policy goals that influence the success of the language-in-education planning stage. They include:

1. Access policy (Who learns what when?)
2. Personnel policy (Where do the teachers come from and how are they trained?)
3. Curriculum policy (What is the objective in language teaching and learning?)
4. Methodology and materials policy (What methods and materials are employed?)

5. Resourcing policy (How is everything paid for?)

6. Community policy (Who is consulted?)

7. Evaluation policy (What is the connection between assessment and methods and materials?)

Notably, in the supporting research for #4 above, which provides case studies on Japan, Sweden, and South Korea, the researchers include no details on process for development of resources (Kaplan & Baldauf, 2005). Thus, there is a pronounced gap in how the “methods” are translated into “materials”, or in other words, the process of how theory and curriculum is translated into educational resources.

Similarly, Liddicoat (2005) describes textbook creation as connected to corpus development and mentions the importance of process; however, his examples of materials development are small-scale. For example, individual activities with a publishing process are described within a few sentences, and the situations apply to developing countries where a language has not yet been used.

Cooper’s (1989) accounting scheme encourages more details about the process by suggesting variables that need to be addressed (What actors? Attempt to influence what behaviours? Of which people? For what ends? Under what conditions? By what means? Through what decision-making process? With what effect?), but again, there is no comprehensive information in the literature on roles and relationships that need to be formed when curriculum is created and educational resources are developed to communicate this curriculum to teachers and students. Further, these gaps in the actual frameworks and the associated literature of Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2005), Baldauf (2005), Cooper (1989), and Haugen (1983) leave unanswered
questions, for example, Which actors “should” be involved in a curriculum review? Once curriculum policy is confirmed, what is the best method to translate it into resources? And to communicate it to teachers and students? What are the barriers? What is the impact on publishing and resources when instructional methods evolve from research findings, such as the current change in all subject areas from the “what” of learning to the “how of “learning?

Although Kaplan and Baldauf (1997) suggest that Cooper’s accounting scheme of key questions encourages an analysis of roles and relationships between key stakeholders, they confirm that neither Cooper nor Haugen “actually describes how one goes about the process of language planning” (p. 87). As mentioned previously, as a further reinforcement of the gap, even Kaplan and Baldauf (1997, 2005) fail to provide a comprehensive and practical step-by-step approach for some of their seven education-in-planning objectives.

**The actors: Where do educational publishers fit?**

According to the literature, the actors, or those involved in language planning, are derived from four basic areas: “governmental agencies” such as Canadian provincial ministries; “education agencies,” which refer to, for example, province and school board activities; “non-governmental agencies” such as civil society, the courts, and the increasingly influential media; and finally “other groups,” reflecting all those remaining who exert influence over language policy creators (Fishman, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf, 1997). Within these various frameworks, educational publishers are not mentioned, although I would posit that they fit into the last category, “other groups”.

In reference to the actors’ roles and relationships, several sociolinguists agree that a language plan impacts a number of contexts and levels, from government through to individuals (Fishman, 1991; Kaplan & Baldauf 1997). Reflecting these contexts, Haarmann’s (1990) visual...
representation of his framework (see Figure 2) attempts to depict the complementary and collaborative goal of the actors and their activities, where both a top-down and bottom-up approach could possibly be viewed on a continuum of interconnectedness.

![Figure 2. Haarmann’s 1990 model for language planning.](image)

This framework stands in contrast to Haugen’s model (1983) and Baldauf’s model (2005), both of which offer an overview of language planning that follows a linear progression, with no visual hint of interactivity, or reciprocity, between the levels.

Speaking from a publisher’s perspective, Haarmann (1990) addresses best the interactive nature of the language planning process through his reciprocal framework, especially when compared to Haugen’s (1983) linear approach. Haarmann (1990) does not provide in his paper the necessary details on process to validate the theme of interconnectedness in his framework, although he underscores process and suggests a continuum of activity, “In its very nature language planning is a process rather than a state of affairs. Any sociolinguistic approach to applied or methodological matters in this field should aim at illustrating the processual character of planning… language planning is a continuous activity… (p. 106).
Controversy continues to exist today among researchers with regard to the differences and similarities between macro-level and micro-level planning, leading to further arguments regarding the validity of a “continuum of activity” between the levels. Some researchers have even questioned whether micro-level planning belongs in a separate sub-field of applied linguistics (Baldauf, 2008). These differing opinions and research findings have given rise to the examination of agency, or who holds the power to influence change (Baldauf, 2008). There is currently a variety of studies that offer examples from around the world of resistance at the micro level to top-down language policy. These resistances to macro-created policy stem from a wide range of concerns, e.g., related to the language itself that is the focus of a policy, or related to an instructional method that is encouraged in the policy. As interest in the micro level of language gains further momentum, researchers continue to encourage agency among micro-level actors when coping with disconnects from top-down planning. In my thesis, I will be examining these disconnects and resistances in Canada’s language planning and policy with regard to FSL, at a critical juncture where policies are being translated into actual educational resources, which in turn have the potential to shape educational practices.

Figure 3 highlights the actors that I will be focusing on in this study and underscores the potential reciprocal nature of the relationships, and the influential position of educational resources in communicating policy and research to teachers and students.
Figure 3. Spotlighting the relationships of stakeholders in second language learning.

Language Planning and Policy and the Canadian Context

The formulation of language policy in Canada begins at the federal level, with the cooperation of the provinces, followed by policy implementation through boards, districts, and individual schools (Mady, 2007). The Canadian government works within a framework of both
status planning, through the recognition of two official languages, and of acquisition planning, through its plan to increase language users (Mady, 2007).

In 1969, the federal government confirmed its support of two official languages with the promulgation of the Official Languages Act. Over 30 years later, after an intervening update in 1988, issues related to achievement of equal status between the two languages continued to linger. In an effort to address equality, and to respond to the call from the Commissioner of Official Languages at the time to strengthen FSL programs, the Privy Council Office released in 2003 an action plan, called *The Next Act* (Government of Canada, 2003). As mentioned earlier, funding in excess of $750 million accompanied the 2003 Action Plan.

Over these past 40 years, the Canadian federal government has reinforced its support of the two official languages through generous funding programs valued in billions of dollars. In contrast, at the meso level, Table 2 reveals the inconsistent provincial responses regarding the second official language in Canada. I have focused on Core French only since over 90% of Canadian students are enrolled in this area (Lapkin, 2003). Although Table 2 presents information from 2005, only one province, Alberta, had altered its policy by 2009 and mandated a second language in Grades 4-9.
Table 2

Provincial Policies for French as a Second Language in Canada (Kissau, 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>FSL: Mandatory grades</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>Grades 5-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>Not mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>Not mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>Not mandatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Grades 4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>Grades 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Grades 4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>Grades 4-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newfoundland and Labrador</td>
<td>Grades 4-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The policy at the federal level continues to promote two official languages through generous funding, as reflected in the 2008 Lord report, in which the former New Brunswick premier requested a further $1 billion to support second language efforts. To date, this request has been approved and the release of funds is in progress (Canadian Heritage, 2009).

According to research findings learning a second language leads to the enhancement of one’s first language and interest in learning other languages (Cummins, 1979; Swain & Lapkin, 1982). As an officially bilingual country in an era of globalization, we are fortunate to have this built-in opportunity to extend a Canadian child’s ability to learn a second, or third, language. Sadly, however, there appears to be a disconnect between the federal policy, i.e., two equal and official languages, and its implementation at the critical meso (provincial) level, and possibly at the micro level (boards and schools).
My study will explore the impact of the inconsistent implementation of policies in the mandatory status of Core French across the provinces. I will examine, through publishers’ lenses, if this lack of enthusiasm for second language learning at the provincial government policy level impacts negatively the activities at the micro level, thereby contributing to a lack of collaboration between the stakeholders, and creating further disconnects during implementation of policies. My study will explore resulting issues around the prestige, or image, of French, such as the sources of the negativity expressed in the Canadian media, and the impact of missing the critical message that learning a second language enhances first and other language learning.

In the following areas of my literature review, I will attempt to examine some of these topics in greater depth, within the context and associated activities of the two key events. The exploration will continue in Chapter 5 with the analysis of data.

**The National Core French Study (NCFS)**

The model of a multi-dimensional syllabus introduced by the NCFS provided a progressive and pedagogically sound alternative to the previous, more grammar-driven policies of the 1980s. For educational publishers in the 1990s, this focus on new pedagogy provided an opportunity for the first time to unite all provinces across the country, with the exception of Ontario, through one common pedagogical framework in one resource.

A closer examination of the activities leading to the NCFS model, which are detailed below, illustrates how educators from all levels, led by prescient academic researchers, can successfully initiate change by working with both federal and provincial policy-makers, through appropriate and timely funding and curriculum review, to alter the direction of pedagogy and influence learning in Canadian classrooms.
“It was at the 1982 Winnipeg Conference that the much respected, late H.H. Stern, pronounced the words which would later constitute the basis for the multi-dimensional approach and the creation of the NCFS, in his rousing keynote address, ‘Let's use our heads to reach their hearts’…” ¹

This quote is taken from an historical report by Manitoba’s former FSL provincial consultant and former CASLT president, Caterina Sotiriadis. In her report, Sotiriadis recounts the activities leading up to the publication of the NCFS in 1990. She describes how Dr. H. H. Stern was inspired to initiate a national FSL study, after research in Europe foreshadowed the challenges that lay ahead for second language learning in Canada. She details how, after two years of negotiation, the federal government finally agreed to fund CASLT’s first project, the NCFS, and outlines how Dr. Stern assembled an influential and enthusiastic group of key educators from all levels of education across the country to form writing teams, review teams, and pilot teams. She mentioned the tragedies that beset the study, with the death of Dr. Stern and two other key members prior to its publication in 1990. Most importantly, she discusses how the provinces worked together to create, in 1994, a model for implementation that subsequently influenced curriculum guidelines, right up to this day across the country.

According to information provided by CASLT, the final report of the Study included two key recommendations:

1. that the provinces and the territories carry out changes to their FSL programming following the results of the study;

2. that educational publishers offer educational materials in line with the new ways of teaching FSL.

¹ Retrieved on December 1, 2008 from www.caslt.org/Info/memories.htm -7k-
Thus, educators associated with the NCFS did eventually include publishers at the close of their study, by calling on them in the final report to communicate the findings to teachers. In retrospect, however, the long and arduous road to producing resources, and thereby transferring theory to practice, which I experienced first-hand, could have been smoother had publishers been included in the study from the outset.

The Federal Action Plan for Official Languages

As the first phase (2003-2008) of the Action Plan was drawing to a close, the Canadian Conservative Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Josée Verner, the Minister of Canadian Heritage, commissioned Bernard Lord, the former premier of New Brunswick, to preside over the government’s consultations on linguistic duality and official languages, and to submit a report on activities associated with this first phase, with recommendations for the next, and final, phase of the plan, 2009-2013. In his February 29, 2008 report, Lord states, “… given that the Action Plan will soon be coming to an end, the Government organized consultations in order to gather the perspectives of Canadians on important issues relating to linguistic duality… These consultations are just one of the sources of information that will inform the elaboration of the next phase of the Action Plan. The results will complement the work carried out by the parliamentary committees on official languages…” (Lord, 2008, p.1).

The Lord report is not the sole source of information for planners implementing the next phase of the Action Plan; however, it appeared to be inconsistent with the policy of the previous Liberal government under Jean Chretien, which stated a goal of doubling the number of bilingual high school graduates. This particular initiative was conspicuous by its absence in the Lord report.
According to information provided through Canadian Heritage and the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, the following are some of the Action Plan first-phase activities which preceded the Lord report, and which are also conspicuous by their absence in his report:

1. December 2003-April 30, 2004: a study funded by the Department of Canadian Heritage, provided over 50 recommendations to address the goal of doubling bilingual high school graduates (Rehorick, 2006).

2. November 2003: a research paper called Rising to the Challenge: A research perspective on how to double the proportion of secondary school graduates with a functional knowledge of French, funded by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages (Lapkin, 2003), provided five core recommendations.

3. March 2-4, 2004: A symposium funded by the Office of the Commissioner of Official Languages, in partnership with Canadian Heritage, Intergovernmental Affairs, and Canadian Parents for French, discussed numerous issues and potential solutions for achieving the 2013 goal, and other goals.

4. September 2006: a research report funded by Canadian Heritage on Teaching French as a second language: Teachers’ Perspectives (Lapkin, MacFarlane & Vandergrift, 2006), provided a comprehensive literature review to inform a national survey and a comprehensive table of information on both general and specific challenges faced by FSL teachers.

provided numerous discussion questions pertaining to the achievement of the 2013 goal.

The focus on FSL as a result of the Action Plan and its initiative to double the number of bilingual graduates brought with it much needed activity in the FSL subject area, as demonstrated in the list above. Although educational publishers were not notified of, nor invited to participate in, any of the activities above, the collaboration between policy-makers and researchers produced many invaluable recommendations. These include: define the meaning of bilingual (also referred to as functional knowledge in the documents), promote more frequent and better use of technology, promote research into second-language education, establish a national group to preside over the developments leading up to the 2013 goal, increase the number of qualified teachers, develop national standards, and finally, improve Core French programs, where over 90% of non-French speaking students are enrolled, as stated in Lapkin (2003).

**Bilingualism and the Canadian Media**

A review of the literature associated with the Action Plan reveals the negative discourse and controversy associated with the federal policy, and the potential impact on the broader topics of bilingualism in Canada and language planning. Following are two examples of the media reaction to the Lord appointment in 2007 and his subsequent report in 2008.

In a *Globe and Mail* article, following the appointment of Bernard Lord, journalist Fenlon (2007) challenged the focus on bilingualism itself and stated, “for the first time allophones - those who speak neither French nor English - represent one-fifth of the population”. He continued by adding that according the 2006 Census, 19.8% of Canada’s total population was born outside the country, a percentage that proves there are now as many Canadians with a non-
official language as there are francophones. There was no mention in his article of academic research that underscores Canada’s leadership role in bilingualism. There was no mention of the research findings revealing that learning a second language leads to the enhancement of one’s first language and the interest in learning other languages (Cummins, 1979; Swain & Lapkin, 1982), or that students acquiring a third language hold a learning advantage (Mady, 2007). There was no mention in the article of the argument that our country may be well positioned, as a result of the research, to address the key issues today around literacy and diversity in this era of globalization. Further, there were no suggestions to build on second language research findings in this country, and transfer some of this knowledge to ESL, and third language learning.

In another *Globe and Mail* article titled “Good Lord, what an uninspiring bilingualism report,” journalist Johnson (2008) acknowledges his anticipation of the Lord report since Johnson is the son of a Franco-Ontarian mother. He expressed his disappointment when Lord gave “no analysis of success or failure of the first five years of the plan”. Johnson asked: “Are 50% of Canadian youths now bilingual? Can federal officials now work in their own language in Ottawa and Quebec? If not, what caused the failures? What are the remedies?”

Second language experts are communicators, but in examining the literature, the manner in which a political initiative like the Action Plan has been developed, launched, and executed, reveals that deficiencies in planning and communication have weakened its effectiveness, thereby negatively impacting both students and teachers of second language learning and the advancement of Canadian bilingualism in general.

This short review of these two different events reveals that although the development of adequate educational resources is a key element of the successful implementation of second
language policies, educational publishers, as key stakeholders, have been practically ignored during the decisional process.

**Educational Publishers**

My review of the literature that addresses curriculum and the publishing industry worldwide disclosed a limited number of articles addressing the field of educational publishing from 1955 to present. As Watt (2004, p.88) noted in his literature review detailing the publishing activities in the United States, “the understanding of its workings is at best imperfect”. He adds that the “mystery” surrounding the publishing industry in the United States is further enhanced by the fact that few, if any, researchers have conducted substantive studies around the publishing industry in either the United Kingdom or Australia.

**Educational publishing and the Canadian context.**

According to Roht (1978), a decade following the authorization of textbooks in the late 1840s came the birth of the Canadian educational publishing industry. While serving as Ontario’s Superintendent of Education from 1844 to 1874, Egerton Ryerson, often referred to as the grandfather of the Canadian educational publishing industry, created a book depository. He bought textbooks from outside Canada, usually from the United States or Britain, in large quantities and at a reduced rate, and then resold the materials to schools boards. This reduced rate created much controversy among the other booksellers at the time since the merchants were unable to sell their textbooks at an equally low rate. The popular Bookseller’s Association of Canada even joined in the protest against the monopoly of the depository, but to little avail, since Ryerson claimed that most booksellers did not carry appropriate materials. Consequently, schools that did not purchase (his) authorized textbooks did not receive grants from their school board.
Textbook publishing in Canada remained fairly consistent until the 1940s. Up to that time, provincial ministries of education commissioned educators to write the textbooks, and publishers to print them. Thus, the publishing company’s role up to the mid 1940s was restricted generally to production and printing tasks, as opposed to creative activities. After World War II and continuing until 1960, it was common practice to have a single prescribed textbook for each subject area. With populations increasing, this system offered many rewards to the fortunate educational publishers, who by now were creating and printing their own materials, and often adapting their American text to Canadian conditions. After 1960, the single-listing system for textbooks was abolished and authorized textbook lists took effect. It was during this time that decentralization for purchasing became an important factor for publishers, continuing as an increasing concern right to this day. By the 1960s, the authority to select and purchase books, as well as establish courses and budgets, was transferred to the school board level, in most jurisdictions. Also during this decade, many small educational publishing companies started to emerge, reflecting the nationalistic fervour of the times, as this was the era of Expo 67, Trudeaumania, and a backlash against aggressive American conglomerates.

*Educational publishing associations.*

Established in 1971 in response to the takeover of Ryerson Press by the American publisher McGraw-Hill of New York, the Association of Canadian Publishers (ACP) is committed to the promotion of a healthy Canadian-owned and controlled publishing industry. Its lobbying activities have resulted in a number of programs that regulate foreign investment in the book industry, and funding, such as the Canada Council direct funding to publishers, which was created in 1972.

In addition to ACP, the Canada’s Educational Resource Council (CERC) represents:
the interests of developers and suppliers of educational materials for the K-12 sector. CERC monitors political, economic and pedagogical trends across Canada and maintains close liaison with Ministries/Departments of Education, educators and parents' organizations. CERC is dedicated to promoting the interests of the learning resources industry to positively influence support for curriculum resource development… The need for the learning resources industry to work co-operatively with educational policy-makers has never been so urgent. Ongoing communication between the providers of educational resources, school boards and provincial officials can help ensure a predictable, adequately funded educational marketplace in which students have access to high quality learning resources that support their efforts and achievements.” ²

My attempt to more closely examine the CERC web site failed on many occasions since either many areas of the site were not yet active, while others were outdated, or under renovation. In the information available, the site fails to acknowledge the dramatic leadership changes during the past three to five years in each of the key publishing companies.

Considering the lack of knowledge on actual practices in the publishing industry, the substantial transformations that have occurred in this industry over the past decades, and the crucial, collaborative role imparted to curriculum developers and publishers in the implementation of language policies, a study of the practices and cultural norms of the educational publishing setting, as well as the relationships between the key stakeholders, seems absolutely necessary and timely.

**Theoretical Framework**

In my study, I use a range of methodologies that combine an adaptation of critical discourse analysis (CDA) from Fairclough (1992, 1995), with thematic analysis and ethnography procedures such as interviews, focus groups, and reflections on personal experiences. My goal is to describe the socio-cultural practice of educational publishing, as well as the relationships between the key stakeholders.

² Retrieved on January 10, 2009 from www.cerc-ca.org
I begin my analysis with a general overview of educational publishing through themes. As cited in Abodeeb-Gentile (2008), “Practically speaking, with themes as with categories, we may list many, go through processes of refining and combining them, and in the end select those that seem most salient, or most relevant to the story we have chosen to tell” (Ely, Vinz, Downing, & Anzul, 1997, p. 206). My analysis of themes consists of three layers, beginning with the identification of three key publishing functions: publisher, editor, and product manager. From these functions, the data reveals two common publishing activities within which these functions occur: the decision to publish and the publishing process. From the two common activities, five broad themes emerge to describe the educational publishing context: multi-dimensional skills, profitability, partnering with the market, the impact and future potential of technology, and the trailblazing efforts of FSL. Following this macro-analysis of the publishing field, I continue using CDA to analyze the stakeholder relationships.

CDA is a research approach and critical tool that combines social theory and linguistics. Spearheaded in the late 1980s by Norman Fairclough, Ruth Wodak and others, it focuses on social interactions and the various means through which language connects relationships of power (Bourdieu, 1977; Foucault, 1969, 1972; Gee, 1999). Unlike most other streams of research in linguistics which most often fail to connect the micro level textual analysis with the bigger social issues, according to Fairclough and Wodak (1997) the role of the researcher in this approach is to examine relationships that exist between social practices and texts.

A popular discussion among researchers of CDA relates to the role of context, how it impacts social interactions, and how much of it should be considered by the researcher (Billig, 1999; Rogers et al, 2005). A principal focus of CDA is the macro context, encompassing both the broader topics of society and institutions, and its impact on the micro, or local, level of a text.
and its grammatical make up. Unlike content, or conversation, analysis, where the text itself is
the main focus, CDA encompasses a broader multi-dimensional focus. According to Rogers et al
(2005), from the point of view of analytic procedures, there are a number of CDA approaches
available to researchers ranging from Fairclough (1992, 1995), to the historical approach from
Wodak (2000), and multimodal from Kress (1996).

Fairclough (1992) based his analytic approach on Systemic Functional Linguistics
(Halliday & Hasan, 1976) and the work on social theory from Foucault (1972, 1979, 1981). In
simple terms, SFL rejects frequency or word count in analysis, which is common to content
analysis, and focuses rather on point of view. In other words, it is not how often the word is used
but how it is used in terms of grammar and context. Fairclough incorporated the SFL framework
into his own three-tiered, or three-dimensional, approach to analysis, which he identified as

Abodeeb-Gentile (2008) confirms that Gee defines discourse in relation to group
membership by stating that it is “a socially accepted association among ways of using language
of thinking, and of acting that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially
meaningful group or ‘social network’ ” (1989, p. 20).

Fairclough defines text as being either written discourse or oral discourse; discourse
practice is defined as the manner in which texts are produced; and socio-cultural practice refers
to the establishment of the immediate, and the broader institutional context, as well as the widest
social and cultural context within which the communicative event is situated. According to
Mullany (2000), Fairclough confirms the interconnection between these three elements, with
discourse practice providing the link between the other two elements. Fairclough admits that a
critical analysis does not have to include, however, all three elements.
Mullany (2000) confirms that Fairclough focused his analysis on the dynamics of power in discourse, and how individuals and societies maintain levels of power through use of language. According to Mullany, in Fairclough’s (1989) research, “dominant discourse” provided the focus of his analysis.

If a discourse so dominates an institution that dominated types are more or less entirely suppressed or contained, then it will cease to be seen as arbitrary, and it will come to be seen as natural and legitimate because it is simply the way of conducting oneself. (p. 91)

Recognizing that many discourses operate within cultures, in my thesis, I will be addressing dominant discourse and incorporating elements of this feature in my overall analysis.

As cited in Abodeeb-Gentile (2008), agency, when viewed through a humanistic lens, implies that individuals “make choices about what they do” (Davies, 1993, p. 9). Choices can therefore be free and reflective of desire. Many theorists argue that choice is never free, and that individuals are always affected by social forces. Thus, by resisting a dominant discourse, an individual could be viewed as accessing agency, in an attempt to exert control (Davies, 1993). As mentioned earlier in this thesis, I will be examining the use of agency in my analysis in order to understand publishing practices and deconstruct language as it relates to power.

An analysis that draws on the ethnographic approach requires that the researcher participate as an insider in order to offer a deeper understanding of the institution’s, or group’s, socio-cultural practices. Having been employed in the educational publishing industry in a variety of positions over the past two decades, I have had the opportunity to observe group behaviours and the socio-cultural practices that impact these behaviours in the publishing setting. My own ethnographic interpretation of various events and practices in publishing, which is provided in Chapter 4, offers a context for the understanding of the subsequent data analysis provided in Chapter 5. The qualitative methods used to gather the data allowed for a more open-
ended approach to data collection with a limited number of participants, which produced a rich description of the culture of publishing as well as the interactions between the stakeholders.

At the micro-level of analysis, my focus is primarily on stakeholder relationships and the dominant discourses. Using two layers of analysis, I identify first an organizing system and then the dominant discourses. Refer to Figure 4 for the first layer, which identifies the organizing categories for the dominant discourses. This organizing system provides an opportunity to examine relationships that exist within the Canadian educational publishing industry and between the stakeholders, while at the same time showcasing the resulting barriers and their implications.

Figure 4. The organization of dominant discourses: A represents Within One Company, B represents Within the Industry, and C represents Between Stakeholders.

The second layer of analysis reveals the three overwhelmingly dominant discourses (see Figure 5), which interact within the organizing system in Figure 4. Examples of agency, and the use of it to resist dominant discourses are also explored.
Figure 5. The dominant discourses: A is Communication, B is Collaboration, and C is Competition.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Design

For this thesis, I combined ethnographic, thematic analysis with critical discourse analysis in order to describe educational publishing practices and the relationships that exist between the key stakeholders. Using an inductive approach, grounded in my personal experiences in publishing, combined together with interviews, a focus group, and an analysis of related documents, my goal was to present a multi-dimensional view of the educational publishing world in order to respond to my research questions on socio-cultural practice and stakeholder relationships.

Data Collection

In order to explore the issues from a variety of perspectives, I triangulated the data for this study using the following four methods:

1. A personal account that enumerates my experiences in publishing over the past two decades, at the time of the two key events.
2. Semi-structured, in-depth interviews with five key stakeholders from the publishing industry, in which the focus was on the FSL publishing process and the impact of policy and research on the development of resources in response to The National Core French Study and the 2003 Action Plan;
3. Documents related to the two key events;
4. A focus group with the five publishing representatives to investigate outstanding issues and new directions.
For my personal account, I started by reviewing some of my archived digital files, which included communications that took place during the development of previous FSL projects on which I had worked as a publisher, author, or editor. I also reviewed final published versions of the educational resources associated with these past projects. Additionally, I contacted some of the authors and editors with whom I worked in order to review some of the key events of the past. After examining my notes, I designed my personal account with the following goal in mind: to compare and contrast practices and events between two FSL projects in order to highlight what happens in development of an educational resource when publishers collaborate with academic researchers. I also reviewed my digital files from a recent freelance contract, where I was hired to gather market information on Canadian History. To provide an alternate example of collaboration, I compared my experiences with educators and curriculum reform in Canadian History to my experiences in FSL.

From this overview of my personal experiences, I then proceeded to finalize the interview protocol. I created questions based on the following goals - to determine the participants’ perspectives on publishing practices in general, the two key events, and the process leading to educational resources, as well as their opinions on relationships between the stakeholders over the past two decades.

Although a seemingly small group, collectively the participants for this study represent almost the totality of the key players in the Canadian industry as a result of their diversity; for example there are representatives from companies of different sizes, and all participants have performed a variety of functions within a number of companies.

I selected participants for this study based on their roles as active practitioners in FSL publishing for the past 20 years. Consequently, they were able to offer an historical overview of
educational publishing during the time of the National Core French Study up to present day, provide details about the evolution of the publishing process, and provide contextual facts related to the two selected key events. I did not approach anyone in the FSL area with whom I am currently associated.

I informed each participant that my goal in examining the two key FSL events is to produce findings that will benefit the Canadian educational publishing industry, as well as researchers and policy-makers. I would not draw attention to any one learning resource or publisher, and to further support this statement and ensure confidentiality, each participant selected a pseudonym for use in the study. Also, the name of each publishing company would be altered. With a focus on fairness and to highlight the benefits of participation, I informed participants that the findings of this study would be made available immediately to all publishers at the same time.

I acknowledged a conflict of interest through my previous involvement in the FSL domain as a freelance author, publisher, and editor, and my current role as a freelance FSL consultant. My dual role as researcher and participant in this study (by including my personal account in the thesis), also contributes to the conflict of interest. As a result, I informed all participants of this conflict of interest and of my intention to continue my work in the Canadian educational publishing industry following the completion of my thesis. Participants were provided with the option to decline participation. From the six participants whom I contacted, only one declined as a result of a family illness. The other five participants agreed immediately, and enthusiastically, and with a full awareness of the conflict previously mentioned. All of the participants know me and have worked with me at some point over the past 20 years either as my superior, as a member of the same development team, or as a competitor.
I conducted a semi-structured, individual, tape-recorded interview, lasting 1-2 hours, with each participant. In each interview, my focus was first on gathering background information on the participant’s experiences in the FSL publishing domain, specifically in relation to the development of learning materials during the past 20 years. Then I asked questions to determine the kind of relationship that the participant had developed with other publishers, policy-makers at both the provincial and federal level, and academic researchers during the time of the National Core French Study and/or the federal Action Plan. In addition, each participant was offered the opportunity to share any documentation, including strategies and resources pertinent to the two key events, which might support, or add to, their interview. The interviews for my study were conducted in summer of 2009 at the institutional offices, or homes, of each participant; the focus group followed at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

I recruited the participants using the following procedure:

1. Contacted each potential participant to introduce the study and to determine level of interest in participation.

2. Once I received the individual’s consent, I forwarded a recruitment letter and consent form through email.

3. I followed the email correspondence with a telephone call or email. During this correspondence, I responded to any questions, and scheduled a day and time to conduct the individual interview. I shared the interview protocol with the participant.

4. Following the individual interviews, I invited each interviewee to participate in a focus group. I confirmed the date, location, and time through email communication.
5. I held a focus group with four out of the five participants at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Since the participants chose not to share documentation, the documents that I used for analysis were primarily taken from my own archived digital files and included two proposals for publishing and various email correspondences regarding processes. Again, these files were used primarily to assist in documenting the events of the past and supporting the dominant discourses from the interview and focus group.

The focus group was held after the interviews in order to allow time for an analysis of the interview data and thus to identify areas that required more information. I began the focus group session with an explanation of the findings to date; then I proceeded to gather further feedback on the category that required more information - competition between the stakeholders - by asking specific questions related to the two key events and the role of key stakeholders.

To process the data, I transcribed in detail all of the recorded interviews, including every utterance of each participant. At the macro-thematic level, my focus was specific to data around the publishing field. Using coloured markers, I coded the transcripts according to the following three layers of analysis. First, I coded the transcripts to indicate the key publishing functions: publisher, editor, and product manager. Second, I organized the functions under two emerging, but common activities in publishing: the decision to publish and the publishing process. Third, within this organization, five broad themes emerged to describe the publishing world: multidimensional skills, profitability, partnering with the market, the impact and future potential of technology, and the trailblazing efforts of FSL. At the micro-level of analysis, I reviewed all of the data related to both to the publishing world and the stakeholders, with a focus on their relationships. I colour-coded the data according to the following two layers of analysis. The first
layer revealed three broad categories, or organizing systems: within one company, within the industry, and between stakeholders. The second layer of analysis revealed the three emerging dominant discourses of communication, collaboration, and competition. With regard to the data collected from the focus group, I recorded the focus group discussions, listened to the recording several times, then noted and organized the material according to both the macro- and micro-frameworks above. I did not transcribe the discussions from the focus group.

**Data Analysis**

For exploration and interpretation of the data, I used critical discourse analysis. To introduce the educational publishing context, I began with an analysis of its broad, related themes, and then from these findings, I conducted a micro-analysis on stakeholder relationships using dominant discourses (see Figures 4 and 5). The later technique presented an opportunity to explore the issues around agency and power in the recurring publishing discourses, as well as to understand the relationships between the stakeholders and the connections to the socio-cultural context of educational publishing.

**Critical Discourse Analysis**

I adopted a method of critical discourse analysis from Fairclough (1992, 1995) in which he suggests a three-tiered framework combining analysis of text, discourse practice and socio-cultural practice (Faircough, 1995). For my study, I focused on the following critical phase in my analysis: socio-cultural practice (the context).

I began my analysis by identifying the broad thematic patterns within the educational publishing field. At this macro-level, my focus was solely on educational publishing, not the other stakeholders. The process required a review of all transcripts from individual, one-on-one
interviews, followed by an examination of documents, and a review of my personal account of experiences in publishing. From an initial scan, three recurring functions in publishing emerged - publisher, editor, and product manager, which reflected the participants’ areas of expertise. I then reviewed all data related to the publishing field numerous times and noted that there existed two common activities within which each of the functions occurred and could be organized - the decision to publish, and the publishing process. Within these two activities, five broad themes in educational publishing were revealed – multi-dimensional skills; profitability; partnering with the market; the impact and future potential of technology; and the trailblazing efforts of FSL. I confirmed these five topics as themes since each one could be located in four out of five of the transcripts. From this broad-scope analysis of the educational publishing field, I proceeded to analyze stakeholder relationships through a micro-analysis of the transcripts.

Following the identification of themes at the macro level, I continued with a micro-analysis by focusing on the dominant and competing discourses that contributed to the interviewees’ understanding of their publishing culture and the relationships that existed between the stakeholders. After examining all of the data related to both the publishing world and the stakeholders, I identified three broad categories – within one company, within the industry, and between the stakeholders - under which I could organize the three dominant discourses - communication, collaboration, and competition. During this stage of analysis, my primary focus was stakeholder relationships and I was seeking to identify further recurring patterns and broader social issues from which I could determine the connections and implications of the discourses.

Some of the macro- and micro-patterns that I identified in the data, in response to my research questions, were initially identified in my personal account of the past, which represents
my own self-reflections on the key socio-cultural practices and relationships. The results of these reflections are included in the next chapter.

According to Mullany (2000), in a critique of CDA, Toolan (1997) underscores that the researcher cannot escape his or her personal ideologies during analysis:

> It is far preferable to concede that you cannot analyze or write about power… without yourself being implicated and compromised by the powerful and hegemonizing turns of your own discourse. (p. 87)

I include this critique to underscore the fact that during both my research and analysis, I was cognizant of, and sensitive to, the factor of power stemming from my role as a researcher during interviews, and the factor of power stemming from membership in the same publishing “club” as those whom I interviewed during my analysis of data related to stakeholder relationships.

**Challenges**

Ideally, in the macro-analysis of the data, I would have liked to include additional functions associated with a publishing company, for example I would have preferred to extend the analysis to the areas of sales representatives, production, and design specialists. Through this extension to other divisions in a publishing company, I would have been able to address in greater depth the difference in perceptions and social interactions that develop between sales representatives and FSL teachers versus teachers in other subject areas. As well, I would have been able to provide a more comprehensive profile of the changes in the publishing process over the past two decades if I had included production and design specialists as participants.

With regard to the role of educational associations, it would have been helpful as well to include an interview with the current director of CERC as part of my analysis, in order to
validate the critical role of this association as well as investigate further the history and future goals of the organization.

In my original plan for this thesis, I had proposed an analysis of all three key stakeholders; however, as with all of the suggestions above, I now realize that each of these ideas could represent, potentially, one thesis topic.
Chapter 4:
Educational Publishing in Canada:
One Publisher’s Perspective

The 1980s

After teaching Core French at the high school level with the Halton Board of Education, in Hamilton and then Burlington Ontario, I pursued a career in educational publishing, starting in the position of junior editor at Copp Clark Pitman in the early 1980s. My first project was a series of textbooks designed for use in Core French, Grades 9-12. This two-colour series was created to reflect the provincial curricula at the time, with the development of grammar as its central focus. The goal of the project: to win adoptions either province-wide, or in most cases, board-wide. Notably, this more centralized purchasing pattern is in contrast with today’s FSL profile, where individual and school-based purchases increasingly dominate the educational stage.

My primary roles as a junior editor consisted of copyediting and proofreading tasks, as well as seeking permissions to reproduce the authentic documents and the few photos or visuals that appeared in the textbooks. In most cases, the FSL authors in the 1980s represented board consultants or practicing Core French teachers from the province of Ontario. Often, the author team consisted of one lead (male) educator, working with one lead (developmental) editor, and in selected cases, a second junior (production) editor. A common development strategy consisted of having the author write the textbook, and when it was published, the same author, or often a second author who was not connected in any way with the text, would follow with the teacher’s guide. The textbook comprised various readings, with accompanying grammar exercises, while
the teacher’s guide, considered an optional component, offered isolated ideas on how to address selected content in the textbook.

The production process at this time was, by today’s standards, awkward and slow. From typewriters and ubiquitous use of correction fluid in manuscripts, to designers’ manual paste-ups using actual glue and utility knives, the development and production of one textbook could take up to two years.

By the mid 1980s, second language learning resources were forging a new path for all subject areas through the introduction of full-colour textbooks, with an accompanying integrated audio component. While the visuals in second language textbooks, like all textbooks at the time, simply decorated the printed page, the audio component introduced students to a variety of native speakers and their varying accents, thereby providing an opportunity for development of listening skills, as an addition to the traditional focus on reading and writing skills. It is noteworthy that this provision for listening did not reflect authentic communication; rather, in most cases the exercises were designed to assist students in the memorization of grammar rules. In order to develop speaking skills, short dialogues in textbooks became popular as well, but again the role of memorization of vocabulary and structures, over real communication, remained overwhelmingly strong.

**The 1990s**

By the early 1990s, I was working as a freelance editor on a new Core French program for Grades 4-6. In an experimental attempt to address new directions and broaden its author base from one or two lead Ontario educators, the publisher of this project combined a team of successful and experienced Core French authors from Ontario with educators from other provinces. The project development phase just happened to coincide with the launch of the
National Core French Study, which was in the process of attempting to reform curriculum across the country.

In the following paragraphs I will provide a brief summary of my experiences and observations during the development of this project (Project A), which took place in the early- to mid-1990s, as well as my experiences and observations with its subsequent competitor (Project B), which I worked on from the mid- to late-1990s. These accounts detail my personal experiences and observations; other participants may offer different views.

As the lead editor of Project A, I collaborated closely from the outset with the author team in order to meet the company’s FSL mandate, i.e., to design a new Grade 4-6 Core French series for use in classrooms across the country. Quite early in the project, it became clear that the team would encounter some difficulty in reaching a consensus on new directions. This was due in part to the diversity of views on a new instructional approach, which included differing opinions on the role of grammar. Essentially, the new author-educators outside Ontario embraced what they had been hearing about the NCFS, while those experienced authors in Ontario were less than enthusiastic about its potential. Unfortunately, no one on the author team had any official affiliation with the diverse NCFS development team, so the challenge to even translate any of its principles into a resource proved formidable. After numerous false starts, the author team, eventually greatly reduced in number, agreed to accept the interpretation of the NCFS from one (non-Ontario) team member, but to offer two instructional options in the teacher’s guide. One option represented the lead author’s response to the call for new directions, while the other offered a more traditional grammar-driven approach. Notably, during our discussions leading to these decisions, no one associated with the NCFS was invited to speak with our team. We talked of a “whole language approach” to FSL versus the importance of
grammar, but I do not recall our team members sharing any official documentation that outlined
the precise principles of the freshly launched multi-dimensional curriculum - and yet the NCFS
and its diverse team of educators were in the process of reforming all of the curricula outside of
Ontario. In essence, this publishing process reflected the times. During this era of publishing, it
was common practice for some FSL publishers to create an educational resource based on the
vision of one or two educators from Ontario, and with little research conducted in the market
prior to writing, or little feedback from the market on the first drafts. It was thus already a
dramatic break from tradition to have a board consultant from outside Ontario assigned the lead
position on an FSL program.

Furthermore, it was also a common practice at this time (that continues to this day in
some cases where traditional textbooks are being developed) for editors to assume an authoring
role when the text’s author may be encountering some difficulty in meeting the requirements of
tight deadlines. I have observed when the focus is on the “what” of learning, or simple content,
be it grammar in a second language or historical facts in the subject of Canadian History, an
author’s writing skill is the primary factor. Practical experience in the classroom is not
necessarily a priority. Thus, an editor, or other professional writer, can assume a lead writing
position.

Had I not left Project A in the mid-1990s and started Project B at an alternate publishing
company, I would have considered my experience with Project A both normal and acceptable.
When I left to work on Project B, a three-level series which was also designed for use in Grades
4-6, Project A was entering its third and final level.

While the publishing company responsible for Project A was focused on transitioning
beyond its key Ontario authors to embrace one new lead author from another province, Project
B’s FSL publisher was conducting extensive research in the marketplace, observing with great interest the overwhelming national response to the NCFS initiatives. Intrigued by the participation of educators from all levels of education across the country, the publisher monitored closely the changing provincial curricula and decided to respond to the delayed call for participation from the NCFS through creation of new resources. Rejecting the traditional publishing model of one, or two, lead authors, and recognizing the new and increasing focus on instruction, or the “how” of learning (which only today is being embraced in other subject areas), the publisher of Project B took a calculated risk and selected as series editor and senior author an academic researcher and professor from Atlantic Canada who had been affiliated with the NCFS and who, for many years, had been experimenting with instructional design in her classroom. At the time, this authoring model was considered risky since publishers assumed most academics were too concerned with theory for school publishing. In an attempt to further address inclusivity and diversity, the publisher then selected practicing teachers from each province to participate as contributing authors working under the guidance of the series editor/academic researcher. Considering that there were 8 units per level, or 24 units in total in this Grade 4-6 series, the author team for Project B comprised over 50 practicing educators from across the country— with all provinces represented. A provision for two manuscript reviews by educators across the country was included in the publishing model, further ensuring the project’s eventual credibility. It was about this time, during the selection of authors, that I joined the team as a managing editor, and eventually, after a lengthy training period with the series editor, as a senior author.

My association with Project B represented a pivotal moment in my career in education, from the point of view of instructional methods and the publishing process, both of which I will elaborate on below. Although the discussions with team members in Project A challenged some
of the traditional features of second language learning at the time, the arguments reflected frequently the individual member’s personal opinions. These opinions were generally based on current classroom experiences for some members, and experiences in the past for others. Since this project coincided with the launch of the NCFS, and possibly since no publisher had been invited to become directly involved in the development stages of the study, our discussions on emerging topics proved lively, but as I came to learn, lacked the cohesion that accompanies a broader vision grounded in academic research. Our topics included trends such as project-based learning (“yes” from some members, “modified approach required” from others); cooperative learning (a consensus of no); communicative and experiential learning (“yes” but each had own loose interpretation), literacy (not discussed). In the end, clearly, the published form of Project A reflected the transitional mood of the times – it was indeed creative, but it was limited in terms of instructional method, and even publishing process. The textbook was written first, followed by the recording of the cassettes, and the teacher guide followed later. There was an attempt to create a video, but it was cancelled after proving to be too costly for an optional component.

As I learned at a very early stage in Project B, there are serious implications to publishing when the “how” of learning becomes as important as the “what.” For one, it is critical, in terms of credibility and life of product, to create a development team that combines both practicing academic researchers with educators and well-trained editors. Thus, the existence of a team, embracing one common vision, becomes more critical than ever if the project is to succeed.

When I began my work on Project B under the guidance of an academic researcher in the role of series editor, I was exposed, for the first time in my publishing career, to a broader, richer vision of second language learning based not only on individual educators’ experiences, but on a wide breadth of findings from academic research in real classroom settings. Our own team
discussions took place after a thorough review of all documents related to the NCFS, including interviews with active NCFS participants, combined with the academic researcher’s own comprehensive findings and numerous individual educators’ stories in the classroom. The roles of team members were also clearly defined and distinct: the subject publisher was responsible for comprehensive research in the market to determine needs and to seek out a leader for the project with whom the publisher could create a vision; the academic researcher/series editor as leader was responsible for designing an instructional framework based on the most current research findings and best practices in classrooms, as well as training other authors and editors; and the contributing authors were responsible for sharing creative ideas and activities from their own classrooms. Prior to editing, the editors, most of whom traditionally had no experience in the classroom, were required to attend lengthy training sessions and were no longer allowed to alter the direction of manuscript without the series editor’s approval.

To mirror the goals of the NCFS and accurately reflect the emerging focus in FSL on the “how” of learning, the FSL publisher and series editor initiated a format that is just now, almost 20 years later, gaining popularity amongst publishing competitors: the team started, not with the textbook, but with the teacher’s guide. Following the first draft of the teacher’s guide, the authoring of all other components simultaneously took place, using an instructional method that reflected project-based, thematic, communicative /experiential learning grounded in the principles of the NCFS.

At the beginning of Project B, I recall vividly a conversation with the series editor/academic researcher, in which she introduced me to the emerging research. Our discussions focused on literacy and transfer of techniques from first-language learning, including a three-year plan for communication and learning strategies, and comprehensive lessons on how
to address cooperative learning in the second language classroom, to name just a few of the eventual innovative features of the program. Furthermore, reflecting some of the research in the 1990s on multiliteracies, the series introduced the integration of a multimedia format including print, audio, and video.

Not surprisingly today, almost 20 years later, these elements from Project B continue as leading features in FSL resources, further validating the long-term benefits to all when a publisher partners with a prescient academic researcher, practicing teachers and well trained editors to design new FSL resources.

**The 2000s**

By the early 2000s, I was working as both an FSL publisher and senior author on a Grades 7-9 Core French series, which was designed to follow Project B. Further developing the areas of literacy and multi-literacies, with a continuing focus on powerful learning strategies, this program embraced the multi-modal approach. During this time, I started to observe teachers in subject areas outside FSL enthusiastically embracing multidimensional curriculum, project-based learning, active learning, all principles of the NCFS that had been introduced to national FSL educators over a decade earlier.

Also during this time, I had the opportunity to travel across the country and speak with numerous educators in various subject areas about their views on the future of textbooks and the role of technology. Clearly, a disconnect exists between the technological practices of students inside and outside the classroom. Issues around infrastructure and sustainability continued to dominate discussions about technology, and it was evident that educators are waiting for someone, perhaps publishers, to identify a (simple) solution to this complex issue that will, in the end, most assuredly and dramatically impact all of the stakeholders in education.
While those involved with the NCFS provided a model for collaboration and partnering among educators, which blossomed further in the 2000s to educators in all subject areas through the influence of literacy and English Language Arts, and most critically among academic researchers and publishers, in some instances policy-makers remained elusive, as exemplified by the 2003 Action Plan.

To offer a comparative anecdote - recently, I was contracted by an educational publishing company to assemble a team of authors for the purpose of creating a new resource for students enrolled in the last compulsory Canadian History course at the high-school level. Although my educational publishing focus for the past two decades is primarily in the second language arena, and in multimedia educational resource development as opposed to traditional textbook publishing, my client believed that these areas of expertise would assist the company in producing an alternative response to teachers’ and students’ needs in History at the secondary level. During my discussions with key History contacts in the marketplace, I learned that a leading academic researcher was attempting to reform nation-wide how students learn Canadian History through a research initiative. This research project offered a new multi-dimensional framework for History, with a goal to direct teachers away from the transmission of facts in the History classroom to focus on historical thinking and reasoned judgment. Immediately, the similarities to the NCFS were clear - with one exception. Although this project remains in the early stages of influence, the initiatives of its organizing group thus far have proved highly effective across the country. Recognizing at an early stage the critical role of curriculum and educational resources in the path to reform, the group organized a meeting last year with all of the key stakeholders, e.g., policy representatives from each province, teachers, academic researchers, and educational publishers, with the goal of gathering opinions on the best methods
for next steps to national reform. As I reviewed the summary report, the collective success of this meeting was obvious – teachers learned about findings from the most current research available in History education, both national and international; publishers were introduced to pilot teachers, and possibly future authors; policy-makers learned about some practical barriers to curriculum reform through their discussions with researchers, publishers, and educators, and vice-versa. In my opinion, this call to include educational publishers, and partner them with the other key stakeholders from the outset, will ensure an effective and efficient transfer through educational resources of research and policy to teachers and students of Canadian History in classrooms across the country.

Let us briefly review this study’s main research question and one of the sub-questions:

How do FSL educational publishers interrelate with academic researchers and policy and curriculum developers, and how can their relationships be designed to produce the maximum benefit for students, teachers, and Canadian bilingualism efforts in general?

How do publishers collaborate with academic researchers prior to and during the publishing process of a resource?

The major goal of this personal overview was to respond to the study’s main research question and one of the sub-questions by sharing a lesson that I learned in the 1990s – there is a dramatic improvement in educational resources when a publisher partners with an academic researcher and practicing teachers to create educational resources in response to a national curriculum. The improvement is particularly significant if the new national curriculum has been created, designed and piloted through a collaborative effort undertaken by educators at all levels and embraced by policy-makers.
Chapter 5: 
Socio-Cultural Practice of Educational Publishers:
Themes and Dominant Discourses

Themes

In this chapter, I begin with a macro-analysis of the data. First, I describe three key functions associated with the world of publishing. These key functions informed this study through a thematic analysis of the transcripts from the individual interviews and company documents. Second, to further enhance an understanding of the world of educational publishing, I include a description, using transcript excerpts from the individual interviews, of two general, but common activities:

1. how a publishing company arrives at a decision to publish

2. the publishing process

Third, I explore the five themes that emerge from the analysis of publishing functions and the two common activities identified above. These themes include:

1. multi-dimensional skills

2. profitability

3. partnering with the market (teachers and students)

4. the impact and future potential of technology

5. the challenges of specialized needs in FSL, as well as its trailblazing efforts

All of these themes will be explored in the sections that follow this introduction.
Following the thematic analysis at the macro-level, I present a subsequent micro-analysis of the collected data using dominant discourses. Further, I compare and contrast excerpts to highlight the socio-culture practice, different perspectives, associated barriers, and implications.

**Publishing Functions**

There are numerous functions that are presented in a publishing company – ranging from publishing, editorial, marketing, and sales functions, to production and manufacturing, graphic design, human resources, warehouse, and more recently, Internet and new media, software, technical support functions, to name just a few. For this study, the main functions of interest include publishing, editorial, and marketing, as reflected in the experiences of the participants.

The following excerpts describe each of the three key functions that constitute the focus of this portion of the analysis – publishing, editing, and marketing. For each, I include an excerpt taken from the interviews or focus group, in which a participant offers a definition of her area of expertise as either a publisher, editor, or product manager.

**Publishing**

A [subject] publisher looks at what a curriculum requires provincially, what the realities are in the classroom, and marry the two. Otherwise, there is no one to fill that gap. When you think how critical a publisher’s role is in actually allowing curriculum to function, it is astounding that publishers aren’t involved earlier, and the role of publishers hasn’t been acknowledged. (Focus Group, Participant No. 1)
Editing

The Managing Editor transmits the publisher’s vision of the resource to the editorial team. The editor oversees the development of the manuscript. She [or he] takes what she [or he] is given from the author and sees it through all writing, revising and reviewing stages, as well as through the production process. The work depends on the author – the editor receives the manuscript and edits it, but sometimes there are huge holes where the editor has to provide the material herself. Most often, the editor is the writer. (Focus Group, Participant No. 2)

Marketing

The decision to publish comes from the publisher and publishing team, and it is up to the publisher to communicate with the product manager regarding how he or she can support the vision and the research that is necessary, looking at all the factors that are involved in the decision to publish. From there, as the vision becomes clearer and is shared, the product manager becomes the liaison between publishing and sales. His or her role increases as the product is in development to make the sales team [and market] more familiar with the direction. (Focus Group, Participant No. 4)

Although the examples above offer descriptions of only three functions within educational publishing, there is an increasing number of skills and areas of expertise within a company, largely due to the impact of technology.

This thematic analysis continues below with a description of two common activities in publishing, the decision to publish and the publishing process, and the five themes that emerged from this data.
**Decision to Publish**

The decision to publish an educational resource, whether it is in FSL or other subject areas, is generally based on the same criterion, i.e., profitability factor. The following excerpt addresses how publishing decisions are made, from a publisher’s perspective. This information is corroborated on the next page in the excerpt from the second publisher. Both individuals offer many years of experience in the world of publishing, and have held a wide range of positions in publishing.

Now, how publishing decisions are made in FSL - it would be the same, as for any subject area. Essentially, you have to understand what the market is; what the needs are; looking at the competitive publications. Basically, to see if there is a financial opportunity, so not just a curricular need… or a need for new materials that reflect latest thinking, or the latest classroom needs that have been identified. Then, also, for a publishing company, if that in fact is financially viable, if there are great enough numbers, if the competition is such that you can actually compete against them and actually earn revenues. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

A curricular need, or a need for new materials to reflect the latest trends, provide incentives to publish, in addition to the major goal of earning revenues. Thus, the objective of meeting educational needs is presented in tandem with profitability.

The steps leading to the decision to publish, although seemingly more consistent in the 2000s during the time of the Action Plan, were less homogenous in the past, prior to the era of the NCFS. According to the excerpt below from an FSL publisher who has worked with two major companies during mergers, the more formal approach to publishing a resource today is a direct result of corporate mergers and the increasing focus on achieving financial benchmarks.

There are some milestones that we have in place now, because the mergers have happened and they’ve become more corporate. The risk of just going in to publish
something just because it sounds like a good idea, is no longer the case. There are more checks and balances in place for the corporation to ensure that their money is being spent on a buyable financial product. A healthy return on investment. I remember in the 80s, for example, when [Company X] could publish anything that they wanted to publish, because it was a good idea. Very little market research done. It was author-driven really. An author had an idea, and a concept, and the publishing company identified that author because of meeting [him or her], or something like that. Then, the product was clearly author-driven. I would say that the biggest change now is that companies really are publishing more market-driven products, than author-driven…so, that to me, along with the corporate sign off, there was no formal business plan presentation [before]. I’m talking about a formal process in place…, now it’s a very serious, and a formal event. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

The excerpt above underscores the increasing importance of a healthy return on investment, which impacts the decision to publish to a greater degree than in the past.

Some publishing companies have always embraced a more collaborative market-driven approach, as confirmed in the statement below from a second FSL publisher. It should be noted that the term “market” refers to educators.

It was one of the reasons why I loved working for [Company A]. They always, always had the view that you get your information about what to publish from the marketplace. It was always a very market-driven company, and listening to the market was the key to success. We never had in-house writers, whatever. … We knew that [Company B] was always much more like that; a kind of the author knows best. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

The increasing importance placed on partnering as a foundational element in publishing can be witnessed in all of the excerpts thus far, for example publishing in response to policy-makers’ new curricula, or to academic researchers’ new trends, or to a need in the market (educators).
As a specialized subject area, however, FSL presents some unique challenges to publishing companies, particularly in the area of staffing, as underscored in the following excerpt from the same publisher as quoted directly above.

The decision to publish in FSL is one where they look at their own internal capabilities. Do they have the right specialized staff, or can they easily recruit that right staff? Do they have the right staff that knows the marketplace, knows the subject area, knows what the challenges and what the risks are? Knows all the big issues, and the needs of the customers. It’s important for a publishing company to have the right people - the people who know this specialized market well enough to make good publishing decisions. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

This same publisher describes how the staffing challenges associated with FSL publishing have been further exacerbated by corporate mergers within the Canadian publishing industry.

I want to talk about the impact more on the industry of these mergers because the products were then diminished. The number of products diminished because the companies were folding into each other, and the FSL publishers were disappearing. So, fewer and fewer companies were producing and developing resources. Therefore less choice in the marketplace. But, the other impact, I believe, and it shouldn’t be overlooked, is the impact of FSL specialists who worked in the publishing industry. In a highly specialized area, because of the mergers, there were fewer and fewer positions for employees of publishing companies who were expert in publishing for FSL. Therefore, unfortunately, the career for many of them ended in terms of the publishing industry. Many of them were forced out, or packaged out, or simply chose to leave under difficult circumstances, because the number of positions diminished. I think that needs to be said, because it isn’t just the matter of the number of choice that the customer then didn’t have. It’s also a matter of losing very experienced, skilled, specialized people in FSL. Again, this is all my perspective (Interview, Participant No.3).
In summarizing, four key themes emerged from the data associated with publishing functions and the decision to publish. From the information on publishing functions, it is evident that a wide variety of people with a growing multitude of skills work together within a publishing company. The educational culture within and of itself is thus increasingly multidimensional. From the information on the decision to publish, it is evident that a focus on profitability has always been a major factor in publishing; however, today the profitability factor is more formally monitored. Publishing in the past was often a more author-driven activity, as opposed to the now more common market-driven approach. This is partially due to company mergers, which provided an opportunity for the more corporate institution to communicate with, and exercise influence over, the company with whom it merged. Thus, whether publishing companies desired to move in this direction or not, mergers and the resulting focus on market-driven resources demanded a new level of partnerships both within the industry and between publishers and their market. Also, as a result of the mergers came the limited number of available job positions within the industry, especially in the specialized FSL area. The fifth theme, i.e., technology, will be addressed in the next section, the publishing process.

The Publishing Process

In terms of the overall production today of an educational resource, the process of publishing from concept to publication, offered from a publisher’s perspective below, may be applied to all subject areas. The impact of mergers referenced previously, which underscores a more formal, market-driven and comprehensive approach to decision-making, is reflected in this description of today’s common process for publishing, during the era of the Action Plan.

First of all, we start with market research, always. I would call that a phase one activity. From the market research…we do an environmental scan and make sure
that all of that data is collected … If there’s a real opportunity, and we’ve identified the opportunity, and we’ve done a risk analysis. We put a business plan together… and present it to the senior executive team, to gain approval, for funding, or for the money to actually go ahead and develop the resources. Once the sign off of the business plan has been completed, then, typically, we would have authors write manuscript… Of course, it gets developmentally edited. It is reviewed in the marketplace thoroughly…Then it gets launched into production. Of course, that’s when the design template is approved, we go into design, then finally a product is published, and we march it into the marketplace - launch events, such as, workshops, in-services, at national conferences, provincial conferences. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

From the risk analysis to checking in regularly with the market for confirmation of directions, the publishing process today demands that checks and balances, and partnerships, are securely in place all along the developmental path to ensure a healthy return on investment.

In general, from an editor’s perspective, the editorial portion of the publishing process has changed and evolved over the past two decades as a direct result of technology. Thus, the gradual move away from print to digital has altered both the format of delivery for components, as well as the process of development.

Technology has made a huge difference… That didn’t exist in the late 1980s… Well, now, I think to get a program out there you would have to worry about, not only your paper, your concrete student book, workbook, and teacher’s guide. But …you would have to have a web site that caters to this program; you would have to have references to the Internet throughout your components. It’s just a lot broader now…I guess it’s a lot more open now because of technological advances, and it’s just bigger, multimedia. Whereas, that aspect was a lot more narrow in the late 80’s. I just think, more people are involved, more different types of people, from different industries. (Interview, Participant No. 2)
Now, you’re expected to comment on design pages on Adobe Acrobat. You’re expected to know how to work with a program like that to make editorial changes. So, really there’s a lot expected of an editor technologically. It’s not that you can pass it off with written comments, or email. With an email you have to share it with a group, and you’re basically right in there with the design. You’ve got the same files that the designers have. (Interview, Participant No. 2)

Technology has altered all aspects of the publishing world, in particular an editor’s domain of responsibilities. The impact of integrated, multimedia and multi-component programs, introduced almost 20 years ago in FSL in response to the NCFS, foreshadowed some of the issues today around technology and the need for creative responses to delivery of content, as described by this FSL editor.

I would say that FSL was ahead of its time because still if you work in the other [subject areas], and this is 2009, in the other areas like Social Studies, or Language Arts even, you’re still working with a student book and a teacher’s guide, and that’s it. There aren’t yet many other [integrated audio, video] components, whereas, FSL had all of that – even back in the 1980s and 90s. … but it required more people, required more training and more money and more time. (Interview, Participant No. 2)

The FSL field was spearheading an early approach to multidimensional curriculum and to multi-literacies through integrated audio, video, and print in the early 1990s – all of which, collectively, greatly impacted the publishing process in this subject area.

Similarly, some publishers viewed the developments in FSL in response to the NCFS as clear indicators of the future, in both process and pedagogy, for all subject areas.

Well, we always used to say that FSL was the perfect model for any area, right. At Language Arts we were looking at it, you know. When you actually look at what happened with curriculum…in Ontario curricula, the final culminating task.
Yes, …we had been doing that for ten years in FSL. But we always thought that once we actually understood the National Core French Study, the principles of education that it espoused were so solid, I think…so applicable to other subject areas, and you started to see little threads of it happening ten years later…You could do a model like that in any subject area. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

To review some of the themes associated with the publishing process - as a result of mergers, the process today for a publisher in any subject area is more comprehensive and inclusive, thus demanding partnering with the market during the initial research stage and also during the manuscript review stage. Similarly, the advances in technology have resulted in a broadening of skills and responsibilities on the part of editors. Where in the past an editor could work in isolation and record comments on the hard copy of a manuscript, now the process entails more sharing within a group through technology. With regard to FSL, this innovative field in the areas of both multi-dimensional pedagogy and the multimedia publishing process served as a model for other subject areas. All of these themes will reappear and be explored in greater depth in the next section, within the three dominant discourses.

**Dominant Discourses**

The goal of this section is to provide a further in-depth profile of the educational publishing world and its culture, as well as a profile of the relationships that exist between the stakeholders. This will be achieved through an analysis of the dominant discourses in the collected data. As explained earlier, the three dominant discourses include:

1. communication
2. collaboration
3. competition
These dominant discourses have been organized according to the following three categories:

1. within one company
2. within the industry
3. between stakeholders

Within One Company: The Discourses of Communication and Collaboration

The interacting discourses of communication and collaboration are revealed repeatedly throughout the data. With regard to these discourses within one company, the participant below reveals how her innovative designs, in response to an equally innovative multi-dimensional curriculum from the NCFS in the early 1990s, called for new levels of communication and collaboration within the publishing company.

I think one of the challenges was creating a product that was multi-component. That was, I mean, French always had components, there was the textbook, and there were the tapes. But this was different in that … it wasn’t one big textbook, it was broken up into modules. We were going to have the modules packaged in carry-on, carryable cases, whatever. All of this was new, and I had a lot of resistance from management, from operations. It was going to be a warehousing disaster. It was going to be too hard to keep track of from an inventory point of view. All of which, by the way, was perfectly true. So, with that kind of resistance, and scepticism from main office, I had to do a sales job on the concept to the office, before we even got to the marketplace. Then the sales reps had to be taught how to sell something that was fairly complicated, or perceived to be fairly complicated. I think in the end they understood that it wasn’t that big a deal. Those were the biggest challenges. Otherwise, once you got to the marketplace, and you had reps. who understood how to explain it, I think that the product, teachers recognized that this was something that they could really use, and it
would be something new and really useful for them. So that once it got to the actual teachers for whom it was developed. Because I think it was developed exactly on track for teachers, that wasn’t the problem. It was more within the company, getting them to understand this more challenging format. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

One of the key tasks of a publisher is the translation of curriculum into resources through a creative delivery format. For numerous decades, the format for delivery in all subject areas was the printed textbook. With the launch of the National Core French Study and its multi-dimensional approach to second language learning, came the challenge in the 1990s for FSL publishers to translate its principles into motivating resources. Some FSL publishers’ innovative responses to these challenges, such as the use of multimedia modular units as opposed to textbooks, brought with them a need to initiate effective training programs within the company, and to communicate persuasively and effectively, to all divisions of the company, as indicated in the excerpt above. The impact of the NCFS, therefore, challenged publishers to address a new level of communication and collaboration, not previously experienced by any division within a publishing company.

The excerpt above underscores the dominant discourses of communication and collaboration in relation to innovative practices. It reveals as well a new competing theme that I will be exploring frequently in this thesis, i.e., the push and pull factor within educational publishing of the following two (sometimes) opposing objectives – the desire to address best practices and the need to achieve profitability goals. These competing themes can act as potential barriers to innovation and progress, as demonstrated in the excerpt above.

From a point of view of agency, it could be said that FSL educators, through banding together to create the NCFS more than 20 years ago, resisted the discourse of traditional
curricula to create a new multi-dimensional directive. This directive further incited agency within the micro level in educational publishing. It inspired educational publishers at the time to resist the discourses that supported the more linear, author-driven and traditional textbook process.

As we have just learned, the innovations in FSL pedagogy during the time of the NCFS combined with a creative format for delivery of resources required more effective communication and a collaborative effort at all levels within a publishing company. This heightened focus on “the team” affected the author and editorial development group as well.

The first excerpt below describes the process that a publisher designed for her new Grades 4-6 program in response to the NCFS multi-dimensional curriculum. The second excerpt represents a publisher’s reflection on the change in the FSL publishing process that started with the NCFS and continued to develop in the era of the Action Plan up to present day.

The first FSL resource [that I designed], which was for Grades 4 to 6, was developed with [academic researcher]. She was basically the Senior Editor, and overall program Series Editor, [leading the] conceptualization. Then within that team we worked with a number of teachers and other educators across the country. It was kind of a pyramid structure, whereby the teachers would write the materials according to a framework that was developed by [the academic researcher] and myself. We also worked in conjunction with a …Managing Editor. The three of us basically worked together to maintain the integrity of the plan, once it was established. Then working with the authors to flesh out the materials. Working with editors, to edit those materials. It was quite a large team. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

Especially in FSL it is such a huge project but…in the early days you would tell an author what to write and [he or she] would write it…it was much more linear.
Now especially with a huge program… publishers are always talking to authors and checking with editors to see that they have followed the blueprint … I found it increasingly much more collaborative. (Focus Group, Participant No. 1)

From a publisher’s point of view, the increase in communication between an author and an editor and a publisher during the development of a resource ensured the integrity of the blueprint. This focus on communication, which led to a collaborative effort, presents a contrast to the more linear, author-driven approach of the past.

Specifically, in relation to FSL, with the NCFS in the 1990s and its new multi-dimensional approach to the subject area came the necessity to train FSL editors in pedagogy. Subsequently, the training extended to FSL product managers and sales representatives.

We did, as you know, we had to train editors before they even started editing. They just couldn’t plunge and apply their skills. They had to actually understand the conceptual framework, and what we were trying to do. Some with more success. I mean that was … a big challenge…, with the rotating team of editors. Some of whom got it, and some of whom never did. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

In contrast to the author-driven textbook approach of the past, the new focus on pedagogy in response to the NCFS, together with experimentations in multi-components and multimedia, necessitated training for all members of the team.

From the perspective of the FSL editor who worked on the same Grades 4-6 program described above, the focus on a team, under the leadership of an academic researcher, proved to be highly beneficial, and the collaborative element was viewed positively, as a reinforcement of the project’s credibility.

I liked having a guru [academic researcher] to go to with regard to development of the product. Yes, there were more people involved and it required a more collaborative approach, but it made for a higher quality product… you had a
better feeling about the product…more money, more training was required but the product was solid as a result. (Interview, Participant No. 2).

According to the following participant, who holds extensive experience as an author and product manager, the focus on the team today impacts the authors as well.

We’ve gone to writing teams as opposed to one singular writer… for efficiency we have gone to teams and we have to have collaboration… this is a change for publishers… a lot more going on now between authors and editors… more contact more often than before… in past as an author it was fairly straight forward… with a check in just a couple of times. (Interview, Participant No. 4)

The NCFS and its multi-dimensional curriculum introduced a new era to educational publishing, which encouraged the development of communication and collaboration at all levels within the divisions of a company, as well as within the actual project development team. This pioneering method in the early 1990s provided a future model for other subject areas, with respect to communication, collaboration, and multi-dimensional alternatives to textbook delivery.

**Within One Company: The Discourse of Competition**

The discourse of competition permeates the world of publishing, both internally and externally. As only one subject area within an educational publishing company, FSL must compete with other, mandatory, subjects for the publishing company’s attention and financial support. Although spearheading in nature, some of the previously mentioned factors, or barriers, to FSL publishing, such as specialized staffing needs and large teams to support innovative pedagogy and resource delivery formats, contributed to the FSL image of “different” and thus sometimes even “demanding”.
As an FSL publisher explains in the following excerpt, the marginalization of French today that second language educators experience across the country (Lapkin, Mady & Arnott, 2009) mirrors the relationships that exist in a publishing company between FSL and other subject areas.

Yes, it’s a competitive marketplace because we’re competing for dollars. But, it’s not just the other FSL publishers we’re competing for. We’re competing for dollars even within our own company… Coming back to my remark much earlier, French teachers and French being marginalized, and the status of French diminishing year by year, more and more. That has resulted in French teachers using older resources because money is needed for Math; money is needed for Language Arts; money may be needed for Social Studies, or Science. But French is at the bottom of the list. So… that has a ripple effect because that impacts publishers who might otherwise publish more rigorously. But, because of the risk, then they don’t publish for a long time. Therefore, the resources get stale, and old. Then [Company B] or [Company C] can come into that market…and they can publish, and be successful, because they aren’t competing with themselves. So, at [Company A], French is the last subject area in the list of their priorities. It truly is. It brings in the least amount of revenue, and it receives the least amount of priority. It receives the least amount of support, internal support, and just is a blip on a screen. We even have a problem, we compete with ourselves, more than anything; because our sales reps. are busy selling Math and Language Arts. They’re not comfortable selling French. They even marginalize it, because they all hear, “Who wants to sell French?” When we talk about publishing, and competing; you might think that I’m looking at my competition as being [Company B] and [Company C]. But, really, I’m looking at my biggest competitor - the rest of my company. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

The divisive factor associated with bilingualism in Canada can be witnessed on a macro scale with regard to the relationship between Quebec and Canada, and at the micro level as well,
in schools across the country between FSL teachers and educators of other subject areas. This marginalization is active in the educational publishing culture, too. Thus, in addition to the traditional external competitors, FSL publishers today must consider their internal competitors as well when writing a business plan or promoting a new concept to senior management.

The discourse of competition that exists within a publishing company between French and other mandatory subjects, and the profile of French as “different”, is further reinforced by innovative FSL curricula and the subsequent innovative responses on the part of FSL publishers, as evidenced by the next excerpt through a publisher’s reflections on the past.

The fact that the curriculum, or the pedagogical methodology changed [with NCFS] from something that was a lot more linear, if you want, just more grammar driven to something that was more multifaceted, culture, language, general education, that type of thing. That made it, so it was kind of an explosion, all of a sudden you have many different ways, and many different goals, and you had a whole new way of achieving those goals, through much more talking, listening, final projects. So, in some ways it ran counter to what you were seeing in other subject areas. Where, here is the list of all the facts that students need to know. So, that was different. So you had to then find a way to package all of the new kinds of pedagogical thinking in FSL in a package that ultimately you could reduce to evaluation sheets, deliverables, check off what students had learned. So, no, they didn’t escape that, but, it was more challenging, and exciting, let me just say that, because of what was happening in pedagogy. For me, my interest in publishing, not that it ever waned. But, it was a lot more interesting… when you could creatively come up with really interesting ways of delivering a curriculum, as compared to just making sure that you covered all the facts in a six hundred page book, because there were so many facts. So, from a publisher’s perspective, a product developer’s perspective, that was a lot less interesting. So, in a lot of ways FSL was the last bastion of creative thinking, because of the interesting pedagogical trend. (Interview, Participant No. 1)
After examining both of these excerpts, it would appear that the image of FSL in publishing as “different”, both in terms of curriculum directives and educational resources, which began in earnest in the early 1990s after the launch of the NCFS, has overshadowed its trailblazing efforts in education over the past two decades. Further, the unenthusiastic response to FSL within a publishing company mirrors the tepid support from across the country at the provincial level, as represented through the inconsistent mandating of this subject from Grades 4 through to Grade 9, outlined in my literature review. This lack of action at the meso provincial level contributes to the diminished status of French in all jurisdictions at the micro level. Thus, even though both second language publishers and other stakeholders have spearheaded innovative measures, FSL is perceived within the publishing culture as a “different” field that requires specialized staff, larger development teams, and therefore significant financial commitments to support new and “demanding” curricula. Further, its variable status and entry levels across the country, contrary to federal mandates, places its future in educational publishing in peril. This is particularly so with regard to the dominant discourse of competition against its other, equal, official partner, i.e., English Language Arts, which is a required subject for graduation from high school. This perilous future for FSL is further enhanced and reinforced by the ever-present competing theme of best practices (such as the innovations in FSL both in curriculum and resources) versus profitability (revenue gained from mandatory subjects with more traditional and thus more economical delivery formats).

Within the Publishing Industry: The Discourse of Communication

The role of associations, specifically CERC, has changed and evolved during the past two decades. With corporate mergers came the reduction in number of CERC members, which led to more effective communication, as we will learn below. Clearly, this association has the potential
for managing and enabling effective relationships within the industry. This will be explored further in this paper here and in the section on stakeholders.

The excerpt below presents a publisher’s perspective on the evolution of the discourse of communication within the publishing industry, and posits some barriers to this discourse over the course of the past two decades.

I would say that in the mid-to late 90s the message started to be heard more clearly. I think, because some of the tactics were different. I think, in the 80s and 90s, let me just say, CERC itself changed dramatically. In 1995…, there were 17 members of CERC. By the [2000s], there were 5 members. Companies had gone out of business, taken over, amalgamated. It was just shocking. It was a perfect microcosm of what was going on in our industry - the shrinking base of publishers. But, my view, as a member in the 90s, I wasn’t there in the 80’s, but I was working in the industry in the 80s… so I knew what was going on. It was all the [male] Presidents, and they’re going to use their, you know, “We have to tell them [the Ministries of Education] what to do”. In some ways the approach was not necessarily collegial, it was more adversarial - these are just my impressions, because I wasn’t a member then. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

[In the 2000s] because the group was smaller, much smaller... It was in some ways more efficient. So we had much better advice as to how to deal with governments. Smaller group, so it was more mobile, easier to get people to agree. I think that we did start to make some inroads. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

The excerpt above reveals the past relationship between publishers and policy-makers as less than collegial, and suggests the tension between them that has waxed and waned over the years, since the days of Egerton Ryerson and his book depository. This struggle for control of what is to be taught, and how it is to be taught, represents a second competing theme, which also
acts as a potential barrier to effective communication and collaboration. This theme will be explored further in the section on stakeholders.

**Within the Publishing Industry: The Discourses of Collaboration and Competition**

The close link between the opposing discourses of competition and working together as an industry to achieve collective goals, or collaboration, is evident in the following excerpt from an FSL publisher who has held various positions within CERC and the educational publishing industry. The struggle to collaborate in order to compete more effectively constitutes the underlying, conflicting message.

It’s a tricky balance because everyone has common interests and by working together as a formal group, with credibility, you can therefore approach Ministries of Education, policy-makers, and such, with some credibility. So, it requires a level of working together. The awareness was always very strong that we’re competitors and people were always waiting to see, so-and-so going to get an edge. For example, if we want to go talk to Alberta about their new math curriculum, because we need to be partners right up front, rather than after the fact, so-and-so from X will go, “Oh, if he goes he’ll get insider information, so, I want to go to”. People were always conscious about being competitors. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

The excerpt above underscores the critical role that a mediator or association could play to ensure collaborative efforts between the stakeholders.

Some of the following excerpts illustrate the many additional factors contributing to the discourse of competition within the industry. One major factor – technology - has had an enormous impact, not only in the obvious area of actual process and production of educational resources as noted earlier in the thesis, but also in relation to unknown future paths and
competitors associated with technological advancements. The following excerpt from an FSL publisher underscores the mystery associated with technology and competitors of the future.

We’re talking about the sheer impact of technology, and living in this digital world, in this Google world, and who our competitors are going to be… tomorrow. We don’t even know who they’re going to be. Even 10 years ago, we were just concerned about competitors in our own industry. Now there are competitors emerging… that we didn’t conceive of, or perceive of 20 years ago, or even 10 years ago (Interview, Participant No. 3).

As described in my personal account, there is a disconnect between the practices of students, from a technological perspective, outside the classroom versus inside the classroom. The inconsistent response in education to technological advances stems from many areas such as school infrastructure issues associated with these advancements, sustainability concerns, and funding conditions across the country. As indicated in my personal account, there is a widespread notion that education is on the brink of dramatic reform as a result of technology - but it is as if educators are waiting for someone, perhaps publishers, to identify a (simple) solution to this complex issue. Clearly, technology, together with corporate mergers, have impacted the dominant discourse of competition in educational publishing by adding a level of apprehension – about one’s job, about risky ventures that threaten the bottom line, and about unknown competitors.

As with many industries, corporate mergers have greatly altered the landscape of the educational publishing business in Canada. These events have precipitated change at all levels – some of which have produced a positive impact on the dominant discourse of competition such as the opportunity for new publishers to emerge in FSL, while others have produced a negative
impact such as the competitive environment for fewer and fewer jobs and the loss of talented people.

The following excerpts from the same FSL publisher as above provide a contrast between the positive and negative impacts of mergers, commencing with the positive impact.

As well, I would say that the competitive environment, which is healthy, has really diminished quite a bit through the mergers. So, we now have companies that basically can come in and monopolize a great deal of the marketplace, because of their sheer size… The positive side is that a merger sometimes creates an opportunity for a smaller publisher, or a smaller group of individuals, or company that wants to get into a niche to actually purchase a product line that is being divested of, or start from scratch… (Interview, Participant No. 3)

The industry itself is smaller, and more compact, with all the mergers in the past decades. Therefore, there are not a lot of opportunities for upward mobility. Or, even for that matter, lateral mobility, because of the shrinking size of this particular industry… people are staying in their jobs longer, if they are staying in publishing. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

The following excerpt elaborates further on the topic introduced above regarding the positive impact of mergers in creating an opening for new, niche publishers. As indicated below from the same FSL publisher, there is a concern when national curriculum reviews are delayed. As a result of a delay, smaller companies can penetrate the market with new resources, and, if allowed, create their own rules such as avoiding some of the traditional provincial evaluation procedures that have been created to maintain levels of standards.

I would imagine… that the large publishers… were very sceptical and cautious about taking the risk of publishing another core resource before curriculum was renewed. Originally [a revised curriculum] was due to be released in 2009. Then
it was delayed until 2011. In the meantime, there was an opportunity… to come into the marketplace, with an approach and resources, and penetrate the market quite significantly… . (Interview, Participant No. 3)

The classic example of what’s happened with [Educational Resource X] … [Educational Resource X] is not even Trillium approved, and it has been sold, and is being used in… 4,000 classrooms… How did that happen without it being Trillium approved? It’s really astounding to me. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

It is making publishing and FSL perilous. It’s a perilous subject area right now. High risk, and that’s why companies aren’t jumping into it. So, to minimize their risk, especially if they’re new to the marketplace, they wouldn’t go into it. They see a potential opportunity, but it’s risky… for a company whose books are being audited, and approval is being given from the UK or the US … The bottom line is that I am very fearful, not only for the Core French program in Canada, but I’m very fearful for the future of good high quality research-based resources. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

All publishers would admit that competition between companies in the industry is very healthy. And most publishers would express admiration for those individuals who resist a dominant discourse, take a risk, and win. There is, however, a concern in the aftermath of corporate mergers, with the heightened focus on profitability, that FSL is highly expensive, and thus too risky a venture if provincial standards for resources are not exercised and maintained for all participants. Again, the added push and pull factor related to the competing themes in publishing of best practices versus profitability is at play, along with the theme of who controls what is to be taught.

As the NCFS ages, and curriculums are considered for renewal, the lack of collaboration between the stakeholders, which can frequently produce inconsistent responses across the
country in pedagogical directives and provincial standards, could present a further barrier for experienced publishers to competing in the FSL area. In the end, students and teachers will suffer the negative impact.

In the next section, I will be exploring the impact of a lack of collaboration between the stakeholders associated with curriculum development and other pertinent activities.

Between the Stakeholders: The Discourses of Communication and Collaboration

As we have learned, the National Core French Study brought together all levels of educators across the country and introduced a new and innovative era to FSL publishers, from which emerged their ideas for new forms of delivery of content, e.g., modular, multimedia units as opposed to textbooks. With a nationally approved pedagogical directive, grounded in communication and collaboration, more than ever before FSL publishers required partners to guide them through the development of a new instructional design to replace the former grammar-driven approach.

The FSL publisher below describes how, from her perspective, she contributed to the discourse of collaboration between the stakeholders in FSL.

Because [Company X] always had a strong reputation in French they wanted to get back into it, and create something that would get them back up and active. Especially, with regard to [Company Y], who was their main competition at the time. They didn’t want to lose any market share, so I was asked to develop something. So basically, I was completely new to French, and frankly I wasn’t too enthusiastic about doing it because having heard of all the problems in the past with developing French materials with authors, and such. It came with a little bit of a negative reputation. Which was kind of interesting. But once I started I just threw myself into it. I went across the country a couple of times. I interviewed
teachers, and educators, policy makers at Ministry of Education levels, at all levels. Just to get a sense of what everyone’s interest was, and what everyone’s needs were. At that time I was also becoming familiar with the National Core French Study, which was the main pedagogical directive for any new materials. So having done that, I think I did that for about a year, and I think I did cross the country twice. I developed in my head an image of what I thought this product should be. So then, the question became, can I find someone who naturally believes in that position, and who can work with me to develop it. So I wouldn’t have to do a sales job on anyone, because I always believed that it also has to come from the author. It just can’t be something that the publisher imposes on authors, write it this way. It has to be a mutual understanding. I guess a growth of understanding of the needs on both parties for the product to come out best.

(Interview, Participant No. 1)

The publisher above confirms that in order to achieve a clear and accurate translation of curriculum, both communication and collaboration are required between the stakeholders at an early stage in publishing.

To contrast with the efforts above, and keeping with the NCFS, the delayed call for publisher participation identified earlier in this thesis in my literature review, impacted all publishers and their resources. Educational publishers would have benefitted significantly if they had been invited to the NCFS proceedings, even if just as observers. Ideally, an announcement or communication directly to all stakeholders of a new study in progress would in and of itself have initiated a collaborative process. In the excerpt below, an FSL publisher comments on the impact of this missed opportunity.

Because we haven’t been traditionally invited into the discussions or the development of the curriculum or into initiatives such as the NCFS and Action Plan, it is really up to the publishers to interpret the curriculum with the realities
of the classroom in mind. So the interpretation of the curriculum in terms of how it translates into resources. Interesting exercise with the NCFS that the publishers weren’t invited to the discussions…so it was really a mystery to us and we had to run around, read documents, talk to people and so on… and different companies had a different interpretation of what that NCFS meant to suggest. (Focus Group, Participant No. 3)

The following excerpt continues to address the missed opportunity of collaboration, while underscoring the critical role of a publisher in translating and communicating a new curriculum’s principles to teachers and students through educational resources.

It’s interesting when you think of it… The NCFS was proposing things that were so different than what was previously done. If the publishers hadn’t even attempted as we all did, even in our different ways, to translate it, it would have gone nowhere. It would have just been some theoretical document with not even the remotest chance of having any effect in the classroom… it wouldn’t have come to fruition without the resources to back it up. (Focus Group, Participant No. 1)

The success of a publisher’s role is intrinsically connected to the discourses of communication and collaboration. Together with the communication challenges and barriers that publishers face within their own companies, explored earlier in this section, the notion of agency is referenced above, as the publisher reminds us of how ultimately change was executed in the FSL arena in the 1990s. The subtle and underlying competing theme around the struggle for who controls what is taught is revealed as well, although it is overshadowed by the dominant discourse of collaborative effort.

A second example of a barrier to effective communication and collaboration between the stakeholders can also be found with the NCFS. Although their achievements were widespread
and numerous, the NCFS team stumbled in its attempt to bring consensus to all provinces. Even though the NCFS was initiated by Dr. Stern at the University of Toronto, Ontario’s rejection of the NCFS principles went a long way in dividing the country along pedagogical directions for years to come. As a reminder, this rejection resulted in a marked increase in a publishing company’s commitment through the need to produce two separate FSL resources: one for Ontario and another for the national market. Thus, this failure in communication and collaboration between the stakeholders impacted publishers by forcing them to increase substantially their financial investments in this subject area, not only in response to innovative curriculum and delivery format, but now also in response to a significant division in pedagogical directives. These actions in turn reinforced the negative discourse of competition within one company between FSL – an increasingly high-risk, expensive subject area that is inconsistently mandated across the country – and other mandatory subjects such as English Language Arts.

The following excerpt from an FSL publisher offers some potential reasons behind Ontario’s failure to embrace the NCFS, as well as some areas for improvement in the process of curriculum reform.

Ontario never embraced the NCFS. That’s pretty much fact. It was several people’s perception that the Ministry… at that time really didn’t believe in it. …Another reason why Ontario didn’t [support it] was because it was an easier approach to get a groundswell going in the smaller provinces… it wasn’t so daunting a job. But with Ontario, it’s so huge. I think that money, time, and effort was really being spent on other things. It was such a large job to implement the NCFS principles. My other impression is that teachers, consultants, in Ontario, at that time, and really nothing’s changed, consultants were really embracing the methodology and the pedagogy that they had learned. So, because there was very little PD, or professional learning going on in Ontario for French teachers, because they are all specialists. There was a perception that professional learning
wasn’t needed because you got your certificate, your degree, your B.Ed., and you specialized in Second Language methodology, or you took Parts 1, 2, and 3, and you were a Specialist. Whereas, in other provinces, [teachers weren’t] mandated to be a specialist in the area. So, Ontario FSL educators, I don’t think that they perceived the need to change. First of all, the curriculum wasn’t asking them to do so. There was no impetus for change. The change wasn’t being advocated or supported. The consultants didn’t understand the NCFS. The actual document was difficult to read. It wasn’t practical. It didn’t give practical examples. It was very theoretical. It was very sound, it was highly academic in nature. It took someone to really believe in it, to actually go out and spread the word. In Ontario there just wasn’t the impetus. So, lots of reasons for that. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

A lack of communication and collaboration between the stakeholders contributed to Ontario’s rejection of the NCFS and impacted teachers and students in the province for years to come. Today, as individual educators eagerly seek out new alternatives on the path to progress, there exists an entire population of teachers in one large jurisdiction who have not been exposed to the some of the critical and influential history in second language pedagogy.

In contrast to the NCFS, where there existed, with the exclusion of educational publishers and the province of Ontario, communication and collaboration between all levels of educators and policy-makers, the Action Plan presented some unique challenges to all of the stakeholders, particularly the publishers.

[BB]: Did you hear of anyone being involved in that decision [the action plan], or how they arrived at it, or, what the plan was to achieve that goal?

Absolutely not. Nothing. Not a word. You’d think that I would have heard, because I was really quite informed. I was working closely with the consultant… who was very well connected, both at the Ministry, and everywhere. She didn’t know about it… It must have been 2005 when someone told me about it, when I
was meeting with them, and I went back and googled it. After doing a google search I found it, and read it. That’s how I found out about it… As I said, it was not well publicized. Everyone was in the dark about it. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

The following excerpt is provided by another publisher, who has been removed from the publishing world for the past three years, but who was actively engaged from 2003-2005 at the time of the Action Plan.

I googled it this morning, I’d never heard of it. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

The final excerpt is taken from the interview with an editor who has also been removed from FSL for the past three years but was actively engaged in the area from 2003-2005.

I don’t even know what it is, or if it pertains to French. (Interview, Participant No. 2)

With the increasing focus on profitability in educational publishing, and with the obvious planning required to assemble large teams and produce multi-component resources, the lack of communication both within the industry, and between the stakeholders, reinforces the negativity associated with FSL and distances further the senior management teams who make publishing decisions from participation in, and support of, this subject area. One can only imagine the positive impact if prior to the announcement in 2003, all key FSL stakeholders had gathered together to review the NCFS, and build on its innovative initiatives to create an action plan for the next two decades.

Other examples that emerged from the data as barriers to the achievement of effective communication and collaboration between the stakeholders, particularly in relation to the critical topics of funding and curriculum development, are presented below.
In light of the commitment of approximately $1 billion to the last phase of the Action Plan (2009-2013), the issues of transparency, or how the provinces receive and spend their federal dollars, is increasingly of interest to all second language enthusiasts who struggle to promote the merits of second language learning. In the following excerpt, an FSL publisher comments on the topic of transparency with regard to funding.

If the [federal government] is giving money for second language learning, in particular French because it’s one of our official languages then that needs to be made more transparent. How that money is allocated, spent, and make sure it’s going to French education, and not to something else. It must be made more transparent to ensure that for Immersion and Core French…the funding needs to be doled out separately to those two programs. If the funding is deemed, or designated to the umbrella of FSL programs…it includes Intensive French, it includes Core French and all the various and sundry combinations, therein. It needs to become more apparent where that money is being spent. Is it being spent, 90% on immersion, and 10% on core, that’s not good enough. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

Although the Canadian federal government has attempted to strengthen FSL programs across the country with generous financial commitments, the lack of transparency regarding the spending of these funds, and the lack of communication and collaboration in planning toward the announcement of the release of these funds, has contributed to a disconnect between the key stakeholders at both the meso and micro levels, and ultimately to the negative discourse in the media associated with FSL, as referenced in my literature review.

With regard to the key area of curriculum reform, two FSL publishers offer their opinions on the critical role that curriculum plays in the path to progress. The first excerpt offers a description of the current process for curriculum development that is taking place in one of the
The writing team, right now, is busy writing a draft, which I hope we’ll be able to see in the fall. Although, nothing’s a given. Given the fact that it takes us a year to properly develop a resource, and it’s already two years away. So, we should be working simultaneously with that writing team to have input even to the curriculum writing process. In order to drive the publication process, so that it meets the timelines of the curriculum implementation. Now, there’s another disconnect… look at the Western Protocol, the WNCP Math, that is just, at the present moment, about to be implemented. And Alberta Education, Alberta Learning… it feels very natural for them to work with publishers to develop resources that really meet their own provincial needs and curricula. And that’s very evident in Alberta. It’s very evident with WNCP Math. Those are two examples. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

It’s interesting …because, you know what? National Core French Study established that kind of methodology almost 20 years ago now. That’s shocking. And I think it’s still viable… Governments though are going to have to move out of the very prescriptive content-driven curriculum if they want those kind of changes to happen in other subject areas. So, it’s interesting when you look at the survival. How are publishers going to survive? How can they recreate themselves? Maybe they can’t recreate themselves, or pedagogical resources, until the concept of curriculum, and what you deliver to a classroom changes, too. You know, my guess is that it’s not just the publisher’s responsibility to come up with some amazingly brilliant technological idea that’s going to transform publishing [and education]… Probably curriculum is going to have to change, too. (Interview, Participant No. 1)
According to the first excerpt above, communication and collaboration between educational publishers and policy-makers does in fact exist in other subject areas and in other jurisdictions across the country. The publisher’s call for collaborative efforts at an early stage, rather than after a curriculum document is approved, echoes the criticisms directed at the NCFS, regarding the delayed call for publishers to participate. This underscores the benefits of reflecting on, and evaluating the past, as well as communicating with other jurisdictions prior to a move forward.

A silo approach to progress is showcased in the second excerpt above, as it relates to the critical role of curriculum. Acknowledging that technology will impact significantly how students learn in the future, the publisher underscores the need for curriculum to change and evolve, along with educational publishing, in order to address the obvious transformations that will be required to achieve educational reform.

**Between The Stakeholders: The Discourse of Competition**

As we have seen in some of the other sections in Chapter 5, the discourse of competition can create a barrier to both communication and collaboration. Between the stakeholders, there exists the obvious competition among the provinces themselves and their policy-makers, which we read about daily in the newspapers, stemming from various areas such as comparisons between provincial standard test findings.

Within the socio-cultural practices of the publishing industry, competition is active at all levels, both within one company and between companies in the industry, and it only continues to grow even though mergers have reduced the number of players. In this section, I will examine briefly how the publishing industry’s culture of competition impacts stakeholder relationships,
beginning with a brief overview of stakeholders’ perceptions of each other through a publisher’s lens.

The following excerpt represents a participant’s perception of publishers at the time when she was an FSL educator.

My perception of the industry, at that time, was that they certainly had a service to provide, that it seemed glamorous in a way, but that the sales reps. were rather sleazy. [Between the 1980s and now] the teacher’s perception of publishers has not changed, interestingly enough… they still perceive the publishing representatives to be motivated by money, greed, the sale, somebody trying to sell you something you didn’t want, even if you need it - so, very wary, mistrustful. That has not changed. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

This mistrust of the publishing industry is further reinforced in the following excerpt from a product manager, who believes that these misconceptions about the industry are based on a disconnect regarding what publishers actually do.

There is a disconnect between what public sectors think that publishers do… they think that it is the money… that we will try to influence somehow… there is mistrust in terms of what they think they can share with us and how we can work together and a misunderstanding what we want in return for that – that we just want money – and just sell books and want [their] stamp of approval so we can sell books (Interview, Participant No. 4).

By not communicating and collaborating with other stakeholders, publishers risk perpetuating a negative image, grounded in the competition for sales or for who controls what is taught, which has been taking shape and developing over several decades since the days in fact of Egerton Ryerson. According to the excerpt below, this mistrust of the industry stems from
history – and the competing discourse between policy-makers and educational publishers around who controls what is to be taught.

I remember [in the 70s] the materials that we used were the curriculum. They were the program of studies. Only recently do teachers teach to the curriculum. Before, I taught to the textbook and taught whatever I wanted. And what I deemed was appropriate. When curriculum writers got in there, there was a mistrust of publishers because of that – because [publishers] had ruled the classroom for so very long. And now the curriculum writers are saying… no, you are not dictating to us, we are going to dictate to you, and if you would like to take the risk to create and sell resources that meet needs… by all means. (Interview, Participant No. 3)

Competition, which acts as a barrier to effective communication and collaboration, could be removed, potentially, if there is a significant incentive for all stakeholders to band together for change. This important incentive for change may appear with the gradual and emerging focus on technology. As one of the FSL publishers cited in the previous section suggested, no one stakeholder alone will be able to present a solution to the inevitable technological changes that will impact policy-makers, educational publishers, and academic researchers. As technology increases the potential for more personalized and individual methods of learning, additional stakeholders such as teachers and students will emerge as increasingly influential participants in the learning process.

As the list of stakeholders potentially increases, so in fact does the need for a mediator. From this limited reflection on the past, two key associations would appear as potential facilitators to effective communication and collaboration. Both CASLT, specifically in the second language area, and CERC, in the broader arena of all subjects, have succeeded in enabling stakeholders to make progress in the past.
I conclude this section with two excerpts from one of the FSL publishers in which she discusses the ongoing issue of communication and collaboration, and the barriers that in the end impact all teachers and students in classrooms across the country.

[at CERC] we always used to just shake our heads in wonderment. Why were policy-makers, curriculum developers across the country, not bringing us in right at the very first moment. We were always an afterthought. That was one of our big questions, for years and years and years, in that organization, we were always fighting to be at the table at some point. To have a say somewhere. When in fact…We should have been at the table right from the start. I don’t care what kind of brilliant curriculum you’re going to develop as a policy-maker… If you can’t actually translate that practically to the classroom, it’s meaningless, yes, it’s useless. I don’t get why there was never that understanding. I don’t understand it. (Interview, Participant No. 1)

I would say that ultimately the overriding mission [of CERC] all of the years was to have greater communication with policy-makers, administrators of education across the country. Having greater influence on, basically trying to form partnerships in terms of actually development of curriculum. The other thing was, always the huge thing, was just getting, it sounds crazy to say this, but just getting Ministries of Education to recognize the value of [educational resources]. Which in some ways – how could they not recognize it?… Create the curriculum, toss it out, and then expect teachers to implement it. As you know, a lot of the provinces would put out teaching units, to help sustain the curriculum, but they didn’t go far enough to providing all of the support that the teacher in the classroom would need. So, getting these Ministers of Education to value, just even, without even participating in curriculum, that was a whole other issue, even just getting them to value the resources. By valuing, I mean, getting them to put aside dedicated funding, so that when a new curriculum came out, schools would actually be given enough money to buy resources to deliver the curriculum. (Interview, Participant No. 1)
Conclusion

In response to this study’s main research question regarding the interactions between the stakeholders, the findings have demonstrated that FSL stakeholders did indeed collaborate within the context of the NCFS, which was initiated by academic researchers in the 1990s. The NCFS offered an example of the positive impact when educators collaborate with academic researchers and policy-makers to reform curriculum on a national basis. To this day, FSL curricula across the country, with the exception of Ontario, are grounded in the principles of the NCFS. The analysis of data further highlighted the positive impact of the NCFS’s multi-dimensional curriculum on advancing educational resource development by encouraging publishers to think creatively about delivery formats and to collaborate with academic researchers in the developmental stages. Additionally, the data also highlighted the critical role of publishers in translating curriculum reform to teachers and students in the classroom. Further, this made visible the negative impact when there is a delay in the call for publisher participation, as occurred in the NCFS.

In contrast to the NCFS, the analysis revealed the pronounced disconnect in the 2000s between the FSL stakeholders in some jurisdictions of curriculum second language renewal, and during the planning of major policy statements, and announcements for major funding initiatives, as reflected during the 2003 Action Plan, which represents a major political initiative in second language learning. The data analysis revealed that this lack of collaboration and communication threatens the prestige of French, resulting in overall negative media coverage, and reinforces the marginalization of second language educators and publishers. Further, the data underscored that educational publishers were for the most part ignored in the decisional process in relation to both the NCFS and the 2003 Action Plan.
The most compelling data, however, highlighted the perilous situation that faces the FSL subject area in the world of educational publishing, mirroring the difficulties and disconnects at the macro and meso levels of language planning in Canada, as well as within other jurisdictions in the micro level. This situation in publishing is exacerbated by the disconnected activities associated with the 2003 Action Plan, particularly in relation to its overall planning and first phase of funding.

From the point of view of the conceptual framework, the use of dominant discourses to describe the educational publishing socio-cultural practices proved effective; however, the original organizational schema to illustrate the three dominant discourses did not provide for the two increasingly critical and competing themes – best practices versus profitability, and who controls what is taught. A deeper analysis of the impact of these themes on the discourses would prove to be valuable contributions toward an understanding of the stakeholder relationships.
Chapter 6:
The Future

Contributions

The analysis of stakeholders relationships, viewed through the lens of educational publishers, has provided the opportunity to examine the publishing domain and its discursive practices. This analysis offers an insight into a key education stakeholder at a time when dramatic change in education is forthcoming and when mutual understandings are critical. This study’s most valuable contribution therefore was to reveal and underscore the positive developments of collaboration between educational publishers, policy-makers, and academic researchers.

Limitations

Although contextualizing my study within the NCFS and the 2003 Action Plan provided a focus for the research and analysis, an extension of the research to other key events would have provided potentially a stronger validation of the findings. As well, extending my research to other functions in educational publishing would have offered a deeper understanding of its socio-cultural practices.

Recommendations

The following five key recommendations reflect the findings from this study.

1. Through CASLT and CERC, establish a committee that oversees the planning for an evaluation of the NCFS, with a goal to renew the NCFS and create a national curriculum for the next decade. Since second language educators across the country are gathering to discuss curriculum renewal in their own province and are
contemplating spending procedures for the last phase of the 2003-2013 Action Plan funds, it would be beneficial to pause, on a national basis, to re-examine and evaluate the last major event that inspired widespread curriculum reform in FSL. An opportunity to gather together potentially all key stakeholders for the purpose of reflecting on the impact of NCFS in each provincial purview would produce valuable lessons from the past about triumphs and mistakes, and serve as the first (of many) collaborative steps to the future.

2. Through CASLT and CERC, establish a committee that addresses the inconsistent mandatory status of FSL at the provincial levels, with a goal to equalize the status between the two official languages. While second language enthusiasts continue to seek out new and different models and methods to influence curriculum, there still remains the foundational issue that the second official language in Canada is not equal to the first. As demonstrated in the literature review, in contrast to the other official language, French is not even consistently mandated across the country in Grades 4-9. As opposed to forming a splinter group of second language activists in support of different program models, it would be more effective to band together for one common vision, and encourage a more equalized and consistent mandatory status for Core French across the country.

3. Through CASLT and CERC, bring together national key stakeholders representing all of the subject areas to address the present and future impact of technology on education.
4. Establish a course on educational publishing for Bachelor of Education students across the country. The goal of this course would be to introduce students to the process of how educational resources are created, with the objective of providing future educators with tools for one of their ongoing, critical tasks as teachers - the evaluation of educational resources.

5. Establish a course on the history of second language pedagogy for students enrolled in Bachelor of Education programs across Ontario.

All of these recommendations present opportunities for reinforcement of communication and collaboration between stakeholders.

**Future Research**

Although answers were proposed in response to the research questions, there remain many other avenues for future research that would enrich the understanding of the FSL stakeholders’ relationships. A similar study, but through the lens of academic researchers, combined with a similar study through the lens of policy-makers, would present a comprehensive overview of the second language stakeholders and their purviews. Research into the critical roles of associations such as CASLT and CERC would also prove beneficial, as would an historical study on the funding procedures around second language learning in Canada.
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Appendix A

Recruitment Letter

June 29, 2009

Dear,

I am writing to ask if you would be willing to participate in research activities associated with my Masters thesis titled, “French as second language in Canada: A Publisher’s Perspective.” If you accept to participate in this study, please sign the attached consent form (Appendix A).

The principal purpose of my research will be to explore the relationships and roles between Canadian educational publishers and other key FSL stakeholders, which for this study are defined as Canadian academic researchers and policy makers. I will be contextualizing my research specifically within two key events - The 1985-1989 National Core French Study and the 2003-2013 Canadian Federal Action Plan for Official Languages. Through an historical perspective, I plan to examine the implications of key stakeholders’ actions on publishers and their resources.

There will be 5-7 participants in this study, representing key players within the Canadian educational publishing industry over the past two decades. During my selection of participants, I considered variables related to gender; area of expertise, e.g., sales, editorial, administrative; and small versus medium versus large company.

I am planning to conduct my research in July 2009. With your consent, I would conduct one audio-recorded interview with you in a private location such as your home. The semi-structured interview will last approximately 1-2 hours and consist of questions based on your experiences in FSL resource development over the past two decades.

I will also be holding a focus group after the interviews, to provide an opportunity for all participants to discuss outstanding issues related to roles and relationships between the key FSL stakeholders.

Both the interview and the focus group will be conducted during regular work hours, on a day and at a time that suit your schedule. Please see the attached Appendix (B and C) for the interview protocol and a preliminary program for the focus group.

Please note that individuals will be recruited on a strictly volunteer basis and are under no obligation to participate in this research. Participants may decline to answer any questions during the interview, or to withdraw from participation at any time for any reason. All information collected from participants who withdraw from the study will not be analyzed and will be systematically destroyed.
I plan to contribute to this study personally by including an overview of my own observations and experiences over the past two decades in publishing. Please see the Interview Protocol (Appendix B) since my overview will follow this pattern. I am in a position that poses a conflict of interest through my previous involvement in the FSL publishing domain, and in my current role as a freelance FSL consultant. My dual role as researcher and participant in this study (by including my personal overview in the thesis), will also contribute to the conflict of interest. However, all participants will be informed of this conflict, and as mentioned above, they will have the option to decline participation.

Please note that all participants and their employers will receive, at the same time, the results of my research.

Only my thesis supervisor and I will have access to the original data with the participants’ identifications and institution names. Please note, however, that by agreeing to attend the focus group, your identity will be revealed to the other participants. Confidentiality will be ensured in my thesis through the use of first-name pseudonyms chosen by the participants. The names of the institutions and their educational resources will be altered for the study to prevent identification. I will store all data in a locked filing cabinet in my home for a period of five years and then systematically destroy them. By ensuring confidentiality, there will be no reason for risk - for the institution or the participants.

Upon completion of this study (summer 2009), I will send each participant a copy of my summary report on the results of the data collection. This report will present common themes related to stakeholder roles and the publishing process.

If you are able to participate in this research, kindly complete the enclosed consent form with your printed name, signature, and date, and return it to me prior to our interview. Please keep a copy of this letter for your future reference. I will contact you again to respond to any questions, and to schedule a day and time to conduct the individual interview.

If you have questions about this research or the procedures, please feel free to contact me at 416-920-6533 or by email at babiggar@rogers.com. Or please contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. Normand Labrie, Professor and Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies, at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 416-978-8440 or by email at nlabrie@oise.utoronto.ca.

Furthermore, please do not hesitate to contact the University of Toronto Ethics Review office at ethics.review@utoronto.ca, or at 416-946-3273 if you have any specific questions regarding the rights of participants who become involved in this study. Thank you so much for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Beverley Biggar
M.A. candidate, Second Language Education Program
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, 10th floor
Toronto, M5S 1V6

Thesis Supervisor
Normand Labrie
Associate Dean, Research and Graduate Studies
Vice-doyen à la recherche et aux études supérieures
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education of the University of Toronto
252 Bloor St. W, Room 12-112
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5S 1V6
Telephone: 416-978-8440
Facsimile: 416-926-4770
Appendix B
The Consent Form

To be completed and returned to Beverley Biggar
M.A. candidate, Second Language Education Program
Department of Curriculum, Teaching and Learning
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and the University of Toronto
252 Bloor Street West, 10th floor
Toronto, M5S 1V6

I have read and understood the details of this research as outlined in the recruitment letter written by Beverley Biggar on June 29, 2009. I agree to participate in her study, “French as a second language in Canada: A Publisher’s Perspective.”

I acknowledge that there will be four possible areas of participation, and I agree to participate in (please check where appropriate):

☐ Interview
☐ Documents related to the National Core French Study and/or Action Plan
☐ Educational resources created in response to the National Core French Study and/or Action Plan
☐ Focus Group

I am returning this letter to her in person, signed and competed, and I have retained a copy, for my records, of the letter detailing this research for my future reference.

My name is (please print): _________________________________________

Signature: ______________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________
Appendix C
Interview Protocol

Note: My personal overview will follow the same pattern as this interview protocol.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION
a. How long have you been working in the publishing field?
b. How long have you been working specifically in the FSL publishing area?
c. How many publishing companies have you worked with in FSL?
d. What roles and responsibilities have you had? Please describe.
e. What is your understanding of how publishing companies make decisions to publish in FSL?
f. How and with what authors did you develop your first FSL resource?
g. What was the publishing process: development, marketing and selling strategy?
h. If you have worked with a number of companies, how have they differed in their approach to FSL publishing?
i. Do you know the mission statements of the companies? If so, please identify.
j. Please describe the key issues for publishers two decades ago, one decade ago, and now. Why the changes?

THE NATIONAL CORE FRENCH STUDY and THE ACTION PLAN
a. How did you become familiar with the principles of the National Core French Study?
b. Did you publish materials in response to the launch of the NCFS in the 1990s?
c. If yes, describe how you arrived at this decision to publish, what you developed, with whom, and the publishing process in general at the time.
d. Are you familiar with the 2003-2013 Action Plan? If yes, how were you notified of the plan, and how did you become familiar with its principles?
e. Did you publish anything in response to the 2003 Action Plan?
f. If yes, describe how you arrived at this decision to publish, what you developed and with whom, and the publishing process in general at the time.

PUBLISHERS’ RELATIONSHIPS
a. Who are the other FSL publishers in Canada?
b. How do you interrelate with other key FSL publishers?
c. Would you want your relationship to change? How and why?

ASSOCIATIONS
a. Are you a member of CERC?
b. Are there other similar organizations that you belong to?
c. What is your understanding of the role of CERC?
d. Have you ever been involved in other Canadian publishing associations? If yes, which one(s) and identify your role.
e. What are your experiences with associations during the publishing of FSL materials in the 1990s and 2000s?

PUBLISHERS’ RELATIONSHIPS WITH RESEARCHERS
a. Who are the key FSL academic researchers?
b. Have you in the past, or do you now, work with academic researchers when you publish in FSL?
c. How do you interrelate with FSL academic researchers?
   And in the past?
d. What would you change?

PUBLISHERS’ RELATIONSHIPS WITH POLICY-MAKERS
a. Who are the key FSL policy makers?
b. Have you in the past, or do you now, work with policy makers when you publish in FSL?
c. How do you interrelate with FSL policy makers?
   And in the past?
d. What would you change?
Appendix D
Focus Group Agenda

1. Welcome and explanation of goals.

2. Discussion on general practices related to publisher; editor; product manager; sales representative.

3. Review of the research findings thus far under the following categories: Within one company; Within the industry; Between stakeholders.

4. Review of the dominant discourses that have been revealed in the data thus far under the three categories above: communication; collaboration; competition.

5. Review of the area where data is missing: competition between the stakeholders. Ask: Where were publishers involved during the NCFS? During the Action Plan? During curriculum review? What are the perceptions of the stakeholders, through publishers’ lenses?

6. Discussion of any outstanding issues.
Appendix E
Transcription Conventions

[brackets] Explanation, or missing word inserted by author

[?] Incomprehensible word or phrase

((laugh)) non-linguistic occurrences such as laughter

… a sequence of dots indicates that text has been removed

(.) brief pause

*italics* for emphasis