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**INTRODUCTION**

Many studies have confirmed that young children acquire their reading and learning habits at a very early age and that, among children from Francophone backgrounds, the linguistic and cultural experiences that they have before they ever set foot in school will strongly influence their ability to learn French and to lead full lives in this language. Hence the responsibility for passing French on to the next generation falls on families first of all. Families also represent one of the critical elements for ensuring that the Francophone community survives and flourishes.

But Francophones who live in linguistic minority settings have limited access to French-language resources and activities. Opportunities to offer their children intellectual stimulation in their mother tongue are thus scarcer for these Francophone families than for Anglophone ones.

To better equip Francophone parents to act as their child’s first teachers and to support them in this role, a number of French-language literacy centres have provided family literacy training programs in several Ontario communities. These programs target Francophone families in minority settings. Composed of workshops given for a few hours per week over several weeks, these programs offer Francophone families the chance to share ideas, to learn, and to pursue recreational activities entirely in French.

Though there have been a number of studies on family literacy training, our review of the literature uncovered few studies that examined the impact of such programs on families. The few studies that did evaluate such impacts were only concerned with Anglophone families. The present study will therefore be of special interest for all Francophone communities in Canada.

**Purpose of This Study**

The study discussed in this report is entitled *A Study of the Impact of French-Language Family Literacy Programs on Francophone Families in Linguistic Minority Settings in Ontario*. This study has been conducted by the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research on Citizenship and Minorities (CIRCEM) at the University of Ottawa for the Coalition Francophone pour l’alphabétisation et la formation de base en Ontario (Francophone coalition for literacy and basic skills training in Ontario). Its purpose is to measure the impacts of French-language family literacy programs on parents and their child.

In this study, we have assessed the changes observed in literacy habits and use of French among parents and children who participated in one of the French-language family literacy programs offered by French-language literacy centres that are members of the Coalition. We have also analyzed the various program models applied in these programs, identified the challenges that they must meet and the factors for their success, and documented their best practices.

This study was funded by the Office of Literacy and Essential Skills (OLES) and comes directly under the umbrella of the Action Plan for Official Languages that the federal government launched in 2003 to ensure the survival of Canada’s linguistic duality and to provide better supports for Francophones living in minority settings. Citing data indicating that “one out of every four Francophone parents experiences difficulties in reading,”1 the Department of Human Resources and Social Development Canada has made a commitment to “expand access to family literacy services for Francophone households in a minority setting.”2 CIRCEM conducted this study over a five-year period. Note that at the beginning of this study, there were seven centres participating. But in 2006, the Moi j’apprends centre in Russell County took over responsibility for offering literacy services in the City of Ottawa as well. So in 2006-2007, there were a total of six centres delivering family literacy programs to the seven geographic areas included in this study.

We began by developing social and demographic profiles of the Francophone communities in each of the participating literacy centres’ service areas. In the process, we also identified some characteristics of these areas themselves. We then assessed five cohorts of Francophone families who participated in the French-language family literacy programs offered by these centres. Each of these programs consisted of a series of eight to 10 workshops. Cohort 1 attended their workshops from January to April 2005, and we published our assessment of the impact of the programs on this cohort in November 2005.3 Cohorts 2 and 3 attended their workshops from September to December 2005 and from January to April 2006 respectively and we published our assessment report on them in December 2006.4 This report presents the results for Cohorts 4 and 5, whose workshops ran from September to December 2006 and from January to April 2007.

**Research Team**

This study has been commissioned and sponsored by the Coalition Francophone pour l’alphabétisation et la formation de base en Ontario. To assess the impact of the family literacy programs, the Coalition retained the services of the Centre for Interdisciplinary Research on Citizenship and Minorities (CIRCEM). CIRCEM’S Research Director, Dr. Anne Gilbert, and its Director, Dr. Joseph Yvon Thériault, are co-leaders of the academic team that worked on this project, while CIRCEM’S Research Co-ordinator, Sophie LeTouzé, was responsible for collecting and analyzing the data and writing the research reports.
This team was also assisted by two resource persons from the University of Ottawa: Dr. Diana Masny of the Faculty of Education and Dr. André Thibault of the Department of Sociology, who developed and validated the measuring tools used in this study.

The Coalition also formed a steering committee to oversee the study. The committee’s members were: Suzanne Benoit, Executive Director of the Coalition Francophone pour l’alphabétisation et la formation de base en Ontario; Marc Bissonnette, Executive Director of La Route du Savoir literacy centre; Lucie Brunet, consultant at Brunet Sherwood Consultants, who acted as project co-ordinator; Gabrielle Lopez, Director of Development at the Fédération canadienne pour l’alphabétisation en français (Canadian federation for French-language literacy); Yvon Laberge, consultant at Excel Learning Concepts; and Sophie LeTouzé, Research Co-ordinator at CIRCEM.

**Definition of Family Literacy Training**

The many different definitions of alphabétisation familiale (family literacy training) reflect the many different kinds of French-language family literacy programs that were implemented in the 1990s. For the purposes of this study, we define “family literacy training” as follows: an approach that supports the parents or other significant adults in a child’s life in their role as the child’s first teachers, thus helping the child develop his or her cultural, scholastic, and community literacies.

When adults attend a family literacy program, they also develop these literacies themselves and thus achieve a better understanding of their own lives as Francophone in minority language communities. They also become more aware of the importance of taking the steps needed to improve living conditions for themselves and their child. They become better prepared to play their rightful roles as their child’s first teachers. They improve not only their ability to express themselves orally in French, but also their reading, writing, and numeracy skills in this language. Lastly, they become better able to contribute more actively to the development of their communities.

The above definition recognizes the various facets of daily life and the various levels of literacy among Francophones in minority settings. The process of family literacy training can thus lead to multiple literacies. It is up to the centres that provide such training to decide how best to combine them.

Family literacy training is based on the following four main principles:

1. Parents, children, and extended-family members use the various forms of literacy both at home and in their communities.
2. Children begin to develop the various forms of literacy at birth, and the subsequent development of these literacies is conditioned by children’s experiences in the settings in which they live.
3. Parents are their child’s first and most important teachers.
4. Not all parents have the same skills for supporting their child in their learning.

In general, French-language family literacy programs:

- promote reading and writing in French as important family activities;
- improve parents’ abilities to help their child learn French-language literacy skills;
- provide learning experiences that are appropriate to children’s development levels;
- increase parents’ own awareness and understanding of Francophone culture;
- encourage parents to participate in positive ways;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Service Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>Regional Municipality of Niagara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>Simcoe County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>District of Nipissing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>Regional Municipality of Peel, Regional Municipality of Halton, and Dufferin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>Russell County and City of Ottawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>Kingston Region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• give parents opportunities to pursue their own French-language educational objectives;
• provide opportunities for schools, communities, community agencies, and government to work together.

**French-Language Literacy Centres Participating in This Study**

French-language literacy centres who are members of the Coalition are funded by the Ontario Ministry of Colleges and Universities to provide literacy-training services to Francophone adults. Before this study began, the six centres that participated in the present phase of this project (the workshops for Cohorts 4 and 5) had already been offering one or more French-language literacy programs to families for several years, but they had had to fund these programs themselves. It is the programs of these six centres that are assessed in the present study. The centres and the areas that they serve are listed in Table 1.

**Francophone Communities Served by These Literacy Centres**

In the course of this study, we developed social and demographic profiles of the Francophone communities in each of the participating literacy centres’ service areas, as well as some characteristics of these areas themselves. Table 2 classifies these centres according to whether they serve metropolitan areas or non-metropolitan areas. Only one of the centres serves an area where Francophones are in the majority: the Moi j’apprends centre serves Russell County, a part of eastern Ontario where Francophones account for 62.5% of the total population. It must be noted however that although these Francophones may be a majority in their immediate surroundings, they are still living in a province where Francophones are a minority, with the lack of Francophone resources and activities that that implies. Two of the centres serve areas where Francophones represent a sizeable minority: the Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing, in the District of Nipissing, with a 27% Francophone population, and the Moi j’apprends centre which also serves the City of Ottawa, with a Francophone population of 16.3%. The four other centres serve areas where Francophones represent a very small minority. These centres and the percentage of Francophones in their service areas are: ABC Communautaire, 3.9%; La Route du Savoir, 3.4%; Alpha Huronie, 3%; and Le Collège du Savoir, 1.7%.

**Methodology**

In order to measure the impact of the literacy centres’ family literacy programs on the families who participated in them, we gathered data in semi-directed interviews with the participating parents, their literacy trainers, and the directors of these centres. We used four questionnaires to structure the interviews. These interviews enabled us to identify the conditions for the success of such programs, the challenges that they must meet, and the distinctive aspects of each of the programs that we studied.

We administered an 18-question questionnaire to the participating parents when they first signed up for the programs to determine how often these parents currently engaged in literacy-related activities (both on their own and with their child) and in what language or languages they did so. At the last workshop of each program, we asked these parents these same 18 questions again. We were thereby able to measure whether, once these parents had completed the programs, they engaged in the same literacy-related activities more often, less often, or just as often as before, and whether they did so in French more often, less often, or just as often as before.

In the post-program interviews, we also asked these parents a different set of questions that were more open-ended, so they could...
express themselves freely, give their impressions of the program in which they had participated, and talk about the changes that had occurred in their families as a result of their participation in the program.

We also held semi-directed interviews with the literacy trainers. The purpose of these interviews was to get a basic picture of who the trainers were, along with information on the participating families and the trainers’ reactions to how the programs had gone, what had worked well, and what should be changed the next time the programs were delivered. The trainers also filled out a general information form on each participating family at the start of the program and a progress sheet at the end of each workshop. These two tools enabled the trainers to get a better sense of the week-to-week changes in these families, as well as to track their attendance.

We also met with the directors of the literacy centres to gather information about their reasons for choosing the particular program models that they did, the ways that they went about setting their programs up, their strategies for recruiting families to participate in them and the support that they received from various quarters in the community. We also discussed with these directors the winning conditions for such programs and the challenges that they present.

At the start of this project, the Fédération canadienne pour l’alphabétisation en français (FCAF) gave several of the literacy centre directors a training course on the foundations of family literacy in Francophone-minority settings (this course was adapted from Foundational Training in Family Literacy, a program designed by the Centre for Family Literacy in Edmonton, Alberta). Another course dealt with a particular French-language family literacy program model entitled Grandir avec mon enfant. This course helped the directors to set up their family literacy programs and train their family literacy trainers. It was delivered by a team from Eduk, a training service for Francophones and Francophiles in Alberta. The Coalition also held a meeting with the directors of the centres that were partnering in this study to brief them on the parameters and the research tools that were going to be used. In addition, the Coalition produced a “study participants’ guide” as a reference tool for the centres. To better understand the setting in which each of the participating centres operates, and the results that their programs achieved, the Coalition also profiled the social and demographic characteristics and the vitality of the Francophone communities in each of the seven geographic areas where the family literacy programs were delivered. At the end of the programs, the Coalition held meetings with the directors of these centres and the literacy trainers who led these workshops to discuss the factors that contributed to the success of their programs as well as the challenges that they encountered.

**How This Report is Organized**

This report presents the results of our research on Cohort 4 (the families who attended the literacy workshops from September to December 2006) and Cohort 5 (those who did so from January to April 2007), as well as a brief summary of the main characteristics of all five cohorts included in this study.

This report is divided into four parts. Part 1 describes how the literacy centres recruited parents to participate in their family literacy programs, the various reasons that these parents had for participating, and some of their characteristics. Part 2 analyzes the data gathered on literacy habits and use of French among the parents and children involved in these programs, both before and after participating in them. Part 2 also reviews the program evaluations by the parents, the literacy trainers, and the literacy centre directors concerned. Part 3 presents some recommendations on improving the programs before they are delivered again. Lastly, Part 4 uses a series of tables to summarize the results of this study for all five cohorts that have participated since the beginning.
PART 1
French-Language Family Literacy and Its Clientele

1.1 Program Models Adopted by Participating Literacy Centres

A wide range of models are available for French-language family literacy programs, and an inventory of such programs has been prepared by the Groupe de recherche en petite enfance (early childhood research group) at the University of Moncton.19 Ruth Nickse classifies such models according to how parents and children participate in them and whether the children involved are preschool-age or school-age.20

As recommended in the assessment report on Cohort 1, all of the family literacy programs that the six centres provided to Cohorts 4 and 5 were based on existing family literacy program models with clear objectives and an instructors’ manual that had already been tested and proven. As Table 3 shows, five of the centres used one of the following three models: Des livres dans mon baluchon, Grandir avec mon enfant and Lire et écrire à la maison. The program delivered by the ABC Communautaire centre, entitled Pour les rendre heureux, borrowed elements from two of them: Grandir avec mon enfant and Des livres dans mon baluchon.21 Three of the six centres decided to work with parents of preschool-age children, while the other three targeted parents of school-age children. One of the centres, Alpha Huronie, decided not to offer any activities for the children themselves, because it did not have an appropriate space to accommodate them. Four of the centres’ programs provided activities to the children directly: the La Route du Savoir centre provided the children’s component of the Des livres dans mon baluchon program model; the Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing and the Moi j’apprends centre provided activities for parents and children from the Lire et écrire à la maison model; and the Le Collège du Savoir provided a children’s activity that it had designed itself, called Mon tapis raconte. The ABC Communautaire centre did not offer a children’s activity based on any of these models, but did provide a regular daycare service.

1.2 Family Literacy Trainers

The trainers who delivered the family literacy programs had a variety of backgrounds and skills. The great majority of them had worked in school settings. Some of them had experience in teaching literacy skills to adults, others had been trained in working with children, and still others had no prior experience. Of the 13 trainers, only two had taken the family literacy training courses mentioned earlier, because they were also the managers of their centres. The other trainers had not received any formal instruction in family literacy training or in the program models. In this regard, we should note that after our assessments of the programs delivered to Cohorts 1, 2, and 3, we had recommended that the centres hire qualified French-language literacy trainers to deliver these programs. But the centres had trouble in following this recommendation, largely because of the lack of qualified personnel and the limited training available in this subject area. However, several of the centres were fortunate enough to retain the same trainers for the entire duration of this project, so these individuals ended up acquiring sound practical expertise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Age of Children Targeted</th>
<th>Type of Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>Pour les rendre heureux</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Direct: adults and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>Grandir avec mon enfant</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Direct: adults only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation</td>
<td>Lire et écrire à la maison</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Direct: adults and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>Grandir avec mon enfant</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Direct: adults and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>Lire et écrire à la maison</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Direct: adults and children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>Des livres dans mon baluchon</td>
<td>Preschool</td>
<td>Direct: adults and children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Recruitment and Participation in the Family Literacy Programs

As Figure 1 shows, schools and daycare centres remain the best places to recruit participants. Once again, as for Cohorts 2 and 3, over 60% of 128 participants were recruited through these institutions. Next came word-of-mouth: 19% of the participants had learned about their program either through a friend (13%) or from someone who had attended an earlier session (6%). Only 5% of the families were recruited through advertisements in the community, and another 5% were already attending other programs at the literacy centres and were recruited directly there. These figures suggest that in their recruitment campaigns, the centres have trouble reaching eligible parents whose children do not attend French-language schools or daycare centres.

As Table 4 shows, the numbers of adults and children that enrolled in the family literacy programs as a result of these recruitment efforts were fairly impressive: 83 adults and 96 children enrolled in the workshops held in Fall 2006 (Cohort 4), and 45 adults and 40 children enrolled in those held in Winter 2007 (Cohort 5), for a total of 128 adults and 136 children participating in the family literacy workshops. Note that the Alpha Huronie centre did not include the families’ children in its program because of a lack of space, and that at the ABC Communautaire centre, Cohort 5 did not consist of parents of preschool-age children, but rather of 5 current and future education practitioners. Hence there were no children in this cohort at these two centres. The 5 current and future education practitioners were included in the category of parents. A total of 109 of the adults that enrolled in the family literacy programs completed them, as can

---

**Table 4. Number of Parents and Children Enrolled in Family Literacy Programs, by Centre**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Cohort 4</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cohort 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Parents Enrolled</td>
<td>Number of Children Enrolled</td>
<td>Number of Parents Enrolled</td>
<td>Number of Children Enrolled</td>
<td>Number of Parents Enrolled</td>
<td>Number of Children Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>96</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 5. Participation in the Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Number of Participants who Completed the Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be seen in Table 5. This corresponds to 85.2%. For the research purposes, adults that had missed three or more of their workshops were not included in the evaluation of the program’s impacts.

1.4 Parents’ Reasons for Enrolling

To understand parents’ reasons for enrolling in family literacy programs and to determine which reasons they considered most important, we asked them to assign importance ratings to several different potential reasons.

Figure 2 shows the three reasons for enrolling in a family literacy program that were considered very important by the most parents and the three that were considered very important by the fewest parents. The three reasons rated as very important by the highest percentages of the 128 parents enrolled in the programs were as follows: to help my child’s development (95.9%), to learn how to give my child a love of learning (89.4%), and to give my child better prospects for the future (87%).

Because, as the title of the present series of reports suggests, parents chose to attend these workshops for their child first and foremost, it is not surprising that fewer of them ascribed great importance to ways that they themselves could benefit, such as improving their own self-confidence (47.2%), learning how to use a library (39.8%), and getting a chance to discuss things with other parents (35.8%).

Though the reasons that the parents identified as very important in response to our survey questions related to their child, the parent interviews that we conducted at the end of each program provided a very different picture. In these interviews, many parents confided that they had participated in the workshops to become better parents and to share experiences with their peers.

1.5 Characteristics of Participating Parents

The first main section of the questionnaire that the adults filled out when they enrolled in the family literacy programs was designed to capture a detailed picture of these parents and their families. A total of 128 adults completed this questionnaire. The following sections describe the families’ characteristics based on this questionnaire.

Figure 2
Parents’ Main Reasons for Participating in the Family Literacy Programs
1.5.1 Sex, Age, and Marital Status

In our reports on the first three cohorts, we noted that the vast majority of the parents participating in the programs were mothers, and this was again the case for Cohorts 4 and 5. Only 23 men enrolled in the programs, compared with 105 women (see Figure 3). Among these men, 15 participated in the programs targeting school-age children that were offered by the Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing and the Moi j’apprends centre. The centre that enrolled the highest proportion of fathers—4 out of 11 parents—was the Le Collège du Savoir.

Figure 4 divides the adults who enrolled in the programs at each centre into five age groups. As this figure shows, most of these adults (79, or 62.2% of the total) were age 31 to 40. This finding is not surprising, since nearly half of them were parents with at least one child in Grade 1. There were also six grandparents enrolled in the programs, representing 4.7% of the total number of adults. At the other end of the age range, almost no parents below age 20 were enrolled in any of the programs.

Of the 125 participating adults who answered the question about their marital status, 90 (72%) were married, 22 (17.6%) were living common law, and the others were single (6, or 4.8%), separated (5, or 4%), or divorced (2, or 1.6%).

We also defined four different levels of education in the questionnaire and asked the parents what level they had reached. As Figure 5 shows, the resulting percentage distributions were similar from one centre to the next. Only 4% of the parents (4 mothers and 1 father, all born in Ontario) had not completed...
secondary school. Slightly more than 17% (22 parents) had secondary school diplomas. And as in the first three cohorts, the vast majority of the parents had some postsecondary education: 42.7% had studied at the college level and 35.5% at the university level; thus a total of 78.2% of the parents had continued their education after secondary school. Note, however, that these figures do not necessarily mean that these parents had completed their college or university studies. Moreover, parents could have some university education but still not have the skills needed to support their child’s learning process or to pass on Francophone culture to their child.

1.5.2 Place of Birth and Number of Years in the Community

Figure 6 classifies the parents in the programs at each literacy centre into three different categories according to place of birth. The resulting percentage distributions vary widely from one centre to the next and seem to reflect the backgrounds of the different population groups in the communities that these centres serve. For example, in the communities of Welland (served by the ABC Communautaire centre), Penetanguishene (Alpha Huronie centre), Sturgeon Falls (Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing) and eastern Ontario (Moi j’apprends centre), the vast majority of the parents enrolled in the programs were born in Ontario. But in Brampton, a highly multicultural suburb of Toronto, the vast majority of the parents who attended the program at the Le Collège du Savoir were born outside of Canada. Meanwhile, the Canadian Forces base in Kingston, where the La Route du Savoir centre is located, attracts a Francophone population not only from Ontario, but also from other Canadian provinces.

Note that out of the 15 parents (12%) who were born in other Canadian
provinces, 14 came from Quebec, and that the 21 parents (17%) who were born outside of Canada came from new countries of immigration, such as Haiti, the Congo, Argentina, Iraq, Peru, and Indonesia.

The depth of the parents’ roots in the community also varied from one centre to another, but as Figure 7 shows, in general, the parents were fairly well established where they lived. Except at the Le Collège du Savoir and the La Route du Savoir, over 50% of the parents who participated in the family literacy programs had been living in their communities for over 11 years. On the other hand, 11.5% of the parents had been living in their communities for two years or less. The family literacy programs provided a good way of helping this group integrate the local Francophone community.

### 1.5.3 Language Characteristics

Given that the families’ use of language is central to this study, we also asked the parents to indicate their mother tongue and that of their partner, if they had one. We also asked what language was spoken most often in their home and what language they spoke most often with their child. The responses to these questions gave us a better sense of the language environment in which the parents and the children were immersed.

As Figure 8 shows, 67.2% of the parents who participated in the family literacy workshops had French as their mother tongue, whereas among their partners, the percentage was 59.8%. The percentage of parents who had English as their mother tongue was also higher among the non-participating partners than among the workshop participants (24.8% compared with 16%). The language

#### Figure 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Over 11 years</th>
<th>6-11 years</th>
<th>3-4 years</th>
<th>2 years or less</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d'alphabilatation</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j'apprends</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Figure 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue of participating parent</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother tongue of other parent</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken most often in the home</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language spoken most often with children</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French &amp; English</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
spoken most often at home, according to the parents who responded to the questionnaire, was French in 55.2% of the families. The language spoken most often with the children in the family was French in more than 63% of the cases. English was the language spoken most often in the home in 17.6% of the families, and the language spoken most often to the children in 11.7%.

Figure 9 classifies the families participating in the program at each centre into three language-based categories: families in which both parents were Francophone (endogamous families), families in which one parent was Francophone (exogamous families), and families in which neither parent was Francophone. Exogamous families accounted for the highest percentage of the total (43.6%); in other words, in 51 of the 117 two-parent families, one of the parents’ mother tongue was a language other than French. There were 43 endogamous families (36.8%); most of these families attended the programs at the Moi j’apprends centre (59.7%) and the Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing (53.3%). In 23 families (19.7%), neither parent had French as his or her mother tongue.

Figure 9
Distribution of Families by Parents’ Mother Tongue
PART 2
Program impacts and Program Evaluations

2.1 Changes Within Families

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of participating in French-language family literacy programs. In order to assess this impact, we asked the parents when they first enrolled 18 questions to determine how often they currently engaged in literacy-related activities (both on their own and with their child), and in what language or languages they did so. Then, once the programs were over, we asked the parents who had completed them the same questions again, to see whether they had altered their habits with regard to literacy-related activities and use of French. A total of 104 parents completed this exit questionnaire. We then conducted semi-directed interviews with them to get their own descriptions of the changes that had occurred in themselves and in their child as a result of their participation in these programs. The 5 current and future education practitioner who followed the program at the ABC Communautaire centre were not included in the evaluation of the program’s impact.

The following section reports our assessment of the impact of the French-language family literacy programs on participating families. To see whether the impact differed according to whether the families live in communities where Francophones are a minority or a majority, we present the results for these two types of communities separately. Therefore the results for the 40 families who attended programs in the eastern Ontario communities of Bourget, Embrun, Hammond, and Limoges, where Francophones are a majority in their immediate surroundings, are treated separately. It must be remembered however that these Francophones still live in a province where they are a minority.

### 2.1.1 Literacy-Related Activities and Use of French and English

Parents can engage in many activities that foster the various forms of literacies both in themselves and in their child. As Tables 6 and 7 show, many of the parents reported that they were already pursuing such activities regularly before their participation in the family literacy programs. However, according to the parents’ responses to the same questions after they had completed them, the programs had little impact on the frequency of the parents’ literacy-related activities; this result held true regardless of whether the programs took place in communities where Francophones are a majority in their immediate surroundings or a minority.

We should note, however, that the post-program interviews with the parents were held in December for Cohort 4 and in March/April for Cohort 5—both being times of year when the parents were very busy, as they confirmed to us during the interviews. Hence the results

---

### Table 6. Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities and Languages in Which They Did So at the Beginning and at the End of the Program (in a Minority Setting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Before the Programs (%)</th>
<th>After the Programs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>In French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching television</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the radio</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching films, videotapes, or DVDs</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at/reading newspapers, magazines, or comic strips</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing short messages or grocery lists</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at or reading books</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing books at the library</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in activities at school or daycare</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing my children’s progress with their teacher or early childhood educator</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of parents: 64
in Table 6 and Table 7 might be attributable to a lack of time to engage in literacy-related activities. Other factors might also come into play, such as the fact that the programs did not all have the same objectives. Some placed greater emphasis on the importance of parents’ engaging in literacy-related activities at home in order to provide good role models for their child.

However, the results do show that among those parents who engaged in literacy-related activities often, the percentages that did so in French were greater after the program than before, and this held especially true for parents in Francophone-minority communities. As Table 6 shows, among this latter group of parents:

- the proportion who watched French-language television programs rose to 14.1% from 4.7%;
- the proportion who watched French-language films or DVDs rose to 19% from 6.3%;
- the proportion who chose French-language books at the public library rose to 34.2% from 23.4%;
- the proportion who spoke in French while participating in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities and Languages in Which They Did So at the Beginning and at the End of the Program (in a Majority Setting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the Programs (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to the radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching films, videotapes, or DVDs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at/reading newspapers, magazines, or comic strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing short messages or grocery lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking at or reading books</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing books at the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in activities at school or daycare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing my children’s progress with their teacher or early childhood educator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of parents: 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8. Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities with their Child and Languages in Which They Did So at the Beginning and at the End of the Program (In a Minority Setting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before the Programs (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching television with my child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing sports with my child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading or looking at books with my child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing craft projects with my child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with my child about things that interest him or her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping my child to do his or her homework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading instructions/recipes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing books at the library</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total number of parents: 64
activities at their child’s school or daycare rose to 92% from 78.1%;
• the proportion that used French when discussing with their child’s
teacher or early childhood educator rose to 86.4% from 68.8%.

The pattern differed, however, when it came to literacy-related activities in which parents and children were both involved. As Table 8 and Table 9 show, families engaged in such activities more often and did so using French more often. Among the families living in communities where French is the minority language (Table 8), the proportion of parents who engaged in such activities was up substantially in all categories, rising:
• to 81% from 51.6% for practicing sports with their child;
• to 66.7% from 54.7% for doing craft projects with their child;
• to 100% from 62.5% for helping their child with his or her homework.

In those communities where French is the majority language in the immediate surroundings (Table 9), the proportion of parents who engaged in literacy-related activities with their child was also up, in almost all categories:
• to 80% from 75% for practicing sports with their child;
• to 57.5% from 52.5% for doing craft projects with their child;
• to 42.5% from 30.7% for visiting the public library.

Note, however, that these increases were far smaller than in the French-minority-language communities.

But the greatest changes occurred mainly in the use of French in literacy-related activities that parents and children did together (Table 8 and Table 9). According to the responses from the parents living in French-minority-language communities, from the start of the program to the end of the program, their families’ use of French increased substantially in almost all of the activities that we asked about. As Table 8 shows, among those parents who engaged in literacy-related activities with their child, the proportion that did so in French rose:
• to 34.4% from 13.3%, for watching French-language television programs;
• to 73% from 46.8% for reading books in French;
• to 72.6% from 54.4% for doing craft projects;
• to 74.6% from 45.9% for talking with their child about things that interest him or her;
• to 90% from 76.7% for helping their child with his or her homework.

Among the families living in communities where French is the majority language in the immediate surroundings, the use of French rose slightly from the start of the program to the end for all of the activities that we considered. As Table 9 shows, among those parents who engaged in literacy-related activities with their child, the proportion that did so in French increased in all categories. It rose:
• to 37.5% from 22.5%, for watching French-language television programs;
• to 75% from 61.5%, for practicing sports with their child in French;
• to 94.9% from 87.2%, for talking with their child in French while helping him or her with homework;
• to 78.1% from 67.7%, for choosing books written in French at the library.

Why did the family literacy workshops have less impact on Francophone parents living in communities where they are in a majority in their immediate surroundings? First of all, it should be noted that Lire et écrire à la maison, the model for the programs attended by the 40

Table 9. Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities with their Child Languages in Which They Did So at the Beginning and at the End of the Program (In a Majority Setting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Before the Programs (%)</th>
<th>After the Programs (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often In French In French and English In English</td>
<td>Often In French In French and English In English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watching television with my child</td>
<td>47.5 22.5 67.5 10</td>
<td>37.5 37.5 52.5 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing sports with my child</td>
<td>75 61.5 35.9 2.6</td>
<td>80 75 22.5 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading or looking at books with my child</td>
<td>92.5 67.5 32.5 -</td>
<td>90 67.5 30 2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing craft projects with my child</td>
<td>52.5 75.7 13.5 10.8</td>
<td>57.5 80 10 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking with my child about things that interest him or her</td>
<td>97.5 72.5 25 2.5</td>
<td>95 72.5 27.5 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping my child to do his or her homework</td>
<td>97.5 87.2 10.3 2.6</td>
<td>100 94.9 5.1 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading instructions/recipes</td>
<td>75 61.5 35.9 2.6</td>
<td>52.5 64.1 23.1 12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing books at the library</td>
<td>30.7 67.7 32.3 -</td>
<td>42.5 78.1 21.9 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of parents: 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
families living in the communities where French was the majority language in a predominantly Anglophone province, was not designed to be delivered in such a setting and therefore does not cover all of the aspects that this study was attempting to evaluate. This partly explains the fact that the programs had such different effects on families living in these two types of communities. But this result also raises a number of questions, because 13 families participated in the Lire et écrire à la maison program in Ottawa, where Francophones are in the minority. Were these parents attending the workshops in a minority-language setting more open to the idea of changing their habits? Did they better recognize the importance of engaging in activities in French precisely because they lived in a more Anglophone environment? Or on the other hand, were the parents who lived in communities where French was predominant in their immediate surroundings so confident in their French-language skills and so unaware of their minority status that they did not feel the need to alter their habits? Unfortunately, the present study cannot answer these questions.

2.1.2 Programs’ Impacts on Learning

“I try to read more in French. I liked receiving novels for adults in French. Right now, I’m reading Les Filles de Caleb! I would never have done that before I attended this literacy program!” (a parent)

“It’s comforting to know that I’m not alone, that other people have already gone through this experience. Also, this program made me realize that we are pretty good mothers to begin with.” (a parent)

As with the other cohorts, at the end of the programs for Cohorts 4 and 5, we conducted semi-directed interviews with the parents to find out more about the impact that these workshops had had on their own learning as well as their child’s. We asked the parents one set of closed-ended questions on things that they themselves might have learned, and another on things that their child might have learned. In addition, we asked them open-ended questions on these subjects during their interviews.

Table 10 shows that as regards things that parents felt they had learned themselves, the impacts of the programs varied with the models used and the centres delivering them. Consider the following two divergent examples. At the Alpha Huronie centre, 100% of the parents in Cohorts 4 and 5 who had attended the family-literacy program reported having greatly improved their French reading and writing skills and begun using French more often to communicate with their child. But 33.3% of these parents did not seem to have greatly altered their way of reading or of doing writing activities with their child. In contrast, the program offered by the La Route du Savoir centre placed great emphasis on learning about the resources available in French in the community, and 100% of the parents said that after completing the program, they were more familiar with these resources and used them more often. But they had not improved their reading or writing skills or altered their attitudes about these activities. These findings about what the participants learned give a better idea of which aspects the various programs emphasize and which aspects they spend less time on, because their objectives differ so much.

As with the three other cohorts, all of the participating parents in Cohorts 4 and 5, regardless of which program they attended, said in their interviews that they had learned strategies that they had applied in their daily lives:

- They felt more confident in their role as parents.
- They had a better understanding of the importance of taking time every day to engage in literacy-related activities with their child.
- They were more aware that children are always in the process of learning.
- They took more time to listen to their child. As one parent put it, “Before, I listened to my child with only one ear while trying to do something else at the same time, but now, I take the time to stop what I’m doing and listen to my child talk about the things that interest her.”
- They tried to be better role models for their child.
- They had a better understanding of the various ways to discipline children, of the need not to lose their patience, and especially of the need to think before reacting.

The parents also reported that they had changed their attitudes and habits with regard to French:

- They used French more often to do certain activities alone and with their child.
- The programs improved the French-language skills and increased the confidence of some highly Anglicized parents. “My daughter helps me to find the words I need,” said one mother. “I am less shy about speaking French than I was before the program.”
- They understood that their child was going to learn English anyway, but that it was important for him or her to master French first.

Next, the parents evaluated the possible effects of the programs on their child. According to the responses compiled in Table 11, the impact of the family literacy workshops on the children was negligible if the program did not include a component designed specifically for the children, even if the program included a daycare service. For example, according to their parents, the children who attended the daycare while their parents attended the workshops at
the ABC Communautaire centre did not show much change in their behaviour once the program was over.

According to most of the parents who participated in the family literacy programs, these programs were a positive experience for their child and benefited them greatly. However, because most of these children were already in school as well, some of their parents hesitated to attribute the things that they learned to the family literacy programs alone. As one parent put it, “My child is in Grade 1, and I know that many of the changes that I see in him are due to what he is learning in school. I think that the program is reinforcing what he learns in school.”

In the post-program interviews, the parents and the literacy trainers made the following observations:
- The children increased their French vocabulary and their knowledge of French. As one mother reported, “I wanted my son to be immersed in a French-speaking environment as much as possible, because his French was very weak at the start of the school year. The program helped him a great deal to express himself better in French.”
- The children acquired a taste for reading. As one of the literacy trainers put it, “It’s wonderful to see the very little ones be interested in choosing and looking at books. Every week, they get better and better at figuring out the words.”
- The children became better able to adjust to a routine and to follow instructions.

### Table 10. Parents’ Evaluation of Possible Effects of the Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABC Communautaire</th>
<th>Alpha Huronie</th>
<th>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</th>
<th>Le Collège du Savoir</th>
<th>Moi j’apprends</th>
<th>La Route du Savoir</th>
<th>All Centres Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel better equipped as a parent?</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you applied the things that you learned in the program at home?</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed an improvement in your skills in reading French?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed an improvement in your skills in writing French?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you changed your attitude about reading French?</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you changed your attitude about writing French?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you changed your attitude about the French language?</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you use French more often to communicate with your child?</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you changed your way of reading with your child?</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you changed your way of doing writing activities with your child?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you changed your way of disciplining your child?</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you more aware of the resources available in French in your community?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you make more frequent use of the resources available in French in your community?</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you have more confidence in yourself?</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note: Number of Families**

|              | 7 | 9 | 14 | 8 | 63 | 3 | 104 |

A Study of the Impact of French-Language Family Literacy Programs on Francophone Families in Linguistic Minority Settings in Ontario
The children used French more often to communicate and to do activities. As one father explained, “My children used to go to an English-speaking daycare and most of their references were in English. Now, thanks to the program, they have many more references in French: music, nursery rhymes, television programs, etc. And they like it!” And one of the mothers told us, “My daughters help me make the grocery list every week, and now we do it in French.”

### 2.2 Evaluations of Programs

To evaluate the family literacy programs delivered by the literacy centres that participated in this study, we questioned all of the adults involved—the parents, the literacy trainers, and the directors of the centres. All of these people were able to express themselves freely on all aspects of the various programs.

#### 2.2.1 Evaluations by Parents

“Isn’t it unbelievable! It’s a miracle! I can’t get over how my son will now spend two hours reading! Before the program, that would have been unimaginable! Even for half an hour! His attitude has changed completely; even his homework is no big problem any more.”

(a parent)

“I learned some techniques to maintain my son’s attention when it comes to reading. I based my approach on the literacy trainers’. They really had the touch with the kids!”

(a parent)

“They don’t make us parents bring anything. We come with our hands empty and they supply us with everything. It’s really exceptional!”

(a parent)

The individual interviews with the parents after they had completed the programs showed that they considered them a positive experience. Like the parents in Cohorts 1, 2, and 3, all of the parents in Cohorts 4 and 5, regardless of which program they had attended, said that they were delighted with the group discussions, the various things they learned, and the resources that were made available to them. The aspect of the programs that they enjoyed the most was being able to exchange ideas with other parents: “Some of the mothers had much older children than I do, and I really liked learning what these women did in certain situations. It’s nice to have some perspective, because they can talk about the consequences of various actions.”; “I didn’t know any other Francophones before the program. It’s nice to be able to discuss things among ourselves, in French.”

As these statements show, the parents enjoyed getting together and

#### Table 11. Parents’ Evaluation of Possible Effects of the Program on their Child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABC Communautaire</th>
<th>Alpha Huronie</th>
<th>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALCE du Nipissing</th>
<th>Le Collège du Savoir</th>
<th>Moi j’apprends</th>
<th>La Route du Savoir</th>
<th>All Centres Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was the program a positive experience for your child?</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed any changes in your child’s attitude or behaviour?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed that your child has more self-confidence?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed whether your child expresses himself or herself in French more often?</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed whether your child has improved his or her knowledge of French?</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed whether your child chooses to do more activities in French?</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>37.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed an improvement in your child’s acquisition of reading in French?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you noticed an improvement in your child’s acquisition of writing in French?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Number of families: 7 9 14 8 63 3 104
discussing their concerns with other parents who were often in the same situation. These discussion sessions broke down the feelings of isolation that some parents experience. Interestingly, though, getting to discuss things with other parents ranked last among the reasons that the parents had cited for enrolling in the workshops when they first did so. Only once the workshops had begun did this component become important to them.

In addition to enjoying the group discussions, the parents said they were happy to have learned so much in the workshops. The parents were most affected by the various strategies for encouraging their child to read and write. For example, one father explained that he’ll now read the same story to his daughter two or three times in a row, and then, a few days later, ask her to summarize the story for him. As he reports, “She remembers the story and follows the logical order of the plot. I realize that by asking her to perform this task, I am getting her to exercise her memory and her sense of logic.” Other parents said that they really liked getting a better understanding of the importance of leading their lives in French, using French in activities both on their own and with their child, and consuming more French-language cultural products.

Apart from what the parents learned themselves, they also greatly appreciated their child’s participation in the programs. As one mother explained, “I want my child to understand that I am interested in her and want to spend time with her.” But what pleased the parents was not just the chance to spend some “quality time” with their child, but also the chance to engage in learning activities with their child so that they could see that even grown-ups are still learning. “My child enjoyed correcting me when I made mistakes in French. The program let us develop a nice sense of closeness around this.”

Some of the programs had a feature that remained popular ever since the first cohort participated in them: literacy kits and resources that the parents could take home every week. These kits contained games, books, and ideas for craft projects, so that the parents could pursue literacy-related activities with their child in French at home. These kits were greatly appreciated by low-income families and by families living in areas where Francophones are a very small minority and French-language teaching resources are scarce. Some centres also sent resources to participating parents by e-mail, as well as Web pages containing exercises for the children to print out, which the parents found very useful.

Contrary to what happened with the other cohorts, the programs delivered to Cohorts 4 and 5 do not seem to have experienced any special problems. The centres had followed all of the recommendations that we had made after evaluating the earlier cohorts about improving the structure of the workshops, making sure to have an appropriate space in which to deliver them, and restricting the age range of the children attending them. These changes greatly improved the satisfaction of the participating families.

2.2.2 Evaluations by Literacy Trainers and Literacy Centre Directors

“I consider it important to ensure that the parents are well equipped. I know that some of them are already doing lots of good things with their child, but they still need to be reassured and to learn some new methods.” (a centre director)

“I think that the parents really liked the relaxed atmosphere that we provided at the centre. As a trainer, I wanted everybody to feel at ease so that they could learn and interact.” (a literacy trainer)

“l often see learners at the centre who lack self-esteem. I consider self-esteem so important for a person’s development that I absolutely wanted to give it a prominent place in our program.” (a literacy trainer)

Like the parents, the literacy trainers and literacy centre directors reported that they were very satisfied with their experience in family literacy training. The comments that they had received from the parents were very positive. All of the trainers and directors had observed major changes in the parents and the children. According to them, the parents had come out of these programs better equipped to play their role as their child’s first teachers and more confident about their ability to do so. They had become more aware of how their own behaviour, actions, and self-esteem affect their child. They also seemed to have grasped the importance of stimulating their child, giving them a love of learning, and supporting them in their learning efforts so that they can succeed in school. Some of the parents also greatly improved their own French-language skills.

As one parent explained: “The workshops helped me a lot in terms of my understanding of French. Now I am better able to help my child do his homework.”

At most of the centres, the work of establishing partnerships, recruiting qualified trainers, and recruiting parents went even better with Cohorts 4 and 5 than with the three preceding cohorts. As the centres gained experience, they developed winning strategies. And luckily, none of the centres had to cancel either of the cohorts’ sessions because of low enrolment, as had happened with Cohorts 2 and 3. However, the problem of poor attendance, which had been experienced with all the other cohorts, did persist; according to the trainers, this was the only negative aspect of this experiment in family literacy training. Also, once
again, the low participation by fathers was a disappointment for several of the centres, which ended up delivering their programs to groups composed almost exclusively of women. Recruiting fathers would therefore seem to still represent a sizeable challenge.

Regarding partnerships, as with the preceding cohorts, the centres that decided to deliver their programs in partnership with other organizations (mainly French-language schools and daycares) were on the whole very satisfied with this experience. As one centre director enthused: “Just like last year, we received excellent co-operation from the French-language schools—they threw their doors open to us!”
PART 3
Findings and Recommendations

3.1 Main Findings
This section presents the main findings from our study of the impact of the French-language family literacy programs on the families in Cohorts 4 and 5. It describes factors for the success of the programs and recommends winning conditions that should be put in place, both at the centres that participated in this study and that might want to continue offering these programs and at other centres that might want to draw on our experiences when setting up new programs of this kind.

The main findings that we can draw from this study are as follows:
- The participating parents vary so widely in age, province or country of origin, level of education, and mother tongue that the groups participating in any given program may often be highly heterogeneous.
- Because the clientele is so heterogeneous, a program cannot always be certain to meet the expectations of all the participants.
- The literacy trainers must show a great deal of flexibility to deal with the differences in the parents’ skill levels and their understanding of French, as well as their cultural differences.
- Very young parents and parents with low literacy skills are always hard to recruit. It would be interesting to know whether this is because they are using other resources available in the community, or simply because they are very hard to reach.
- The literacy centres in this study also created many winning conditions that other centres may wish to emulate if they want to establish successful, permanent family literacy programs of their own:
  - Choose a well structured program model that has already been tried and tested successfully.
  - Include the whole family in the delivery of the program and extend the program’s reach to the older and younger siblings of the children participating in it, so as to make it easier for the parents to attend regularly.
  - Recruit families for the program through community partners, in particular schools and daycare centres.
  - Minimize staff turnover within the program: the more experience the literacy trainers have, the more confidence they will have in their own ability to deliver the program.
  - Keep the workshops well structured—the parents’ satisfaction will depend on it.
  - Keep adjusting the program to the participants’ varying needs.

3.2 Some Recommendations
This study lasted five years and involved the evaluation of five cohorts of families. In our two preceding reports, we presented many recommendations, and the literacy centres that participated in this study have worked hard to incorporate them into their practices. Hence we have relatively few new recommendations to make at this final stage of the project.

Recommendation 1: Continue to evaluate the programs by distributing a questionnaire to the parents at the final workshop.

Recommendation 2: Adopt a program model that includes activities in which the children participate directly. The research has shown that a program has much less impact when the children are not included in it or are simply placed in a daycare setting while their parents attend.

Recommendation 3: Look for new ways of recruiting families, young parents, at-risk persons, fathers, and recent immigrants.

Recommendation 4: Consider offering a family literacy program to parents who once spoke French and who, for various reasons, no longer speak it and wish to reappropriate the language.

Recommendation 5: Include features that raise participants’ awareness of Francophone culture.

Recommendation 6: Provide literacy trainers with training in the family literacy programs that include such training (for example, Grandir avec mon enfant), and give them ongoing supervision and support throughout the program.

Recommendation 7: Develop training for the literacy trainers for the programs that do not include such training, for example Lire et écrire à la maison. Such training can be developed in partnership with the program’s creators.

Recommendation 8: Continue lobbying government authorities to obtain adequate, regular funding.
PART 4
Summary of Results and Recommendations

This report is the last in a series of three, so we have added a summary of the study. This summary aggregates the data on the parents’ and children’s participation in the family-literacy workshops, as well as the data from the questionnaires that the parents answered and the interviews that they underwent afterward; it also highlights some important findings.31

4.1 Families’ Participation in the Programs and in the Research

Over the past five years, five cohorts of families have attended French-language family literacy programs at the French-language literacy centres who participated in the study. As Table 12 shows, a total of 367 families enrolled in these programs and the Moi j’apprends centre hosted by far the largest number: 180.

In some cases, both parents attended the workshops, but as we can see in Table 13, almost 5 times as many women as men attended the workshops: the five cohorts comprised 318 women compared with 64 men (Table 13). Men thus accounted for less than 17% of all the people who participated in the family literacy programs. Many children were affected directly by the programs by participating in them with their parents (382 children), and indirectly by what their parents learned in these programs.

As Table 14 shows, throughout this study, we have had excellent participation by the families in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Cohort 1</th>
<th>Cohort 2</th>
<th>Cohort 3</th>
<th>Cohort 4</th>
<th>Cohort 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’apprentissage et de formation d’Ottawa (CAFO) – (participated for first three cohorts only)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>62</strong></td>
<td><strong>102</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Number of Parents Enrolled</th>
<th>Number of Children Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’apprentissage et de formation d’Ottawa (CAFO)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>318</strong></td>
<td><strong>382</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
research activities (questionnaire surveys and interviews) that followed the workshops themselves. As mentioned several times in our reports, for purposes of this research, we excluded any families that had missed three or more workshops. We also excluded the 5 current and future education practitioners from Cohort 5 at the ABC Communautaire centre. Overall, nearly 80% of the families who originally enrolled in the programs attended them through to the end and participated in our surveys and interviews.

4.2 How Families Were Recruited

As Figure 10 shows, most of the families (60.5%) were recruited through the schools and daycares that the children attended, which is how we had recommended proceeding in our evaluation of the first cohort. Several of the centres also decided to recruit families among the learners already attending some of their other programs; this method accounted for 15% of the total enrolments. Word-of-mouth and advertisements did not have much impact on recruitment.

4.3 Parents’ Reasons for Enrolling in the Programs: “For My Child”

Figure 11 shows the three reasons for enrolling in a family literacy program that were considered very important by the most parents and the three that were considered very important by the fewest parents. Over 90% of the parents rated as very important the reasons that involved learning things that would help them to stimulate their child’s development and improve their child’s prospects for the future. The parents thus regard the workshops as teaching them life habits, ways of raising their child and

Table 14. Number of Families Participating in the Research (All 5 Cohorts Combined)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>Number of Families Enrolled</th>
<th>Families Completing Programs and Participating in Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABC Communautaire</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39 73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Huronie</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24 92.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’alphabétisation ALEC du Nipissing</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32 76.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Centre d’apprentissage et de formation d’Ottawa (CAFO)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13 54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Le Collège du Savoir</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17 70.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moi j’apprends</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>146 81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Route du Savoir</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14 77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>367</strong></td>
<td><strong>285 77.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10

How Families were Recruited (All 5 Cohorts Combined)
being better parents—more ways of being than ways of doing.

Because, as the title of this series of reports indicates, these parents chose to attend the workshops for their child first and foremost, it is not surprising that they accorded less importance to reasons for enrolling that involved benefits to themselves, such as improving their self-confidence, learning how to use the library, and getting to discuss things with other parents.

The degree of importance that the parents ascribed to the various reasons for enrolling that we asked them about was similar from one cohort to another.

### 4.4 Changes Within Families

When we compare the percentages of parents who engaged in certain literacy-related activities either on their own and with their child and the language or languages in which they did so, before and after attending the programs, we see that many of these parents altered their habits regarding literacy and their use of French (figures 12, 13, 14 and 15).

As regards the activities in which parents engaged on their own, Figure 12 shows that after the program, the percentages of parents who did so often had risen:

- to 60.9% from 57.4% for listening to the radio;
- to 39.8% from 34.8% for watching films or DVDs;
- to 51.4% from 44.8% for reading newspapers, magazines, or comic strips;

![Figure 11: The Three Reasons for Enrolling in a Family Literacy Program Cited as Very Important by the Most Parents and those Cited by the Fewest Parents (All 5 Cohorts Combined)](image)

![Figure 12: Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities Before and After Participating in the Family Literacy Programs (All 5 Cohorts Combined)](image)
As Figure 13 shows, the percentages of parents who engaged in these activities in French also increased. By the end of the programs:
- 22.4% of the parents listened to the radio often in French, compared with 15.9% before;
- 25.8% watched films or DVDs often in French, compared with 17.4% before;
- 26.2% read newspapers, magazines, or comic strips often in French, compared with 23.4% before;
- 38.6% read books often in French, compared with 32.2% before.

As regards the literacy-related activities in which parents engaged with their child, Figure 14 shows that here too, the percentages of parents who did so had risen by the end of the programs, for all of the activities about which we asked. This percentage rose:
- to 74.8% from 53.1% for practicing sports with their child;
- to 93.9% from 87.8% for reading with their child;
- to 68% from 47.7% for doing craft projects with their child;
- to 86.9% from 77.9% for helping their child with his or her homework.

Figure 13
Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities, in French Before and After Participating in the Family Literacy Programs (All 5 Cohorts Combined)

Figure 14
Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities with their Child Before and After Participating in the Family Literacy Programs (All 5 Cohorts Combined)
As Figure 15 shows, the percentages of parents who engaged in these activities with their child often and did so in French also increased, for all of the activities that we asked them about. By the end of the programs:

- 36.6% of the parents watched television with their child in French, compared with 25.7% before;
- 68% talked with their child in French while practicing sports with them, compared with 44.9% before;
- 75.4% read with their child in French, compared with 62.7% before;
- 67.5 talked with their child in French while doing craft projects with them, compared with 53.4% before;
- 75.3% talked with their child in French about the things that interested them, compared with 61.4% before;
- 76% talked with their child in French while helping with his or her homework, compared with 72.9% before.
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**Figure 15**
Comparison of the Frequency with Which Parents Engaged in Literacy-Related Activities with their Child in French Before and After Participating in the Family Literacy Programs (All 5 Cohorts Combined)
4.5 Conclusion

On the basis of the preceding data and the comments that we gathered in the interviews, we can state that for the families that participated in these French-language family literacy programs, they were a positive experience—one that they would recommend to other families and would repeat themselves if another program were offered.

Throughout the three years of this study, the parents reported that, thanks to these programs:

- they felt more confident in their role as parents;
- they had a better understanding of the importance of taking the time every day to engage in literacy-related activities with their child;
- they were more aware that children are always learning;
- they took more time to listen to their child;
- they tried to be better role models for their child;
- they had a better understanding of the various ways to discipline children, of the need not to lose their patience, and especially of the need to think before reacting;
- The parents also reported that they had changed their attitudes and habits with regard to French;
- the parents used French more often to do activities alone and with their child;
- the programs improved the French-language skills and increased the confidence of some highly Anglicized parents;
- the parents understood that their child was going to learn English anyway, but that it was important for them to master French first.

The programs also affected the children in many ways:

- they did more activities in French;
- they improved their knowledge of French;
- they gained self-confidence;
- they became better able to follow a routine.

Nevertheless, over the course of this study, we made many recommendations to enable the centres to offer the best possible programs under the best possible conditions. All of the centres acted on these recommendations and incorporated them into the programs that they delivered.

To conclude, here is a list of the recommendations that we have made in the three reports published in the course of this study:

Recommendation 1: Choose a family literacy program model that is well structured, with clearly defined objectives and a proven instructor’s manual.

Recommendation 2: Develop recruitment strategies that are more, suited to the target clientele.

Recommendation 3: Encourage all trainers to follow the FCAF’s training course on the fundamentals of French-language family literacy in Francophone-minority settings (Formation sur les fondements de l’alphabétisation familiale dans un contexte minoritaire francophone).

Recommendation 4: Provide the literacy trainers with training in the family literacy programs that include such training (for example, Grandir avec mon enfant), and give them ongoing supervision and support throughout the program.

Recommendation 5: Develop training for the literacy trainers for the programmes that do not include such training, for example the program Lire et écrire à la maison. Such training can be developed in partnership with the program’s creators.

Recommendation 6: Ensure a strong structure for the programs; that is, guarantee as much as is possible the location where the workshops will be held, to start and end each series of workshops on the scheduled dates, to start and end each workshop at the scheduled times and to stick to the planned topics.

Recommendation 7: Loan educational resources (literacy kits) to parents as part of the programs, to compensate for the limited financial resources of some families and the shortage of French-language educational resources in French-minority settings.

Recommendation 8: Develop partnerships with other Francophone community agencies in the same geographic area in order to raise the literacy centres’ profiles, facilitate sharing of resources such as activity space and expertise, attract clients who may be at risk and create a support network for Francophone families.

Recommendation 9: When a centre plans to borrow space for its program from a partner organization, make sure before the program begins that this space will be appropriate for the adults or children who will be using it.

Recommendation 10: Literacy centres should think about ways to make their family literacy programs more attractive to men. It might be useful to conduct a needs analysis.

Recommendation 11: Define with more precision the age range of children whose families may participate in the program so as to better meet the parent’s needs” and ensure that they are satisfied.

Recommendation 12: Define a clear, specific protocol that sets out the steps to be taken to deal with children during the workshops. Presenting this protocol to the parents at the first workshop and asking for their full co-operation would then make it possible to better welcome the children and provide them with better services.

Recommendation 13: Continue to evaluate the programs by distributing a questionnaire to the parents at the last workshop.

Recommendation 14: Adopt a program model that includes activities in which the children participate directly. The research has
shown that a family literacy program has much less impact when the children are not included in it or are simply placed in a daycare setting while their parents attend.

**Recommendation 15:** Look for new ways of recruiting families, young parents, at-risk persons, fathers, and recent immigrants.

**Recommendation 16:** Consider offering a family literacy program to parents who once spoke French and who, for diverse reasons, no longer speak it and wish to reappropriate the language.

**Recommendation 17:** Aim to include features that raise participants’ awareness of Francophone culture and identity issues in the programs that do not already include these aspects.

**Recommendation 18:** Continue to lobby government authorities to obtain adequate, regular funding.
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