EXPLORING A SECONDARY URBAN ESL PROGRAM: ADDRESSING THE SOCIAL, AFFECTIVE, LINGUISTIC, AND ACADEMIC NEEDS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLS)

by

KATRINA LUNDIEN

B.S., University of Kansas, 1996
M.S., University of Kansas, 1998

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2009

Abstract

Offering a high-quality education to English language learners (ELLs) is a challenge in schools across the United States. Yet, few studies have been conducted to investigate high school English as a second language (ESL) programs. This study provides insights into how a Kansas urban high school ESL program promotes access to the curriculum for ELLs by providing for their social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs. The purpose of this dissertation is to use the premise of educational equity and Catherine Walsh's (1991) educational needs for ELL school success to explore how structural components of the ESL program in this study promote the access of ELLs to the curriculum. This study offers (1) insights into how urban school districts with high ELL populations might address the issue of access to the curriculum, (2) insights into various perceptions of participant groups—administrators, teachers, and students, and (3) insights into how ESL program components address the educational needs for ELLs to gain access to the curriculum.

More specifically, this study emphasizes the following four structural components of the ESL program: (1) student placement, (2) sheltered content courses, (3) teaming, and (4) Spanish for native speakers courses. These structural components are used as a lens to view how social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs are addressed. Although the results of this study cannot be generalized to other schools or districts, this study may help other districts, schools, and individual teachers make informed decisions. By demonstrating how four structural ESL program components meet the needs of ELLs in a high school setting, other educators might replicate components on their journey for educational equity within their own venues.

EXPLORING A SECONDARY URBAN ESL PROGRAM: ADDRESSING THE SOCIAL, AFFECTIVE, LINGUISTIC, AND ACADEMIC NEEDS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELLS)

by

KATRINA LUNDIEN

B.S., University of Kansas, 1996
M.S., University of Kansas, 1998

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2009

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Thomas Vontz

Copyright

KATRINA LUNDIEN

2009

Abstract

Offering a high-quality education to English language learners (ELLs) is a challenge in schools across the United States. Yet, few studies have been conducted to investigate high school English as a second language (ESL) programs. This study provides insights into how a Kansas urban high school ESL program promotes access to the curriculum for ELLs by providing for their social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs. The purpose of this dissertation is to use the premise of educational equity and Catherine Walsh's (1991) educational needs for ELL school success to explore how structural components of the ESL program in this study promote the access of ELLs to the curriculum. This study offers (1) insights into how urban school districts with high ELL populations might address the issue of access to the curriculum, (2) insights into various perceptions of participant groups—administrators, teachers, and students, and (3) insights into how ESL program components address the educational needs for ELLs to gain access to the curriculum.

More specifically, this study emphasizes the following four structural components of the ESL program: (1) student placement, (2) sheltered content courses, (3) teaming, and (4) Spanish for native speakers courses. These structural components are used as a lens to view how social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs are addressed. Although the results of this study cannot be generalized to other schools or districts, this study may help other districts, schools, and individual teachers make informed decisions. By demonstrating how four structural ESL program components meet the needs of ELLs in a high school setting, other educators might replicate components on their journey for educational equity within their own venues.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DEDICATION

To the One who makes the impossible…possible.

CHAPTER 1 - Introduction

Between 1990 and 2000, the national population of English language learners (ELLs) between the ages of 5 and 17 increased by 46%. In 1990, 1,636,874 ELL students were enrolled in public schools. By 2000, ELL enrollment in public schools had increased to 2,584,684. These numbers represent a 57% growth in the ELL student population over the 10-year period. The majority language group in grades K–12 was Spanish-speaking students. Two other language groups of ELLs, Asian/Pacific Islander and Other, grew by 18% and 23% respectively during the same time period (NCELA, 2000).

Similar demographic changes were evident at the state level as well. Between 1990 and 2000, six states had an ELL population of over 100,000 enrolled in public schools. Kansas was ranked as a state with an ELL population ranging between 15,000-100,000 students (NCELA, 2000). In point of fact, Kansas schools increased ELL enrollment from 10,148 students in 1994 to 23,512 students by 2005—a 131.7% increase (Office of English Language Acquisition [OELA], 2006). The site selected for this study demographically supports this phenomenon. Currently, of the 1,155 students enrolled at the site, 13.8% are designated ELLs (although the state average is 8.5%) (Building Report Card, 2008-09).

Across all levels—national, state, and local—schools are increasingly finding themselves dealing with a growing population of students for whom English is not their first language. Thus, there is a pressing need to examine how schools address the educational needs of ELLs to promote access to the curriculum and to implement proven effective ESL program practices.

The problem of offering a high quality education to ELLs is an issue afflicting schools across the United States. Frequently, secondary ELLs are denied access to the curriculum until

they have a complete grasp of the English language. This practice results in many ELLs in the United States who "do not have access to effective secondary education" (National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education [NCBE], 1993, pp. 1-2). Furthermore, as Walsh (1991) states, that there are four types of student needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—that must be met for ELLs to succeed in school. This dissertation explores access to the curriculum for ELLs by investigating how structural components of a Kansas urban ESL program address the needs of ELLs. Specifically, this study investigates how the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs can be addressed through (1) student placement, (2) sheltered content courses, (3) teaming, and (4) Spanish for native speakers courses.

The topic of assisting secondary ELLs in their learning has become of great interest to me as a researcher and as a professional ESL teacher. The issue of providing a high-quality education to ELLs is becoming more urgent today, as schools are being pressured to meet local, state, and national standards for all students. As an undergraduate student, I joined my multicultural education class on a fieldtrip to the high school in this study. I observed an ESL class and saw disinterested students taking turns reading from an English book that was far beyond their English language proficiency level.

In the fall of 1997, I began my teaching career as an ESL teacher at the high school in this study. When I was hired, I remember the principal telling me that I was to act as the "mother hen" to the ELLs, which meant that I was to be the primary advocate in their quest for an education. Initially, counselors who were not aware of these students' unique needs placed ELLs into their classes. I spent the first two months of my teaching career—utilizing my planning time, going in before school, and staying after school—in the counselor's office attempting to correct student schedules with the counselor.

When our school undertook a district-wide reform movement, "First-Things-First," to improve the collective achievement of students, it had no provision for improving ELL achievement. While the entire school was being divided into small learning communities, the district's consulting firm did not consider accommodations for ELLs. Therefore, my colleagues and I came up with a plan of providing Team 7, a support team for ELLs, as the students were to transition into the designated small learning communities upon gaining intermediate and advanced English proficiency. There was some resistance at the district level due to concerns about compliance issues with grant funding for small learning communities. However, the persistence of advocates at the building level prevailed.

Equity for ELLs has been a passion of mine since the beginning of my teaching career. My colleague—who was the only other ESL teacher upon my arrival at the school—and I have advocated for equity for ELLs over the years in various ways: (1) by attempting to educate teachers within the building, including guiding teachers through university ESL endorsement courses, (2) scheduling students on an individual basis, (3) overseeing graduation progress for ELLs, (4) offering input on program decisions, (5) raising awareness of issues that impact ELLs at the building and district levels, (6) appealing for auxiliary educational materials to provide modified instruction for comprehension, and (7) pressing for additional sheltered course offerings and native language support.

Overall, the principal who hired me was dedicated to providing high-quality services for all students, but he had a particular interest in ELLs because Spanish was his first language and he had personal experience with being an ELL. Therefore, with his support and passion to see ELLs succeed, my colleagues' assistance, the current principal's support, and our combined visions and efforts, it has been possible to provide intentional accommodations for ELLs within

the ESL program from 1997 until the present. These efforts have allowed for more access to the curriculum for ELLs, even as the quest for equity in educating ELLs has led me on a journey of advocacy. Thus, it is my hope that the findings obtained from the current study will inform educators about effective program practices for ELLs, so that they can become knowledgeable advocates in their own setting.

Discussion in this chapter is organized according to the following sections: (1) overview of the issues, (2) statement of the problem, (3) purpose of the study, (4) research questions, (5) significance of the study, (6) limitations of the study, and (7) definition of terms.

OVERVIEW OF THE ISSUES

The following issues are foundational elements to understanding the need for this study. This information is organized into the following subsections: (1) compulsory education, (2) No Child Left Behind (NCLB): The pressing need for ELLs to meet standards, (3) access to the curriculum for ELLs, and (4) lack of research on effective programs and practices for ELLs.

Compulsory Education

The United States has taken on the responsibility of educating the masses by offering a free education to students between the ages of five and nineteen. Public education moved toward a more centralized system of governance around the beginning of the 20th century. Though immigrants recognized there was a need for education, they were often forced to put the needs of the family first. This meant that children of immigrants in both rural and urban communities often worked to provide basic necessities for their families. As a result, states developed uniform educational offerings and laws for compulsory attendance and mandated the length of the school year. They expected all citizens to comply with these new laws (Pipho, 2000). However, complying with compulsory attendance in our modern setting engenders other issues for

immigrant families and for schools: (1) Should teens who have never been to school, or who have had large gaps in their education, be forced to go to schools in the United States and be held to the same standards as citizens of the United States? (2) Should schools in the United States be held accountable to the same standards in regard to educating students who have large gaps in their education? Currently, national policy answers in the affirmative to both of the previous questions.

Public education in the United States has been compared to being like the assembly line in manufacturing plants. The student must fit into the system or be rejected in one form or another as defective. Thus, the monopolistic educational bureaucracy is "content to merely frustrate and alienate 'defective' students until they remove themselves by dropping out of school" (Center & Blackbourn, 1992). It is important to note that the view of "defective students" is pre-NCLB, which will be discussed later, as the intent of the 2001 act truly was to leave no child behind in American public schools. The problem with public education is that, overall, it has failed to adapt to the paradigm shifts taking place in the modern world and to incorporate new practices that could enhance education (House, 1979). Schools need to prepare students for the varied environments they will have to successfully navigate to live and work. Therefore, it is essential for public schools to adapt so they can address the individual needs of students (Center & Blackbourn, 1992).

NCLB: The Pressing Need for ELLS to Meet Standards

There is a pressing need for ELLs to meet national, state, and local standards in order for schools to make annual yearly progress (AYP), which is a yearly accountability plan that reports proficiency levels of student achievement in math, science, reading, and language arts. All students must be accounted for in this AYP process, including designated subgroup categories:

racial and ethnic minorities, students with disabilities, economically disadvantaged students, and ELLs. If schools fail to make AYP for two consecutive years, they are designated for assistance and targeted as needing improvement. Repeated failures in ensuing years result in further penalties—including turning the school over to a private company or the state (Ovando, Combs, Collier, 2006).

The establishment of AYP is part of the NCLB Act of 2001, which amended Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and is named, "Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged." The original intent of NCLB was to "ensure that all children have a fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments" (NCBE/Georgetown University Bilingual Education Service Center, 2001, p. 17). Freedom is given to each state to establish its own criteria for assessing AYP in student performance, as measured on state-defined academic achievement tests. However, these tests possess lower validity and reliability for ELLs (Abedi, 2004). More specifically, in Kansas, ELLs must take grade-level assessments after 10 months of being in the United States—with limited or no modifications. Although it takes 7–10 years to attain academic language (Thomas & Collier, 1997), schools are held accountable for student achievement without regard for students' educational backgrounds or language abilities.

To further compound the pressure on schools, the NCLB Act expects all students—including ELLs—to achieve proficient levels by 2014 (NCBE/Georgetown University Bilingual Education Service Center, 2001). Therefore, educational institutions are under increasing duress to close the achievement gap between native-English-speaking students and ELLs. They need to provide access to the curriculum for ELLs not only to benefit students but also to benefit the

school in maintaining a credible status as an educational institution. This means that schools must develop effective ESL programs, as "structural reform of ESL programs nationwide is required" (Kim, 2007, p. 4). The issue then arises as to how structural components of ESL programs provide access to the curriculum for ELLs by meeting their unique educational needs.

Access to the Curriculum for ELLs

Zion (2007) maintains that the United States often fails to provide equal educational opportunities and outcomes to ELL students, although the law and public policy require it. Similarly, one of Johannessen's (1993) major findings is that "the majority of Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are being denied equal and equitable educational opportunities" (abstract). Graduation opportunities are limited for ELLs in high school who do not have access to the full curriculum (Berman et al., 1992).

Cummins (2000) discusses how many secondary teachers are frustrated and confused about the challenges of educating ELLs. They feel prepared to teach their core content areas, such as math, science, and mainstream English courses, but completely incompetent to teach these same courses to ELLs. He continues that some researchers, along with practitioners, would like to see more prolonged instruction within ESL courses so that students attain English fluency prior to entering mainstream courses. This would relieve content-area educators of the responsibility to learn and implement strategies for supporting ELLs within their content areas. While this is a common viewpoint, most researchers agree that such a practice is discriminatory and actually inhibits access to the curriculum for ELLs (Cummins, 2000).

Minicucci and Olsen (1992) mention several factors that contribute to the lack of access to the curriculum for ELLs, including:

1. The complex and diverse needs of ELLs.

2. A shortage of qualified teachers who are able and willing to work with ELLs, combined with inadequate training and support for teachers who are working with ELLs.

3. Assessment practices that provide minimal information about the academic needs of ELLs, with little monitoring of ELLs.

4. An absence of theoretical models to serve as scaffolding for the development of effective secondary programs for ELLs.

5. Difficulties in obtaining appropriate curricular materials.

6. A lack of comprehensive program planning for ELLs, due to the rigidity of departmental structures and schedules in high schools.

These researchers also offer some solutions to the issue of access to the curriculum for ELLs by revealing evidence of the following elements within successful secondary schools: (a) a culturally supportive school climate, (b) a school-wide vision including ELLs, (c) coordination and articulation among teachers between the ESL/Bilingual Education department and other departments within varying grade levels, and (d) continuous staff development and support involving all educators in planning programs for ELLs.

Although there is a need to have special programs that target ELLs who must achieve the same standards as native-English-speaking students in U.S. schools, it has been left to the individual states and local districts to decide how to educate ELLs. As a result, there is a plethora of programs offered nationwide for ELLs to gain access to the curriculum. Some programs offer English-only classes, while others add supplemental native language support, which could range from literacy to content classes (McKeon, 1987). These program models also range in the

content coverage provided for ELLs, running the gamut from full content coverage to partial or sparse content coverage (Minicucci & Olsen, 1992).

In addition, Lucas (2001) indicates that ELL success is dependent upon five critical aspects of secondary programs: (1) contextual factors, (2) structural features, (3) curriculum, (4) instruction, and (5) staff. This study will focus primarily on the second point: structural features. The four specific structural features, which are labeled as structural components for this study, that assist ELLs in gaining access to the curriculum are: (1) student placement, (2) sheltered content courses, (3) teaming, and (4) Spanish for native speakers courses. Overall, ensuring access to the curriculum must be viewed as a continuous process, in which advocates continue to improve logistical processes within the ESL program's structural components for effective delivery of services to ELLs. Only then will ELLs be more likely to gain full access to the curriculum and achieve school success.

Lack of Research on Effective Programs for ELLs

There is a lack of research on effective programs for educating ELLs. Due to the sharp political divide over bilingual instruction, research on ELLs in schools has focused mainly on the role of language within instruction instead of on the effectiveness of the entire school program (Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990). As Lucas and colleagues note, "There is little research of any kind at the secondary level, and little at either the elementary or secondary level that looks beyond effective classroom instruction to the broader issues involved in effective schooling for Language Minority students [ELLs]" (1990, p. 318). Minicucci and Olsen (1992) also mention a lack of information about educational services for ELLs at the secondary level. They magnify the issue by stating that there is a need to direct policy attention toward secondary programs. Mace-

Matluck, Alexander-Kasparik, and Queen (1998) similarly maintain that "few studies exist that focus specifically on these students [secondary ELLs] and those who teach them" (p. 123).

One reason offered regarding the miniscule body of literature in the area of ESL/bilingual education for secondary students is that most research attention and federal funding have gone to the elementary level (Lucas, 2001). Yet, secondary ELLs face a formidable challenge to catch up academically with native-English-speaking peers, even if they arrive with a strong first language (L1) foundation. The problem is further complicated when ELLs arrive with a background of limited former schooling and minimal L1 literacy skills (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Therefore, it is essential to study access to the curriculum for secondary ELLs so educators can make informed decisions to promote ELL success.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There is no one "program or model that meets the needs of all districts or their ESOL [ELL] students" (Simons & Connelly, 2000, p. 64). Practitioners and researchers do not have an operational definition of what constitutes a successful program. The lack of descriptive longitudinal research on models that may provide equal educational opportunities through access to the curriculum contributes to the nebulous guidelines for developing and implementing high-quality ESL programs (Simons & Connelly, 2000). Little research has been directed at investigating the necessary components of secondary school ESL programs (Mace-Matluck et al., 1998). Therefore, there is a need to examine and explore the effectiveness of specific structural components within some of the critical features of ESL/bilingual programs suggested by previous studies.

Secondary ELLs need access to the curriculum to obtain an equitable education, and schools need to find ways to provide that access. Referring to the achievement gaps between

10

ELLs and their academic peers, the NCLB Act of 2001 noted that ELLs "are expected to perform as well as their native-English-speaking peers without the proper academic support or insight that is needed for academic achievement" (Gallardo-Carter, 2006). Thus, the expectations for ELLs in meeting AYP requirements are unrealistic, and schools are hindered in the mandate to meet AYP standards (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Schools face significant barriers in providing adequate access to the curriculum for ELLs. Students' limited English language proficiency is the most obvious barrier, as most classrooms consider English to be the only acceptable medium of communication (Auerbach, 1989). Another barrier is that educators who have had little or no training in ESL often do not know the best practices for ELLs and are not prepared to effectively assist students in diverse contexts (Banks, 1991). Traditionally, mainstream teachers mistakenly assume that the most expedient way to assist ELLs in making academic gains and developing English proficiency is merely to immerse them in an all-English environment (Porter, 1990; Rossell & Baker, 1996). Such teachers are unable to implement structural components for a program that are designed to increase access to the curriculum for ELLs.

According to one study, less than 20% of teachers are prepared to assist ELLs in the classroom (Alexander, Heaviside, & Farris, 1999). Other studies support this notion that mainstream teachers lack knowledge on how to modify lessons to meet the needs of ELLs (Abramson, Pritchard, & Garcia, 1993; Penfield, 1987; Simons & Connelly, 2000). Even after completing professional development on assisting ELLs, many teachers remain underprepared to provide appropriate instruction to ELLs (Krashen, 1996).

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to explore four key structural components of an urban high school ESL program and describe how these components addressed the educational needs of ELLs. Qualitative analysis of each structural component was conducted using an accumulation of criteria pertinent to the four educational needs of ELLs for school success (Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Graves, 1995; Walsh, 1991). These four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—as conceptualized by the researcher, reveal how the four structural components provided access to the curriculum for ELLs. More specifically, the elements that emerged from the study were manifestations of the four educational needs, which serve as guidelines to investigate access to the curriculum for ELLs. As a result, an ESL Needs Rubric was designed as a tangible instrument to investigate how the four educational needs were met within sheltered content courses.

This study utilized participant interviews and survey responses from 13 total participants—five students, two administrators, and six teachers. The student participants were all Hispanic and chosen based on their performance on a district reading assessment and prior enrollment in Spanish for native speakers courses, sheltered English courses, and ESL language courses. In addition, eight classroom observations were conducted by the researcher and a retired colleague. All study participants had some association with the study site—a high school within an urban public school district in Kansas.

Research Questions

The questions for this study sought to investigate the structural components of an ESL program and how they addressed the educational needs of ELLs. Walsh's (1991) educational

needs were focused upon as a means to view how these structural components addressed access to the curriculum for high school ELLs. The following questions guided this research.

Overall Question

To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of English language learners (ELLs)?

Secondary Questions

1. To what extent does student placement in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

2. To what extent do sheltered content courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

3. To what extent does teaming in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

4. To what extent does Spanish for native speakers courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

Specific interview questions then were utilized to gather information that answered the previously stated research questions.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

This study aspires to contribute to new knowledge as it builds upon previous studies in the field and provides new insights to their questions. Simons and Connelly (2000) state that there is a need for more qualitative research on English acquisition programs that would provide researchers and practitioners with documentation of outcomes and allow for more valid program decision-making. They continue by noting that not every district has the same contextual needs

and suggest that districts should review and visit as many programs as possible to grasp the variety of program designs available.

August and Hakuta (1997) propose that there is a need to examine specific components of various program models that make them effective for ELLs. They mention that each community's specific context would result in meaningful application of the data by applying the most effective techniques to a specific population of students. Furthermore, August and Hakuta maintain that additional research is needed on the educational needs of ELLs and the evaluation of programs for this population.

This study addresses the plea for additional research on specific program components in relation to ELL needs and evaluates the program of one urban school from various perspectives. Therefore, it is hoped that this study will contribute to the field of ESL education by serving as a resource for decision makers to utilize in efforts to develop programs that provide access to the curriculum for ELLs. This study also can serve as a catalyst for future research, as additional research could be done to explore how other programs specifically address the four educational needs of ELLs, as defined in this study.

Although the results of this study cannot be exactly replicated and implemented in other schools or districts, this study might help other districts, schools, and individual teachers make informed decisions in their own venues. District level administrators could benefit from this study by developing an increased knowledge base about ESL program support. Such new levels of understanding could enable them to take action by providing funding and resources. They could inform schools under their care about how to best implement structural components to avoid pitfalls and emphasize strengths.

Building administrators could see benefits of these structural components, choose to incorporate them into their own programs, and foster the logistical processes needed for effective implementation of the structural components. Furthermore, they might be more open to suggestions made by teachers who implement these structural components regarding ideas to incorporate into their building's program. Teachers, likewise, could gain insights from this study related to ways these components could help their ELLs gain access to the curriculum. Then they could apply these concepts to their unique situations. In this way, teachers would be better informed and have more confidence when presenting ideas to administrators and school boards to refine or expand the program's structural supports for ELLs.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The limitations identified of this study are grounded in authentic human experiences. The study relied heavily upon interviews and the recollection of the experiences of individuals who directly experienced the ESL program. These genuine individual experiences are valuable in gaining insights into how the structural components address the educational needs of ELLs. However, it is impossible to exactly replicate this study in other settings due to the context of the school, including its varied staff and student prior experiences, the ESL program structural supports offered, and the historical logistical processes in ESL program development.

One limitation of this study is found in the role of the researcher—I am an actual team member on the ESL team in the school of study. It is feared that a sense of over-familiarity with the program, in addition to prejudgments and expectations, might hinder objectivity or skew interpretations of findings due to the subjective nature of a case study. However, there is strength in having the researcher in close proximity to the site, as I have been actively involved in the school of study since 1997. Thus, an advantage is found in my vast amount of background

knowledge of the school. More specifically, I know which individuals to contact and interview to establish information on the history of the ESL program, possess an active knowledge about decision-making processes in the school, and have a deep understanding of the implementation of program supports. It is hoped that any fear of researcher bias is overcome by the multiple sources of data collection that were utilized in the study.

Another limitation is that the study involves only one secondary school and does not offer a variety of programs to compare and analyze. Including data from more schools across the United States that reflect how Walsh's four educational needs are addressed would strengthen the findings and allow for more generalizations to be made across settings. This also would increase the possibility of random sampling and strengthen the ability of the study to be replicated. However, this would require a shift in the questioning, by focusing on Walsh's four educational needs and allowing other sites to apply their own structural components that address ELL needs for access to the curriculum.

In addition, the data collected was limited to four specific program components within an ESL plus program. Because not all schools provide the same type of ESL services, specific applications to other settings are difficult to transfer. This research offers valuable, in-depth information on a micro-level regarding specific structural supports for ELLs in a high school setting, as snapshots of the program were taken from various perspectives through the collection of data from multiple sources. Yet, the study also provides valuable macro-level guidelines for addressing Walsh's four educational needs to promote the school success of ELLs.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms have been defined for the purpose of clarity in the presentation of this research.

1. Content course refers to a course that a student must take to fulfill the graduation requirements for the school in this study. These courses include various elective courses, such as Consumer Resource Management, Business Life Skills, and Introduction to Computers.

2. Core content course refers to a course that corresponds to at least one of the four content areas of courses (i.e., social studies, math, science, English) that are needed to fulfill the graduation requirements for the school in this study.

3. English language learners (ELLs) is defined as "children and adults who are learning English as a second or additional language. This term may apply to learners across various levels of proficiency in English" (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000, p. 198). The term in this study will primarily refer to high-school-aged students who are learning English and possess varying degrees of proficiency in the language.

4. English as a second language (ESL) is "used to refer to programs and classes to teach students English as a second (additional) language" (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000, p. 198).

5. L1 refers to a person's first language. It is "a widely used abbreviation for the primary, home, or native language" (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000, p. 199).

6. L2 refers to a person's second language (Cohen & Swain, 1976).

7. Mainstream classroom refers to a content class conducted at the developmental language rate of proficient English speakers, such as native English speakers, in the United States. The term is used when "we are contrasting separate bilingual/ESL classes that may or may not be on grade level, in comparison to the curriculum for native-English speakers" (Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 81).

8. Office of Civil Rights (OCR) is a part of the U.S. Department of Education. This office investigates compliance with federal civil rights laws and allegations of civil rights violations in schools that serve specific student populations, including ELLs. In addition, it has developed several policies with regard to measuring compliance with *Lau v. Nichols* (NCBE, 2008).

9. Pull-out program is a program model in which ELLs spend part of the day in mainstream classrooms, but are pulled out for a segment of time to receive ESL instruction.

10. Sheltered instruction (SI) is an approach in which academic content matter and its associated concepts, vocabulary, and skills are taught by using context and language to make the information comprehensible. The premise of "sheltered" is that this type of instruction protects ELLs from the linguistic demands of mainstream instruction by providing assistance through supports such as modifications to texts and assignments, visuals, realia, and attention to linguistic needs (Echevarria & Graves, 2007).

11. Spanish for native speakers course refers to a course that is designed to "teach literacy skills to students who speak at least some Spanish" (Adamson, 2005, p. 171).

12. Student placement refers to the practice of placing ELLs into classes based on their linguistic proficiency level. Such placements might include courses that are clustered (a small group of ELLs are placed in a mainstream course with a bilingual aide), sheltered, or mainstreamed.

13. Teaming refers to a practice in which a group of teachers work with the same students. In this study, teaming will refer to one science teacher, one math teacher,

and three ESL teachers who work with ELLs. However, one ESL teacher on the team also offers Spanish for native speakers courses.

SUMMARY

The issue of educational equity in secondary ELLs gaining access to the curriculum has implications for high schools across the United States. When educators view access to the curriculum, especially student placement, as the same for all students, they ignore the reality that individual students have a variety of needs and come from an array of linguistic, cultural, and educational backgrounds. Educators that merely place ELLs into content classes for graduation, without consideration for all their educational needs, have not provided them with equal access to the curriculum.

There is an urgent need for advocacy in regard to ESL issues at the national, state, and local levels to promote equity in access to the curriculum for ELLs. Such equity is essential to increasing the academic achievement of this student population. It is the intent of this study to explore how four structural program components—student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs. Educational advocates at all three levels can benefit from this exploration by becoming more informed and gaining insights needed to make choices that foster attainable achievement standards for ELLs. Understanding that access to the curriculum for ELLs is significantly different from that of monolingual-English students is the first step on the path to student and school success.

CHAPTER 2 - Review of Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a review of the literature on facets of the overall structure of the educational institution as it relates to a study of how an ESL program addresses the educational needs of secondary ELL students. The theoretical framework of the study will be discussed and will highlight the four main sections of this chapter: (1) historical context, (2) social justice theory, (3) second language acquisition (SLA) theories, and (4) research studies on effective ESL programs and characteristics. These sections provide an historical and theoretical framework for this study, as each of these areas is essential to providing context for the study and addressing the research questions.

Specifically, social justice theory offers a way to analyze the ESL program in this study through the issue of providing equal educational opportunities for ELLs. The section on SLA theories provides the core of the framework by describing in depth the educational needs of ELLs. In addition, it presents a foundation of language theory for the final section on effective ESL programs and characteristics. Thus, the last two sections emphasize research that promotes meeting the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs. As these theories are put into practice, educators inherently provide ELLs with equitable access to the curriculum and assist them in achieving academic success.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Educational institutions that have ELLs have different ways of approaching educating these students that can have implications for the type of student access to the curriculum. This

study is designed to investigate some of the issues surrounding the approach that educational institutions take toward meeting the educational needs of ELLs, as addressing these educational needs equates with providing these students with access to the curriculum. The theoretical framework for this study will provide a foundation for understanding the topic of the study, the data collection involved in the study, and, ultimately, the data analysis and results obtained from the study.

Historical Context

The following section will utilize the historical theme of equity as a premise to provide background knowledge on the topic of education for ELLs. In addition, the contribution of two historical ideologies—bilingual education and the English-only movement—to the development of current ESL program ideology and this nation's political stand on educating ELLs will be discussed. As Bell (2007) explains, "Historical examples suggest strategies for acting in the present to address current problems and learn from past mistakes" (p. 5), such an historical view can be applied to current educational program decision-making for ELLs.

Equity

Equity is an important theme in the history of ESL. To better understand the centrality of this concept to ESL programming and services, one must consider the history of equity within U.S. society. Historical documents such as the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, as well as Supreme Court cases, have played key roles in exploring the issue of equity, which has implications for the education of ELLs. The Declaration of Independence states that, "All men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness" (United States Congress, 1776). However, in practice, "All men" clearly did not include everyone. Although equality is

emphasized in this document, it was not immediately put into practice in the United States, as evidenced by the enslavement of the Africans, the abhorrent treatment of American Indians over time, and the denial of women's right to vote until 1920.

Analysis of the Constitution with regard to racial equity reveals that the Thirteenth Amendment put an end to slavery in 1865. By 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment clarified that all people born or naturalized in the United States are to be considered citizens of the United States and the state in which they reside. It further clarified that no state could make or enforce any laws that would take away the life, liberty, or property of U.S. citizens without due process of law. Thus, when a citizen's constitutional rights were in question, there had to be due process of law. In addition, no state could deprive anyone of equal protection under the law. Then, by 1870, the Fifteenth Amendment strengthened the equity issue even more by prohibiting states from denying anyone the right to vote due to race, color, or previous status of servitude (United States Congress, 1865-1870), though this still omitted women.

Plessy v. Ferguson (1896)

The *Plessy v. Ferguson* case brought the issue of equity to the education realm, bridging racial issues in American society to racial issues in education. Although the 13th -15th Amendments were in place at the federal level, and many issues of equity were decided by the states, there was still a culture of separatism and an underlying belief that black individuals were inferior, especially in the South. The Jim Crow laws—which originated at the state level and stated that blacks and whites could not use the same public facilities, attend the same schools, or ride the same bus—were implemented by many states and were unchallenged in court until the 1890s.

In *Plessy v. Ferguson*, the Supreme Court emphasized the "separate but equal" doctrine, as it upheld the Louisiana state law that provided for separate railway carriages for whites and for non-whites. Thus, this case provided a means for the Supreme Court to focus on a discussion of the issue of race and equality. Moreover, it allowed the Court to discuss the "separate but equal" doctrine in regard to education. The justices cited a Massachusetts case that allowed for schools in Boston to create separate schools for non-white children, thereby implementing the "separate" mandate. They argued that this was acceptable because the non-whites were considered to be "equal" within the Constitution. Therefore, all children were to be given an education, but in separate settings due to the social climate of the day (*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 1896).

The justices avoided taking the Constitution too literally regarding racial equality, because their argument was built upon a foundational belief that social equality must be gained through natural means in the communities. Justice John Marshal Harlan was the lone dissenter in the ruling and interpreted the Constitution as being color-blind (*Plessy v. Ferguson*, 1896). This dissenting opinion finds more support in current interpretation, but this did not come about until after there were additional discriminatory rulings.

Supreme Court decisions after the Plessy case continued to uphold racial discrimination such as the Jim Crow laws. In 1899, the Court backed a local school board decision to fund a white high school over a black high school; thus, the black high school had to close for financial reasons (*Cumming v. Richmond (Ga.) County Board of Education,* 1899). In *Gong Lum v. Rice* (1927), a person of Chinese descent was barred from a white school, and the Court upheld the local school's decision by categorizing Martha Lum (the child) as a member of one of the colored races and ruled that "The Legislature is not compelled to provide separate schools for each of the colored races" (*Gong Lum v. Rice*, 1927).

Brown v. Board of Education (1954)

The Supreme Court decision on *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954) was one that socially and politically altered the nation. It decided that the Fourteenth Amendment was being violated due to the segregation of schools based on race, even though the physical factors of the schools may be equal. They ruled that there is no place in education for the "separate but equal" doctrine, as found in *Plessy v. Ferguson*. The following was the main question presented: "Does segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the physical facilities and other 'tangible' factors may be equal, deprive the children of the minority group of equal educational opportunities?" (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954, p. 4). The Supreme Court ruled that it did.

The Court in this case mentioned that the Fourteenth Amendment had an inconclusive history in regard to segregated schools. Justices pointed out that the key case, *Plessy v. Ferguson*, which cemented the doctrine of "separate but equal" into the minds of the American people, was actually a case of transportation, not education. The justices in *Brown* also reviewed the culture of public education at the time of the *Plessy* case. The South did not have free public education supported by general taxation; therefore, education of white children was by private groups and the education of blacks was near nonexistent, as most were illiterate. Furthermore, some states even forbade the education of blacks (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954).

When the case of *Brown v. Board of Education* was being decided, justices reflected on the achievements of African-Americans in education, the arts and sciences, business, and the professional world since the time of *Plessy*. They reviewed the "separate but equal" doctrine and determined that the separate school facilities were inherently not equal (*Brown v. Board of Education*, 1954).

Lau v. Nichols (1974)

Lau v. Nichols is a case that became the foundation of educational rights for ELLs. In 1971, the San Francisco school system failed to provide English language instruction—or other adequate instructional procedures—to approximately 1,800 of the 2,800 students of Chinese descent who did not speak English. The school system was violating section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, "which bans discrimination based 'on the ground of race, color, or national origin,' in 'any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance,' and the implementing regulations of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)" (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974). The violation of this code was in the school system's denial of a meaningful opportunity to participate in educational programs in public schools for 1,800 non-English-speaking students of Chinese ancestry, while receiving federal funding from the Department of HEW (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974).

The justices determined that there was actually no equality in providing all students with the same textbooks, facilities, curriculum, and teachers, because students who do not comprehend English are hindered from any meaningful education, as they cannot understand the material. Therefore, they specified that the state must take action to rectify language barriers and that any tracking system or ability grouping to deal with special language needs must not be a permanent status. Furthermore, the justices stated that Title VI indicates that provision of special training for non-English-speaking students is a required condition in order for schools to receive federal aid (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974). Crawford (1991) suggests that ". . . the decision stopped short of mandating bilingual education, an omission that the program's critics have since interpreted as 'upholding flexibility' for school districts to use alternative methods. The plaintiffs, however, had earlier dropped their demand for bilingual education" (p. 36).

As a result of this case, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) escalated their efforts to ensure school compliance with the law. After the OCR representatives visited 334 schools that were not in compliance with meeting their responsibilities for ELLs, OCR created guidelines for educational approaches that would help schools become compliant and modify their instructional programs as needed. These educational guidelines were named the Lau Remedies. According to Crawford (1991), "The guidelines told districts how to identify and evaluate children with limited English skills, mainstream classrooms, and what professional standards teachers should meet" (p. 37). However, there was a discrepancy between the Lau guidelines for elementary and those for secondary schools when children's educational rights were violated. In essence, school districts had no choice other than to adopt bilingual education for elementary schools, as they were threatened with the loss of federal funding if they chose not to comply. Yet, at the secondary level, "English-only compensatory instruction would usually be permissible" (Crawford, 1991, p. 37).

Castañeda v. Pickard (1981)

Castañeda v. Pickard (1981) is a case that affirmed *Lau v. Nichols* and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act (EEOA) of 1974, in that it mandated special language assistance. The ruling affirmed that the civil rights of ELLs were violated when educational neglect was practiced, regardless of the intent of the discrimination (i.e., whether it was deliberate or not) (Crawford, 1991). The U.S. Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in *Castañeda* recognized that Congress, in the EEOA of 1974, failed to provide a working definition of "appropriate action." The court believed that statute 1703, in the EEOA of 1974, discussed that programs are "'to overcome language barriers' which impede the 'equal participation' of limited English speaking children in the regular instructional program" (*Castaneda v. Pickard*, 1981, p. 26). The judges

26

ruled that a program that primarily emphasizes English language skill development would constitute "appropriate action." In addition, the court believed that schools had a choice in programming ideologies. Schools could implement programs offering native language content courses as they simultaneously developed English language skills. Or, schools could sequentially provide educational services to ELLs by initially focusing on developing English skills and then later remedying deficiencies by providing supplemental and compensatory education. Overall, the court determined that section 1703

> . . . leaves schools free to determine the sequence and manner in which limited English speaking students tackle this dual challenge so long as the schools design programs which are reasonably calculated to enable these students to attain parity of participation in the standard instructional program within a reasonable length of time after they enter the school system (*Castañeda v. Pickard*, 1981, pp. 26, 27).

This ruling provides the foundational ideology for current ESL programming decisions. This is the reason for the variety of programs across the United States used to educate ELLs.

Policy Debate: Bilingual Education vs. English-only

The education debate in the United States between using bilingual education or English-only has turned into more of a political debate than a pedagogical debate (Auerbach, 1993; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 1989; Secada & Lightfoot, 1993). One view regards English-only as a means to bond all Americans and empower immigrants through the mastery of the English language. Another political view believes that English-only creates a negative division in the country and a mean-spirited limitation of minorities' access to government, making it potentially unconstitutional (Crawford, 1999). Within the debate are varying opinions regarding the

definition of bilingual education, the types of programs appropriate for ELLs, the methods of assessing academic achievement for ELLs, and the promotion of bilingualism among ELLs (Brisk, 1998).

Viewing bilingual education in an historical context enables one to gain perspective on the issues that ELLs have faced in the past. By learning from past mistakes, educators can make informed decisions for ELLs in the future. The following history serves as part of the framework for utilizing a student's native language within ESL programming.

Bilingual Education

Historically, bilingual education has existed in various forms in U.S. public and parochial schools since the 1600s (Castellanos & Leggio-Castellanos, 1983). Language decisions were made at the local and state levels, as the federal government stayed out of language choice in the schools but encouraged English use in American life. In the early 1700s, German farmers were settling in relatively unpopulated areas. They had no teachers in these rural areas that knew no English, nor was there a strong need to learn English. They communicated with one another in German as they worked the land and raised livestock. Their strong desire to perpetuate their culture, along with their ambivalent attitude toward Anglo-American schooling and the insignificant role of English in these first settlements, led the Germans to create their own private parochial schools. These schools were designed to preserve their language and continue their ethnic traditions (Castellanos & Leggio-Castellanos, 1983).

By 1753, Benjamin Franklin expressed his fear of Germans outnumbering Anglos and the possibility of losing the English language as the dominant language. Therefore, he attempted to introduce English schools to the German-speaking areas by partnering with the Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge based out of London. However, the Pennsylvania Germans

figured out that the intent was not religious. The realization that the schools were for ethnolingual purposes infuriated the Germans, so Franklin's attempt to convert them to English schools failed (Castellanos & Leggio-Castellanos, 1983).

After the Revolutionary War, English came to have a greater importance. The schools founded by immigrants continued non-English-language instruction, but they acknowledged the role of English. Some schools began to use English as the main language of instruction and reduced the native language to a school subject. The most frequent languages taught were German, Polish, Dutch, and French. Spanish was exclusive in the Southwest, but this land was not part of the United States at that time (Castellanos & Leggio-Castellanos, 1983).

By 1828, the U.S. government recognized the language rights of the Cherokee tribe and actually subsidized the first newspaper published in an American Indian language. However, the 1830s found the Cherokee tribe on the Trail of Tears, as President Andrew Jackson ordered them to reservations in Oklahoma. Yet, by the 1850s, their resilient spirit found their children actually exceeding white students in Texas and Arkansas in English literacy skills. They were accomplishing this through bilingual education, using Sequoyah's Cherokee syllabary.

In 1879, the U.S. government reacted by dismantling American Indian bilingual education by mandating instruction in English only. Native children were separated from their families, forced to attend off-reservation boarding schools, and punished for speaking in their native tongues. As a result, the tribe's functional literacy rate among adults went from 90% in the mid-1800s to 40% by 1969. Though the official policy of repressing American Indian vernaculars was rescinded in 1934, unofficial punishments for native language use continued into the 1940s and 1950s (Crawford, 1991).

There also was a shift in research findings on bilingualism, from perceptions of bilingualism in the 1920s to those found in the 1960s. Research from the 1920s suggested that bilingualism was an obstacle to success. It said that there was a negative relationship between intelligence and dual language capabilities (San Miguel, 2004). The 1930s employed an ESL methodology that met the needs of foreign university students and diplomats, making pull-out classes the most common form of ESL. This meant that students were removed from regular classrooms (Crawford, 1991).

However, research from the 1950s, which was dominated by cultural deprivation theory, rejected genetic explanations for low school achievement by minority children and suggested instead that environmental factors were the cause of lower achievement. These environmental factors included lower-class values that favored "living in the present" rather than planning for the future, inadequate English skills, and parental failure to stress educational attainment. Therefore, minority children were labeled as "culturally inferior," and it was commonly believed that all they needed to do was to master and embrace the values and language of the dominant society. The job of schools was to change the students' culture so that these students could overcome the ethnic background that was holding them back from assimilation (Crawford, 1991).

Mexican-American students endured their own form of discrimination in schools. According to a 1972 OCR investigation, after-school "Spanish detentions" were given to students for using Spanish in schools in the Rio Grande Valley. This remained a formal punishment until the late 1960s (Crawford, 1991). The words of one south Texas principal included in Crawford's report demonstrate the prevailing attitude of educators in this area of the country at this point in history:

Our school is predominantly Latin American—97 percent. We try to discourage the use of Spanish on the playground, in the halls, and in the classroom. We feel that the reason so many of our pupils are reading two to three years below grade level is because their English vocabulary is so limited. We are in complete accord that it is excellent to be bilingual or multilingual, but we must stress the fact that practice makes perfect—that English is a very difficult language to master. Our pupils speak Spanish at home, at dances, on the playground, at athletic events…we feel the least they can do is try to speak English at school. (Crawford, 1991, p. 26)

Using a language other than English to provide public instruction was a criminal offense until 1969. A Texas teacher who was Mexican American was actually indicted in Crystal, Texas, for conducting a high school history class in Spanish as late as October 1970. Fortunately, the case was dismissed (Crawford, 1991).

By the 1960s, however, new research emerged indicating that bilingualism played a positive role in intelligence and was an asset in classroom success, including second language acquisition. Furthermore, in language and intelligence tests, bilingual children were found equal to, or superior to, monolingual students. In 1968, the federal government finally broke the tradition of refraining from creating language policies (Castellanos & Leggio-Castellanos, 1983). The federal government chose to take action and become involved in school language policies by passing the Bilingual Education Act (San Miguel, 2004).

During the 1960s and 1970s, the policy on bilingual education encouraged non-English languages and cultures. The support for bilingual education came from a variety of groups that included lay people, educational groups, and a variety of local, state, and federal agencies. But

by the late 1980s and 1990s, the visible support of these groups diminished and the role of non-English languages and cultures in schools began to decrease drastically (San Miguel, 2004).

One priority of bilingual education is to promote students' second language acquisition in both direct and indirect ways. Krashen (2000, p. 138) defines bilingual education by stating that a full bilingual program possesses the following characteristics:

1. They teach subject matter in the primary language.

2. They develop literacy in the primary language.

3. They provide comprehensible input in the second language in the form of English as a second language (ESL) classes and "sheltered" subject matter teaching.

However, there are opponents of bilingual education. These opponents, especially those who are educators working with students in the public schools, are reluctant to recognize all the issues and needs of ELLs. They want an expedient solution. They know they cannot ignore the reality of students who need to acquire English, but they want a solution that is tidy and fits easily within their school setting. Therefore, they tend to favor programs such as the structured immersion setting, which separates ELLs until they are ready to be mainstreamed (Brisk, 1998).

English-only

Opponents of bilingual education believe that instruction in the native language takes away valuable time from learning English. They believe ELLs are better prepared to function in school when they are taught in the English language (Rossell & Ross, 1986). Porter (1994) suggests that segregation occurs with bilingual education and that it does not provide equity in education. She states that the idea of bilingual education "has created a separate and unequal education for some three million students" (p. 1). Furthermore, the variety of languages in the

United States (127 in New York City alone, for example) makes it impractical, if not near impossible, to create bilingual programs for every language group (Porter, 1994). Thus, opponents of bilingual education justify their argument by stating that English is essential to forming and continuing national unity and for instilling American democratic values (Glazer & Cummins, 1985).

Officially organized opponents to bilingual education did not exist until the late 1970s. This first wave of English-only activism was formed over time and consisted of politicians, conservative journalists, Anglo parent groups, federal bureaucrats, administrators, school officials, and special interest groups. The special interest groups included U.S. English, The Structural Exclusion of and Discrimination Against Ethnic Minorities, Favored Assimilationism, and Limited School Reform (San Miguel, 2004). The climax of this wave of English-only sentiment was reached on August 1, 1996, when the House of Representatives passed the "English Language Empowerment Act" by a vote of 259-167. This was the first official bill at the federal level that mandated English-only in the schools, but it was not even considered in the Senate due to the threat of a veto by President Clinton (Crawford, 1999).

The second wave of English-only activism occured in the late 1990s and resulted in the passage of Proposition 227 in California. Silicon Valley businessman Ron Unz organized a statewide initiative that stressed the importance of "English for the Children," instead of negatively attacking the educational practice of "bilingualism." This movement was based upon the principles of parental choice, equal opportunity, and pedagogical effectiveness, so it euphemistically avoided the rhetoric of bigotry.

To further his cause, Unz utilized the ignorance of most Americans and criticized the educational effectiveness of bilingual programs. He put a positive spin on the issue by saying

immigrants were not to blame for failing to learn English, and he claimed to be their advocate against unresponsive schools (Crawford, 1999). To further his own political aspirations of becoming governor of California, he used the elimination of the state's bilingual education program as a major platform. Unz's influence spread across the country, as he exported his anti-bilingual education message to other states, and the news media continued to report against bilingual education (Crawford, 2000).

The premise of Proposition 227 in California is that ELLs are to learn English as quickly and as effectively as possible. It proposes that all students must be taught in English in California public schools, including ELLs, and that native language instruction is to be prohibited as a means of assisting ELLs in the classroom. In addition, it allows ELLs to be grouped by language proficiency, regardless of age or native-language group. Overall, Proposition 227 emphasizes that ELLs are to enter into a temporary transition period, where they are to spend a maximum of one year in sheltered English immersion classrooms in order to master a functional knowledge of the English language. Then, students are to be transferred to mainstream classrooms (California State Legislature, 1998a). This approach, however, directly contradicts current research findings that it takes 7-10 years for an ELL to fully transition into academic language in the L2 (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

There is an exception to English-only instruction granting parental rights to visit the school and apply for a waiver. This waiver allows for students to be taught various subjects and English by teachers using bilingual education techniques or other recognized educational methodologies. However, there must be at least 20 students in a given grade level whose parents apply for this waiver. Otherwise, the students are allowed to transfer to schools where these classes are offered. The circumstances under which the parental waivers may be accepted include

(a) English proficient children—children already proficient enough in English that they do well on standardized tests in English and they want to learn in another language; (b) older children—children at least 10 years old, and for whom the educational staff believes alternative educational techniques would better assist the acquisition of *basic* English skills in an expedient manner; and (c) children with special needs (California State Legislature, 1998b).

Social Justice Theory

Social justice "seeks to free people from oppression" (Ayers et al., 2009, p. 38). According to Boyles, Carusi, and Attick (2009), "The concept of social justice in education indicates that schools and society are, and always have been, replete with injustice" (p. 30). McLaren and Munoz (2000) express the need for change, stating that the idea of social equality and democracy will be threatened if educators allow racism and social injustice to continue to be an ongoing problem.

Social justice educators concentrate their efforts on understanding the institutions and social factors that perpetuate inequality within educational systems as well as individual attitudes, interpersonal behaviors, or beliefs that support unequal social relationships among the various participants within education (McCarthy & Whitlock, 2002). Overall, it is the goal of social justice in education to address issues of social inequalities within school reform by dismantling the status quo norms of power and privilege (Boyles et al., 2009). Specifically, social justice theory within education offers an opportunity to provide an educational context that addresses students' educational needs for school success.

Though O'Neill (1976) concludes that equal educational opportunity is quite different than equal educational results, it is essential for institutions to provide equal educational opportunities for all students, as these opportunities are essential to promote future achievement.

Furthermore, "in order for someone to possess a real opportunity, she or he must also possess certain relevant information, including of course, the information that the opportunity exists" (Howe, 1997, p. 18), which is the responsibility of educational institutions to provide. Unfortunately, many contemporary scholars equate distributive justice with social justice (Boyles et al., 2009). However, the judges in the *Lau v. Nichols* case discussed that a mere equal distribution of resources does not automatically ensure an equal education, especially if students do not comprehend English (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974).

Howe (1997) posits that social justice plays a pivotal role in equality of educational opportunity. He often equates social justice with distributive justice, but also recognizes that social justice is something else. Specifically, Howe (1997) contends "that social arrangements must be designed so as to tend toward equality in the distribution of benefits" (p. 129). Thus, for a more just society, distributive justice must act jointly with social justice in education (Howe, 1997). The ultimate goal of social justice education, therefore, is to ensure "full and equal participation of all groups in a society that is mutually shaped to meet their needs" (Bell, 2007, p. 1).

Adams (2007) lays out the core pedagogical framework of social justice education practice as follows (p. 15):

1. Establish an equilibrium between the emotional and cognitive components of the learning process.
2. Acknowledge and support the personal and individual dimensions of experience, while making connections to and illuminating the systemic dimensions of social group interactions.
3. Pay explicit attention to social relations within the classroom.

4. Make conscious use of reflection and experience as tools for student-centered learning.

5. Reward changes in awareness, personal growth, and efforts to work toward change, understood as outcomes of the learning process.

This study particularly emphasizes the first four themes of this framework, as the fifth theme is implied if the educational structure is in place. Overall, social justice theory lends itself as a theoretical framework that can be used to comprehend this study's exploration of equity in schools, as the primary goal of social justice education is to socially and institutionally reform education (Creswell, 1998).

Second Language Acquisition Theories

This section highlights general SLA theories that relate to helping ELLs acquire language through content instruction. It explicitly includes Cummins' research-based theories concerning the notion that the native language supports students' acquisition of the second language (i.e., English). When educators put SLA theories into practice, they provide a means for ELLs to attain academic equity by gaining access to the curriculum.

Essentially, the goal of a high school student is to attain a diploma. To achieve this goal, an ELL must learn academic language to gain full access to the curriculum. Thus, this section provides a snapshot of established SLA theories, particularly those related to academic content. Walsh's (1991) four educational needs are used to frame the discussion.

Four Educational Needs—Social, Affective, Linguistic, and Academic

Access to the curriculum is at the crux of this study, grounded in the premise that the solutions to providing access to the curriculum are found in educational equity—through addressing the educational needs of ELLs. Moreover, Walsh's (1991) four educational needs of

ELLs (social, affective, linguistic, and academic) provide the core framework utilized in this study to assess how a Kansas urban ESL program provides access to the curriculum for ELLs. These four educational needs for ELL success in this study are defined as follows:

Social Needs: ELLs need to have their first language (L1) affirmed. They need to be able to interact with other students in their L1, take language courses in their L1, and use the L1 for academic development. Teachers should build upon ELLs' prior knowledge (Thomas & Collier, 1997; Walsh, 1991). Furthermore, students need to use English (their second language, or L2) to interact with other students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Affective Needs: The emotional needs of ELLs in school settings are influenced by many factors, including the following ten teacher practices emphasized in this study: (1) being responsive to cultural and personal diversity, (2) creating roles in the classroom for family and community members, (3) providing constructivist reading and writing activities, (4) providing ample practice and careful corrections, (5) focusing on relevant background knowledge, (6) focusing on content and on activities that are meaningful to students, (7) actively involving learners, (8) using alternate groupings, (9) providing native-language support, and (10) holding high expectations for all learners (Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Graves, 1995).

Linguistic Needs: ELLs need to develop proficiency in the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. This includes the acquisition of written and oral systems of the students' L1 and L2 across all language domains, including vocabulary, phonology, semantics, pragmatics, syntax, and discourse (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Academic Needs: ELLs need to develop content/subject matter knowledge within the coursework of mathematics, science, language arts, social studies (Thomas & Collier, 1997) and elective courses that are essential to the process of fulfilling graduation requirements.

Walsh (1991) does not describe all the educational needs in detail, so other researchers are included to clarify meanings and to guide the study. Echevarria and Graves (2007) reiterate most of the instructional principles from Graves' (1995) findings, employing them in meeting affective needs for ELLs. However, Graves (1995) does not include the use of the L1 or specifically state the need to respond to cultural and personal diversity. Thus, the researcher used a combination of these writings to provide a more robust definition of affective needs.

Thomas and Collier (1997) also state that there are four educational needs that must be met for ELLs to succeed in school—sociocultural, linguistic, academic, and cognitive needs. These are illustrated in Collier's prism model, which will be discussed later in this section. Thomas and Collier's educational needs for ELLs are very similar to Walsh's needs, but have slight variations, as Thomas and Collier combine social and affective needs into one sociocultural category. Then, the researchers extrapolate the cognitive need into its own specific category. They emphasize that the cognitive need in developing L1 is established before students reach high school, which is a phenomenon that is outside the scope of this study.

Walsh does not specifically include the cognitive need in the overarching needs that promote ELL school success. Rather, the cognitive need is inherently addressed throughout the social, linguistic, and academic educational needs. Specifically, Walsh addresses prior knowledge within the social need's definition and does not specify a time period for acquiring the prior knowledge. Thomas and Collier (1997), on the other hand, link prior knowledge with the cognitive need and specify that students acquire such knowledge prior to high school.

39

However, Walsh does mention developing cognitive skills through a focus on dual language literacy (Walsh, 1991). In this study, dual language literacy is promoted by addressing students' linguistic and academic educational needs, including L1 development.

Instructional Theories Focusing on Language and Content-Based Models

Numerous theories related to intersections of language and content learning provide a basis for understanding the many issues to be considered in providing ELLs with an equitable education. This section is intended to provide the reader with an overview of the theories most relevant to ensuring access to the curriculum for ELLs.

Sociolinguistics

Social interaction is essential to acquiring a second language. One can look to Vygotsky for insight into how the language learner progresses. He describes learning as involving two levels. First, there is an actual developmental level, which represents what a student can do. Second, there is a potential developmental level, which represents what the student will be able to do in the future. The ELL advances from the actual to the potential level of development with the assistance of an educator or through peer collaboration. Thus, the distance between these two levels is termed the "Zone of Proximal Development" (Vygotsky, 1978). With regard to this zone of proximal development (ZPD), Vygotsky states that there is a range between an individual's independent problem solving capabilities and his or her potential when someone more knowledgeable assists him or her in making connections between prior knowledge and the information being taught (Miramontes, Nadeau, Commins, 1997).

Vygotsky mentioned that L2 learning is a deliberate and conscious process, as rules are consciously drilled into the student within the classroom. Next, this awareness spreads to the student's familiar language, so that L2 acquisition transfers to learning higher aspects of the L1.

Then, students intuitively view their L1 as one particular system among many. This progression toward awareness of multiple communication systems is accomplished by viewing "its phenomena under more general categories; and this leads to awareness in everyday linguistic operations" (McLaughlin, 1978, p. 185).

Similar to Vygotsky with regard to thoughts on learning, Krashen also considered the distance between actual and potential language development, symbolized by i+1, and known as the Input Hypothesis (Krashen, 1981). This hypothesis represents how ELLs progress from one developmental stage to the next. It assumes that if ELLs receive an abundant amount of "comprehensible input," they will acquire language in a developmental sequence, as they understand the messages. When those comprehensible messages possess new structures, the learners will move slightly beyond their current level of competence. Krashen states, "We move from i, our current level, to i+1, the next level along the natural order, by understanding input containing i+1" (1985, p. 2). This theory can be applied to ELLs during social interaction and academic instruction. Though many researchers have built upon the Input Hypothesis (as well as the ZPD), Cummins (1979) transformed it from a dichotomy into a continuum, which is further discussed in the literature review.

Integral to the effectiveness of Krashen's Input Hypothesis is a low "affective filter" in acquiring language. The Affective Filter Hypothesis appeals to the emotional side of ELLs acquiring a second language, because "comprehensible input is necessary for acquisition, but it is not sufficient" (Krashen, 1981). This hypothesis suggests that there is a filter, or mental block, which can prevent ELLs from utilizing input efficiently, resulting in less second language that is acquired (Krashen, 1987). The theory contends that there are affective variables such as anxiety or low self-confidence that might impede or block efforts to learn a second language.

When individuals are not concerned about the potential of failure in language acquisition, their filter is lowered. Their filter is at its lowest point when they forget they are reading or hearing another language. Additionally, the hypothesis indicates that a positive affective environment encourages language learning. A low affective filter combined with appropriate comprehensible input results in language acquisition (Krashen, 1981).

To implement this hypothesis, teachers need to make sure the environments in their classes are as stress-free as possible, and that students are not directly targeted to give answers. Rather, students should be encouraged to participate at their own comfort level. Teachers can make it easier for students to participate in class by accepting and making use of their answers without insisting on correct speech. In addition, teachers should model correct usage and elaborate on student answers when language errors are made. In this kind of environment, students' affective filters are lowered because they are more relaxed and willing to participate (Echevarria & Graves, 2007). However, Echevarria and Graves caution that "there may be a tendency to lower expectations for ELLs, giving the same credit for 'trying' as for correct answers" (2007, p. 39).

Krashen's theories have been used as a guide to integrate language and content instruction (Snow, Met, & Genessee, 1992). These notions are popular among practitioners because they are comprehensible to educators and provide positive results within the classroom setting (Freeman & Freeman, 2001). Krashen (2003) emphasizes that teachers use context to implement comprehensible input, that pictures and body movements associated with Asher's Total Physical Response (TPR) method are examples of how to make the new language comprehensible. Krashen (2003) continues that language acquisition will take place when there is a lack of affective barriers coupled with comprehensible input. In essence, "all we have to do

is give students comprehensible messages that they will pay attention to, and they will pay attention if the messages are interesting" (Krashen, 2003, p. 4).

Swain (1985) differs from Krashen's initial view of the input hypothesis, as he emphasizes the importance of providing students with opportunities to practice the target language and negotiate meaning for themselves within a meaningful context. Swain also surmises that there needs to be an interaction between the concepts of input and output, insisting that it is during language production (output process) that students realize what their learning needs are. Although, it is important to note that "in recent years, [Krashen has] used the term comprehension hypothesis to refer to the input hypothesis. Comprehension is a better description—mere input is not enough" (Krashen, 2003, p. 4). Therefore, Krashen appeases his opponents in this matter, as he recognizes that comprehensible input is not enough.

BICS v. CALP

Cummins (2000) revealed that the original need for the basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS)/cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) premise was noted by Skutnabb-Kangas and Toukomaa (1976), who brought attention to the fact that educators consistently assumed that Finnish immigrant children in Sweden appeared to be fluent in both Swedish and Finnish. However, these students were frequently performing below grade/age levels on academic performances in both languages. Similarly, in the United States, psychological assessments were given to minority students and found that "teachers and psychologists often assumed that students who attained fluency in English had overcome all difficulties with English (Cummins, 1984, p.1). Furthermore, Collier (1989) mentions that school personnel frequently oversimplify the language acquisition process by assuming that students

who carry on social conversations in English (i.e., demonstrate BICS) have also acquired the language needed for school (i.e., CALP), which is extremely complex and abstract.

Oller's (1981) controversial interpretation of his own research added to these mistaken assumptions. He stated that language proficiency was directly related to intelligence, in that they were indistinguishable. In short, combining these assumptions results in a high likelihood that one will misunderstand the needs, intelligence, and language proficiency of ELLs. For example, educators might perceive that ELLs lack intelligence merely based on their L2 proficiency. Misconceptions can also lead educators to neglect students' development of academic language, as they might assume that if a student can orally communicate, then he or she also is proficient in reading and writing skills.

Cummins (1979) observed the need to make a distinction between social and academic English fluency. He was the first to manifest the conceptual distinction between BICS and CALP. This distinction reveals two strands to learning language—social and academic—which offer a simple dichotomy that has important implications for practice and policy (Cummins, 2000). BICS involves social language and skills that ELLs need to learn to be capable of maneuvering in the L2 society (Cummins, 1979). It includes day-to-day language needed for social interaction with other people. For ELLs, this language is used in the lunchroom, at parties, on the school bus, while playing sports, and when talking on the telephone. These social interactions usually occur within a meaningful context and are not cognitively demanding (Haynes, 2007).

CALP involves academic language and skills that ELLs need to learn in order to function within the academic world (Cummins, 1979). Furthermore, CALP emphasizes that the development of literacy skills in the L1 and L2 closely correlates to the development of

academic language and skills in the L2. Cummins extended the implications of CALP by discussing cognitive, academic, and language elements. The cognitive element pertains to the need for learners to receive cognitively challenging instruction that promotes their use of higher order thinking skills. The academic element refers to the need for curricular content to be integrated with language instruction, so that students learn specific academic language (Cummins, 1980). These notions are reinforced through research indicating that it takes 2-3 years to develop L2 language proficiency in BICS and 4-10 years to gain grade-level CALP (Collier, 1989; Cummins, 1981, 1984).

Ultimately, Cummins proposed a four-quadrant diagram that could be used to view language acts. This diagram emphasizes two dimensions of communicative proficiency and two levels of cognitive demand found in communication. The first continuum involves the amount of contextual support available to a student and ranges from Context Embedded Communication (left side of x-axis) to Content Reduced Communication (right side of x-axis). The second continuum relates to the level of cognitive demand on the student and ranges from Cognitively Undemanding Communication (above y-axis) to Cognitively Demanding Communication (below y-axis) (Cummins, 2000).

The distinction between BICS and CALP helps to explain why some students fail when mainstreamed. Often their CALP is not developed enough to handle the curriculum, which frequently involves communication tasks that are context-reduced and, at the same time, cognitively demanding. To support students' success, Cummins suggests that students' common underlying proficiency (CUP)—or underlying ability/knowledge—needs to be tapped into, and this can be done utilizing the L1, the L2, or both languages simultaneously (Cummins, 1984). A more detailed discussion of CUP is provided later in this chapter.

Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA)

CALLA is an instructional model that was designed to meet the academic needs of ELLs in the United States. A brief overview of the theoretical base for CALLA shows the relationship between current developments in cognitive psychology and this instructional approach. Cognitive theory, for example, indicates that learning is an active and dynamic process in which learners (a) choose information from their environment, (b) organize the information, (c) relate it to their prior knowledge, (d) recall what they consider to be important, (e) use the information in proper contexts, and (f) reflect on the success of their learning efforts (Gagne, 1985; Shuell, 1986). These aspects of learning are incorporated in CALLA.

Furthermore, two of the three main influences for the modern development of cognitive psychology—information processing and linguistics—can be applied to second language acquisition. The information processing approach deals with ideas of perception and attention and involves analyzing the processing of knowledge. The linguistic approach, on the other hand, was developed by Noam Chomsky in the 1950s and offers a mode of analyzing the structure of language (Anderson, 1985).

CALLA includes three components: "a curriculum correlated with mainstream content subjects, academic language development activities, and learning strategy instruction" (Chamot & O'Malley, 1987, p. 227). CALLA is a beneficial model for teaching ELLs at the secondary level because these students have a pressing need to access the curriculum in order to graduate. In high school, there are great cognitive demands in content-area courses such as social studies, science, math, and English. ELLs must be able to read and write to attain new knowledge and display their comprehension of new concepts, perform computational skills, and apply effective learning strategies across the curriculum. These content challenges are coupled with those that students face in acquiring a second language (Chamot & O'Malley, 1986). CALLA, therefore,

was designed to address the cognitive needs of ELLs, while taking into consideration their language needs, so that they could attain content knowledge in grade-level coursework (Chamot & O'Malley, 1986, 1987).

In this way, L2 language development occurs through content-area instruction within social studies, science, math, and English. Students are simultaneously taught learning strategies (e.g., summarizing, categorizing, linking to prior knowledge) that are essential for success in content courses; academic language skills; and the L2 language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. CALLA, therefore, is meant to enhance L2 development rather than replace mainstream courses (Chamot, 2009; Chamot & O'Malley, 1992). Overall, CALLA is one vehicle used to provide access to the curriculum for secondary ELLs.

Sheltered Instruction (SI)

SI uses highly contextualized language to access subjects being taught (e.g. science, math, social studies) in a content-area classroom for ELLs (Richard-Amato, 2010). Krashen designed sheltered content teaching as a vehicle to introduce language acquisition principles to content-area instruction. Originally, this approach was known as subject matter teaching, in which teachers were to modify lessons to help their students understand the content material (Krashen, 1982). Educators were intended to use ESL techniques within mainstream content-area courses (Krashen, 1981).

In 1985, the term "sheltered" was added to the description of subject matter teaching because ELLs are "sheltered" from potential learning problems that could occur within a classroom that has both native speakers of English and ELLs (Krashen, 1985). Echevarria and Graves (2007) mention that within a sheltered instructional context, ELLs are shielded from linguistic demands that are beyond their comprehension within mainstream instruction. SI

incorporates features of the research base including: Vygotsky's (1978) ZPD; Cummins' (1981) construct of CUP; Krashen's (1985) Input Hypothesis; and aspects of Chamot and O'Malley's (1986) CALLA. SI implements instructional strategies such as repetition, visuals, and active involvement to modify assignments and provide comprehensible instruction (Echevarria & Graves, 2007).

The three main features that characterize sheltered content instruction are comprehensible input, a focus on academic content, and segregation. Within SI, teachers attempt to present and explain the information in ways that make the material more comprehensible for students. The focus of instruction is on understanding the academic subject matter, vocabulary, and principles, while language acquisition is of secondary importance—especially at the secondary school level (Faltis, 1993; Faltis & Arias, 1993). For effective instruction to occur, teachers must promote practice with educational tasks and academic skills that are similar to those emphasized in mainstream courses (Adamson, 1990; Chamot, 2009). In regard to segregation, only ELLs are assigned to sheltered content classes. Sheltered teachers often have some knowledge of teaching ESL; however, they are primarily certified to teach their content area of specialization (Faltis, 1993).

Within sheltered instructional classes, there is likely to be a range in student language proficiency levels. Therefore, in SI, students are offered multiple ways to demonstrate their comprehension of the subject content and language growth; possibilities include hands-on projects, pictorial representations, group tasks, performance-based assessments, oral reports, informal class discussions, written assignments, portfolios, and traditional comprehension checks, such as paper-and-pencil tests and quizzes (Echevarria, Vogt, Short, 2000). When educators are cognizant of the need to implement modified instructional practices for

comprehensible input and to offer a variety of ways for ELLs to demonstrate their knowledge

and learning, students have a greater opportunity for access to the curriculum. Thus, SI provides

a means for these processes to occur, while it also shares various characteristics found in

effective ESL programs, as further discussed in this chapter.

Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis

Cummins extended Vygotsky's ZPD and Krashen's Input Hypothesis by developing the

Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis. This hypothesis suggests that there is a transfer of

proficiency from the L1 to the L2 when there is adequate exposure to the L1 in either the

environment or in school and adequate motivation to learn the L2. The link between Cummins'

Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis and Krashen's Input Hypothesis is found in the

knowledge gained through linguistic interaction in the L1—it plays a major role in allowing the

input in the L2 to be comprehensible (Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages

Affairs [OBEMLA], 1987). Therefore, "the more background knowledge we have, the more

capable we are of understanding and internalizing new input" (OBEMLA, 1987, p. 24).

A student's prior knowledge of literacy-related language functions in the L1 serve as a

predictor of his or her ease in learning these functions in the L2, because L1 and L2 CALP are

manifestations of the same underlying dimension. Cummins states that for this hypothesis to be

valid, the L1 and L2 CALP must depend upon each other and show correlations with other

variables such as nonverbal and verbal ability. Overall, Cummins' (1980) findings suggest the

following:

. . . measures of cognitive/academic aspects of L1 and L2 are assessing the same

underlying dimension to a similar degree. However, these relationships do not

exist in an affective or experimental vacuum and there are several factors that

49

might reduce the relationships between L1 and L2 measures of CALP in comparison to those between intralanguage (L1-L1, L2-L2) measures (p.179).

Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP)/ Iceberg Analogy

Cummins' CUP model, also known as the Iceberg Analogy, is a model of bilingualism that indicates an underlying proficiency that is common to both languages, or an interdependence that exists between two languages for a bilingual person. The premise is that the development of one language strongly aids the development of the second language (Cummins, 1981). This CUP model can be pictorially represented in the form of two overlapping icebergs. Above the surface there appear to be two completely separate icebergs. Each iceberg represents one of the languages. The two are visibly different, just as two languages are obviously different with regard to outward conversation. Yet, beneath the surface the two icebergs are fused together, so that the two languages represented are not functioning separately, but rather they are operating through the same central processing system (Cummins, 1981).

However, a quite different model of bilingualism is perceived by large sections of the public, including politicians, parents, and teachers. This model is termed the separate underlying proficiency (SUP). It envisions the two languages operating separately with no transfer and with a limited amount of room for each language (Baker, 2001). However, research suggests that this assumption is incorrect and that there is an unlimited amount of room in the brain for language skills. Additionally, research indicates that language attributes are not separated in the cognitive system, but that, as the CUP model would suggest, they are interactive and readily transfer. For example, when school lessons are taught in Spanish, the whole brain is fed, as opposed to the information only going into the "Spanish section" of the brain. The reciprocal scenario also holds true with regard to English. Lessons conducted in English do not merely feed the "English

section" of the brain. More specifically, if a student is taught how to use a dictionary in English, or to multiply numbers in Spanish, then those skills of referencing a dictionary or multiplying numbers easily transfer to the other language. The skills do not have to be re-taught (Baker, 2001).

Cummins' argues that students' proficiencies in their native languages are important to their acquisition of a second language. He maintains that students' L1 should be considered when implementing structural supports in an ESL program, so that students have the opportunity to gain access to the curriculum. Other researchers (e.g., Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994; Collier, 1989, 1992; Hakuta, 1987; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Wong-Fillmore, 1991) also have found that proficiency in the student's L1 is a strong predictor of acquiring the L2. Thus, this theory and research provides the rationale for using the L1 in various programs that provide educational services for ELLs.

Research Studies on Effective ESL Programs and Characteristics

As the number of ELLs in the United States continues to increase, there is also increasing pressure on schools to meet national, state, and local standards in order to remain accredited, particularly at the secondary level. Consequently, many questions have arisen regarding effective programming practices for secondary ELLs. Allowing secondary ELLs to equally participate in a traditional high school experience, while making no considerations for programming accommodations, does not provide the students with equal access to the curriculum. Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) does not consider monolingual instruction without an ESL component adequate. TESOL maintains, "The content [mainstream] standards do not address the specific needs of ESOL [English to Speakers of Other Languages] students who are adding English to their home language. Therefore, ESL standards are needed" (1997, p.

2). TESOL adds that schools need to implement these standards within appropriate program models for student success.

Although there are various program designs for ELLs, not every school setting has the same contextual needs. Prior research studies that explored effective secondary program characteristics for ELLs provide insights for determining the best programmatic fit for a given setting. For example, Lucas, Henze, and Donato (1990) provide a touchstone study in the field that addresses successful secondary programs for ELLs. The study investigated six high schools—five in California and one in Arizona—that were nominated by state, county, and local educators for taking specific steps to promote academic success for ELLs.

These high schools produced quantitative evidence of school success through the key indicators of dropout rates, attendance rates, test scores, and post-secondary education enrollment. During an intensive three-day period at each school, project staff members collected data that consisted of questionnaires, classroom observations, audiotapes, and notes from structured interviews. These interview participants included 2 district-level bilingual program directors, 1 superintendent, 5 school-level project and program directors, 6 principals, 6 assistant principals, 15 counselors, 135 students, and 52 teachers and aides. In addition, 124 student questionnaires (89 from non-newcomers and 35 from newcomers), 54 classroom observations, and various archival documents were gathered in the data collection process. In order to gather a range of student perspectives based on academic ability levels, the researchers intentionally selected student interview participants based upon four groups. The researchers chose students recently immigrated (within the last two years), poor achievers (but recently improved), average achievers, and high achievers.

The focus of the study was to explore features of effective schooling. Eight features emerged across all sites that the researchers proposed to be most important in promoting school success for high school ELLs. These eight key features for school success were as follows: (1) value is placed on the students' languages and cultures, (2) high expectations of ELLs are made concrete, (3) school leaders make the education of ELLs a priority, (4) staff development is explicitly designed to help teachers and other staff serve ELLs more effectively, (5) a variety of courses and programs for ELLs is offered, (6) a counseling program gives special attention to ELLs, (7) parents of ELLs are encouraged to become involved in their children's education, and (8) school staff members share a strong commitment to empower ELLs through education.

Implications cited by the researchers indicate that the study provides educators with a working model of effective educational features for ELLs at the secondary level. These could be used as general recommendations or a checklist for comparing other ESL programs. Overall, Lucas et al. propose "high schools must place a high priority on services and attitudes that go beyond academic instruction" (1990, p. 337).

In the early 1990s, very little research had focused on secondary education for ELLs. Researchers knew little about the responses of districts and schools to ELL needs. Minicucci and Olsen (1991) began to address this void through their exploratory study on services and programs for secondary ELLs in California. They discovered that ELLs were inadequately served due to their complex and diverse needs, a lack of programming, a shortage of trained teachers, the departmental structure of secondary schools, and a lack of materials.

Minicucci and Olsen (1992) then conducted a study in California that examined programs and services for ELLs that involved visits to five schools, a telephone survey of twenty-seven schools, individual site consultations, and interviews with State Department of Education

personnel and local school district personnel. The purpose of the study was to investigate schools with extensive program offerings for ELLs and to explore their ESL programming policies. The researchers divided the findings into five aspects: (1) assessment and placement procedures, (2) content program models, (3) content-area coverage, (4) ESL programs, and (5) policy factors.

In regard to assessment and placement procedures, schools followed the California state guidelines when ELLs entered the secondary level: (1) a home language survey was given; (2) if another language was spoken in the home, students were given an oral English language assessment—either the Bilingual Syntax Measure (BSM), the Language Assessment Scales (LAS), or the IDEA Oral Proficiency Test (IPT); (3) students were given an English academic skills assessment by means of a standardized achievement test; and (4) some schools supplemented these steps with an academic assessment in the L1, a review of previous high school transcripts, and/or interviews with the parents and students to determine prior educational experience.

After students were assessed, they were placed within one of California's four basic program models for ELLs: (1) Model A—Sheltered English Only programs, which provide academic content instruction through content classes composed exclusively of ELLs; (2) Model B—Native Language programs, which provide academic content instruction in students' L1 (this study only observed Spanish-speaking ELLs); (3) Model C—Native Language combined with Sheltered English programs, which provide sheltered instruction for some academic content classes and L1 instruction for others; or (4) Model D—Mainstream Placement programs, which place students in regular educational content classes. In some instances, bilingual aides might be used, as teachers might cluster students by language group. Once ELLs reach an intermediate level of oral English fluency, they are placed in mainstream content classes.

However, schools in this study varied on their content coverage provisions for ELLs—from full content, to partial content, to sparse content coverage. Full content coverage implied that students were enrolled in a thorough set of course options including: ESL, science, social studies, math, and electives. Partial content coverage meant that students were enrolled in a short schedule of classes including: one or more content classes, ESL, and elective courses or study halls. With regard to content courses, students were scheduled in either science or math, but not both. Sparse content coverage meant that the content-area coverage had large gaps. For example, math or science might or might not be scheduled, or students might be limited to the lower grade-level courses (e.g., grade 9 or 10). Usually, students were enrolled in elective courses and ESL, and they were limited in their content options.

Regarding ESL programs, Minicucci and Olsen (1992) found that although secondary ELLs had a wide range of needs for English language development, these needs were not being met by ESL program offerings in most of the schools in the study. Some students were literate in their L1, while others were not. Some students needed oral, reading, and writing skills, while others only needed comprehension literacy skills. Thus, if the placement tests were based solely on oral abilities—a practice that assumes that ELLs are linguistically proficient if they are orally proficient—then a false interpretation could occur, as many students lacked literacy skills.

After initial placement in ESL, movement of students to other levels primarily depended on teacher judgment. However, three schools used a language proficiency test and one school designed its own ESL placement test for upper-level movement. All the schools surveyed offered more than one level of ESL instruction, with the exception of one school. These levels ranged from an introductory/newcomer level to advanced ESL classes, which stressed writing and

literature. There also were transitional English classes for students who were failing the mainstream English classes, even though they had completed the ESL sequence of courses.

Regarding policy factors, the researchers suggested that concerted state leadership and support were vitally necessary for California to meet the major challenges confronting secondary schools, which included limited access to content-area courses for ELLs. They offered four major recommendations: (1) locally-based networks to allow educators to share their knowledge about educating ELLs and to disseminate information, (2) staff development in second language acquisition for all secondary teachers in California, (3) an increase in classroom resource materials for ELLs from the state level, and (4) "an initiative by the State Department of Education to bring practitioners and researchers together to advance the state-of-the-art of providing effective programs and services for students at the secondary level" (Minicucci & Olsen, 1992, p. 15). The primary implication of this study was that additional research should be conducted to investigate the extent to which the trend of limited curriculum access for ELLs existed. The results then would provide educators with additional impetus to review their own programs.

Thomas and Collier (1997) provided another touchstone study on effective educational practices for ELLs and offered insight into the length of time it takes for ELLs to attain L2 proficiency. This study was conducted on a national scale by including five large urban and suburban school districts throughout the United States. Data was collected from 1982–1996 and included over 700,000 ELL student records. The focus of the research was to provide a practical guide for local program decision makers by offering insight into bilingual/ESL education.

Findings related to the "how long" research section of the study provided foundational insight in the field of ESL education on the length of time necessary for ELLs to attain L2 proficiency. Specifically, findings indicated:

that students who arrived between ages 8 and 11, who had received at least 2-5 years of schooling taught through their primary language (L1) in their home country, were the lucky ones who took only 5-7 years. Those who arrived before age 8 required 7-10 years or more! (Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 33)

Implications from this finding cited by the researchers indicate that although students made steady yearly gains, those who arrive in the United States after age 12 with adequate formal schooling in their L1 "run out of time to catch up academically to the native-English speakers" (Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 33).

To continue the discussion about age, rate, and eventual attainment of language acquisition, one popular hypothesis is that it is easier for younger acquirers of language to attain a second language. However, the research indicates that

older children in general initially acquire the second language faster than young children (older-is-better for rate of acquisition), but child second language acquirers will usually be superior in terms of ultimate attainment (younger-is-better in the long run). Distinguishing rate and attainment, then, resolves the apparent contradictions in the literature. (Krashen, Long, & Scarella, 1979, p. 574)

Furthermore, people often envision that younger children are better at attaining a second language, because

the types of linguistic tasks young children are expected to perform are generally

simple face-to-face communicative activities that fit their developmental level.

With increasing age, the language (including the written form of the language)

that students must comprehend and use to match their developmental level rapidly

outstrips their rudimentary command of the second language, thus creating a

mismatch (if not a tremendous chasm) between conceptual and linguistic

competence. (Davies-Samway & McKeon, 2007, p. 29)

With these notions in mind, differences in context and content are two factors that must

be considered when viewing the perceptions of how language acquisition occurs in younger vs.

older second language learners. To illustrate, younger learners have more opportunities to view

nonverbal cues such as gestures, facial expressions, and tone of voice in face-to-face

conversations. In addition, learning to play a game involves visual demonstrations, which is

more than mere verbal directions.

In contrast, the experience for older language learners is often different. Older learners

are often placed in decontextualized environments. They must strictly rely on words for

comprehension of the content, with no pictures in the reading materials and lectures lacking in

nonlinguistic clues to support meaning (Davies-Samway & McKeon, 2007). "Since much of

school language tends to be decontextualized once one moves beyond the earliest grades,

children learning English as a second language in school often find themselves lost in a world of

meaningless words" (Davies-Samway & McKeon, 2007, p. 30).

Another key result of Thomas and Collier's (1997) study was the development of a

conceptual model of language acquisition for school—the prism model. The prism model

indicates that there are four major components—linguistic, academic, cognitive, and

sociocultural processes—that impact school language acquisition of ELLs. One primary

implication from this finding was that the prism model assists decision makers in comprehending

second language acquisition within a school context. This research knowledge can be applied to

various school programs across the country.

Additional findings indicated that two-way bilingual programs promoted the highest level

of long-term academic success for ELLs. However, the authors "caution the field of

bilingual/ESL education not to focus so much on the name or label of a given program, but

instead, to think about the underlying characteristics that lead to a given program's success"

(Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 48). These effective program characteristics include: L1 instruction,

L2 instruction, interactive discovery learning and other current approaches to teaching,

sociocultural support, and integration with the mainstream.

In 1981, Cummins highlighted a natural phenomenon—that students' native language is

the best vehicle for them to learn new information. Furthermore, based on a study of nine

exemplary K-12 programs for ELLs in which English was the main language of instruction,

Tikunoff et al. (1991) declared that incorporating students' native language—either in a direct or

indirect instructional way—need not be an all-or-nothing phenomenon. These researchers

conducted a study that included 147 educators who were involved in educating ELLs in some

form.

The educators were asked to designate Specially Alternative Instructional Programs

(SAIPs)—ranging from preschool, to elementary, to secondary programs where the student's L1

was not the main instructional tool. The educators included 59 representatives of SAIPs, 59

representatives of bilingual departments at State Education Agencies, 19 Title VII Evaluation

Assistance Center and Multifunctional Resource Center network people, and 10 Desegregation

Assistance Center directors. Educators deemed programs exemplary based on student achievement. The result was the designation of 70 SAIPs that the research team then contacted and asked to submit information about student outcomes and program features. Sufficient amounts of information were gathered on 39 SAIPs. This information was used to rank the programs in terms of quality, which was determined by their program results. Then the research team visited the 17 most highly rated SAIPs to verify and collect more information. The final determinations for the study resulted in viewing the 9 most exemplary sites located in six states—California, Florida, Oregon, Massachusetts, New York, and Texas.

The researchers spent five days at each site collecting data. First, they gathered demographic, contextual, and descriptive information. Then they conducted pre and post interviews with teachers in conjunction with classroom observations. Overall, 87% of the classrooms were multilingual environments—meaning that 3 to 10 languages were present; 13% were bilingual classrooms—meaning that all students spoke the same L1. The focus of the study was to highlight ways that SAIPs created positive learning environments for ELLs by utilizing their L1.

To investigate this aspect, researchers organized each of the ways that native language was used into three categories: native language support in the larger school context, use of native language by teachers/instructional aides, and use of native language by students. Specifically, the findings indicated that monolingual-English teachers can incorporate students' native languages in a variety of ways, such as having students use their L1 to interact in pairs or groups, involving community members in classroom activities, and incorporating L1 writing activities (e.g., journal writing) and reading activities. Implications cited by the researchers indicated that use of the L1 occurs even when assumptions and policies press against it. As this study did not compare SAIPs

to other types of programs, however, it was not intended to address the level of effectiveness for content and language learning within programs that include native language as a significant component of instruction. Therefore, policymakers should not use this study to discount or abolish bilingual programs; rather, the study should be used to support the value of the native language in educating ELLs.

Johannessen's (1993) findings from her dissertation on equity aspects in bilingual education in the state of Washington found that there are certain characteristics that can be implemented in programs for ELLs to combat inequitable treatment. These recommendations include increasing guidance and leadership for bilingual education within school districts by: (1) improving teacher certification and training within bilingual and ESL education, (2) requiring school districts to gather background and monitoring information on ELLs as they progress through the educational system, (3) providing to school districts standardized exit criteria based on established standards, (4) monitoring exit procedures within schools, (5) evaluating school practices of integrating ELLs into the mainstream, (6) ensuring a minimum of a three-year schedule for monitoring a school district's practices, and (7) formalizing the monitoring process of schools to ensure that educational services are not denied to ELLs.

Johannessen also addressed state funding. She recommended that the state of Washington take into consideration migrant status, socioeconomic status, level of previous education, degree of literacy in the primary language, and length of stay in the United States. In addition, Johannessen described the characteristics that should drive program funding—provision of bilingual education (academic instruction in ESL and the L1), time allocated for L2 language acquisition and learning, time allocated for L1 instruction, and student-to-teacher ratios. She stressed that ELLs require intensive support services, and that the intensity is influenced by their

prior educational experiences. Johannessen assumed that a combination of intensive, high-quality

educational services geared toward students' needs and an extensive amount of time during

which services are offered, would result in a more expedient and successful transition of students

into mainstream courses. Thus, according to Johannessen, the inability of the state to provide

equitable funding reflected its inability to provide adequate leadership to ensure equal

educational opportunities for ELLs already at risk.

Summary

It is important to note that there is no specific formula for school success, just as there is

no single combination of components that will produce an effective school (Lucas et al., 1990).

For many years, the field of ELL education has neglected "central research questions on school

effectiveness that really inform educators in their decision-making. [Rather], policy makers have

often chosen 'Which program is better?' as the central question to be asked" (Thomas & Collier,

1997, p. 19). However, studies conducted on this question do not provide educational decision

makers with crucial information about the long-term consequences of curriculum choices.

Instead, school decision makers must "make high stakes decisions for their students now, with or

without help from the research community" (Thomas & Collier, 1997, p. 19).

Various researchers (e.g., Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990; Lucas & Katz, 1994; Mace-

Matluck et al., 1998; Minicucci & Olsen, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Simons & Connelly,

2000) cite the scarcity of research that exists to inform educators about effective high school

bilingual/ESL programs that provide equal educational opportunities for ELLs. Although the

research conducted thus far mostly informs the field about effective classroom instructional

strategies for ELLs, subsequent studies will help address gaps that continue to exist in the

literature. Studies that examine specific, effective program components that meet the educational

needs of ELLs and address the evaluation process of these programs are essential (August & Hakuta, 1997).

In the current study, an evaluation of an ESL program is conducted by describing how four structural program components address the educational needs of secondary ELLs and provide the students with access to the curriculum. High school ELLs have unique educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—that must be addressed in order to ensure equal educational opportunities for access to the curriculum. In this study, these needs are generally based on Walsh's (1991) four educational needs for ELLs, but they are specifically defined through a compilation of research from Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991). This study proposes to unite premises of research and a high school program to provide insights on how the structural program components of student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses address the educational needs of ELLs. This study is intended to provide educators with specific information regarding elements to include in their own programs for access to the curriculum as well as how to evaluate their own programs for ELLs.

CHAPTER 3 - Methodology

This chapter offers a description of the research methodology used within this study. All aspects regarding the qualitative research methodology are reported in this chapter. This study examined how the structural components of an urban high school ESL program addressed the four educational needs of ELLs. The information within this chapter is organized into the following sections: (1) research design, (2) ethics, (3) role of the researcher, (4) site selection, (5) participants at the site, (6) means of data collection, and (7) means of data analysis.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This study examined four key structural components of a Kansas urban high school ESL program and how they addressed the educational needs of ELLs. A qualitative case study was chosen for this investigative study, as Marshall and Rossman (2006) note that some form of a case study is usually used for studies that focus on a program. This strategy is coined as the most complex strategy in conducting research and can include multiple methods of data collection, such as "interviews, observations, document analysis, and even surveys," (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 56). Because this study focused on the documentation and analysis of a program and involved multiple methods of data collection, a case study was a natural choice.

Simons and Connelly (2000) mention, "Researchers and practitioners have yet to develop an operational definition of what constitutes a 'successful program'" (p. 65). However, this study is valuable, as Crawford maintains that "the key issue is not finding a program that works for all children and all localities, but rather finding a set of program components that works for the children in the community of interest, given the community's goals, demographics and resources" (1999, p. 5). By pre-establishing the primary themed categories and collecting the

perception samples of the structural components, qualitative techniques such as a combination of categorical aggregation and direct interpretation techniques were utilized to compose naturalistic generalizations through a discovery of patterns in the data (Stake, 1995).

Categorical aggregation and direct interpretation are methods of interpretive inquiry that develop new meanings from either an aggregation of instances (i.e., categorical aggregation) or a single instance (i.e., direct interpretation) (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995). According to Stake (1995), patterns are a means to search for meaning, as patterns can be discovered immediately while interviewing, reviewing documents, or observing. Stake continues, "Often, the patterns will be known in advance, drawn from the research questions, serving as a template for the analysis. Sometimes the patterns will emerge unexpectedly from the analysis" (p. 78).

The objective of categorical aggregation and direct interpretation is to ascertain the structure of meaning found in understanding the case—the ESL program—through analyzing text materials or episodes with a sense of pattern development. The assumption is that the discovery of the structure of the meaning found in the patterns tells the researcher something about the program. In this study, categorical aggregation and direct interpretation analysis through patterns allowed the researcher to relate the structure of the meaning found in the relationships between the program structural components and the educational needs of ELLs. The structure of these pattern relationships was the conduit that produced the meaning attached to the participants' perception samples of the program.

In this qualitative study, the researcher focused on how structural components of an ESL program influenced access to the curriculum, by the extent to which educational needs were addressed for ELLs. This was done by exploring the four structural components—student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—of an

ESL program by means of various participant viewpoints and instruments. The secondary research questions were used as a guide to focus the investigation of access to the curriculum through the underlying theme of equity, in the sense of providing equal educational opportunities for ELLs.

Specifically, the recognized definitions of the four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—of ELLs were utilized as a main framework to explore the secondary questions that were based on the four structural components. Furthermore, the tertiary questions within the interview scripts focused on how the four structural components addressed the four educational needs for ELL school success. These elements of the study were explored from the perspectives of administrators, teachers, and students. Overall, the study explored how an ESL program provides equal educational opportunities for secondary ELLs by providing access to the curriculum. Appendix A provides the timeline of the study.

The conceptualization of the questions grew from the specified definitions of the educational needs for ELL school success. These definitions were generated from the compiled research of Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991). These questions were intentionally designed to gain insight from the participants on the degree to which each program component addressed, or neglected to address, the four educational needs discussed in this study. This qualitative study was guided by the following questions:

Overall Question: To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of English language learners (ELLs)?

Secondary Questions:

1. To what extent does student placement in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

2. To what extent do sheltered content courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

3. To what extent does teaming in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

4. To what extent does Spanish for native speakers courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

Appendix B and Appendix C possess more specific questions within the interview scripts that were tailored to address the secondary questions asked of the various interview participants in order to glean the necessary information to answer the questions through data analysis. Together, these questions laid the foundation for an in-depth study, as this qualitative investigation sought to expand upon limited research regarding the educational programming of ELLs.

In the current study, the researcher desired to develop an understanding of how a high school ESL program provides access to the curriculum for ELLs by addressing their educational needs. An understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of program services then might be utilized to enhance the ESL program decision-making processes. This study poses questions for educators as they seek effective teaching practices for ELLs. According to NCLB, ELLs are "required to learn the same content and pass the same assessments as other students" (Capps et al., 2005, p. 1). This presents a dilemma for students, educators, and schools, as schools with large populations of ELLs must "meet performance standards for all groups [of students] or face

the interventions required by NCLB" (Capps et al., p. 2). Therefore, it was appropriate to use a qualitative approach for the overall design of this study to explore how four structural components of an ESL program address the educational needs of ELLs for equitable access to the curriculum.

To conduct the qualitative analysis within the research design, NVivo 8 software was used in addition to (a) an ESL Needs Rubric based on the four educational needs of ELLs and (b) Perception Grid Surveys. NVivo 8 is a qualitative research program that was developed by Tom Richards and Lyn Richards and is distributed by QSR international. The NUDIST software program, developed in 1981, was the first program developed by Richards and Richards and is the initial precursor to NVivo 8, as various other software versions were developed between 1981 and 2008 (QSR International, 2009). Miles and Weitzman (1994) discuss choosing computer programs for qualitative data analysis and mention that the NUDIST program was designed to assist with coding and retrieving information and allows one "to make connections between codes (categories of information); to develop higher-order classifications and categories; to formulate propositions or assertions, implying a conceptual structure that fits the data; and/or to test such propositions to determine whether they apply" (p. 312). Thus, utilizing categories within the analysis in this study data assisted in making connections between the structural components and the educational needs of ELLs.

Ethics

Prior to beginning data collection, the researcher submitted the appropriate human subjects forms to the university for review, and these were approved. Additionally, the researcher made revisions to questions for the participants, as the researcher wanted permission to learn more about a specific topic, or the questions needed to be redesigned to gain meaningful

information from particular participants, given their unique background knowledge on the topics.

This process required a thoughtful analysis of each participant's background knowledge. The

university review board approved these revisions. There were neither any direct benefits to

participants nor any direct risks associated with the design. Indirect benefits included the

possibility of a sense of satisfaction as a result of having the opportunity to voice one's opinions.

Risks included minimal discomfort from being asked to be critical of the school's ESL program

and breach of confidentiality.

Role of the Researcher

The researcher has been an ESL teacher at the school of study since 1997 and has taken

an active role in influencing the decision-making processes of the ESL program at this school.

Specifically, the researcher has been an active participant in many activities that were explored

within the study, such as team meetings and scheduling ELLs into classes. Therefore, a natural

bias exists, because the researcher was a participant observer and had a vested interest in the

program. Glesne and Peshkin (1992) caution about studying people or a site in which one has a

vested interest, as expectations for data collection may severely compromise the value of the

data; individuals might slant the information to what the researcher wants to hear, withhold

information, or provide politically risky knowledge for an "inside" investigator.

The issue of bias was addressed through triangulation measures, such as data source

triangulation, investigator triangulation, and member checks, and is further addressed within the

section of this chapter that discusses triangulation of the data. However, there were several

benefits of the researcher being a participant observer, as there was automatic access to the

school site. In addition, the researcher possessed an in-depth knowledge of the history of the ESL

program. The researcher already knew which people to contact with regard to identifying

interviewees, the location of the historical documents, and the logistical processes of

maneuvering through the building and gaining access to information. Overall, the researcher, as

the participant observer, utilized this background knowledge of the ESL program to maximize

insights into collecting data, interpreting data, and making natural generalizations from the data

in order to present valuable findings to add to the research base.

Researcher interest in the current study has evolved through experiences in advocating

for ELLs in ESL program decision making, in student placement (scheduling), and in teaching

sheltered content courses for over a decade. The foundation for this study was the researcher's

interest in providing access to the curriculum through offering equal educational opportunities

for ELLs so that their educational needs might be met. The researcher has a need to advocate for

equity, to discover and provide effective educational practices for ELLs, and to relate those

practices to program development. This need has been a driving force behind the researcher's

personal and professional quest for educating ELLs.

Site Selection

The site selected for this study was an urban high school in Kansas that serves a large

population of ELLs. All study participants are currently involved, or have been involved, in

some fashion within the school of study—either as a student or staff member. The first criterion

in selecting a site for a qualitative study should be to maximize what can be learned (Stake,

1995). The researcher had access to the school site and insider knowledge about the ESL

program. Thus, selecting Amos Heights was a natural choice for the study in order to maximize

what could be learned.

Most of the ELLs in this study are from Mexico, but some are from other Latin American

countries and various African countries. Of the approximate 1,155 total students enrolled at

Amos Heights, 21.7 % are designated as African American, 55.1% as Hispanic, 19.4% as White, 3.8% as Other, and 13.8% are classified as ELL. However, due to the transient student population, the actual enrollment number fluctuates throughout the year. For further clarification, the 13.8% figure only includes ESL codes 1, 2, and 3, which describes ELLs who are eligible to receive direct ESL services.

Code 1 students are new arrivals to the United States with no or limited background in the English language. Code 2 and Code 3 students are limited language proficient students that range from beginning, to intermediate, to advanced English language proficiency levels. However, it leaves out code 4 students who are on monitor status and code 8 students who are former ELLs that have exited the program. Though a student might be exited from the program, research has shown that it can take up to 10 years for an ELL to reach academic language proficiency (Thomas & Collier, 1997). Therefore, the pool of ELLs is actually larger than the numbers suggest, because many are either on monitor status or have exited the ESL program and could use further assistance with academic language. This coincides with the fact that the building has a high Hispanic population of 55.1%. Many of these students have been in ESL programs at lower grade levels, or they are second-generation immigrants who have heard Spanish spoken in the home.

The school uses a modified block scheduling system. The site serves all Code 1, 2, and 3 students either through direct services with ESL endorsed teachers or those working on their ESL endorsement through a state accredited university program. Students receive their codes through the district based upon information and scores collected by Team 7 when the students are enrolled at the site.

The Team 7 scheduler then becomes responsible for creating schedules for these students. Students with the designation of Code 1 typically are scheduled into two or three sections of Beginning ESL courses, sheltered science, sheltered math, and elective courses. Those students may be clustered in physical education, art, music, or enrolled in a Spanish for native speakers course. If the Code 1 student has sufficient skills, he or she may be enrolled in an ESL Read 180 class. At the end of one school year, district policy mandates that these students automatically become Code 2 students, regardless of whether they have progressed in the language.

Depending upon their language skills, students with the designation of Code 2 take ESL Read 180 classes. In addition, they begin the transition into mainstream classes where they usually are clustered and have the services of a bilingual aide or a service learner classroom assistant. Code 3 students continue the transition into mainstream classes, though the lower English proficient students continue to be served by Team 7 teachers in some manner—such as with Advanced ESL Read 180 or sheltered English 3. These students also frequently are clustered with the services of a bilingual aide or a service learner in the mainstream classroom. Regardless of students' schedules, Team 7 continues to monitor the progress and grades for Code 2 and Code 3 students that are primarily mainstreamed. This allows the team to intervene and work with the teacher of any struggling student in danger of failing a class due to language acquisition issues.

School success is encompassed within the background of this study through dropout rates, graduation rates, and postsecondary pursuit. Previous research studies have defined school success in quantitative forms through dropout rates, attendance rates, postsecondary education attendance, and/or test scores (Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990). However, the building in this study does not disaggregate this data for ELLs. To gain a general sense of this data, the

researcher used the numbers for Hispanic students by gender. Though this is not the most precise method of gathering data for ELLs, this will provide a sense of how implementing ESL program components might affect Hispanic ELL students.

The researcher began with the 1996-97 school year for baseline data for background information. This was one year prior to the researcher's arrival at the school and prior to the implementation of the four key structural components. The 1996-97 school report card revealed that there was a 33% Hispanic male dropout rate, while Hispanic females had a dropout rate of 23.5%. Ten years later, the 2006-07 school report card revealed the Hispanic male dropout rate to be 4.5% and the Hispanic female dropout rate to be 5.8%. These numbers illustrate a 28.5% decrease in dropout rates for Hispanic males and a 17.7% decrease for Hispanic females. The aggregate of both groups reveals a 23.44% decrease over a ten-year period.

Graduation rates revealed that 75.86% of Hispanic males, and 85.19% of Hispanic females, graduated in May of 1997. Ten years later, in May of 2007, Hispanic males graduated at a rate of 88.24% and Hispanic females graduated at a rate of 93.75%. This depicts a 12.38% growth in the rate of Hispanic males graduating and an 8.56% growth in the rate of Hispanic females graduating, over a ten-year period. The overall totals reveal a 10.55% increase in graduation rate over the same period.

The postsecondary pursuit of the 1996-97 graduating class found that 12 of 22 Hispanic males (54%) pursued postsecondary education, while 12 of 23 Hispanic females (52%) pursued postsecondary opportunities. The 2006-07 school year found that 26 of 45 Hispanic males (57%) went on to pursue postsecondary education, and 28 of 45 (62%) of Hispanic females pursued postsecondary opportunities. For males, this depicts a 3% increase; however, there were 14 more students in the 2006-07 school year that continued to postsecondary education. The females

showed a 10% increase over the ten-year period, with 16 more females pursuing postsecondary educational opportunities.

Overall, school success—as shown through the significant increases in Hispanic graduation rates and postsecondary pursuits, and in the decrease in dropout rates for Hispanic students—might be attributed to implementation of stronger ESL program components over time. It is difficult to be precisely accurate in directly relating this finding to school success for ELLs, because the data is not disaggregated by ESL code and does not include other ethnicities. However, this data can serve as a reason to select this school for the study, as the findings reveal a potential for ELL school success. This provides the premise that the structural components are significant enough to explore and that the findings are valuable, as they reveal how structural components of an ESL program can address the educational needs of ELLs for school success.

Participants at the Site

Data was collected from an urban high school in Kansas. The study relied heavily on human experience and perceptions. Five student interviews were held, along with two administrator interviews, and six teacher interviews. The following descriptions depict the interview participants in detail.

Students

Five junior level students were selected to participate in interviews in order to get snapshots of student perspectives on the ESL program. Purposeful sampling was implemented, as specific parameters were utilized to select students for interviewing (Creswell, 2007). One piece of the historical data used in this study was the district's reading assessment known as the Northwest Evaluation Association's Measure of Academic Progress (NWEA—MAP, referred to simply as the MAP assessment in the school of study). After reviewing the historical data from

the 2007-08 school year, a pattern emerged involving increased MAP scores for ELLs who were simultaneously enrolled in a sheltered English II course, Spanish for native speakers course, and an ESL Read 180 course.

The researcher chose to interview students from this particular pool of students who were placed in the previously stated courses. The researcher selected both the girl and the boy who increased their test scores the most, a girl in the middle range, and one girl and one boy who had decreased in MAP scores. The students also were chosen based on their exposure to the ESL program components, so that they would have prior experience to draw from in providing valuable student perceptions in this study. In addition, students' more advanced English language proficiency was helpful, as the interview questions and responses did not have to be interpreted. A disadvantage to using these criteria for a sampling selection was that all the students were Spanish speakers, as there are no other native language courses offered in the school to assist ELLs with L1 literacy. Consequently, only Hispanic student voices were heard, while African and Asian student perspectives were neglected. The students involved in this study were Naomi Pena, Pedro Fuentes, Roberto Iverson, Rosa Lugo, and Tania Iglesias (Note: All participant names in this study are pseudonyms, for purposes of confidentiality.) All of the students are from Mexico. Naomi first arrived in the United States in 2006; Pedro arrived in 2003; Roberto arrived in 2003; Rosa arrived in 2006; and Tania arrived in 2004. Naomi and Pedro had the highest MAP score gains, Rosa scored in the middle range, and Tania and Roberto had the poorest MAP score performances from this selected group of students.

Staff

Perspectives were gained from a group of current and former staff members—including administrators, ESL teachers, and content teachers serving ELLs—who have a range of

knowledge of the ESL program in this study. Information gathered from three key informants enhanced this study. Specifically, interviews with a retired administrator, a current ESL teacher, and a retired teacher of Spanish for native speakers courses offered historical perspectives on the development of the program from the beginning stages of the process.

The administrators involved were Dr. Garcia and Dr. Juarez. Dr. Garcia is a retired male Hispanic principal of the school in this study. Spanish is his first language, as he was born in a Latin American country. Dr. Garcia began the process of implementing sheltered content courses that are required core content classes for graduation at Amos Heights. These classes included English I, II, and III; Algebra I, II, and III; Biology I; Physical Science; Chemistry; World History; and American History. In addition, he is credited with initiating the Spanish for native speakers course offerings in the school of study. His vision of providing access to the curriculum for ELLs was accomplished through his perception of how the budget at the building level could be manipulated through prioritizing the resources available to the school as district-level support waned. There were no extra allotments of teachers designated by the district for mainstream content instruction.

The other administrator interviewed was Dr. Juarez, who is also a retired male Hispanic principal, but he was the active principal in this study during the data collection process. Spanish is his first language, as he was born in Mexico, but moved to the U.S. at an early age with his family. He did not share the same vision as the former principal, as far as the extent to which sheltered content courses were offered. Dr. Juarez felt that the responsibility to provide more support for ELLs in regard to mainstream content course offerings should come from the district level. However, he did allow for the following sheltered content courses—English III; Algebra I

and II; Advanced Algebra II and III; Biology I; Physical Science; Consumer Resource Management; and Spanish for native speakers I and II.

All teacher interviews involved teachers who were officially a part of ESL Team 7 during the 2008-09 school year, with the exception of Mr. Rodriguez and Ms. Lane. Team 7 met twice a week during a common planning period to discuss student issues and perform required and essential program tasks for student monitoring. Ms. Rivers is a Caucasian teacher, who is currently an ESL teacher and team leader. She began her ESL teaching career by teaching English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in the Middle East for 12 years. She took a break to raise her children then began her teaching career again. She has since taught at Amos Heights for thirteen years. Ms. Rivers has worked in tandem with the researcher since 1997 in teaching and advocating for ELL student needs. She taught ESL Read 180 for intermediate to advanced students as well as a sheltered English III course for ELLs.

Ms. Lane is a retired Caucasian teacher of Spanish for native speakers courses and of sheltered English content courses for ELLs. She taught in the Amos Heights school district for over 30 years and was a member of ESL Team 7 in this study before she retired in the Spring of 2008. Initially, she was a mainstream Spanish teacher, but Dr. Garcia was instrumental in placing her with Team 7 and convincing the district-level administration to increase the staff allocation so that her position was paid for with the district ESL resources.

Mr. Bond is a Caucasian science teacher who has taken university courses towards an ESL teaching endorsement. He has taught science at Amos Heights for over a decade and has served on Team 7 since its inception. Mr. Bond was allocated to provide three sections of sheltered Physical Science courses for ELLs, while the remainder of his schedule was designated for mainstream courses. Biology I will be offered during the 2009-10 school year, as Mr. Bond is

on a yearly rotating basis in providing Physical Science and Biology I, so that more sections of each course can be offered each year.

Ms. Hermosa is a Hispanic first-year teacher (2008-09 year) who is actually a former ELL of Amos Heights. Her first language is Spanish, as she arrived in the U.S. from Mexico in seventh grade. She replaced Ms. Lane upon her retirement. However, ESL course offerings were reduced by district-level management, as sheltered English I and II courses could no longer be offered. Therefore, Ms. Hermosa only taught Beginning ESL and Spanish for native speakers courses, but not sheltered English I and II courses.

The sheltered math allocation for the 2008-09 school year was divided between Mr. Rodriguez—who has never served on Team 7—and Mr. Track, who has served as a sheltered math teacher on Team 7 since its inception. For the 2008-09 school year, Mr. Rodriguez (who is a mature Hispanic math teacher) taught sheltered Algebra I and II for ELLs as well as mainstream courses. He also knows Spanish and utilizes the language in the classroom to explain concepts. Mr. Track (who is a seasoned Caucasian math teacher) taught a sheltered advanced Algebra II/III course for ELLs and other mainstream courses.

MEANS OF DATA COLLECTION

The data collected for this study informed the comparison between student and staff perceptions of how an ESL program addresses the educational needs of ELLs. Data for the study was obtained through interview responses to designated questions, classroom observations, and Perception Grid Surveys. These three primary methods of data collection were utilized to gather information on how the structural components addressed the educational needs of ELLs.

All interviews were conducted in a one-on-one setting, tape-recorded, and transcribed verbatim, including the researcher's questions and comments as well as responses from the

participants. The transcriptions totaled 286 pages. In addition, field note snapshots of pertinent information were taken during team meetings. The Perception Grid Surveys were distributed to all interview participants at the end of each interview. Each participant was asked if he or she was willing to complete the survey to reveal his or her opinion about how the educational needs were met by each structural component of the ESL program, and all agreed to fill out the survey. Classroom observations never were recorded on videotape or audiotape. Field notes and the ESL Needs Rubric for classroom snapshot observations were the only data gathering techniques used in the observations. Archival documents were collected whenever they seemed pertinent.

Interviews

The perceptions used for analysis within the current study were derived from transcripts of interviews with staff—including two administrators and six teachers—and five current students. The student perceptions were obtained from study participants who all responded to the same script of structured questions pertaining to the structural components (i.e., student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses) of the ESL program in the study and the extent to which the components addressed their educational (i.e., social, affective, linguistic, and academic) needs.

Specifically, all questions related, in some fashion, to the Overall Question: "To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of English language learners (ELLs)?" The additional interview questions designed to answer the overall question were heavily based upon the definitions of the educational needs that were derived from Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991). These questions were intended to elicit meaningful perceptions tied to the participants' own life experiences. Designing the questions around the

four educational needs was done to reveal how the ESL program promotes access to the curriculum for ELLs.

The staff had questions similar to those of the students; however, the questions were tailored to fit their viewpoint as program decision makers and implementers. One retired administrator and two teachers who have in-depth knowledge of the ESL program since 1997 were considered to be special informants. These participants gave additional background knowledge and insights into the program.

At times, important themes became repetitious during the course of an interview due to the researcher's pursuit with the designated questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Participants could confirm what was said when topics were repeated. Yet, problems could arise from asking repetitious or closed questions. When this problem arose, the interviewing procedure allowed for clarifications or follow-up questions at a later time. Specifically, an additional student question was submitted to the review board for approval after the interview with Naomi Pena. Thus, the approved follow-up question was asked of Naomi at a second session that merely involved the follow-up question.

All participants were given ample time to answer the questions, as they could take as long as they needed to formulate their responses. Each participant was interviewed one time. Student participant interviews lasted from 30 to 45 minutes each. The staff interviews ranged from 45 to 90 minutes each. The three key informant interviews took the longest because they had more questions to answer due to their knowledge of the historical context of the program. Interviews were formal in the sense that the researcher had a set of regimented questions prepared related to the four structural components and how they addressed the four educational needs of ELLs. The

participants were informed of the purpose of the interviews and were assured of their

confidentiality and the anonymity of their responses.

Classroom Snapshot Observations

According to Stake (1995), observations pertinent to a study's issues are necessary to

increase professional understanding of the case, so a few opportunities should be selected to

provide better familiarity with the case. Thus, classroom observations were conducive for

gathering information that was a true reflection of the sheltered content course and Spanish for

native speakers course components. This natural setting of the instructional environment was one

of the key elements of the qualitative study design.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) proffer that a natural setting allows for phenomena (i.e.,

intersections of program structural components and educational needs) that siphon their meaning

from the setting's context. Furthermore, the natural setting allowed the observations to capture

the realities of program components within the world in which they exist, which is bound by

context and time (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Therefore, the educational needs of ELLs found in the

sheltered content course and Spanish for native speakers course components were studied within

the relationship of the context and time that supports their existence. An ESL Needs Rubric

designed and utilized by the researcher and was literally based on the definitions of the four

educational needs of ELLs, drawing from Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier

(1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991). Refer to Appendix D for the ESL Needs Rubric for

classroom snapshot observations.

Before the observations, the researcher spoke with each teacher, seeking permission to

observe his or her classroom. The researcher also sent an e-mail to each teacher describing the

observation protocol along with an attachment of the actual ESL Needs Rubric. Teachers were

reassured that the observations were strictly to explore how the educational needs of ELLs were addressed during a short observation time period, that this was not a formal evaluation of their teaching styles, and that their identities would continue to be kept confidential.

Ms. Lane (the retired Spanish for native speakers teacher and former Team 7 member) and the researcher performed the classroom observations in tandem, so that peer review could be implemented for trustworthiness. Both observers had their own ESL Needs Rubric to complete for each observation. There were eight observations conducted, and observation times ranged from 14 to 29 minutes each, for a total of 184 minutes, or 3.06 hours for each observer. The overall average time for each observation was 23 minutes—though there was a target observation time of 20 minutes. Observation times varied for such reasons as stopping the observation early due to no change in activity (e.g., students were working on worksheets) to staying longer in the classroom to observe students in a lesson activity after teacher lecture time. The observations were conducted over the course of two separate days: January 23 and January 29, 2009.

Classes observed included the following: Team 7 sheltered content courses of Physical Science, Advanced Algebra II/III, Beginning ESL, Spanish for Native Speakers, English III, and ESL Read 180. Ms. Hermosa and Ms. Rivers were both observed twice, in order to view more sheltered classes. Specifically, Ms. Hermosa taught Beginning ESL and Spanish for Native Speakers, and Ms. Rivers taught an English III course and ESL Read 180 courses. Two observations were performed in classes that did not have Team 7 teachers. One of these classes was Algebra I, a designated sheltered content course for ELLs. The other non-Team 7 class was American History; it was considered to be a "clustered" class. The term "clustered" is used when

a group, or a cluster, of ELLs is in a mainstream class and a bilingual aide is there to assist the students in learning the content.

During the classroom observations, the observers were non-participating observers and essentially were "invisible." They did not interject nor attempt to initiate interaction with the teachers or students. The students within the classrooms being observed were accustomed to visitors for a variety of reasons. Occasionally, students would ask why the observers were there. The observers merely replied that they wanted to see how students learned in their classes. Afterwards, some teachers asked, "Did you get what you needed?" and the observers reassured them that the observation went well.

Perception Grid Surveys

The Perception Grid Survey (see Appendix E) was designed by the researcher to gain an overall assessment of how the participants perceived the educational needs of ELLs were being met within the ESL program. This survey was based on Walsh's (1991) four educational needs, as they relate to the four structural components explored in this study. Within each educational need's category, participants assigned numbers to each structural component, using a Likert scale format to choose a number from 1 to 3 to reveal their perception of how each component addressed each educational need. Refer to Appendix F for Perception Grid Survey results.

Data Collection Processes

The data collection process drew upon multiple sources of information, such as archival documents, interviews, and observations, to gain a clear picture of the ESL program in this study over the past 10 years. Yin (2009) recommends collecting the following six types of information: interviews, documentation, direct observations, participant observations, physical artifacts, and archival records. The forms of information utilized for this study included interviews, direct

observations, documentation (in the form of surveys), participant observations, and archival records. Physical artifacts were excluded.

Interviews were used as a primary source of data collection because they can offer personal insights into the actual experience of a program. The researcher gained different perspectives by interviewing three different types of people: students, administrators, and teachers. These interactions allowed the researcher to learn from people, instead of merely studying people (Spradley, 1979). In fact, Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest that interaction is the best vehicle to achieve purposeful sampling. The sampling for this study was purposeful, as the participant-observer knew which staff members were familiar with the ESL program. In addition, the researcher had first-hand knowledge of students from previous classroom experience and knew of their varied reading test performances, so a cross-section of student perspectives could be gained. Purposeful selection of participants provided rich perspectives regarding ELLs' access to the curriculum at this school.

Interviews were the primary means of collecting in-depth perception samples, whereas Perception Grid Surveys were used to obtain a general overview of participant perceptions regarding the structural components. Direct observations and participant observations, along with the previously stated forms of data collection (e.g., archival records), were used to explore the current program status. All these data were combined to create a pool of information from which to analyze the ESL program and extrapolate valuable information to reveal which program supports were beneficial in helping secondary ELLs gain access to the curriculum.

MEANS OF DATA ANALYSIS

After the program perception samples were collected, data were analyzed using a qualitative approach. Categorical aggregation and direct interpretation (Stake, 1995) were used

to study program perception samples of study participants from all data instruments. The purpose

of this dissertation was to explore four key structural components of an urban high school ESL

program and describe how these components addressed the educational needs of ELLs to

promote access to the curriculum.

Overview of the Data

The initial layer of analysis involved a thorough review of all interview perception

samples in the transcripts. During the first reading of the transcripts, the researcher performed a

"read through" of all transcripts to gain an overall sense of the data (Creswell, 2007) and

highlighted initial surprises in the responses. During the second reading of the transcripts, the

researcher highlighted the educational needs addressed in the transcript for each question and

then designated hand-written coding categories in the margins (e.g., "prior knowledge") next to

the highlighted areas. A yellow highlighter was used to indicate a social educational need, pink

was used for an affective need, green for a linguistic need, and blue for an academic need. This

was done for all student interview transcripts, as well as for transcripts of interviews with Mr.

Track, Mr. Bond, and Dr. Garcia. The remaining interview transcripts were strictly coded within

NVivo 8. The previously mentioned transcripts—from all students, Mr. Track, Mr. Bond, and

Dr. Garcia—were coded a second time within the NVivo 8 program during the third reading.

The initial coding categories were based on structural coding, as this form of coding is

best suited for interview transcripts and for concepts that are specifically related to the interview

questions, as in a semi-structured or standardized interview (Saldaña, 2009). These categories

were based on the educational needs of ELLs (up to that point in the analysis), and the researcher

placed these categories into a table format. The table included the categories (i.e., social needs,

affective needs, linguistic needs, and academic needs) and examples of the codes assigned to them based on the definitions of the educational needs.

Additional coding categories were added, as necessary, throughout each subsequent analysis of all interview perception samples from each participant group; thus, emerging data prompted the development of categorization codes. Stake (1995) suggests that categorical aggregation allows the researcher to view a collection of instances in the data and for issue-relevant data to emerge. The finalized coding categories were formed throughout the NVivo 8 process. Each structural component—student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—had its own coding categories based on each educational need category. Since these coding categories were computerized, complete words were utilized rather than abbreviations.

After the coding process was completed within NVivo 8, queries were developed based on each participant group, each program structural component, and the coding categories found within those components. The query results were displayed within a matrix format. The matrix revealed the number of times a coding category appeared within each structural component for each participant group. Thus, counting, as mentioned by Miles and Huberman (1994), was utilized for analysis. Counting allowed the researcher to view all results and focus on the top two categories within each structural component that included all three participant groups, so they could be selected for in-depth analysis as the results were displayed.

Matrices were used to extrapolate patterns that emerged from the data, as each structural component had its own analysis sheet that included discovered results. These matrices/tables provided the means for categorical aggregation and direct interpretations to occur, as conclusions were drawn through the patterns and themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995). Finally,

naturalistic generalizations were developed (Creswell, 2007; Stake, 1995). The data analysis allowed for these generalizations to transpire. These generalizations were intended to inform readers of the study data and illustrate how the findings of the study might apply to a broader audience.

Categorical Aggregation and Direct Interpretation

According to Stake (1995), there are four forms of data analysis and interpretation within case study research—categorical aggregation, direct interpretation, patterns, and naturalistic generalizations. Categorical aggregation derives meanings from a compilation of instances. Direct interpretation draws meanings from isolated instances within the data. Patterns involve searches for correspondence between categories to establish meaning. Naturalistic generalizations relate to developing conclusions from the data through the researcher's personal connection.

Categorical aggregation is utilized with the interviews, classroom observations, and Perception Grid Surveys. Direct interpretation is implemented when specific examples are highlighted within the interviews and classroom observations. The primary form of data analysis and interpretation is found within patterns—"This correspondence might take the form of a table, possibly a 2 x 2 table, showing the relationship between two categories" (Creswell, 2007, p. 163). Many tables were created to interpret the data, along with matrices within the NVivo 8 software. Miles and Huberman (1994) offer that within matrices, "the most frequent, basic tactics we have seen used for drawing first conclusions are noting patterns, themes; making contrasts, comparisons; clustering; and counting" (p. 243). Thus, matrices were developed and patterns were identified through categorical aggregation and direct interpretation.

NVivo 8 Analysis: Interview Perception Samples of Four Structural Components

Computer software programs provide a means to organize the data so that the researcher can easily and expediently locate material and accumulate it in one place. In addition, when searching for themes, segments of text that pertain to a single theme, or idea, can be tagged to the appropriate theme. Afterwards, information can be retrieved within the node, or category, and formatted/printed in various ways to facilitate sharing of the data (Creswell, 2007).

This protocol was followed, as items from the interview transcripts were labeled under the designated theme, or parent node. Initially, parent nodes were created based on the overall themes of the structural components and educational needs. For example, the first theme, or parent node, was Placement—Social Needs. Underneath each of the parent nodes were child nodes. These child nodes represented the more specific coding categories based on the definitions of the educational needs.

Then the transcripts were coded through clustering the data into the coding categories. Clustering occurs when attempting "to understand a phenomenon better by grouping and then conceptualizing objects that have similar patterns or characteristics" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 249). This was primarily done within the interview analysis, as clustering occurred (a) within the process of coding the data in NVivo 8 and (b) when tables were created to reveal the interview results based on the information gathered from the NVivo 8 software. Educational needs were used to analyze how each structural component addressed the educational needs of ELLs. The researcher then promptly retrieved and printed out information during the analysis process, according to the structural component being analyzed.

Initially, the researcher explored the student interviews by manually coding the transcripts to become familiar with the coding process. Thus, coding categories were manually developed, based on the educational needs definitions, and implemented into the manual coding

process. After manually coding the student data, the researcher imported all the interview transcriptions into the NVivo 8 project database.

The researcher coded the student data a second time, in the NVivo 8 software, through topic coding. Richards (2009) describes that topic coding "allocates passages to topics. It usually involves little interpretation. You are putting the data 'where they belong'. . . The topic coding may also be a first step to more interpretive work" (p.92). After the topic coding was performed, queries were run within NVivo 8 to form matrices and reveal patterns with the assigned demographic attributes of administrators, teachers, and students in relation to the coding categories (that were based on the definitions of the educational needs). Information was gathered from the NVivo 8 matrices and exported into preliminary EXCEL spreadsheets in order to create tables for analysis. Then the data was interpreted through pattern seeking and was placed into final EXCEL spreadsheets for organizational and display purposes. Finally, naturalistic generalizations were made from the results displayed within the final EXCEL tables.

ESL Needs Rubric: Analysis of Classroom Snapshot Observations of Sheltered Content Course and Spanish for Native Speakers Components

The second phase of the data analysis involved exploring the classroom snapshot observations for the sheltered content course and Spanish for native speakers course components. The ESL Needs Rubric that was created by the researcher, based on the definitions of Walsh's (1991) four educational needs within this study, along with categorical aggregation and direct interpretations were used for this phase of analysis.

The observers went through each point of evidence under each educational need—social, affective, linguistic, and academic. They marked a 0 for "Not Applicable"—N/A (some items were not relevant to the course, e.g., formally developing L1 language skills), a 1 for "No"—the item was not observed, a 2 for "Somewhat"—the item minimally occurred, or a 3 for "Yes"—the

item was solidly observed. Eight criteria describe the social educational need: (1) native language affirmed in the classroom, (2) interact with peers in native language, (3) language courses in native language, (4) native language for academic development, (5) use of students' prior knowledge, (6) interact with ELL peers in English, (7) safe setting (meaning no ridicule due to limited language proficiency), and (8) intellectual and emotional fairness (Thomas & Collier, 1997; Walsh, 1991).

Ten criteria describe the affective educational need: (1) responsive to cultural and personal diversity, (2) high expectations for all learners, (3) actively involved learners, (4) use of alternate groupings, (5) constructivist reading and writing activities, (6) ample practice and careful corrections, (7) focus on relevant background knowledge, (8) native language support, (9) meaningful content and activities for students, and (10) roles in the classroom for family and community members (Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Graves, 1995).

Two sets of criteria describe the linguistic educational need of developing language proficiency—one set of the same criteria is for English and the other set is for Spanish, which was the native language used for the purposes of this study. The criteria included in the first set are: (1) reading in English, (2) writing in English, (3) listening in English, (4) speaking in English, (5) phonology (pronunciation), (6) semantics (analyzing the interpretation of the meaning of words), (7) pragmatics (analyzing language in situational context), (8) syntax (grammar rules and sentence formation), (9) vocabulary (developed in content area), and (10) discourse (academic discussions). The second set includes the same criteria, only the Spanish language is substituted for English (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Twelve criteria describe the academic educational need: (1) appropriate placement of students; (2) content course for graduation; (3) cross-curricular concepts; lesson modifications in

90

the form of (4) visuals, (5) graphic organizers, (6) vocabulary introduction, (7) starter sentences, (8) audio support, (9) examples of production, (10) modeling; (11) native language for comprehension; and (12) bilingual aides (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

After the observations, tables were created in an EXCEL format so the researcher could "aggregate frequencies, and find patterns" (Stake, 1995, p. 78). In some instances, the researcher used direct interpretation, asking herself what a particular single episode meant within the context (Stake, 1995). The researcher created tables based upon the actual number of points gleaned within an educational need, and these points were eventually converted into percentages for data review.

Each criterion within each educational need could receive up to a ranking of 3 points. The total number of actual points of evidence were added together for each educational need category. Then, the total number possible was calculated based on the number of criteria for each educational need. To attain more accurate results, each case that had a 0 (N/A) ranking was not calculated into the total points possible. Next, the total number of actual points of evidence was divided by the possible points of evidence for each educational need category, so percentages could be attained in order to investigate the data for patterns. The specifics of this data analysis are discussed in detail in Chapter 4.

Refer to Appendix G for the total results found for the sheltered content courses component within only Team 7 classroom observations for each educational need. This display depicts an aggregation of the data as it relates to the extent to which the sheltered content courses structural component addresses the educational needs of ELLs within each Team 7 sheltered content classroom observation. These teachers are considered to be the primary providers of educational services within the ESL program. The Algebra I and American History observations

were removed from this display, because the teachers were not on Team 7 and the American History class was not a pure sheltered content course.

The Spanish for native speakers courses component was analyzed on a smaller scale. This was due to the fact that the Spanish for native speakers courses structural component was part of the more general sheltered content courses component. Thus, results for the sheltered content courses component included the Spanish for native speakers courses component, along with the other classroom observations. However, as the Spanish for native speakers courses component was its own category, discussion of this component solely included classroom observation results from the Spanish for Native Speakers class.

Perception Grid Surveys: Analysis of Overall Program Perceptions

The third phase of the analysis involved exploring the overall program perceptions of all participants through Perception Grid Surveys, in conjunction with categorical aggregation and direct interpretations. For this phase of analysis, the structural components of the ESL program were analyzed by using a Perception Grid Survey designed by the researcher, based on Walsh's (1991) four educational needs (i.e., social, affective, linguistic, and academic) for ELL school success. Then, the researcher formed EXCEL tables to aggregate the data so that patterns could be detected and direct interpretations could be made (Stake, 1995).

The educational needs were placed in a grid format that also included the four structural components (i.e., student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses) of the ESL program in this study (see Figure 1). The grid was utilized to determine the perceptions of the extent to which each structural component addressed each educational need within the school of study.

Figure 1—Perception Grid Survey

Linguistic	Social	Academic	Affective
Placement	Placement	Placement	Placement
1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3
Sheltered	Sheltered	Sheltered	Sheltered
1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3
Teaming	Teaming	Teaming	Teaming
1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3
Spanish for Native Speakers	Spanish for Native Speakers	Spanish for Native Speakers	Spanish for Native Speakers
1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3	1 – 2 – 3

After the surveys were completed, the researcher created tables in an EXCEL format in order to "categorize properties and make tallies in some intuitive aggregation" (Stake, 1995, p. 74). Thus, the search for patterns continued, as categorical aggregation and direct interpretation greatly depend on patterns (Stake, 1995). The researcher created tables based upon the actual number of points tallied from each participant's responses within each educational need category.

Each educational need category has a maximum of 12 possible total points. For example, within the linguistic need, the maximum ranking of 3 is multiplied by 4 structural components in order to arrive at 12 total possible points. Then, the total actual points for each category, divided by the total possible points for each category, reveals a percentage. These percentages were utilized for pattern analysis. The process of analyzing the Perception Grid Survey data is detailed

in Chapter 4. Appendix F exhibits overall Perception Grid Survey results combining all participant groups.

Between-Instrument Analysis

The fourth and final phase of data analysis involved the determination of differences and similarities between interview results, classroom snapshot observation results, and Perception Grid Survey results that characterized the addressing of ELL educational needs. The researcher conducted this analysis by exploring and explaining the differences and similarities between interview, classroom observation, and survey results. A table was created to display the perception results for each structural component within each instrument for analysis. The results focused on which educational needs possessed the highest and lowest percentages of appearances within each structural component. The highest percentage indicated that the educational need, within that particular structural component, was perceived to have been addressed the most, while the lowest percentage indicated that the educational need, within that particular structural component, was perceived to have been addressed the least.

In addition, structural components were analyzed from highest to lowest within each educational need. The highest percentage within each category indicated that the structural component was perceived to have addressed that particular educational need the most (out of all four structural components). The lowest percentage indicated that the structural component was perceived to have addressed that particular educational need the least.

Trustworthiness

Trustworthiness involves the criteria in a qualitative study that increase credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability of findings in the quest for truth (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). To combat the issue of researcher bias and to promote trustworthiness,

triangulation was the primary technique of choice. Triangulation is defined as, "the act of bringing more than one source of data to bear on a single point" (Marshall & Rossman, 2006, p. 202). Jick (1979) states that triangulation is a concept based on the assumption that any bias that is found in specific data sources, methods, or investigators would be neutralized when used together with other data sources, methods, or investigators.

This study demonstrated triangulation through the use of multiple resources including: archival documents, participant observations, surveys, and interviews from varying viewpoints—students, administrators, and teachers. Each source of information was used to view four chosen structural components—student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—in an urban high school ESL program. Specifically, the sources were used to view how those four structural components promoted access to the curriculum by addressing the four educational needs of ELLs (social, affective, linguistic, and academic).

Trustworthiness through triangulation also was established through member checking that was conducted by the researcher and Ms. Lane, a retired teacher who was the former Spanish for native speakers and sheltered English teacher at the school in this study. This process was completed through Ms. Lane's review and feedback on the study as a whole. This member checking was performed "to review the material for accuracy and palatability" (Stake, 1995, p. 115). In addition, investigator triangulation—when "other researchers take a look at the same scene or phenomenon" (Stake, 1995, p. 113)—occurred when Ms. Lane and the researcher conducted classroom observations using the same ESL Needs Rubric.

Furthermore, triangulation of perspectives about the ESL program was ensured by attaining the perceptions of students, administrators, and teachers through interviews and the completion of a survey titled, "Perception Grid of Meeting the Four Educational Needs of ELLs"

95

by all participants. Participants rated how the school performs in meeting the needs of ELLs by using the following scale: 1—needs improvement, 2—performs adequately, 3—performs excellently.

Credibility, which is comparable to internal validity in quantitative research, was instituted through strategies such as insider status (established trust and good rapport with participants); prolonged engagement in the research site; observation with a peer (sheltered content-area courses, ESL courses, Spanish for native speakers courses) in the research setting; audiotape recordings and transcriptions of data from interviews; and triangulation of the data through the use of several data methods, such as interviews, observations, Perception Grid Surveys, archival documents, and journal notes. Thus, this study meets the standards for verification, as suggested by Creswell and Miller (2000), that at least two of their nine verification procedures should be met for credibility (in this case, triangulation, member checking, prolonged engagement in the field, thick/rich description, and researcher reflexivity were met).

Transferability, comparable to external validity, was rendered by this case study through the perceptions of students, administrators, and teachers and through the points of evidence for the educational needs, which form "proper thick description" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The resulting description was sufficiently thick to "provide the data base that makes transferability judgments possible on the parts of the potential appliers" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 316). The researcher also performed purposeful sampling by selecting participants with direct knowledge of the ESL program. Staff members were chosen due to their direct experience with ELLs, as they all possessed either direct or indirect decision-making responsibilities within the ESL program at the school of study.

96

The researcher purposefully selected students based upon their experience in the ESL program and the varying ranges of performance on the MAP assessment, which is the district reading assessment. All five students were simultaneously enrolled in a Spanish for native speakers course and a Read 180 course, and four of the students also were enrolled in a sheltered English course. Student selections were made in order to gain a range in student perspectives. Overall, transfer of the theoretical implications of this study and the tools used for ESL program observations (e.g., ESL Needs Rubric for classroom observations, Perception Grid Survey)—to another context becomes possible.

Dependability, comparable to reliability, and *confirmability*, comparable to objectivity, were established through many of the strategies previously stated for credibility, including prolonged engagement in the research site, archival documents, peer review within observations, member-checking for the overall study, and instruments that promoted triangulation of the data (e.g., interviews, classroom observations, and Perception Grid Surveys). The interviews were coded with the intention of (a) re-examining sources in relation to social justice theory, with specific regard to equity in access to the curriculum by meeting the educational needs of ELLs and (b) sustaining examples from the raw data.

The data analysis findings are presented in both textual and visual forms in Chapter 4. The textual interpretation of the data was used to create a description for each structural component of the ESL program in this study, so that conclusions could be drawn regarding equity in access to the curriculum for ELLs. The visual interpretation of the data utilizes codes that match the categories represented frequently in the data.

SUMMARY

A qualitative analysis was chosen as an effective means of studying how an urban high school ESL program addresses the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs. This study specifically explored four structural components of the program—student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses. Data for this study were collected through interviews, classroom observations, participant observations, Perception Grid Surveys, and authentic archival documents.

Purposeful sampling was used to select the participants of the study. Note: I have tried to consistently order the groups in the same way that you discussed them in text. One group—the students—represented people who are affected by ESL program decisions and implementation. Another group—the administrators—represented the program overseers responsible for ultimate staffing decisions for the ESL program. The final group—the teachers—represented people who are responsible for implementing ESL program decisions (some are influential in driving program decisions as well). Each participant completed a Perception Grid Survey and, during an interview, was asked questions about the four key structural components of the ESL program and how they address Walsh's (1991) educational needs for ELL school success.

The intent of the study was to discover how an urban high school ESL program addresses the four educational needs of ELLs in the quest to provide equal access to the curriculum. By studying an ESL program through four of its components, the researcher hoped to illuminate characteristics of an ESL program that establish a means of providing equal educational opportunities for ELLs in regard to access to the curriculum. It is anticipated that the results garnered from the study will inform and have an impact upon ESL program decision makers in the quest for equal access to the curriculum for ELLs.

CHAPTER 4 - Analysis of the Data

This study was conducted to investigate how four structural components of an urban ESL program (i.e., student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses) address the educational needs of secondary ELLs. The contents of this chapter are focused on reporting the detailed data analysis of the study. In this chapter, statements of students, administrators, and teachers—in their own voices—are presented and used to explore the designated themes during the data collection process. The findings cover themes and categories that were primarily focused around Walsh's (1991) four educational needs, which were specifically defined through Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991). Four structural program components were filtered through Walsh's (1991) educational needs, in order to view how the school in this study addressed the four educational needs for ELLs' school success. The information provided in this chapter is organized according to the following sections: (1) Characteristics of the ESL Program's Structural Components, (2) Interviews—NVivo 8 Analysis, (3) Classroom Snapshot Observations—ESL Needs Rubric Analysis, (4) Archival Records—Analysis of MAP Scores, (5) Overall Program Perceptions—Perception Grid Survey Analysis, and (6) Comprehensive Summary of Findings.

The analysis is organized according to the four specific structural components in relation to the educational needs of ELLs. The analysis of student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses was first conducted for the student group and then for the staff group. A comparative analysis between participant groups was then conducted to compare the perceptions of how ELL educational needs are met through the program

components. Throughout the chapter, the direct authentic opinions of participants involved in the study are prefaced by quotation marks, or are summarized through assigned numerical values based on participant responses either to the Perception Grid Surveys or to matrices developed from the interview data. In addition, the researcher utilized classroom observations (documented through an ESL Needs Rubric), archival documents, and journal notes to discover how the structural components of the ESL program addressed the educational needs of ELLs.

Characteristics of the ESL Program's Structural Components

The intent of this study was to investigate how an urban high school ESL program addresses the four educational needs of ELLs through four key structural components of an ESL program. Analysis of the ESL program's four structural components—placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—provided specific information regarding participant perceptions of how the four ELL educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—were being addressed. Analysis of within-group coding categories began with the student participant group, as many of the questions for this group lent themselves to positive and negative responses.

Interviews—NVivo 8 Analysis

Coding Categories

After a thorough review of all 13 interviews with students, administrators, and teachers, 8 classroom snapshot observations, and 13 Perception Grid Surveys, 16 primary themes and 39 coding strategies emerged. Steps for data analysis included a combination of analysis strategies from Bogdan and Biklen (2007) and Huberman and Miles (1994). The following is a framework

that includes the combined general data analysis strategies from these authors that were followed within the interview analysis:

Step 1: Sketching ideas: Write margin notes in collected data.

Step 2: Taking notes: Write observer's comments.

Step 3: Identify codes: Develop coding categories.

Step 4: Reduce information: Sort material into categories.

Step 5: Display data: Develop tables and matrices.

Step 6: Count frequency of codes: Count frequency of codes.

Step 7: Relating categories: Noting relations among variables.

All coding categories in the current study were founded on the definitions of the four educational needs. The following is a summary of how the previously stated steps of data analysis were implemented in this study:

Step 1: Sketching ideas: In order to grasp the data, the researcher reviewed the 13 interviews. Initial researcher observations were highlighted within the transcripts, and handwritten notes were written in the margins of the transcripts.

Step 2: Taking Notes: Some of the initial observations made by the researcher during this review included questions such as, "Does student attitude towards the importance of learning in the L1 determine levels of academic achievement in Spanish for native speakers courses and/or reading scores in English?"

Step 3: Identify codes: The researcher developed additional coding categories during the NVivo 8 analysis process. The coding categories were amended as emerging characteristics were sorted into existing categories and developing categories.

During this step, the researcher added coding categories and merged categories
that were similar to each other.

Step 4: Reduce information: Information was reduced through the query process within
the NVivo 8 software program, and the results were displayed in matrix form.

Step 5: Display data: The researcher constructed various tables, based on the NVivo 8
information, in the form of EXCEL spreadsheets that reduced and summarized the
data so that further analysis could occur.

Step 6: Count frequency of codes: After the frequency of codes were counted in the
NVivo 8 analysis and displayed into table formats, they were used to reduce the
data and determine which coding categories would be analyzed in-depth.

Step 7: Relating categories: Relationships among the variables were considered by
viewing the data in the tables that were created from NVivo 8 queries so that
further analysis could occur through Stake's (1995) forms of data analysis.

With each review of the interviews, it became evident to the researcher that the majority
of the coding categories were present in all three participant groups due to the format of the
interview questions. Interviews with students, teachers, and administrators were all categorized
and analyzed with NVivo 8 software. The same coding categories were used for analyzing all
interviews for each group of participants within the initial general coding in NVivo 8. Next, the
researcher reviewed and summarized the data.

To gain a general understanding of the characteristics found within the program's
structural components, Table 1 illustrates the pre-determined coding categories that act as
tangible points of evidence for the educational needs within the structural components. To
reiterate, these pre-determined coding categories were all based upon the definitions of the four

educational needs, as derived from Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991). For a preparatory understanding of the analysis structure within NVivo 8 (in regard to Table 1) each educational need is considered to be a parent node (i.e. **Social Needs**, **Affective Needs**, **Linguistic Needs**, and **Academic Needs**), and the coding categories below each educational need are considered to be child nodes.

Table 1—Pre-determined Coding Categories Based on the Educational Needs of ELLs.

Social Needs	Affective Needs	Linguistic Needs	Academic Needs
L1 Affirmed	Diversity	Develop Proficiency in Four Language Skills	Develop Content Matter Knowledge within Required Courses for Graduation
Interact in L1	Roles for Family and Community Members	Acquisition of Written and Oral Systems in L1 and L2	
Courses in L1	Reading and Writing Activities		
Use L1 for Academic Development	Practice and Corrections		
Prior Knowledge	Relevant Background Knowledge = Prior Knowledge		
Safe Setting	Meaningful Activities		
	Active Engagement		
	Alternate Groupings		
	Native Language Support		
	High Expectations		

There is some overlapping of child nodes within the parent nodes due to the nature of the

questions and to the similarities of needs. Specifically, in some instances, social and affective

needs are difficult to distinguish from each other. For example, interactions in a safe setting

could be interpreted as addressing the social needs (through mere interaction with peers) and

affective needs (because students feel safe in the classroom environment). All the child nodes are

based, in some fashion, on the perceptions of the interviewed participants in conjunction with the four educational needs. The basic structure of the coding categories, derived from Walsh's (1991) educational needs, was found consistently across structural components. For example, the same social needs codes are found within all four structural components—student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—in addition to a few emergent codes.

The following are descriptions of the 39 actual coding categories that were put into place after being collapsed from the total number of actual coding categories (see Appendix H for list).

Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses—when academic concepts are addressed by Spanish for native speakers courses (e.g., primarily when mainstream English course concepts are addressed in the SNS courses).

Academic Discourse—when students have the opportunity to discuss academic concepts in either their L1 or L2.

Alternate Groupings—when students are placed in groups with students who either speak another language or possess different proficiency levels of English for group activities within the classroom setting (e.g., cooperative learning activities).

Appropriate Placement—when students are placed according to their linguistic and academic needs.

Assistance—primarily refers to teachers providing the help that students need.

Attitude about Team 7 Teachers—student perceptions of how they feel about Team 7 teachers.

Bilingual Aides Assist with Academic Needs—student perceptions of the presence of bilingual aides in courses and how they assisted students.

Building Provision of Sheltered Content Courses—staff perceptions of how the building provides sheltered content courses to ELLs.

Clustering—refers to when small groups of ELLs are "clustered" together within mainstream courses, as bilingual aides attend the class to assist the ELLs.

Comprehensible Input—refers to instructional practices that promote ELLs' comprehension of course material.

Content Courses ELLs Placed In—refers to courses such as math, science, English, social studies, and other courses required for graduation.

Correlations Between Developing Four Language Skills in L1 and L2—refers to when students learn aspects of the four language skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—in their L1, and this new knowledge transfers to their L2.

Correlations Between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks—when similar benchmarks from other courses are addressed in the Spanish for native speakers courses.

Courses Promoting Four Language Skills—refers to courses that promote the four language skills.

Develop Four Language Skills—when a course develops the four language skills.

Diversity—refers to respecting the various cultures within the classroom.

Expectations—refers to the expectations of staff members, regarding educating ELLs.

Fairness—when students are treated in a fair manner.

Groups—refers to placing students together for instructional purposes.

Interaction—when students interact either in their L1 or L2 for instructional purposes.

Layering Description—background provided by a key informant about how courses are "layered" by proficiency level during the same class period. For example, when a Beginning

ESL course, Intermediate ESL course, and an Advanced ESL course are offered during the same class period, the movement of students can more easily occur at any time for student placement. This movement, or change in schedule, occurs when students have been misplaced in courses due to unforeseen factors (e.g., a student performed poorly on the placement assessment, but actually possesses higher proficiency skills in English.)

Lesson Modification—when teachers modify, or provide instruction that is comprehensible for ELLs.

Materials in L1—when instructional materials are provided in the L1 for ELLs.

Meaningful Activities—instructional activities that are meaningful, or provide students with "real world" applications.

Native Language—is affirmed in the classroom and courses provided in the L1.

Other—is found within all parent nodes and offers opportunities for all participants to mention anything not previously addressed in their responses on the particular educational need, within each structural component.

Practice and Corrections—when students are provided with opportunities to practice their L1 or L2 language skills and make corrections.

Prior Knowledge—background knowledge that each student possesses.

Procedures of Placement—logistics of how students are placed into courses for their class schedules.

Program Development—background information from one administrator.

Program Suggestions—ESL program suggestions for improvement offered by any interview participant.

Purpose of SNS Courses—refers to reasoning behind offering Spanish for native speakers courses.

Rationale for ELL Placement—refers to reasoning behind placement of ELLs into courses.

Role of Family and Community Members—refers to the presence of family and community members in the classroom or school.

Safe Setting—a learning environment in which students feel safe to participate.

Similar Situation—students are placed within the same situation as other students, as they experience the same things (e.g., transitioning from their home country to the United States).

Students Placed in Team 7 Courses—refers to ELLs being placed into Team 7 courses, such as the sheltered content courses provided.

Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input—when Team 7 teachers (Mr. Bond, Mr. Track, Ms. Hermosa, Ms. Rivers, and the researcher) work together to provide comprehensible instructional activities for ELLs.

Vocabulary Acquisition—when ELLs acquire vocabulary for linguistic or academic purposes.

The first structural component of the ESL program to be described within the interviews was student placement, with the component term abbreviated to "Placement." The following coding categories were developed from the initial definitions of the educational needs, and others emerged from the data during the process of coding within the NVivo 8 software. With regard to the table displaying "Coding Category Descriptions" for this component, the following bolded words are considered to be the parent nodes (also known as primary themes for the program analysis) within NVivo 8: **Placement—Social Needs, Placement—Affective Needs, Placement—Linguistic Needs, and Placement—Academic Needs.** The child nodes are considered to be the specific coding categories, which are located directly underneath the parent

nodes. For example, "Assistance Team 7" is a child node located under the parent node (or

theme) of **Placement—Social Needs**. Refer to Table 2 to view the specific coding categories for

each theme.

Table 2—Coding Category Descriptions: Student Placement Component

NVivo 8 Coding Categories		
Placement—Social Needs		**Placement—Linguistic Needs**
Assistance Team 7		Academic Discourse in L2
Bilingual Aide Present		Appropriate Placement
Clustering		Courses Promoting Four Language Skills
Fairness		Courses Promoting Four Language Skills in L1
Interaction		Courses Promoting Written and Oral Systems
Native Language		Other
Other		Procedures of Placement
Prior Knowledge		Vocabulary Acquisition
Program Development		
Safe Setting		
Similar Situation		
Placement—Affective Needs		**Placement—Academic Needs**
Diversity		Assistance
Fairness		Attitude about Team 7 Teachers
Other		Clustering with Bilingual Aides
Safe Setting		Content Courses ELLs Placed In
Similar Situation		Layering Description
		Other
		Rationale for ELL Placement
		Students Placed in Team 7 Courses
		Suggestions for Program Improvement

The second structural component of the ESL program to be described is Sheltered

Content Courses, with the component term abbreviated to "Sheltered." The parent nodes within

NVivo 8, also known as themes, include: **Sheltered—Social Needs, Sheltered—Affective**

Needs, Sheltered—Linguistic Needs, and Sheltered—Academic Needs. Refer to Table 3 for

the specific coding categories, also known as child nodes.

Table 3—Coding Category Descriptions: Sheltered Content Courses Component

NVivo 8 Coding Categories		
Sheltered—Social Needs		**Sheltered—Linguistic Needs**
Assistance Team 7		Academic Discourse
Fairness		Courses Promoting Four Language Skills
Groups		Develop Written and Oral Systems --Phonology, Semantics, Pragmatics, and Syntax
Interaction in a Safe Setting		Native Language
Interaction in L1		Other
Native Language for Academic Development		Vocabulary Acquisition
Other		
Prior Knowledge		
Sheltered—Affective Needs		**Sheltered—Academic Needs**
Alternate Groupings		Assistance
Diversity		Bilingual Aides Assist with Academic Needs
Expectations—Administrators		Building Provision of Sheltered Content Courses
Expectations—Teachers		L1 Used for Comprehensible Input
Meaningful Activities		Lesson Modification
Native Language		Meaningful Activities
Other		Other
Practice and Corrections		Prior Knowledge
Prior Knowledge		
Promote Active Engagement		
Role of Family and Community Members		
Safe Setting		

The third structural component of the ESL program to be described is "Teaming," which refers to the team of teachers designated as the ESL support team, currently known as Team 7. Bilingual aides also are affiliated with this group; they work in conjunction with Team 7 teachers as support in the content classrooms and with parent/student communication in the native language. The parent nodes, or themes, within NVivo 8 include: **Teaming—Social Needs, Teaming—Affective Needs, Teaming—Linguistic Needs, and Teaming—Academic Needs**. Refer to Table 4 for the specific coding categories, also known as child nodes.

Table 4—Coding Category Descriptions: Teaming Component

NVivo 8 Coding Categories		
Teaming—Social Needs		**Teaming—Linguistic Needs**
Fairness		Academic Discourse
Interaction		Assist with Four Language Skills
Interaction in a Safe Setting		Attitude about Team 7 Teachers
Native Language for Academic Development		Develop Four Language Skills in L1
Other		Develop Written and Oral Systems --Phonology, Semantics, Pragmatics, and Syntax
Prior Knowledge		Other
		Vocabulary Acquisition
Teaming—Affective Needs		**Teaming—Academic Needs**
Assistance Team 7		Assistance Team 7
Diversity		Comprehensible Input
Expectations—Administrators		Other
Expectations—Teachers		Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input
Fairness		
Groups		
Interaction		
Meaningful Activities		
Other		
Promote Active Engagement		
Role of Family and Community Members		
Safe Setting		

The fourth structural component of the ESL program to be described is "Spanish for native speakers courses," which is abbreviated as SNS within the coding system. The parent nodes, also known as themes, within NVivo 8 include: **SNS—Social Needs, SNS—Affective Needs, SNS—Linguistic Needs, and SNS—Academic Needs**. Refer to Table 5 for the specific coding categories, also known as child nodes.

Table 5—Coding Category Descriptions: Spanish for Native Speakers Courses Component

NVivo 8 Coding Categories		
SNS—Social Needs		**SNS—Linguistic Needs**
Fairness		Academic Discourse in L1
Groups in L1		Correlations Between Developing Four Language Skills—in L1 and L2
Native Language for Academic Development		Develop Written and Oral Systems --Phonology, Semantics, Pragmatics, and Syntax
Other		Materials in L1
Prior Knowledge		Other
Safe Setting		Program Suggestions
		Purpose of SNS Courses
		SNS Assist with Four Language Skills
		Vocabulary Acquisition in L1
SNS—Affective Needs		**SNS—Academic Needs**
Diversity		Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses
Expectations—for SNS Courses		Assistance
Groups		Building Provision for SNS Courses
Meaningful Activities		Comprehensible Input with SNS Courses
Native Language		Correlations between SNS and Other Content Area --Benchmarks
Other		Other
Practice and Corrections		
Prior Knowledge		
Promote Active Engagement		
Role of Family and Community Members		
Safe Setting		

Student Placement—NVivo 8 Analysis of Interviews

Addressed in this section of analysis is Secondary Question One: To what extent does student placement in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

An analysis of each of the most dominant coding categories for the student placement component provided insight into the most prevalent patterns found in the perception samples.

According to the NVivo 8 matrix queries the researcher ran, there were varying combinations of coding category results within the perception samples of the student placement component. For example, two coding categories were present only within the administrator perception samples, just as two different coding categories were present only within the teacher perception samples. Some coding categories were found only within the teacher and student perception samples; others were found only within the student perception samples. For further clarification, the coding category of "Attitude About Team 7 Teachers" is found only within the student perception samples, due to the nature of the interview question. The question is designed to gain only student perceptions of their experience with Team 7 teachers; whereas, this would not be an appropriate question to ask the administrators or teachers. Table 6 depicts the coding categories that were present in the interview perception samples of the student placement component of a high school ESL program.

Table 6—NVivo 8 Results: Student Placement

	Role = Administrator	Role = Teacher	Role = Student
1 : Placement— Academic Needs	0	0	0
2 : Assistance	0	0	1
3 : Attitude about Team 7 Teachers	0	0	5
4 : Clustering with Bilingual Aides	1	5	5
5 : Content Courses ELLs Placed In	1	5	5
6 : Layering Description	0	1	0
7 : Other	1	5	5
8 : Rationale for ELL Placement	2	5	0
9 : Students Placed in Team 7 Courses	1	5	5
10 : Suggestions for Program Improvement	0	0	4
11 : Placement— Affective Needs	0	0	0
12 : Diversity	2	4	4

13 : Fairness	0	0	4
14 : Other	1	5	5
15 : Safe Setting	1	5	5
16 : Similar Situation	0	1	1
17 : Placement— Linguistic Needs	0	0	0
18 : Academic Discourse in L2	0	0	5
19 : Appropriate Placement	0	0	5
20 : Courses Promoting Four Language Skills	1	5	5
21 : Courses Promoting Four Language Skills in L1	1	5	5
22 : Courses Promoting Written and Oral Systems	1	5	0
23 : Other	1	5	5
24 : Procedures of Placement	0	1	0
25 : Vocabulary Acquisition	0	0	5
26 : Placement—Social	0	0	0

Needs			
27 : Assistance Team 7	0	0	5
28 : Bilingual Aide Present	0	0	5
29 : Clustering	1	0	0
30 : Fairness	1	5	5
31 : Interaction	1	0	5
32 : Native Language	1	5	0
33 : Other	0	5	5
34 : Prior Knowledge	2	5	5
35 : Program Development	1	0	0
36 : Safe Setting	0	5	5
37 : Similar Situation	0	0	3

For the purpose of this analysis, the coding categories that were found within all three perception samples will be closely examined. There were a few instances when more than two coding categories met this criterion. Thus, the researcher selected for analysis the top two coding categories within each educational need's theme (also known as a parent node in NVivo 8). There are four themes/parent nodes within the component of student placement: **Placement— Social Needs, Placement—Affective Needs, Placement—Linguistic Needs, and Placement— Academic Needs**. Since the top two coding categories were chosen for analysis, there are a total of eight predominant patterns that emerged from the researcher's initial observations. The eight predominant patterns that emerged were concentrated within the categories of Fairness, Prior Knowledge, Diversity, Safe Setting, Courses Promoting Four Language Skills, Courses

117

Promoting Four Language Skills in the L1, Clustering with Bilingual Aides, and Students Placed in Team 7 Courses.

Placement—Social Needs

Fairness and Prior Knowledge, were the only two coding categories that possessed responses from all three participant groups within the structural component of student placement, with regard to social needs.

Fairness

All the students agreed that their Team 7 teachers were fair with them. Dr. Garcia noted that, "if you have a program, it'll help" (Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 13), meaning that student placement would help in providing intellectual and emotional fairness. He continued, "if you don't have one [an ESL program], you basically will have chaos and the kids—you won't meet the needs of the children…It's the difference between success or failure for the children" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 13).

The teachers mentioned that if students are placed together within the same classes—especially the sheltered courses—they are given "the support and the confidence [they need]" (Hermosa Interview, 12/1/08, p. 3), especially when placed with peers who speak their language. Ms. Rivers escalated the issue of fairness by mentioning that Team 7 teachers are able to intervene for an ELL who might appear to be isolated in a mainstream class, though she stated that "most teachers provide a learning environment that the students are welcomed" (Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 9), that they are usually treated in a fair manner within the school.

Prior Knowledge

Prior knowledge is essential to student placement. This view is illustrated through comments from Ms. Rivers. She states that

. . . student placement takes into consideration the prior knowledge, and the

classes that a student has brought with them from other countries, or other

schools. We look at the transcripts and make sure that we don't double up on the

classes that they've already successfully passed. And we try to make sure that

they're placed in classes that they haven't had in another school—so that they will

be ready for graduation when they arrive at the twelfth grade. We also note any

gaps in education and try to place them in appropriate, not only ESL classes, but

appropriate content classes. (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 9)

Therefore, it is necessary to discover each student's prior knowledge about the content

taught within each class, so that teachers know how to address their academic needs.

Mr. Bond mentions that some students "do not have a lot of educational experience" (Mr.

Bond Interview, 11/13/08, p. 3), so they possess limited prior knowledge for content courses.

This is the case with students who are labeled as a student with limited or interrupted formal

education (SLIFE) (DeCapua, Smathers, & Tang, 2009). However, this study does not

extensively address the SLIFE issue, as the student participants are from Mexico and have

uninterrupted educational experiences.

Most students mentioned that their transcripts were reviewed for student placement. Two

students mentioned that their transcripts were not reviewed, but they were merely unaware of the

educational background review, as they were enrolled in a feeder school in eighth grade. This

means that the ESL teacher scheduler reviewed the length of time in which they had studied in

the United States and their academic performance—including course grades and district reading

test scores—before they started their first class at Amos Heights.

As far as administrators, Dr. Garcia believed that for student placement success, "a teacher or a team would be the ones that would have to make those decisions" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 13). Dr. Juarez (Interview, 12/17/08) attributed the positive transformation of ELLs over the years to Team 7. He also mentioned that Team 7 was essential to meeting the needs of ELLs, that placing ELLs—especially those with limited education—in a sheltered environment is the best way to provide for those educational needs.

Placement—Affective Needs

The top two coding categories for student placement and affective needs were Diversity and Safe Setting.

Diversity

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) pointed out that ELLs have diverse needs and background experiences—academic and linguistic—and that these issues began to be a part of the placement process for these students when he became the principal at Amos Heights. Dr. Juarez offered that when you group ELL students together "from different countries, and different schoolings, or no schooling background…you give them a quick identity group…in which they find a lot of comfort" (Dr. Juarez Interview, 12/17/08, p. 10). Thus, through that identity group, the students have one general focus—to learn the English language. It is essential that they learn how to speak, read, and write the English language, and this gives them all a common ground. Therefore, placing students into similar classes provides the means for the students to develop a sense of identity and comfort, as previously discussed, and "serves as a way for parents to know who their [child's] teachers are" (Dr. Juarez Interview, 12/17/08, p. 10).

The teachers recognized that the school responds well to cultural and personal diversity. They discussed that the school provides opportunities for students from different cultures to

120

participate in various cultural celebrations and to practice their own religious beliefs. Specifically, Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) pointed out that the Movimiento Estudiantil Chicano de Aztlán (MEChA) student organization sponsors celebrations such as Mexican Independence Day.

Ms. Lane mentioned that all teachers have been encouraged to take university coursework in ESL methodologies, and she believes that the teachers have developed a "better respect for that cultural diversity and the benefits that it can bring to our community" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p.10). Ms. Rivers specifically stated that placement in Team 7 sheltered classes is "one of the major ways that the school responds to cultural and personal diversity" (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 13).

The students welcomed diversity within their classes. They mentioned that it was beneficial for students from other countries to help each other within their classes. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) specifically discussed that students could learn from each other about other cultures and different forms of Spanish. In addition, he mentioned that they could and do make friends with their peers within their classes. Thus, placing together students with diverse backgrounds allows for these opportunities.

Safe Setting

Safe Setting is another prominent coding category within student placement. Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) described how placing ELLs together provides a safe learning environment where students can learn English. The classes are a safe place because that is where the students have their friends and where they can speak their native language with peers. This sense of security extends outside the classroom, as they gravitate to their ELL peers in places such as the lunchroom.

Teachers also verified that a safe setting is created through placing ELLs together in the same classes. Mr. Track mentioned that when new students arrive from another country and can converse immediately with other students in their own language, then they "just open up—it makes [them] feel so much more—comfortable and it doesn't alienate [them] from everybody in the classroom" (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08, p. 7). Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) discussed the student placement process and how this provides a safe setting for new students. She stated that culture shock is minimized through the placement process, as Team 7 is notified, the family and student are introduced to Team 7, and students are given an orientation to the building. Furthermore, Ms. Rivers (Interview, 12/5/08) mentioned that the safe setting allows for a bonding process to occur for students who are placed in a similar situation.

Students reiterated that placement in Team 7 courses provided a safe setting by helping them understand the new language and culture by putting them with others who spoke their native language (Spanish). Specifically, Pedro stated that Team 7 "helped us because, when we arrived to this country—there's a new life, a new future, and the most important thing—a new language…they make us feel like if we are accepted in this country" (Pedro Interview, 11/19/08, p. 8).

Placement—Linguistic Needs

The predominant categories that emerged within student placement and linguistic needs were Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills (referring to courses in the L2) and Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills in the L1.

Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) said that the whole purpose of the ESL classes was to promote the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking for ELLs. Mr. Bond

(Interview, 11-13-08) said that his science classes, in addition to providing all the content, promoted all four language skills. Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) mentioned that ESL classes initially promote the four language skills. Then, as student language skills improve, students take mainstream English classes that address the four language skills. "However, all of us have been trained and are asked to be cross-curricular—in all of our classrooms," Mr. Track noted (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08, p. 13).

The other teachers referred to the following courses that promote the four language skills. There is a progression of placement in meeting linguistic needs for ELLs: students start with Beginning ESL courses, then move on to ESL Read 180 courses, to advanced ESL Read 180 which has a writing focus, to sheltered English III, and then to clustered English IV. Students are placed in mainstream English courses when they are more advanced in their proficiency. However, students progress at different rates in acquiring English proficiency. Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) touched upon sheltered English I and II courses, which she taught before she retired; however, these two courses were cut due to budget constraints.

The students had varied responses when they discussed where they learned the various language skills. Additional linguistic needs, such as grammar, vocabulary, and academic discourse were added to the four language skills of reading, writing, speaking, and listening for investigation. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) discussed that English class was where reading and grammar were emphasized, as writing, speaking, listening were improved upon in all classes. Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) revealed that ESL Read 180 was the primary class that emphasized all four language skills, grammar, vocabulary, and academic discourse in the L2. She also stated that all courses assisted her with discourse, while English and American History also assisted

with listening skills. She added that English classes assisted with vocabulary in the L2 and grammar skills.

Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) discussed that ESL Read 180 addressed reading and listening skills and vocabulary in the L2. She mentioned that English classes addressed writing and grammar skills, and that History addressed speaking skills. In her opinion, all classes, except for Spanish for native speakers courses, promoted discourse in the L2. Roberto (Interview, 12/8/08) mentioned that all courses promoted the four language skills and that English classes promoted grammar skills, vocabulary in the L2, and discourse in the L2. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) similarly commented that ESL Read 180 courses provided for all four of the language skills. She indicated that English III promoted speaking and grammar skills, and English promoted vocabulary in the L2. According to Tania, all classes promoted discourse in the L2.

Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills in the L1

The second coding category within student placement and linguistic needs involved courses promoting the four language skills in the L1. Obviously, this was heavily based on the Spanish for native speakers courses, as these courses promote the L1 of an ELL and this school only offered Spanish as a native language. Dr. Garcia mentioned that "the whole basis of the Spanish for native speakers courses were to continue to develop Spanish. It was specifically for writing, and reading, and cognitive development" (Dr. Garcia, 11/15/08, p. 28). In addition, he discussed how the equivalent of English I and II literature courses were done in Spanish.

Teachers primarily stated that Spanish for native speakers courses addressed the linguistic needs in the L1. However, Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) and Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) both mentioned that other sheltered courses utilize students' L1.

124

Specifically, Mr. Track said that the math program offers bilingual dictionaries and that "we try to foster. . . that comfort level in the native language" (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08, p. 13).

Students also primarily mentioned Spanish for native speakers courses as developing their L1, but they did mention other courses that developed their L1. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) stated that all courses supported vocabulary development in his L1, and Spanish for native speakers primarily supported grammar and discourse in his L1. Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) and Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) both stated that ESL Read 180 developed vocabulary in their L1, and Spanish for native speakers developed their grammar skills and discourse in the L1. Yet, Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) also mentioned math and science as assisting with discourse in the L1. Surprisingly, Roberto (Interview, 12/10/08) discussed that English class primarily assisted him with developing vocabulary in his L1. In addition, he mentioned that Spanish for native speakers developed his grammar skills and discourse in the L1. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) stated that English classes promoted her vocabulary and grammar skills in the L1. Finally, she mentioned that all courses assisted her with discourse in the L1.

Placement—Academic Needs

Clustering with Bilingual Aides and Students Placed in Team 7 Courses were the two coding categories highlighted within student placement and academic needs.

Clustering with Bilingual Aides

Ms. Rivers defined clustering by stating that "Clustering is putting several students together in a content class, so that they can converse with each other. They can help each other with the content and converse with each other" (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 25). Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) discussed that it is easier to assist ELLs with content concepts if they are grouped together with a bilingual aide, as the aide can explain the concept in the native language.

125

Thus, higher order thinking skills can be accessed immediately. Ms. Lane said that clustering students with bilingual aides "opens up free access to the curriculum for the students and helps them to get the explanation, or the assistance that they need, in order to be successful in that particular class" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p.24). Ms. Rivers mentioned,

> . . . we encourage teachers to use graphics, graphic organizers, to slow down their speech pace—to do things to scaffold the knowledge for the ESL students. But I think primarily, it's the bilingual aides that do the bear share of helping them [students] get that content. (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 25)

Dr. Garcia offered that clustering students with bilingual aides provides for their academic needs, since the students lack proficiency in English (Dr. Garcia, 11/15/08).

With regard to students' views, Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) stated that bilingual aides helped other students. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) mentioned that bilingual aides assisted him by helping him comprehend the lessons and to pass his classes with good grades. Roberto (12/8/08) felt that bilingual aides only helped with language issues, as opposed to content issues. Rosa (12/10/08) and Tania (12/15/08) both agreed that bilingual aides assisted them by helping them comprehend the lessons.

Students Placed in Team 7 Courses

The final coding category to be discussed within student placement and academic needs is Students Placed in Team 7 Courses. Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) believed that the primary reason for placing students into Team 7 courses was that students who had a low proficiency in English had a simultaneous academic need to not fall behind. The teachers mentioned that Code 1, Code 2, and some Code 3 ELLs are placed into Team 7 courses. Ms. Lane discussed the type of students who are placed in Team 7

126

courses in the following way: "Basically, students that come in that do not have enough English background or language skills to be in a regular classroom. Those students are maintained in Team 7 [courses] until they're ready to be totally placed within their regular academy" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 24). Ms. Rivers (Interview, 12/5/08) continued with this notion by adding that students placed in Team 7 courses possess weaker English language proficiencies and would have difficulties in achieving in mainstream courses.

Students revealed the specific names of Team 7 courses and teachers that they have been placed in. Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) discussed that she has taken classes in Math—Mr. Track, English—Ms. Lane, Science—Mr. Bond, ESL Read 180—Ms. Rivers, World History—Mr. Bull, ESL—Ms. Lakes, ESL—Ms. Summers, and Spanish for Native Speakers—Ms. Lane. However, as a programming note, Mr. Bull and Ms. Summers were removed from Team 7 due to budget cuts in the Spring of 2008. Therefore, World History is no longer offered as a sheltered course. There also are fewer ESL courses available to students, as Ms. Summer's position was terminated.

Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) was placed into Algebra I, II, and III with Mr. Track, ESL with Ms. Lakes, ESL with Ms. Summers, World History with Mr. Bull, and English I, II, and Spanish for Native Speakers with Ms. Lane. Again, English I and II are no longer offered as sheltered content courses due to budget cuts. Roberto (Interview, 12/8/08) had been placed into Algebra I, II, and III with Mr. Track, Physical Science with Mr. Bond, Spanish for Native Speakers with Ms. Lane, and Read 180 with Ms. Lakes and Ms. Rivers.

Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) was placed in Algebra I—Mr. Track, Read 180—Ms. Rivers, Biology and Physical Science—Mr. Bond, and Spanish for Native Speakers I and II—Ms. Lane. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) was placed in English—Ms. Lane, Biology and Physical Science—Mr. Bond, and World History—Mr. Bull. Tania also mentioned Geography and American History in her statement, but these courses were not offered to her as Team 7 courses when she took them.

Sheltered Content Courses—NVivo 8 Analysis of Interviews

The research question addressed in this section of analysis is Secondary Question Two: To what extent do sheltered content courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

As previously indicated in this chapter, all perception samples from the ESL program's structural components were analyzed for possible coding categories. Table 7 depicts the coding categories that were present in the interview perception samples of the sheltered content courses component of a high school ESL program.

Table 7—NVivo 8 Results: Sheltered Content Courses

	Role = Administrator	Role = Teacher	Role = Student
1 : Sheltered—Social Needs	0	0	0
2 : Assistance Team 7	0	0	5
3 : Fairness	1	5	5
4 : Groups	0	0	5
5 : Interaction in a Safe Setting	1	6	5
6 : Interaction in L1	0	0	5
7 : Native Language for Academic Development	1	5	5
8 : Other	1	6	5
9 : Prior Knowledge	2	6	5
10 : Sheltered— Academic Needs	0	0	0
11 : Assistance	0	0	5
12 : Bilingual Aides Assist with Academic Needs	1	6	0
13 : Building Provision of Sheltered Content	2	5	0

Courses			
14 : L1 Used for Comprehensible Input	1	6	5
15 : Lesson Modification	1	6	4
16 : Meaningful Activities	0	0	5
17 : Other	1	6	5
18 : Prior Knowledge	0	0	5
19 : Sheltered— Affective Needs	0	0	0
20 : Alternate Groupings	1	6	4
21 : Diversity	1	6	5
22 : Expectations— Administrators	2	6	0
23 : Expectations— Teachers	2	6	5
24 : Meaningful Activities	1	6	5
25 : Native Language	2	6	4
26 : Other	1	6	5
27 : Practice and	1	6	5

Corrections			
28 : Prior Knowledge	1	5	5
29 : Promote Active Engagement	1	6	0
30 : Role of Family and Community Members	1	6	0
31 : Safe Setting	1	6	4
32 : Sheltered— Linguistic Needs	0	0	0
33 : Academic Discourse	2	5	2
34 : Courses Promoting Four Language Skills	1	6	5
35 : Develop Written and Oral Systems	0	1	2
36 : Native Language	1	6	5
37 : Other	1	6	5
38 : Vocabulary Acquisition	1	6	5

Some coding categories emerged in both the student placement component and the sheltered content component. However, the NVivo 8 matrix queries again found a varying combination of coding category results within the perception samples of the sheltered content component. For the purpose of this analysis, the coding categories that were found within all three perception samples will be closely examined. Again, the researcher selected for this analysis the top two coding categories within each educational need's theme.

An analysis of each of the most dominant coding categories for the sheltered content courses component provided insight into the most prevalent patterns found in the perception samples. There were a few instances when there were more than two coding categories that met this criterion. However, the coding categories were narrowed down to two for each theme for analysis. The researcher did this by removing those categories that were discussed within other themes, so that duplication would be minimized.

The four themes/parent nodes within the component of sheltered content courses include: **Sheltered—Social Needs, Sheltered—Affective Needs, Sheltered—Linguistic Needs, and Sheltered—Academic Needs**. Again, the top two coding categories (child nodes) within each theme provided eight total dominant coding categories within sheltered content courses for analysis. These dominant coding categories (from Table 7) included: Native Language for Academic Development, Prior Knowledge, Expectations—Teachers, Meaningful Activities, Courses Promoting Four Language Skills, Vocabulary Acquisition, L1 Used for Comprehensible Input, and Lesson Modification.

Sheltered Content Courses—Social Needs

The two primary coding categories for sheltered content courses and social needs are Native Language for Academic Development and Prior Knowledge. However, the Interaction in

the L1 category will also be touched upon within the discussion of Native Language for

Academic Development, to provide a more robust student voice.

Native Language for Academic Development

Native Language for Academic Development is the first coding category analyzed within

the sheltered content courses and social needs theme. Bilingual aides play a major role in native

language use for academic development within sheltered content courses, as all three participant

groups referred to them. However, Dr. Garcia's perception stressed that it depends on how well

the classroom teacher directs the bilingual aides and develops the lesson, "because the aide will

not be able to do much if he or she does not receive directions from the teacher" (Dr. Garcia

Interview, 11/15/08, p. 14).

From a teacher's perspective, Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) refers to translations of

vocabulary terms and content material in Spanish. Mr. Track stated that students need to feel

important, "and without the ability for them to speak in their native tongue, and think in the

native tongue" (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08, p. 4) it is difficult to achieve this. Therefore, it is

essential to provide for use of the students' native language in sheltered content courses. Mr.

Track also discussed how bilingual aides have assisted him over the years in being able to access

the students' prior knowledge—the concepts that students have learned in the past. In addition,

he empathizes with ELLs by mentioning that there are different processes that occur in a

bilingual student's brain in a content course. The student listens to instruction in English,

attempts to convert it into Spanish, then think about the concept in Spanish, then must translate

his or her response into English for the instructor, which makes it more difficult to learn the

content (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08).

Ms. Lane discussed the importance of sheltered content courses and native language use for ELLs.

> I don't think, unless you've had to go through that process yourself—you have no idea what a strain it is emotionally, physically, mentally—to be trying to work the entire day, every minute of the day, in a language that's not your own language.
>
> (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, pp. 6-7)

Therefore, sheltered content courses allow students to work together in their own language, so that they can process information, problem solve, have a greater opportunity to self-check their comprehension of the material, and feel more confident in their responses.

Ms. Rivers declared that peer-to-peer interaction in students' native languages can occur, despite the teacher's lack of proficiency in the students' L1. She continued that use of the native language between peers makes students feel more comfortable, and if this occurs then "their academic knowledge and development is going to increase more rapidly" (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 10). A negative aspect about using the native language in the classroom arose, as Ms. Rivers mentioned that overuse of the native language deters students from developing their L2—English.

Students stated that they were allowed to use bilingual dictionaries in their sheltered content courses. The coding category of Interaction in the L1 was also added to this analysis, as it coincides with the coding category of Native Language for Academic Development and was only viewed in the student participant group. Thus, students mentioned that they were allowed to interact in their L1 in sheltered content courses. Roberto (Interview, 12/8/08), Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08), and Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) mentioned that discussing assignments in their native language increased their comprehension of the assignments. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) also

mentioned this and extended this notion by commenting that interacting in her L1 helps her to do better work on her assignments.

Prior Knowledge

The coding category of Prior Knowledge also emerged within sheltered content courses and social needs. Dr. Juarez (Interview, 12/17/08) mentioned that prior knowledge should be utilized at all times within the classroom. Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) recognized that a lot of students in the sheltered content courses previously attended high school in Mexico; therefore, they had prior educational knowledge. He further stated that this knowledge should be built upon while working in content courses at Amos Heights, as students learn English. However, when a student has limited prior educational experience, then the situation becomes more difficult for educators and students to be successful together.

Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) said that it is easier to build upon students' prior knowledge if he had them as freshmen, and then again as sophomores in regard to his science classes. Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) believed that from his experience in teaching math with ELLs—students from Africa who had limited schooling—that African boys are more likely to have some prior knowledge, as opposed to African girls, who often have almost no prior math knowledge. Yet, he believed that girls and boys from Mexico arrive with similar prior knowledge levels in math.

Mr. Track believed that one of the more difficult things to do is to assess what students truly know; yet it is the sheltered content course component that provides a means to accomplish this task. Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) and Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) stated that teachers in sheltered courses attempt to relate new content information to students' prior knowledge in order to make the content more comprehensible. Ms. Rivers (12/5/08) discussed

that teachers are informed about students' prior coursework. If students have previously had

Biology for a semester in another school, then teachers can build upon what the students already

know. If they have not had prior coursework, then teachers know that they need to build more

background knowledge.

Most of the students mentioned that their sheltered content teachers asked them about

their prior knowledge, or information that they already knew from their life experience.

However, in regard to prior knowledge, Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) could only remember the

English placement test that he was given when he initially enrolled at Amos Heights. Naomi

(Interview, 11/21/08) recalled that some math concepts that she learned in Mexico helped her

comprehend the problems at Amos Heights much better.

Sheltered Content Courses—Affective Needs

The two primary coding categories for sheltered content courses and affective needs are

Expectations and Meaningful Activities.

Expectations

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) stated that teachers should maintain high expectations

for ELLs and that it is essential to mainstream students as soon as possible. Yet, he discussed

that there are limitations due to students' language backgrounds, so teachers should have realistic

expectations. Dr. Juarez (Interview, 12/17/08) believed that expectations should be the same for

all students. He shared that students need to be able to read with comprehension of the content,

write about the content, and speak using the vocabulary of the content.

Mr. Bond's (Interview, 11/13/08) expectations are that students should arrive to class

willing to learn and that teachers should do their best to provide various instructional activities to

assist students' comprehension of the material. Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) revealed

that his primary expectation is for students to learn English, then to learn math. He also has a poster of his classroom expectations involving: (1) Respect, (2) Responsibility, and (3) Results. In addition, Mr. Rodriguez attempts to provide an environment where students feel comfortable, yet they are expected to participate in answering questions. If a student has limited English, he accommodates them by having a peer assist them in understanding the question in their language and then the student is allowed to answer in both their language and English.

Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) discussed that administrators and teachers should have the same expectations for ELLs. He believed that the student's language should be accepted, while at the same time, he or she should be encouraged to understand English. Ms. Lane's view of teacher expectations for ELLs revealed that "Teachers should expect that those students will be able to compete and to do as well as native speakers of English, but again, with modifications that are based on the needs of those individual students" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 12). Ms. Rivers thought that teachers

> . . . should expect them [ELLs] to learn, to make progress, to achieve academically, to focus on their work, and behave the same that we would expect any other student to behave. But again, I think that we cannot expect them to display the knowledge, and the growth that they are making, in a paper-pencil kind of test—always (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, pp. 14-15).

This brings to light that there are modifications that should be made in order for ELLs to be able to reveal the content knowledge they possess. Thus, traditional means of testing should be reconsidered when assessing ELLs.

All the students agreed that sheltered content course teachers have high expectations for them to improve their four language skills in English and that they want all students to be able to learn the content material.

Meaningful Activities

The second coding category within sheltered content courses and affective needs was Meaningful Activities. Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) again puts the responsibility back on the teachers. He specifically mentioned that none of the sheltered content course teachers within science, math, or social studies watered down the curriculum. He said that it was a matter of adapting the content for the students—that it was a little easier for math teachers to go into more depth in a more expedient manner, since numbers seem to be a universal language. However, he noted that social studies is more difficult to go in-depth.

Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) commented that the science content is based on the curriculum benchmarks set forth by the school district, and these benchmarks are correlated with the Kansas State Science Assessment. Therefore, the teachers have been instructed to align their instruction towards those benchmarks, which should assist the students with standardized tests that they might take in the future, such as the ACT. Therefore, the content is made meaningful as it can be applied to future assessment settings.

Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) commented that the content must be made meaningful, or students will not learn; the material has to be presented in such a way that students want to learn. To accomplish this task, Mr. Rodriguez attempts to relate problems to real world situations. For example, he uses manipulatives, such as apples, to demonstrate problem solving exercises. He also incorporates X-Boxes into word problem activities, because these things capture the students' attention.

Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) discussed meaningfulness from a different angle by communicating that most ELLs he has worked with take education very seriously. They know they must have an education to succeed in life; therefore, the content is meaningful for the students because they know they need to learn the material to improve themselves. Ms. Hermosa said content is made meaningful for students, especially when they have prior knowledge in a content area like math or science; in these cases, students can easily transfer their knowledge into their current class. Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) discussed the importance of relating the content to the prior knowledge of students, so they will actively participate. Ms. Rivers agreed with Ms. Lane saying,

> I think that we do try to make a connection between what's happening outside of the school, as to what they're learning in the classroom, and explain why they need to study it, and why they need to learn it (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/18, p. 16).

Students revealed that sheltered content course teachers have activities for them to learn in class, as opposed to merely lecturing. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) mentioned that sometimes games were used to learn the content. In addition, he stated that teachers used examples to help students learn and that students had to reciprocate by doing examples on the chalkboard.

Sheltered Content Courses—Linguistic Needs

The main coding categories for sheltered content courses and linguistic needs were Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills and Vocabulary Acquisition.

Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) insisted that the entire sheltered piece compels the students to learn English, as the teachers do not speak the students' native language (with the exception of the Spanish for Native Speakers teacher—Ms. Lane in the past or, currently, Ms. Hermosa). In addition, bilingual aides or bilingual peers might assist students' learning of English through the use of their native language. The sheltered courses create a safe environment so that students can feel free to practice their pronunciation.

Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) mentioned that reading and writing skills are developed through the acquisition of content vocabulary, as students have to engage in applying those terms in the correct contexts. Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) noted that there is not a lot of writing involved in math courses. Some reading is required throughout the math courses, whereas speaking and listening are promoted within the classroom through the class-wide question and answer periods. He also mentioned that the amount of student desire is a key to how quickly they learn English.

Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) declared that ELLs are expected to read in Algebra and that all four language skills are utilized. It is important to introduce terminology, use strategies such as word walls, and use the native language. Yet, students are required to practice English by reading problems and working them in English. Ms. Lane stated that sheltered content courses

> . . . provide them [students] with that lexicon of vocabulary and terms that they
> are going to have to understand when they're in the regular English classroom. It
> gives them a chance to experiment with framing an answer—like they would have
> to frame it within a regular English classroom. And of course, gives them ample
> opportunity to learn how to write in that second language, which is just about the
> last skill that they develop. And there's a lot of concerted effort to take the child

from a simple paragraph into the five-paragraph essay. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 19)

Ms. Lane continued that individual student conferences are important to hold with students when they are practicing their writing skills—especially if the teacher is bilingual—so that the teacher can say, "O.K.—that in Spanish we always do this, or we put our adjectives here, but in English we don't do that" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 20).

Ms. Rivers provided a detailed account of the ESL language classes and how they meet students' linguistic needs.

Beginning ESL courses start the foundation depending on the level of the student of the English language, and develop it from there in all of the domains—reading, writing, speaking, and listening. ESL Read 180 accepts students that have the ability to read, even at a more limited ability, and we work to develop that reading comprehension and the fluency that students need to really comprehend what they read. We work with both fiction and non-fiction materials that are authentic. And give them plenty of time to work on, not only the sound systems, but also just reading, or reading and listening to the book read to them on CDs. And English III—the content is scaffolded. I use pictures, I use explanations, I pre-teach the vocabulary, because they are reading the literature that is being read in English III classes. And I just build a lot background knowledge—or at least I try—and hopefully scaffold that knowledge, so that the students will understand the stories. (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 20)

Ms. Rivers continued that in her classes, writing, reading, and listening are emphasized more than speaking. She often uses a graphic representation of a concept, then students write within a graphic organizer, or they write a sentence, or they develop a list of information.

The students declared that the sheltered content courses helped them with their reading skills in English by having them read materials in which they were interested in, such as scary books or romantic books. They also were allowed to read in their L1 as well as in English. Students were assisted with their speaking skills by giving formal presentations, reading aloud, and interacting with peers. Sometimes, students were allowed to speak in their native language to develop their linguistic skills. As far as developing their listening skills, students listened to the teacher, other students, cassettes, and videos in English. Occasionally, students participated in listening activities in their native language. Grammar skills were developed in English and in Spanish, as they were instructed to write when they were in English class and to write when they attended Spanish class.

Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) remarked that the sheltered courses helped her with her writing skills by having her write about what she read. Regardless of whether she read a book in Spanish or in English, she had to write about it in English. She did mention that she had written in Spanish in some of her classes at times, but then she had to translate the writing into English. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) declared that he reads bigger books than those he read in the previous year, because he learned to use a glossary and note cards to understand words that he didn't know before. He specifically remembered that he gave a formal presentation about an invitation to a party for the president that fostered his speaking skills. Pedro, however, did not recall speaking in Spanish in his sheltered courses. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) specifically

recalled reading and writing in Spanish in her Spanish classes, and that she read books and short stories. She also wrote about topics such as graduation, family, or class assignments in Spanish.

Vocabulary Acquisition

The second coding category within sheltered content courses and linguistic needs was Vocabulary Acquisition. Dr. Garcia consistently returned to the teachers and how the need is met through their planning and whether "they are developing specific vocabulary within the way they develop their curriculum. That's why you can't just put anybody in to do a sheltered class" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 29).

Mr. Bond (11/13/08) reiterated that initially reviewing key vocabulary terms before addressing the content is essential to students' comprehension of the material, as it provides some background knowledge while students learn new concepts. Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) stated that he develops with his students various word lists that are related to the math content. Often, these word lists are translated into the native languages of the students. He builds upon key words that are critical to comprehending the content. One way that he fosters interaction with the vocabulary is through students playing games with the key vocabulary.

Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) found humor in the idea that many people believe that math is a universal language. He mentioned that there is terminology that everyone needs to agree on in order to achieve comprehension (e.g., *divide*, *multiply*, *add*, *subtract*). In order to reinforce the math vocabulary, Mr. Track attempts to use his minimal language skills in Spanish, or other languages, to have students repeat vocabulary terms in their own language. He relies heavily on bilingual aides and bilingual students to interpret various math terms and math processes. At times, students comment that they understand the teacher's explanation, but that

they are familiar with performing a different process to come up with the same response. Mr. Track has no problem with this, as long as the process is logical and results in the correct answer.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) provides five new vocabulary words within each class period for ESL Beginners. The teacher and students review the five words during class; then students are to write a sentence for each word for their homework. However, most of the students do not write their sentences correctly, so their sentences are reviewed the next day as a class and corrections are made as a class. Ms. Lane revealed that there are various techniques for teaching vocabulary.

However, personally, I try to make sure that I keep the vocabulary in context for the students, so that it's not just a word that's floating around out there in outer space. But, I try to look at the selection ahead of time, and to isolate those words that I think might be problematic for the students, and I carefully check as we're going along. I'll stop and I'll ask students, "Do you understand what that particular word means?" And if there—if it's a multiple meaning word, we'll talk about how, in this context, that this might be the meaning of the word. However, if it was in another context, it might have another meaning, because multiple meaning words are very difficult for ELLs to negotiate. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 20)

Ms. Rivers (Interview, 12/5/08) mentioned that teachers must choose the key vocabulary that students need to know for learning the content, as it is impossible for ELLs to learn each vocabulary word that they do not know when they are reading grade-level textbooks. She pre-teaches key vocabulary in her Read 180, writing, and English III classes. Initially, Ms. Rivers provides an overview of the word, a simplified explanation, and various examples. Then, as discussion ensues, she involves context and expands into various parts of speech as necessary. In addition, she always asks students if the word occurs in their language. If the term is known, she

144

asks if it is a cognate and reminds students that they should always seek out cognates.

Students revealed that their sheltered content courses assisted them in learning vocabulary through pictures, activities, listening activities, and computer activities as well as by having them keep a glossary with note cards and use dictionaries and graphic organizers. Only two students, Roberto (Interview, 12/8/08) and Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) mentioned that they did not learn vocabulary in their native language in the sheltered content courses.

Sheltered Content Courses—Academic Needs

The primary coding categories for sheltered content courses and academic needs were L1 Used for Comprehensible Input and Lesson Modification.

L1 Used for Comprehensible Input

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) discussed the use of the L1 for providing comprehensible input. He said that if the teacher speaks the students' language, he or she can explain the content in the L1. However, if the teacher does not speak the students' L1, he or she has to rely on bilingual aides or bilingual students. At times, there are students in the sheltered classes called "service learners." These students are older peers, usually Juniors or Seniors, who are bilingual and who are assigned to either a sheltered content course or a required course for graduation in which some ELLs are clustered. These service learners assist ELLs and the teachers with language issues by, for example, translating instructions from the teachers to the students. Some of these service learners are former ELLs who received ESL services in the past.

Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) mentioned that the L1 is used on a limited basis in science, though there are bilingual aides in every science class who assist students through discussions in the L1. Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) stated that the L1 plays a part in students learning math. Mr. Rodriguez utilizes bilingual dictionaries in his classrooms for

comprehension of terminology. He speaks Spanish with the students and has bilingual aides to assist with small groups of students in learning the content in the L1. Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) has always had bilingual aides or bilingual student service learners to assist him in translating materials and his verbal instructions to students. He also highlighted one teacher outside of the sheltered content courses who actually encourages students to use their L1 when giving speeches.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) revealed that if students know basic concepts in their L1, then those concepts easily transfer to the L2 and additional learning can take place. Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) allowed students to answer questions in Spanish, even though she asked questions in English. Next, Ms. Lane would repeat what was said in English for the entire class. Then, she would write the answer in English on the board for students to see, so that students could hear and see correct English.

Ms. Rivers (Interview, 12/5/08) reiterated that in the content classes that she does not teach, they use translation in the L1 through bilingual aides and student service learners to assist in explaining the content and linking it to the prior knowledge of the students. However, within Ms. Rivers' courses, students use bilingual dictionaries—Spanish, Somolian, Burmese—and Read 180 software provides limited support in Spanish. In lieu of explaining in the L1, since Ms. Rivers does not know Spanish, she provides simplified explanations and offers simplified dictionaries for beginning English learners.

With regard to the student participant group, all students said they were allowed to use their native language in their sheltered content courses.

Lesson Modification

The second coding category within the sheltered content courses component and academic needs was Lesson Modification. Dr. Garcia revealed that lesson modifications depend on "how well and prepared the teachers are—it takes awhile—you just can't throw a teacher into [a class] and expect them to be able to meet the needs of these children" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 36). He continued that teachers do not have to water down the curriculum, but they need to simplify their language in presenting the material. He offered that teachers should use educational techniques that increase comprehension for ELLs, such as the use of audio-visuals.

Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) mentioned that he starts with vocabulary introductions at the beginning of a unit, in which he uses visuals such as concept maps or graphic organizers to provide a visual meaning for students. Mr. Rodriguez (Interview, 12/18/08) discussed how he attempts to heavily structure his lessons in a one, two, three [step-by-step] format, as it forces him to succinctly consider the needs of ELLs and their comprehension abilities. This assists him in simplifying his language and teaching methods, so that students have a greater opportunity to understand the material. He further stated that computers are used to encourage interaction with the material in a different format.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) revealed that lesson modifications occur within translations, working individually with students, and pairing students together to assist each other. Ms. Lane stated,

> . . . in English classes we've looked at what the students have to have for the particular content. I am working with the same pieces of literature and with the same SBIs [Standards, Benchmarks, and Indicators] as the teacher in the regular English classroom. However, I need to look at that from the standpoint of the ESL student to determine ahead of time what background the student might need. Is

there any correlation to something that I know of within a piece of literature in the students' native language? What kinds of vocabulary will be problematic? How am I going to teach that, so that it remains in context for the students, and to generally then provide them with more time, and more individual assistance to be successful in that particular content. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 25)

Ms. Lane has valuable insight that is difficult to duplicate, because she is proficient in Spanish; she was educated in Spanish and knows literature with which students might be able to relate. It is very beneficial for her to be able to correlate concepts in Spanish and English and find resources in both languages to assist the students in learning the content. Ms. Rivers (Interview, 12/5/08) emphasized that scaffolding is essential for modifying lessons and that it is important to use simplified language when providing instruction to ELLs. She offers other ways to modify lessons that include the use of pictures, videos, overhead projectors, and graphic organizers, techniques for students to find information, a slower pace, and additional materials to build background knowledge about topics.

Students mentioned that their sheltered content course teachers modified lessons, or assisted them in different ways, such as by explaining in more in-depth ways or offering more examples. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) also mentioned that he received additional explanations after school.

Teaming—NVivo 8 Analysis of Interviews

The research question addressed in this section of analysis is Secondary Question Three: To what extent does teaming in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

As previously indicated in this chapter, all perception samples from the ESL program's structural components were analyzed for possible coding categories. Table 8 depicts the coding categories that were present in the interview perception samples of the teaming component of a high school ESL program.

Table 8—NVivo 8 Results: Teaming

	Role = Administrator	Role = Teacher	Role = Student
1 : Teaming—Academic Needs	0	0	0
2 : Assistance Team 7	0	0	5
3 : Comprehensible Input	1	5	0
4 : Other	2	5	5
5 : Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input	2	5	5
6 : Teaming—Affective Needs	0	0	0
7 : Assistance Team 7	0	0	5
8 : Diversity	1	5	5
9 : Expectations—Administrators	1	5	0
10 : Expectations—Teachers	1	5	5
11 : Fairness	0	0	1
12 : Groups	0	0	5
13 : Interaction	0	0	3
14 : Meaningful	0	0	5

Activities			
15 : Other	2	5	5
16 : Promote Active Engagement	1	5	0
17 : Role of Family and Community Members	2	5	5
18 : Safe Setting	2	5	5
19 : Teaming— Linguistic Needs	0	0	0
20 : Academic Discourse	1	5	0
21 : Assist with Four Language Skills	1	5	5
22 : Attitude about Team 7 Teachers	0	0	5
23 : Develop Four Language Skills in L1	1	5	0
24 : Develop Written and Oral Systems	1	5	0
25 : Other	2	5	5
26 : Vocabulary Acquisition	1	5	0

27 : Teaming—Social Needs	0	0	0
28 : Fairness	2	5	0
29 : Interaction	0	0	5
30 : Interaction in a Safe Setting	1	5	5
31 : Native Language for Academic Development	1	5	0
32 : Other	2	4	5
33 : Prior Knowledge	1	4	0

Some coding categories were present in all components, due to the structured nature of the study. Again, the NVivo 8 matrix queries found a varying combination of coding category results within the perception samples of the teaming component. For the purpose of this analysis, the coding categories that were found within all three perception samples will be closely examined. However, only one out of the four dominant themes had at least two coding categories that involved evidence from all three participant groups. Therefore, in three out of the four dominant themes, the researcher used only the top coding category for analysis.

The four themes/parent nodes within the component of teaming included: Teaming—Social Needs, Teaming—Affective Needs, Teaming—Linguistic Needs, and Teaming—Academic Needs. Given that within this teaming component, three of the four dominant themes had only one top coding category that involved evidence from all three participant groups, there

was a total of only five dominant coding categories used for analysis: Interaction in a Safe Setting, Role of Family and Community Members, Safe Setting, Assist with Four Language Skills, and Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input.

Teaming—Social Needs

The coding category for teaming and social needs that was found in all three participant groups was Interaction in a Safe Setting.

Interaction in a Safe Setting

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) cultivated an atmosphere where teacher teaming played a significant role and where it is carried out to this day. Teachers received years of training by working with a nearby state university. This training informed teachers on how to interact with staff and students as a team. Particularly, Team 7 teachers formed an interactive network with other teachers throughout the building. This was especially crucial when mainstreaming ELLs— the ESL team could provide academic and behavior information to mainstream teachers. In addition, they could impart suggestions on how different techniques could help particular students.

Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) discussed that Team 7 has a common planning time to discuss student issues—their needs, their strengths and weaknesses, how to adjust instruction. Then, because the students are together in Team 7 classrooms, the students are motivated to do their best, as they are in a similar situation. Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) mentioned that Team 7 classrooms have students from different countries. Therefore, a common bonding occurs as they develop friendships and interact academically within a safe environment.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) summarized that Team 7 teachers check on students, meet their needs, and assist students when they have questions. Ms. Lane stated,

153

. . . we make a lot of use of visual aides, manipulatives, Kagan strategies, so that

we are all able to support and encourage students as they're learning a new

language, and this lowers that affective filter and promotes confidence within the

students. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 7)

Ms. Rivers detailed how Team 7 provides a safe setting, saying,

. . . there's not one of us on the team that has the sheltered classes that would

allow a student to be ridiculed, as we stop it immediately. We talk with the

students and work with them to learn to get along. I think we provide very safe

environments that the students feel free to venture answers, even though they're

not sure they are correct. (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 11)

Most of the students reported that they felt safe in Team 7 courses. Pedro said that it is

"because they know I speak English, but not very well. So, they help me, and they don't make

fun of us" (Pedro Interview, 11/19/08, p. 6). Roberto (12/8/08) recognized that not all students

speak perfect English, so the students help each other. Rosa stated that she felt safe because

"they are like me. They don't know English very well" (Rosa Interview, 12/10/08, p. 6). Tania

(Interview, 12/15/08) agreed with this sentiment, mentioning that students in Team 7 courses are

in a similar situation—that they all need to learn English. However, Naomi (11/21/08) expressed

that, at times, she felt embarrassed because she did not know how to say a word and that some

people made fun of her, even though those same students had the same language issues that she

had. A follow-up question revealed that this occurred in a social studies class with a teacher who

is no longer with the district. The established Team 7 teachers were not involved.

Teaming—Affective Needs

The two primary coding categories for teaming and affective needs were Role of Family and Community Members and Safe Setting.

Role of Family and Community Members

Dr. Garcia revealed that Team 7 teachers are an integral part of "reaching out, getting the parents involved, letting the parents know what is going on in school. Letting the parents know that they are sensitive to the needs—not only emotional, but academic needs of the kids" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 25). Dr. Juarez (Interview, 11/15/08) specifically mentioned that Team 7 teachers have held parent meetings, suppers with the students and parents, and several meetings with state universities that provided college information sessions for students and parents.

Mr. Track (Interview, 11/14/08) said that Team 7 attempts to get parents involved with their student's education by going out into the community, rather than solely expecting them to come to the school. One example was when the team went to the community center for a pizza party. Other ways that Team 7 teachers involved parents included having meetings with them and offering luncheons at the school. Bilingual aides would call the homes to invite the parents to various events, whether they were social activities or parent-teacher conferences. Ms. Lane stressed the importance of parent involvement by stating,

> . . . the family is your very best ally. And Team 7 has done a lot, where they have had the parent come up and sit down with the parent liason, the entire team, and have talked with the parent about situations with the student and asked for the parents' input and suggestions about working with that student. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 16)

The staff members remembered involving parents in informal events or meetings about their students. However, none of the students specifically remembered having any family or community member help students within their Team 7 courses.

Safe Setting

The second primary coding category for teaming and affective needs was Safe Setting. Dr. Garcia said that Team 7 creates a safe setting by "working closely with kids. And identifying the moment they see something that is not normal" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 24). Dr. Juarez addressed the issue of a safe setting in the sense of providing a safe cultural atmosphere, and that Team 7 plays a vital role in accomplishing this. He said that he does not hear students being ridiculed and that Team 7 becomes the in-between during school-wide cultural events, as ELLs are often included by bringing in their traditional cultural attire, participating in cultural dancing, or giving informative cultural presentations. In addition, Team 7 reduces student stress levels, helps students feel accepted within the school, and assists them with confidence in their right to learn. As Dr. Juarez stated, "I see them awfully pushy and very aggressive for learning. And very aggressive for what's rightly theirs, but not in a bad way, but in a way that—'Yeah, I'm here for this particular purpose'" (Dr. Juarez Interview, 12/17/08, p. 13).

Mr. Track mentioned that Team 7 does an excellent job of placing students with bilingual peer mentors within the mentorship program, and that the teachers try to get the parents involved. In addition, the teachers attempt "to surround them [students] with as many different possibilities in growth as we possibly can, and [attempt to] understand where they're coming from" (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08, p. 11). Ms. Lane discussed that, as the students are from various countries, there is a diverse ELL population, and she said,

I think the Team 7 has done a really good job of having reward parties for those

students—to foster times when the students can simply sit and talk about what

they did, or what life was like in their own individual countries. And that helps to

foster a sense of dignity and acceptance of kids who are, look, or sound different.

than you do. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 15)

Ms. Rivers (Interview, 12/5/08) revealed that Team 7 provides a safe setting for ELLs by pairing

students with peers who speak their native language within classes, orienting students to the

building, scheduling students in ways tailored to their needs, and assisting them with logistics,

such as with I.D. badges and lunch applications.

All students reported feeling comfortable and safe within their Team 7 courses. Naomi

mentioned that she felt comfortable, "when they talk to me in my language" (Naomi Interview,

11/21/08, p. 10). She also mentioned that her comfort level increased when the teachers

explained words that she did not understand, and when teachers allowed her to ask her peers

questions about her assignments. Pedro said that he felt like his teachers were like friends, "that I

could ask them questions if I had one" (Pedro Interview, 11/19/08, p. 10). In addition, he

mentioned that if he had a problem in their class, or other classes, that he felt free to discuss

these issues with his Team 7 teachers.

Teaming—Linguistic Needs

The primary coding category for teaming and linguistic needs was Assist with Four

Language Skills.

Assist with Four Language Skills

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) relayed that the whole concept of teacher teaming was

developed around meeting the needs of the students, and developing the four language skills with

ELLs is a part of addressing their academic needs. Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) mentioned that Team 7 views tests, such as the MAP test (district reading test), to decide as a team how to adjust the curriculum to assist students on the skills on which they did not perform well. Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) stated that Team 7 teachers provide activities for each of the four primary language skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) discussed how the teacher team makes joint decisions on the placement of students that are based on their individual needs to develop the four language skills. Ms. Rivers mentioned that the course offerings for ELLs provide "overlapping training in reading, and writing, and speaking, and listening. And that we make various demands of them in those four areas" (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 22).

The students confirmed the teachers' sentiments. All the students mentioned that they learned reading, writing, speaking, and listening in all their Team 7 courses.

Teaming—Academic Needs

The primary coding category for teaming and academic needs was Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input.

Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input

Dr. Juarez discussed that teacher teaming provides "a quick glance of how the kids are doing across content areas. It also allows them a good tracking mechanism of kids that are either falling behind, and/or progressing well, or making adequate progress" (Dr. Juarez Interview, 12/17/08, p. 16). Mr. Bond (Interview, 11/13/08) discussed working together with Ms. Hermosa by providing additional science activities that reinforce vocabulary and content knowledge for the students. Ms. Hermosa uses these materials during the advisory class period, which is also used by Team 7 to reinforce content-area knowledge.

Mr. Track verified that the team has "numerous hours of communication together, and we work together as a team" (Mr. Track Interview, 11/14/08, p. 19). Ms. Lane stated,

> We spent a lot of time actually examining individual students and looking at their grades, not just in our classes, but all the classes. And in working with those teachers—finding out what it is that those students need to do to be successful… We just do a lot of discussion, and a lot of record keeping on the students, and so that we are able to go to those students and provide them the assistance that they need in order to be successful. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 26)

Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) also revealed that the seminar, or advisory, period was used to provide additional tutoring for beginning ELLs. For example, there were station rotations in science, math, vocabulary, and English language learning within the freshmen advisories of Ms. Lakes and Ms. Hermosa. Sophomore ELLs were placed with Mr. Track or Mr. Bond for advisory; they provided focused instruction for the state math assessment that all students take during their sophomore year. Juniors were placed with Ms. Rivers for advisory, as she had the same students in her English III class. Ms. Rivers utilized the additional time to focus on instruction that would help the students with taking the state reading assessments during their junior year.

All students thought that it was a good idea to have a few teachers, or a teacher team, who have the same students work together. Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) mentioned that this teaming aspect helps students, as all the Team 7 teachers help students to understand the material if they are incorrect in their English usage. However, if the students are correct, then the teachers inform them that they are correct. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) stated that it is good to have a team of teachers working together, because they encourage the students to continue studying. If

159

the students do not understand a concept, then the teachers continue to assist them through

further explanations to increase their comprehension. Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) said the

teachers help the students to better understand the content. Tania thought that the teacher team

"can complain to make other job(s) for the students" (Tania Interview, 12/15/08, p. 20). By this

she meant that teachers work together to provide more rigorous content and activities for

students.

Spanish for Native Speakers Courses—NVivo 8 Analysis of Interviews

The research question addressed in this section of analysis is Secondary Question Four:

To what extent do Spanish for native speakers courses in an urban ESL program address the

social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

As previously indicated in this chapter, all perception samples from the ESL program's

structural components were analyzed for possible coding categories. Table 9 depicts the coding

categories that were present in the interview perception samples of the Spanish for native

speakers courses component of a high school ESL program.

Table 9—NVivo 8 Results: Spanish for Native Speakers

	Role = Administrator	Role = Teacher	Role = Student
1 : SNS—Academic Needs	0	0	0
2 : Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses	1	2	5
3 : Assistance	0	0	4
4 : Building Provision for SNS Courses	2	2	0
5 : Comprehensible Input with SNS Courses	0	2	5
6 : Correlations between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks	1	2	5
7 : Other	1	5	5
8 : SNS—Affective Needs	0	0	0
9 : Diversity	1	2	0
10 : Expectations—for SNS Courses	1	2	5

11 : Groups	0	0	5
12 : Meaningful Activities	1	2	5
13 : Native Language	1	2	0
14 : Other	1	5	5
15 : Practice and Corrections	1	2	5
16 : Prior Knowledge	1	2	5
17 : Promote Active Engagement	0	2	0
18 : Role of Family and Community Members	1	2	5
19 : Safe Setting	1	2	0
20 : SNS—Linguistic Needs	0	0	0
21 : Academic Discourse in L1	1	2	4
22 : Correlations Between Developing Four Language Skills in L1 and L2	1	2	1
23 : Develop Written	1	2	2

and Oral Systems—Phonology, Semantics, Pragmatics, and Syntax			
24 : Materials in L1	0	0	5
25 : Other	2	5	5
26 : Program Suggestions	0	0	5
27 : Purpose of SNS Courses	1	0	0
28 : SNS Assist with Four Language Skills	1	2	5
29 : Vocabulary Acquisition in L1	1	2	5
30 : SNS—Social Needs	0	0	0
31 : Fairness	0	0	5
32 : Groups in L1	0	0	5
33 : Native Language for Academic Development	1	3	0
34 : Other	1	5	5
35 : Prior Knowledge	1	3	5
36 : Safe Setting	1	3	5

The NVivo 8 matrix queries again found a varying combination of coding category results within the perception samples of the Spanish for native speakers courses component. For the purpose of this analysis, the coding categories that were found within all three perception samples will be closely examined. Again, the researcher selected for this analysis the top two coding categories within each educational need's theme.

An analysis of each of the most dominant coding categories for the Spanish for native speakers courses component provided insight into the most prevalent patterns found in the perception samples. There were a few instances when there were more than two coding categories that met this criterion. However, the coding categories were narrowed down to two for each theme for analysis. The researcher did this by removing those categories that were discussed within other themes, so that duplication would be minimized.

The four themes/parent nodes within the component of Spanish for native speakers courses include: SNS—Social Needs, SNS—Affective Needs, SNS—Linguistic Needs, and SNS—Academic Needs. The top two coding categories within each theme provided the following eight total dominant coding categories for analysis: Prior Knowledge, Safe Setting, Meaningful Activities, Practice and Corrections, SNS Assist with Four Language Skills, Vocabulary Acquisition in L1, Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses, and Correlations Between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks.

SNS—Social Needs

The two primary coding categories for Spanish for native speakers courses and social needs were Prior Knowledge and Safe Setting.

164

Prior Knowledge

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) believed that it was for the teachers, the counselors, or team leaders to discover the prior knowledge of the students, as far as official transcripts. He said that the students came to the school with a variety of knowledge backgrounds. Some have more cognitive knowledge than others, while others do not have any content knowledge and can only speak their native language. He continued that, essentially, teachers have to figure out each student's abilities on a one-on-one basis.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) maintained that Spanish for native speakers courses need to affirm and increase the students' knowledge of their L1, so that it will be easier for them to transfer their linguistic knowledge from one language to another language. Ms. Lane stated,

> The way that the course was structured, there was a good deal of setting up, and examining prior knowledge, at the beginning of every unit. The thematic concept might be explored for something that the student did—within his [or her] own native country—an experience that he or she might have had. There's a great deal of care to bring prior knowledge in—to help the student understand that they [he or she] will be able to manage the content of any particular unit. (Ms. Lane, Interview, 11/16/08, p. 10)

Ms. Rivers continued with a description of how Spanish for native speakers courses address the prior knowledge of students. She relayed,

> They are given an assessment, to see how much Spanish they do know, and then the teacher works to fill in that prior knowledge. They also look at transcripts and know what kind of classes the students have had—what kind of grades they've had in their native language and plan their lessons accordingly. (Ms. Rivers Interview, 12/5/08, p. 13)

Overall, all the students agreed that they were able to use their prior knowledge—the information they already knew from their life experience, or information that they had learned in school in their home country—in their Spanish for native speakers courses.

Safe Setting

The second dominant coding category for Spanish for native speakers courses and social needs is Safe Setting. Dr. Garcia discussed the importance of Spanish for native speakers courses and how they meet the needs of students in providing a safe setting. He shared the following perception, which combines social and affective needs.

> I think if you feel good about yourself, you don't let anything bother you. And these kids did feel—or do feel good about themselves now. And I think if the teachers and the administration keep on saying, "Hey! The use of the second language—I mean the use of Spanish [for] the native speakers—is O.K. The more you know, the better you are." And if they keep on harping on—"If you speak two languages and you know two cultures—you are richer than the person that speaks one language and knows one culture." (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 18)

Ms. Lane mentioned that most people assume that students are from Mexico when they hear the phrase, "Spanish for native speakers." She continued that a large percentage of students who take the classes are from Mexico; however, many students are from other areas of Central and South America. Ms. Lane further made the case for a safe setting by stating, "I think that even amongst the students, it's fostered a sense of respect of other Spanish-speaking nations, and their culture, and their contributions to the Spanish-speaking society as a whole" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 9).

Ms. Rivers discussed the unique perspective that the Spanish for native speakers teacher has in meeting the educational needs of students. She commented,

I think that the instructor of the native speakers courses can talk with the students on a different level than we non-Spanish speakers. And I think the students have respect for their opinions. So if they think that a teacher is picking on them, because they keep calling on them, or something, I think that that teacher can talk with them and discuss it in Spanish—about how the teacher is just trying to get them—encourage them to respond, and that doesn't necessarily mean that they are picking on them. And that teacher is also available for the students to go to, and talk about any setting, or any situation that they are uncomfortable in, and then that teacher can help the student work out that difficulty. (Ms. Rivers, Interview, 12/5/08, pp. 12-13)

Overall, the students confirmed the sentiments of the staff members, as every student informant revealed that he or she felt safe, or free, to participate in Spanish for native speakers courses without being worried about other students making fun of them.

SNS—Affective Needs

The two primary coding categories for Spanish for native speakers courses and affective needs were Meaningful Activities and Practice and Corrections.

Meaningful Activities

Dr. Garcia equated Spanish to any other content class, such as English, by stating that teachers, "are going to try to provide the kids with the curriculum and the level that the kids are in—you do the same in Spanish" (Dr. Garcia Interview, 11/15/08, p. 21). Therefore, the

expectation is that meaningful activities should be performed in each class, regardless of the content.

Ms. Hermosa mentioned that meaningful activities are implemented within Spanish for native speakers courses throughout each topic covered (e.g., reading, writing, grammar, and culture). Ms. Lane detailed meaningful activities that were particularly related to literature, stating,

> The content automatically in a Spanish for Native Speakers course is probably more meaningful to the student, because they are coming across pieces of literature that they've heard of, or that perhaps they've read some of in the past. They're seeing writers that are familiar to them—and even those that aren't, they're still Spanish-speaking authors. And so that automatically—is more meaningful to them, than to have a writer that they have never heard of. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 18)

All of the students agreed that their Spanish for native speakers courses had activities for them to participate in, as opposed to mere teacher lecture, and that they were able to relate the information from those activities to their daily life. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) mentioned that speaking in Spanish was one activity. In addition, students confirmed that they had to do projects that included speaking. Furthermore, Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) discussed that students had to make big posters related to what they read, such as a book. Specifically, he recalled one book, called "Josefa;" when the students finished the reading, they had to apply information to a big poster and present it to the class.

Practice and Corrections

The second primary coding category for Spanish for native speakers courses and affective needs was Practice and Corrections. Dr. Garcia inferred that practice and corrections, within Spanish for native speakers courses, play a major role in improving students' reading and writing skills in their language, and that the goal is to improve the students' L1.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) mentioned that she daily promotes reading and writing activities in her Spanish for native speakers courses, especially summarization activities. Ms. Lane discussed that reading and writing activities in Spanish for native speakers courses are utilized in a similar manner as found in English courses, and that practice and corrections play a significant role in these processes. Students have to practice writing in formal and informal settings, and the "Six Trait Analytical Model" (Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 2000) is used to review their writing. Ms. Lane stated, "They're expected to do all of the same pre-writing, writing, correction, self-correction, peer correction, and final production as students are in an English classroom" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 17).

With regard to the student participants, they confirmed that their Spanish for native speakers courses provided them with opportunities to read and write in Spanish and to make corrections when they made mistakes.

SNS—Linguistic Needs

The two significant coding categories for Spanish for native speakers courses and linguistic needs were SNS Assist with the Four Language Skills and Vocabulary Acquisition in L1.

SNS Assist with Four Language Skills

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) discussed that the entire purpose of the Spanish for native speakers courses was to provide students with something they could immediately comprehend and improve upon, while at the same time, they could receive credits for graduation. These courses were created because students were not ready to immediately function in mainstream English courses.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) stressed that she provides various activities—reading, writing, and speaking—to meet the needs of ELLs. Specifically, the speaking activities involve different projects in which students must verbally present. Ms. Lane provided insight into how the Spanish for native speakers courses address the linguistic needs of ELLs. She stated, They provide a good deal of assistance, because a lot of native speakers that we get in the building are highly proficient at speaking. However, their reading skills are deficient, their writing skills are deficient, and their listening skills are moderate. So, the course evens out those skills and helps the students individually develop better reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 22)

All students mentioned that they participated in classroom discussions in their Spanish for native speakers courses, and all students but Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) reported giving formal speeches. Writing and reading skills were addressed in Spanish for native speakers courses, as Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) specified that students wrote about books and newspapers that they read. Tania (12/15/08) stated that students wrote about authors that they read in class and that students practiced writing letters. Students developed Spanish listening skills by listening to Spanish videos, the teacher, and other students. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) specifically added that she listened to CDs in Spanish.

170

Vocabulary Acquisition in L1

The second coding category for Spanish for native speakers courses and linguistic needs was Vocabulary Acquisition in L1. Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) mentioned that the more students know about their native language, as in vocabulary, the easier it will be for students to learn their second language—English. Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) discussed that the Spanish for native speakers courses focus on developing academic vocabulary, as students are not normally exposed to this vocabulary from daily social interactions. Specifically, she stated that students are learning about 30 words per unit, every two to three weeks.

Ms. Lane pointed out that students learn Spanish vocabulary in a similar fashion to how students learn vocabulary in English courses. The vocabulary is kept in context, as "the teacher examines the text ahead of time for words that might be problematic to the student" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 23). Therefore, teachers are able to highlight the vocabulary and discuss it with students for increased comprehension in assigned readings.

Students discussed how they learned vocabulary words in Spanish. Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) said that she saw words, listened to their pronunciation, and worked with them through writing. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) revealed that Ms. Lane taught students new words and that he used dictionaries for new vocabulary words when he read books in Spanish (and in English), such as the Harry Potter books. Surprisingly, Roberto revealed, "I really didn't learn anything— anything in Spanish. It was just stuff that I already knew" (Roberto Interview, 12/8/08, p. 16). Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) talked about using dictionaries for new vocabulary and implementing the vocabulary in writing activities. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) discussed learning vocabulary from the teacher explanations and using dictionaries. In addition, she mentioned that some of the stories were from Puerto Rico; therefore, some of the vocabulary was similar to what she already knew from Mexico.

171

SNS—Academic Needs

The primary coding categories for Spanish for native speakers courses and academic needs were Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses and Correlations Between SNS and other Content Area Benchmarks.

Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses

Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) declared that the primary academic concepts that Spanish for native speakers courses addressed were language skills. Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) provided a specific example of how students were expected to transfer information from English into Spanish. She assigned a project that involved studying Pablo Neruda, a poet, and students transferring information they had gathered from research in English into Spanish. Ms. Lane outlined the crux of how Spanish for native speakers courses addressed academic concepts by stating,

> Spanish for Native Speaker courses—as we have already stated—use the same SBIs (Standards, Benchmarks, and Indicators) as the English class. And so, they're working on those same concepts—character analysis, setting, plot, the individual parts of poetry, word analysis, etc. So, those kinds of academic concepts are taught in much the same way that the student will find them being taught in their regular English classroom. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, pp. 26-27)

All students agreed that they practiced reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills in their Spanish for native speakers courses, which addressed their academic needs in regard to developing language skills. Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) said that writing essays helped her the most with her Spanish academic needs. Pedro (Interview, 11/19/08) declared that writing helped him the most with his Spanish academic needs. Roberto (Interview, 12/8/08) mentioned that

172

reading assisted him the most with his Spanish academic needs; this detail is interesting, because he mentioned earlier that he did not learn anything new, since he already knew Spanish. Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) stated that writing summaries about stories helped her the most with her Spanish academic needs. Finally, Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) indicated that learning new vocabulary words and reading assisted her the most with her Spanish academic needs.

Correlations Between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks

The second coding category for Spanish for native speakers courses and academic needs was Correlations Between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks. The administrator participants were not aware of the correlations in curriculum standards and benchmarks that exist between English courses and Spanish for native speakers courses. To be fair, district-wide standards for English did not exist when Dr. Garcia was principal at Amos Heights.

Ms. Hermosa (Interview, 12/1/08) declared that there are no district-wide standards for Spanish for native speakers courses. Therefore, she uses the standards from the English benchmarks for her Spanish for native speakers courses; however, the coursework and evaluations are conducted in Spanish. This coursework is implemented to prepare students for English III and IV concepts, since the concepts do transfer between Spanish and English. As indicated in the prior coding category of Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses, Ms. Lane reiterated that there is a correlation between Spanish for native speakers courses and English benchmarks. She emphasized, "the concepts and the benchmarks are almost identical" (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 27).

With regard to students' perceptions, Naomi (Interview, 11/21/08) revealed that the Spanish for native speakers courses helped her learn material for other content classes, especially English, as the benchmarks seemed like they were the same, with a few words changed. Pedro

specifically mentioned that Spanish for native speakers courses helped him with the English concepts of "setting, plot, and character—uh—background" (Pedro Interview, 11/19/08, p. 23). Roberto (Interview, 12/8/08) reiterated that the Spanish for native speakers courses did not assist him in learning material for other content courses. Rosa (Interview, 12/10/08) mentioned that the Spanish for native speakers courses helped her with understanding vocabulary words for other content classes. Tania (Interview, 12/15/08) also revealed that the Spanish for native speakers courses assisted her with understanding vocabulary words in Spanish and in English.

Classroom Snapshot Observations—ESL Needs Rubric Analysis

The research questions primarily addressed in this section of analysis are Secondary Questions Two and Four: To what extent do sheltered content courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs? To what extent do Spanish for native speakers courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

All observation samples from the ESL program's structural components were analyzed for possible strengths and weaknesses in addressing the educational needs of ELLs. Table 10 depicts the results of how often each educational need was noted within each classroom observation, which addressed the structural components of sheltered content courses and Spanish for native speakers courses.

Table 10—Classroom Snapshot Observations with Overall Percentages
(Note: B.L. represents Birdie Lane observations)

		Classroom Snapshot Observation Totals						
		Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Total**	**Highest**	**Lowest**
Courses Observed								
Physical Science	**(B.L.)**	70.00%	83.00%	88.89%	81.82%	80.93%	Ling.	Social
Physical Science		85.71%	70.00%	88.89%	83.33%	81.98%	Ling.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**77.86%**	**76.50%**	**88.89%**	**82.58%**	**81.46%**	**Ling.**	**Aff.**
Algebra 2/3	**(B.L.)**	85.71%	95.83%	73.33%	77.78%	83.16%	Aff.	Ling.
Algebra 2/3		80.95%	91.67%	66.67%	69.70%	77.25%	Aff.	Ling.
Average Totals:		**83.33%**	**93.75%**	**70.00%**	**73.74%**	**80.21%**	**Aff.**	**Ling.**
Beginning ESL	**(B.L.)**	80.95%	77.78%	76.67%	63.64%	74.76%	Soc.	Aca.
Beginning ESL		76.19%	70.00%	76.67%	71.79%	73.66%	Ling.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**78.57%**	**73.89%**	**76.67%**	**67.72%**	**74.21%**	**Soc.**	**Aca.**
SNS	**(B.L.)**	100.00%	95.83%	86.67%	70.00%	88.13%	Soc.	Aca.
SNS		100.00%	88.89%	86.67%	69.23%	86.20%	Soc.	Aca.
Average Totals:		**100.00%**	**92.36%**	**86.67%**	**69.62%**	**87.16%**	**Soc.**	**Aca.**
English 3	**(B.L.)**	85.71%	66.67%	73.33%	63.64%	72.34%	Soc.	Aca.
English 3		85.71%	60.00%	76.67%	69.44%	72.96%	Soc.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**85.71%**	**63.34%**	**75.00%**	**66.54%**	**72.65%**	**Soc.**	**Aff.**

ESL Read 180	**(B.L.)**	76.19%	66.67%	70.37%	69.70%	70.73%	Soc.	Aff.
ESL Read 180		66.67%	63.33%	76.67%	63.64%	67.58%	Ling.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**71.43%**	**65.00%**	**73.52%**	**66.67%**	**69.16%**	**Ling.**	**Aff.**
Algebra 1	**(B.L.)**	85.71%	70.37%	60.00%	72.73%	72.20%	Soc.	Ling.
Algebra 1		90.48%	56.67%	56.67%	72.73%	69.14%	Soc.	Aff./Ling.
Average Totals:		**88.10%**	**63.52%**	**58.34%**	**72.73%**	**70.67%**	**Soc.**	**Ling.**
American History	**(B.L.)**	90.48%	91.67%	70.83%	69.44%	80.61%	Aff.	Aca.
American History		95.24%	91.67%	63.33%	69.44%	79.92%	Soc.	Ling.
Average Totals:		**92.86%**	**91.67%**	**67.08%**	**69.44%**	**80.26%**	**Soc.**	**Ling.**
TOTALS		***84.73%***	***77.50%***	***74.52%***	***71.13%***	***76.97%***	***Soc.***	***Aca.***

The classroom snapshot observations performed by Ms. Lane and the researcher were used to analyze the sheltered content courses and Spanish for native speakers courses components. Ms. Lane, a retired Spanish for native speakers teacher, former Team 7 member, and interview participant for this study, was utilized in this piece of the study to increase trustworthiness in the data through member checking. The researcher developed a classroom snapshot rubric that was centered around the four educational needs of ELLs (see Appendix D). The points of evidence were based on the definitions of the educational needs (Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Graves, 1995; Walsh, 1991), as previously discussed.

Both observers used the rubric during a total of eight classroom observations, which ranged between 20 and 30 minutes. Afterwards, the observation points were converted into percentages for analysis. In some instances, a point of evidence was not applicable, due to the nature of the courses. Therefore, these elements were not included in the calculations for the total points available within that specific educational need. The researcher counted the actual points of evidence and divided that number by the total number of points of evidence possible for each particular educational need. Then, the researcher converted this number to a percentage.

Next, the percentages for both of the researchers' observations were averaged for each educational need within each observation. These total percentage numbers for each educational need were then compared to each other, so that the highest percentage determined which educational need was cited the most. The lowest percentages determined which educational need was cited the least. The overall percentages revealed which educational need possessed the highest points of evidence in reference to all the observations. In this case, it was the social need. In addition, the overall percentages revealed which educational need possessed the fewest points of evidence in reference to all the observations. In this case, it was the academic need (see Table

10). Therefore, one might determine that ELL social needs are addressed the most within sheltered content courses, and that attention to ELL academic needs should be increased.

To investigate the sheltered content courses more thoroughly, the highest overall percentage scores are reviewed for each sheltered content course. The following analysis is based on Table 10, which revealed results based on percentages of the average totals between the two observers for each educational need and class observation. The highest overall percentage scores for the social educational need were found in the sheltered courses of Beginning ESL, Spanish for Native Speakers, English III, Algebra I, and American History. Five out of the eight observations indicated the social educational need as the need most addressed during these particular snapshots in time, as demonstrated by percentage.

The second highest scores for the linguistic educational need were evident within the sheltered courses of Physical Science and ESL Read 180. The last educational need within the highest category revealed the affective educational need, which was found within the Algebra 2/3 course. Thus, the academic educational need was noticeably absent from any of the observations within the highest total categories.

In fact, the lowest percentages for the overall observations were found within the academic educational need. When reviewing each observation, the lowest scores for the academic educational need were evident in the following classes: Beginning ESL and Spanish for Native Speakers. However, the "Lowest" category in Table 10 showed that academic need appeared twice in the Average Totals from the two observers, as opposed to the linguistic and affective needs that emerged three times in the lowest category, though they had higher overall percentage rates of evidence. The second lowest overall percentage was the linguistic educational need. Specifically, the following courses demonstrated that the second lowest

category—the linguistic educational need—was found in Algebra 2/3, Algebra I, and American History. The courses within the Lowest category for the affective need involved Physical Science, English 3, and ESL Read 180.

Though the American History class was not an official Team 7 course, it was a clustered course, in which a bilingual aide assisted the teacher with a group/cluster of ELLs. However, after removing this observation from the result totals, there were no changes. Therefore, the overall results for the ESL program's structural components of sheltered content courses and Team 7 were not skewed.

The "Total," "Highest," and "Lowest" columns in Table 10 summarize how sheltered content courses address the educational needs of ELLs in their entirety. Each sheltered course possesses combined average totals for all four educational needs. The overall findings for the snapshot observations revealed that the overall needs of ELLs were addressed by courses according to the following percentages (courses are listed in descending order): Spanish for Native Speakers—87.16%, Physical Science—81.46%, American History—80.26%, Algebra 2/3—80.21%, Beginning ESL—74.21%, English 3—72.65%, Algebra I—70.67%, and ESL Read 180—69.16%. In addition, the overall percentage for all the combined observations in regard to meeting the four educational needs of ELLs was 76.97%. Thus, the Spanish for Native Speakers course appears to perform the best at addressing ELL educational needs, while the ESL Read 180 course needs the most work to improve efforts in addressing the educational needs of ELLs.

Table 11 provides a different interpretation of the observation data than that illustrated in Table 10. When looking at the total points of evidence available and the actual points of evidence observed, the investigator uncovered that the academic need had the most points of

evidence observed. The actual points of evidence were ordered from largest to smallest in

number for each educational need, so that sheltered content courses could be explicitly analyzed.

Table 11—Classroom Snapshots Results with Points of Evidence
(Note: B.L. represents Birdie Lane observations)

		ESL Needs Rubric Classroom Snapshots Results						
		Social				Affective		
		Actual	Total	Percentage		Actual	Total	Percentage
Teachers								
Physical Science	(B.L.)	14	20	70.00%		20	24	83.33%
Physical Science		18	21	85.71%		21	30	70.00%
Algebra 2/3	(B.L.)	18	21	85.71%		23	24	95.83%
Algebra 2/3		17	21	80.95%		22	24	91.67%
Beginning ESL	(B.L.)	17	21	80.95%		21	27	77.78%
Beginning ESL		16	21	76.19%		21	30	70.00%
SNS	(B.L.)	18	18	100.00%		23	24	95.83%
SNS		21	21	100.00%		24	27	88.89%
English 3	(B.L.)	18	21	85.71%		18	27	66.67%
English 3		18	21	85.71%		18	30	60.00%
ESL Read 180	(B.L.)	16	21	76.19%		18	27	66.67%
ESL Read 180		14	21	66.67%		19	30	63.33%
Algebra I	(B.L.)	18	21	85.71%		19	27	70.37%
Algebra I		19	21	90.48%		17	30	56.67%
American History	(B.L.)	19	21	90.48%		22	24	91.67%
American History		20	21	95.24%		22	24	91.67%
TOTALS		**281**	**332**	**84.64%**		**328**	**429**	**76.46%**

		Linguistic				Academic		
		Actual	**Total**	**Percentage**		**Actual**	**Total**	**Percentage**
Teachers								
Physical Science	**(B.L.)**	16	18	88.89%		27	33	81.82%
Physical Science		16	18	88.89%		30	36	83.33%
Algebra 2/3	**(B.L.)**	11	15	73.33%		21	27	77.78%
Algebra 2/3		12	18	66.67%		23	33	69.70%
Beginning ESL	**(B.L.)**	23	30	76.67%		21	33	63.64%
Beginning ESL		23	30	76.67%		28	39	71.79%
SNS	**(B.L.)**	26	30	86.67%		21	30	70.00%
SNS		26	30	86.67%		27	39	69.23%
English 3	**(B.L.)**	22	30	73.33%		21	33	63.64%
English 3		23	30	76.67%		25	36	69.44%
ESL Read 180	**(B.L.)**	19	27	70.37%		23	33	69.70%
ESL Read 180		23	30	76.67%		21	33	63.64%
Algebra I	**(B.L.)**	18	30	60.00%		24	33	72.73%
Algebra I		17	30	56.67%		24	33	72.73%
American History	**(B.L.)**	17	24	70.83%		25	36	69.44%
American History		19	30	63.33%		25	36	69.44%
TOTALS		**311**	**420**	**74.05%**		**386**	**543**	**71.09%**

Table 12 was created to show an overall picture of the extent to which specific sheltered content courses addressed the specific educational needs of ELLs during classroom observations at given points in time. For analysis of the specific points of evidence, the researcher used the observations from the observer that possessed the highest actual score for each educational need.

Table 12—Classroom Observations Breakdown

ESL Needs Rubric Classroom Snapshots Results: Actual Points of Evidence						
	(*B.L. represents Birdie Lane Observations)					
Social				**Affective**		
Actual				**Actual**		
	Teachers				**Teachers**	
21	SNS			24	SNS	
20	American History			23	Algebra 2/3	**(B.L.)**
19	American History	**(B.L.)**		23	SNS	**(B.L.)**
19	Algebra I			22	Algebra 2/3	
18	Algebra 2/3	**(B.L.)**		22	American History	**(B.L.)**
18	Algebra I	**(B.L.)**		22	American History	
18	English 3	**(B.L.)**		21	Physical Science	
18	English 3			21	Beginning ESL	**(B.L.)**
18	Physical Science			21	Beginning ESL	
18	SNS	**(B.L.)**		20	Physical Science	**(B.L.)**
17	Algebra 2/3			19	ESL Read 180	
17	Beginning ESL	**(B.L.)**		19	Algebra I	**(B.L.)**
16	Beginning ESL			18	English 3	**(B.L.)**
16	ESL Read 180	**(B.L.)**		18	English 3	
14	Physical Science	**(B.L.)**		18	ESL Read 180	**(B.L.)**
14	ESL Read 180			17	Algebra I	
281	**TOTALS**			**328**	**TOTALS**	

Linguistic Actual	Teachers			Academic Actual	Teachers	
26	SNS			30	Physical Science	
26	SNS	(B.L.)		28	Beginning ESL	
23	Beginning ESL			27	Physical Science	(B.L.)
23	Beginning ESL	(B.L.)		27	SNS	
23	English 3			25	American History	(B.L.)
23	ESL Read 180			25	American History	
22	English 3	(B.L.)		25	English 3	
19	American History			24	Algebra I	(B.L.)
19	ESL Read 180	(B.L.)		24	Algebra I	
18	Algebra I	(B.L.)		23	Algebra 2/3	
17	American History	(B.L.)		23	ESL Read 180	(B.L.)
17	Algebra I			21	Algebra 2/3	(B.L.)
16	Physical Science	(B.L.)		21	Beginning ESL	(B.L.)
16	Physical Science			21	English 3	(B.L.)
12	Algebra 2/3			21	ESL Read 180	
11	Algebra 2/3	(B.L.)		21	SNS	(B.L.)
311	**TOTALS**			**386**	**TOTALS**	

Sheltered Content Courses—Social Needs

Table 11 delineates the most prevalent educational need for the sheltered content courses

component—social needs. Social needs emerged as the highest need present in the observations

when the findings were converted to percentages—84.64%—which resulted from averaging the

findings between the two observers. However, there are only 281 actual points of evidence—the

fewest hits out of all four educational needs. Table 12 reveals that Spanish for Native Speakers

and American History were the top two observations that addressed social needs. However, the

American History course was not a true sheltered content course; it was a course in which

clustering occurred, as a group of students were "clustered" with a bilingual aide for assistance

with the content. To gain clearer insight about the sheltered content course component, American

History was replaced with Algebra I—a designated sheltered content course—as the sheltered course with the second most actual points of evidence.

The points of evidence that received the highest markings within social needs in Spanish for Native Speakers included: native language affirmed in the classroom, interact with peers in native language, language courses in the native language, native language for academic development, use of students' prior knowledge, safe setting, and intellectual and emotional fairness. The points of evidence that received the highest markings within social needs in Algebra I involved native language affirmed in the classroom, interact with peers in native language, and a safe setting.

Sheltered Content Courses—Affective Needs

Affective needs were the second highest educational need met for the sheltered content courses component, as discovered when averaging the findings between the two observers at 76.46% (see Table 11). In addition, Table 12 confirms this ranking, as there were a total of 328 actual points of evidence—the second highest number of hits out of all four educational needs. The top two sheltered content courses that addressed affective needs were Spanish for Native Speakers and Algebra 2/3. Observers mutually agreed upon these findings.

Regarding the Spanish for Native Speakers observation, the highest points of evidence within affective needs included: responsive to cultural and personal diversity, high expectations for all learners, actively involved learners, ample practice and corrections, focus on relevant background knowledge, native language support, and meaningful content and activities for students. The Algebra 2/3 course exhibited the highest marks in the following coding categories: responsive to cultural and personal diversity, high expectations for all learners, actively involved

186

learners, use of alternate groupings, ample practice and careful corrections, focus on relevant background knowledge, and meaningful content and activities for students.

Sheltered Content Courses—Linguistic Needs

Linguistic needs are illustrated within Table 11 as the third most addressed educational need—74.05%—within the sheltered content courses component. There are 311 total actual points of evidence found within the linguistic need, which confirms the linguistic need's third place standing. Table 12 reveals that Spanish for Native Speakers and Beginning ESL were the two major sheltered content courses that addressed the linguistic need. The two observers verified this finding, as their actual points of evidence scores exactly matched. The focal linguistic coding categories addressed within Spanish for Native Speakers involved developing proficiency in the four language skills —writing in the native language, listening in the native language, speaking in the native language, phonology (pronunciation), semantics (analyzing the interpretation of the meaning of words), pragmatics (analyzing language in a situational context), and vocabulary (developed in the content area). Whereas, the foremost coding categories for Beginning ESL involved reading in English, writing in English, listening in English, and semantics (analyzing the interpretation of the meaning of words).

Sheltered Content Courses—Academic Needs

Table 11 reveals that academic needs ranked last among the four educational needs— 71.09%—within the sheltered content courses component. However, there are 386 total actual points of evidence found within the academic need, which has the most points of evidence out of the four educational needs. Table 12 reveals that Physical Science and Beginning ESL were the two sheltered content courses that most addressed the academic needs of ELLs. The two observers agreed upon Physical Science as their top choice addressing academic needs; however,

they disagreed regarding second place. The researcher scored Beginning ESL with 28 actual points of evidence, whereas Ms. Lane scored American History with 25 actual points of evidence. As previously mentioned, however, American History was removed from further analysis.

The Physical Science objective for the period of observation was about the states of matter, to "differentiate between solids, liquids, and gas." Physical Science revealed the following coding categories that chiefly addressed the academic needs of ELLs: appropriate placement of students, content course for graduation, lesson modifications—visuals, graphic organizers, vocabulary introduction, examples of production, cloze activity, and computer interactive practice and reviews. The Beginning ESL objective during the classroom observation was to "review nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs within a paragraph context." Beginning ESL involved the following coding categories that predominantly tended to the academic needs of ELLs: appropriate placement of students, content course for graduation (substitutes for an English I credit), cross-curricular concepts (English grammar), lesson modifications—visuals, a language activity, native language for comprehension, peer interaction about the assignment, and students asking questions to the bilingual teacher.

Spanish for Native Speakers Courses—Summary of Needs

Table 10 revealed that social needs were the needs primarily addressed by the Spanish for native speakers course, scoring a 100% by both observers based on the defined points of evidence for social needs. The second highest type of need addressed was affective needs, at 92.36%, which was deduced from averaging the scores of the two observers. Affective needs showed the greatest difference (6.94%) between the two observers for this content course. Regarding the degree to which linguistic needs were met, both observers agreed on 86.67%,

which put linguistic needs third. Academic needs were the least addressed by the Spanish for native speakers course at an average of 69.62%; the two observers were in close agreement with only a .77% difference between their judgments in findings. From the standpoint of actual points of evidence, Table 12 indicated that the Spanish for native speakers course was the dominant sheltered content course. Furthermore, it was the primary sheltered content course in addressing three of the four educational needs (social, affective, and linguistic).

Archival Records—Analysis of MAP Scores

The MAP scores from the district reading assessment for the 2007-08 school year drew the researcher's attention. The researcher reviewed the results from Ms. Lane's sheltered English II course, including the Fall 2007 and Winter 2008 assessments. A total of 26 students took the MAP assessment in both the Fall and Winter. The Fall scores served as the baseline data for comparing results with the Winter scores. Of the 26 students who took the test, 12 students produced growth in the double digits. This is remarkable, since this finding reveals that 46% of the students in this sample made significant gains in their district reading scores. This led the researcher to review the course placement of these 12 students.

Six students were simultaneously enrolled in three specific sheltered courses emphasizing language—English II, Spanish for Native Speakers, and ESL Read 180. Four students were enrolled in two of the sheltered courses emphasizing language—English II and ESL Read 180. However, these students had taken a Spanish for native speakers course the previous year. The remaining two students were African students, so the Spanish for native speakers course did not apply to them. However, they were enrolled in two of the sheltered courses emphasizing language—English II and Read 180. These findings suggest that student placement in more than one sheltered content course that emphasizes language can increases reading skills for ELLs.

189

Overall Program Analysis—Perception Grid Surveys

Perception Grid Surveys were given to each of the 13 interview participants and completed after each interview. The surveys were utilized as another instrument to gather the perceptions of various participants about the four components of the ESL program, as to how they met the educational needs of ELLs. The surveys were developed by the researcher, based on Walsh's (1991) educational needs, and placed into a grid format. Each component and need were matched up to a three-point Likert scale (see Appendix E). Participants selected a number to designate their perception of how each structural component met each educational need. The number one meant "needs improvement," two meant "performs adequately," and three meant "performs excellently."

Table 13 was created to show how each participant group and individual perceives the extent to which each educational need is addressed within the ESL program in the school of study. The data were transferred into an EXCEL format. Each participant's responses were added up and averaged into a percent format for each educational need and for each structural component. Overall totals were calculated for each participant group—administrators, teachers, and students. Then, overall totals were calculated for each structural component and educational need.

Table 13—Perception Grid Results by Participant Group

	Social	Affective	Linguistic	Academic	Total	Highest	Lowest
Perception Grid Results by Participant Group							
Administrators							
Dr. Garcia	100.00%	83.33%	75.00%	75.00%	83.33%		
Dr. Juarez	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	91.67%	89.59%		
TOTALS	**100.00%**	**91.67%**	**70.84%**	**83.34%**	**86.46%**	**Social**	**Linguistic**
Teachers							
Mr. Bond	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		
Mr. Track	77.78%	100.00%	77.78%	88.89%	86.11%		
Ms. Hermosa	100.00%	83.33%	83.33%	100.00%	91.67%		
Ms. Lane	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	83.33%	95.83%		
Ms. Rivers	100.00%	91.67%	83.33%	83.33%	89.58%		
Mr. Rodriguez	83.33%	66.67%	33.33%	83.33%	66.67%		
TOTALS	**93.52%**	**90.28%**	**79.63%**	**89.81%**	**88.31%**	**Social**	**Linguistic**
Students							
Pedro	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		
Naomi	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%		
Rosa	66.67%	66.67%	75.00%	75.00%	70.84%		
Roberto	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	83.33%	87.50%		
Tania	91.67%	91.67%	100.00%	100.00%	95.84%	**Tie:**	
TOTALS	**91.67%**	**91.67%**	**88.33%**	**91.67%**	**90.83%**	**S, Af, Ac**	**Linguistic**

The perception grid survey results found that administrators and teachers agreed in their perceptions of educational needs—that the ESL Program addressed social needs the most and linguistic needs the least. The student perceptions had a three-way tie between social, affective, and academic needs being addressed the most, and they agreed with the administrators and teachers that the linguistic needs of ELLs were the least addressed. Thus, the conclusion could be made that the program should improve upon providing for students' linguistic needs.

Table 14 combines data from all participant groups and was created to show how each participant group perceives the extent to which each structural component addressed the educational needs of ELLs. Each component revealed that the level of support for the linguistic need should be improved upon. This need possessed the lowest percentage within each component's category. When viewing the Perception Grid Surveys' highest results for each component, the researcher found that student placement addressed social needs. Sheltered content courses equally addressed affective and academic needs. Teaming equally addressed social, affective, and academic needs. Spanish for native speakers courses addressed social needs. Overall, when analyzing the percentage totals for each structural component, teaming had the highest percentage marks and placement possessed the lowest percentage.

Table 14—Perception Grid Survey Results—Combined from all Participant Groups

	Perception Grid Survey Results				**Educational**
	Placement	**Sheltered**	**Teaming**	**SNS**	**Need Totals**
Social:	94.87%	89.74%	94.44%	100.00%	94.44%
Affective:	87.18%	92.31%	94.44%	93.33%	91.67%
Linguistic:	79.49%	79.49%	88.89%	86.67%	83.33%
Academic:	82.05%	92.31%	94.44%	90.00%	89.58%
					89.76%
Component Totals:	85.90%	88.46%	93.05%	92.50%	**89.98%**
	Placement	**Sheltered**	**Teaming**	**SNS**	**Component Totals**
Highest:	Social	Aff./Aca.	Soc./Aff./Aca.	Social	Social
Lowest:	Linguistic	Linguistic	Linguistic	Linguistic	Linguistic
					Educational
	Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Need Totals**
Highest:	SNS	Teaming	Teaming	Teaming	Teaming
Lowest:	Sheltered	Placement	Placement/Sheltered	Placement	Placement

Table 15 depicts the perceptions of each participant group for each of the individual structural components. *Student placement*—the student group gave the highest marks to placement, whereas the administrator group had the lowest marks for student placement. *Sheltered content courses*—the student group gave the highest marks, and the administrator group provided the lowest marks for this component category. *Teaming*—students had the highest rankings for teaming, and teachers gave the lowest rankings for teaming. *Spanish for*

native speakers courses—administrators gave the highest marks for this component, whereas teachers provided the lowest marks. Though the teacher category had the lowest percentage rankings for the Spanish for native speakers courses component, this was primarily due to three teachers—Mr. Track, Mr. Bond, and Mr. Rodriguez. They did not answer or wrote in an N/A (not applicable) within the Spanish for native speakers courses component. They were not comfortable providing feedback on the Spanish for native speakers courses component because they were not familiar with the content and focus of the courses. Although their responses were considered to be not applicable, they were left in the calculations as a 0 to show in the results that these teachers were not privy to details of the Spanish for native speakers courses component.

Table 15—Perception Grid Results by Component and Individual Participant Groups

		Perception Grid Results by Structural Components and by Individual Participant Groups					
		Placement					
	Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Total**	**Highest**	**Lowest**
Admin.	100.00%	83.33%	66.67%	66.67%	79.17%		
Teachers	100.00%	83.33%	77.78%	77.78%	84.72%		
Students	86.67%	93.33%	86.67%	93.33%	90.00%	Stud.	Admin.
		Sheltered					
	Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Total**	**Highest**	**Lowest**
Admin.	100.00%	100.00%	66.67%	83.33%	87.50%		
Teachers	88.89%	88.89%	77.78%	88.89%	86.11%		
Students	86.67%	93.33%	86.67%	100.00%	91.67%	Stud.	Admin.
		Teaming					
	Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Total**	**Highest**	**Lowest**
Admin.	100.00%	83.33%	66.67%	83.33%	83.33%		
Teachers	77.78%	83.33%	77.78%	83.33%	80.56%		
Students	93.33%	93.33%	93.33%	93.33%	93.33%	Stud.	Teach.
		SNS					
	Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Total**	**Highest**	**Lowest**
Admin.	100.00%	100.00%	83.33%	100.00%	95.83%		
Teachers	50.00%	50.00%	44.44%	50.00%	48.61%		
Students	100.00%	86.67%	86.67%	80.00%	88.34%	Admin.	Teach.

	Placement	OVERALL Sheltered	PROGRAM Teaming	TOTALS SNS	Totals	Highest	Lowest
Admin.	79.17%	87.50%	83.33%	95.83%	86.46%	SNS	Placement
Teachers	84.72%	86.11%	80.56%	48.61%	75.00%	Sheltered	SNS
Students	90.00%	91.67%	93.33%	88.34%	90.84%	Teaming	SNS

In regard to overall perceptions of all participant groups, administrators ranked the Spanish for native speakers courses component the highest and student placement the lowest. Teachers ranked the sheltered content courses component the highest and Spanish for native speakers courses the lowest, mainly due to a lack of knowledge about the component. Students ranked the teaming component the highest and Spanish for native speakers courses the lowest.

The researcher cautions that quantifying these findings should not be directly interpreted as a formal evaluation, because it is difficult to gather accurate judgments without context. Therefore, the researcher suggests that these findings be utilized to facilitate a forum discussion among all participant groups regarding specific reasons for the rankings of each component. Then, program improvement could proceed from the suggestions gathered through the various participant dialogues.

Comprehensive Summary of Findings

This research revealed patterns that emerged in four areas of analysis: (a) dominant criteria for the component of student placement, (b) dominant criteria for the component of sheltered content courses, (c) dominant criteria for the component of teaming, and (d) dominant criteria for Spanish for native speakers courses. The findings for each of these areas revealed key differences between participant group perceptions within each component being studied.

Dominant Criteria for Student Placement

The participant perceptions of the high school ESL program revealed that the dominant criteria for the student placement component included: fairness, prior knowledge, diversity, a safe setting, courses promoting the four language skills (in the L2), courses promoting the four language skills in the L1, clustering with bilingual aides, and students placed in Team 7 courses. The aggregate scores of all participant groups revealed that within student placement, the social

need was addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least (Table 14). The administrators indicated that within student placement, the social need was addressed the most, while the linguistic and academic needs were addressed the least. The teachers also perceived that the social need was addressed the most, while linguistic and academic needs were addressed the least. Students perceived that the affective and academic needs were addressed the most, while the social and linguistic needs were fostered the least (Table 15). This indicates that student placement most strongly promotes the social need. The linguistic need might need to be revisited and strengthened within the student placement component. The MAP scores evidenced that 46% of the students who were placed in Sheltered English, ESL Read 180, and Spanish for Native Speakers (with the exception of two African students) increased their reading test scores by double digits. The conclusion from this finding is that placement into more than one sheltered content course that focuses on language development is essential to increasing reading skills. In addition, this could be interpreted to mean that the placement component really might be addressing linguistic needs better than participants perceive that it does.

Dominant Criteria for Sheltered Content Courses

The dominant criteria for the sheltered content courses included: native language for academic development, prior knowledge, expectations—teachers, meaningful activities, courses promoting four language skills, vocabulary acquisition, L1 used for comprehensible input, and lesson modification. Overall, the participant groups indicated that the affective and academic needs were addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least (see Table 14). The administrators perceived that the social and affective needs were addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least. Teachers believed that social, affective, and academic needs were equivalently addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least.

Students judged that the academic need was addressed the most, while the social and linguistic needs were addressed the least (see Table 15). The ESL Needs Rubric evidenced that the social need was addressed the most, and the academic need was addressed the least (see Table 10). Therefore, triangulation highlights that the highest overall educational need was the social need. There was agreement between the surveys and rubric that the social need was the strongest need addressed within the sheltered component.

Dominant Criteria for Teaming

The dominant criteria for the teaming component included: interaction in a safe setting, role of family and community members, safe setting, assist with the four language skills, and Team 7 teachers work together for comprehensible input. Overall, the participant groups indicated that the social need was addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least (see Table 14). Administrators perceived that the social need was addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least. Teachers perceived that the affective and academic needs were addressed the most, and the social and linguistic needs as addressed the least. Students believed that all four educational needs were equally addressed (93.33%) (see Table 15). Journal notes revealed concerted efforts of Team 7 members in working together to address all four educational needs.

Dominant Criteria for Spanish for Native Speakers

The dominant criteria for the Spanish for native speakers courses component included: prior knowledge, a safe setting, meaningful activities, practice and corrections, SNS assist with the four language skills, vocabulary acquisition in the L1, academic concepts addressed by SNS courses, and correlations between SNS and other content area benchmarks. Overall, the participant groups indicated that the social need was addressed the most, while the linguistic

199

need was addressed the least (see Table 14). Administrators perceived that the social, affective, and academic needs were equally promoted the most, while the linguistic need was promoted the least. Teacher results for the Spanish for native speakers courses component were skewed, because teachers who did not teach Spanish did not feel adequate in their knowledge to respond. Teachers perceived that the social, affective, and academic needs were equally addressed the most, while the linguistic need was addressed the least. Students perceived that the social need was addressed the most, while the academic need was addressed the least (see Table 15). The classroom observations, through the ESL Needs Rubric, revealed that the social need was addressed the most, and the academic need was addressed the least (see Table 10). This depicts a correlation in findings between the surveys and observations emphasizing that the social need was well addressed in the Spanish for native speakers courses component.

A comparison of all groups revealed aspects of structural component perceptions that proved to be specific to each group, lending further insight into possible implications for ELL programming issues in providing access to the curriculum. A review of the findings, study conclusions, and implications for research and practice are discussed in Chapter 5 of this study.

CHAPTER 5 - Discussion, Findings and Implications

This study explored four key structural components of an urban high school ESL program and how these components addressed the educational needs of ELLs for access to the curriculum. Program perception samples were gathered through participant interviews, classroom observations, and Perception Grid Surveys. Samples of the four structural components were analyzed according to the four educational needs of ELLs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic. Study participants' perceptions were elicited in response to the following overall question: *To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?*

The theoretical framework utilized for the current study began with an overview of the historical context of equity within society and education for ELLs—bilingual versus English-only education, social justice theory—emphasizing equal educational opportunity, and SLA theories—focusing on educational needs, language acquisition, and content-based models. This framework was chosen to provide a means to establish the historical context of educating ELLs, to highlight the need for alternate programming for ELLs, and to encourage schools to provide ELLs with equal educational opportunities to attain access to the curriculum. Equal educational opportunities equate to access to the curriculum and is demonstrated in the ways an ESL program addresses the four educational needs of ELLs. The extent to which an ESL program addresses the educational needs of ELLs through structural program components appears to be an essential factor in providing equal educational opportunities for ELLs.

The qualitative techniques used for this study were centered on the exploration of four key structural components of a high school ESL program and how they provided equal

educational opportunities for access to the curriculum through addressing the educational needs of ELLs. Categorical aggregation and direct interpretation were the primary qualitative methods used to analyze the data. Patterns and matrices were utilized within this process and natural generalizations were developed as needed. The underlying assumption with patterns is that they are a way to search for meaning, as they can be drawn from the research questions to serve as a template for the analysis (Stake, 1995). Patterns can also be drawn from matrices to draw initial conclusions (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Thus, the exploration of an ESL program's structural components through the use of patterns and matrices, in conjunction with categorical aggregation and direct interpretation, provided the possibility of elaboration upon existing concepts and engendering new concepts about high school ESL programs.

A thorough review of the four structural components—placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses—revealed characteristics found in all components that provided insight into how they promote the educational needs of ELLs. A specific analysis involving the educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic— was conducted using an accumulation of criteria outlined by the four educational needs of ELLs for school success (Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Graves, 1995; Walsh, 1991). The criteria thus were used to examine how each of the four structural components of the ESL program addressed the four educational needs of ELLs. The comprehensive data analysis leads to a discussion of the findings aligned with the original research questions of the study.

This chapter includes a discussion of (1) the overall research question, (2) secondary research question one, (3) secondary research question two, (4) secondary research question three, (5) secondary research question four, (6) lessons learned—addressing findings and

assumptions, (7) implications for classroom practice, (8) implications for future research, and (9) conclusions.

Overall Research Question: Structural Components and Educational Needs of ELLs

To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of English language learners (ELLs)?

Qualitative techniques were used to investigate the four structural components of student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, and Spanish for native speakers courses in an ESL program. Perception samples from a total of 13 participants, including five students, two administrators, and six teachers, were gathered through interviews and were thoroughly reviewed to allow all possible patterns in the samples to emerge. Throughout researcher reviews of the samples, informal notes were taken in the margins of the transcripts to reveal specific coding categories. More codes emerged and were added during the coding process within NVivo 8. Definitions of these coding categories and corresponding codes were summarized in tables to assist the researcher with viewing emerging patterns regarding how the structural program components address the educational needs of ELLs.

Secondary Questions

The NVivo 8 software program, designed by Richards (QSR International, 2009), as well as the ESL Needs Rubric and Perception Grid Surveys based on Walsh's (1991) educational needs, as defined by Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991), were utilized for analyzing the structural component of student placement. This analysis was accomplished through categorical aggregation and direct interpretation of patterns discovered within the matrices that were developed within NVivo 8 and the tables

created within EXCEL. Then, naturalistic generalizations were made (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Stake, 1995). The secondary research questions were utilized to explore the overall question in depth. Finally, the lessons learned are compared to Adams' Social Justice Theory Framework.

Question One: Student Placement

To what extent does student placement in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

Participant perceptions of student placement were analyzed using the previously stated instruments and methods, with the exception of the ESL Needs Rubric within classroom observations. The findings supported that the structural component of student placement addresses the educational needs of ELLs through eight primary coding categories that emerged within the NVivo 8 coding process.

- **Fairness:** when students are treated in a fair manner.

- **Prior Knowledge:** background knowledge that each student possesses.

- **Diversity:** refers to respecting the various cultures within the classroom.

- **Safe Setting:** a learning environment in which students feel safe to participate.

- **Courses Promoting Four Language Skills:** refers to courses that promote the four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—in English.

- **Courses Promoting Four Language Skills in the L1:** refers to courses that promote the four language skills—listening, speaking, reading, and writing—in the L1 (Spanish)

- **Clustering with Bilingual Aides:** when small groups of ELLs are "clustered" together within mainstream courses and bilingual aides attend the class to assist ELLs.

- **Students Placed in Team 7 Courses**: refers to ELLs being placed into Team 7 courses, such as the sheltered content courses.

These primary coding categories should be considered key elements for applying the structural component of student placement to another setting. Though Team 7 is an element that is found only in the school of study, other programs can apply the idea of a team of teachers that works together to monitor the progress of ELLs and provides sheltered content courses to ELLs.

The aggregated results from all perception groups within the Perception Grid Surveys revealed that within student placement, the social need was addressed the most (with a 94.87% rating), while the linguistic need was addressed the least (with a 79.49% rating) (see Appendix F). When separating the results by participant group, the students gave student placement the highest overall ranking (with a 90.00% rating), while administrators ranked placement the lowest (with a 79.17% rating) (see Table 15). Perception Grid Survey results by each educational need revealed that the social need was rated the highest by administrators and teachers at 100%. The affective need was rated the highest by students at 93.33%. The linguistic need was rated the highest by students at 86.67%, and the academic need was rated the highest by students at 93.33% (see Table 15).

There was discrepancy in the findings between the Perception Grid Surveys and student interview results within NVivo 8 for student placement. The social need was ranked the highest in the survey results, while the linguistic need was ranked the highest in the interview results. In addition, the linguistic need was ranked the lowest within the survey results, and the affective need was ranked the lowest within NVivo 8. The overall percentage rate for the student

placement component, when combining all participant groups from the surveys, found that student placement was rated at 85.90% (see Appendix F). This high percentage indicates that the structural component of student placement is addressing the educational needs of ELLs.

Question Two: Sheltered Content Courses

To what extent do sheltered content courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

Participant perceptions of the sheltered content course component were measured by interviews through the NVivo 8 program, classroom snapshot observations through the ESL Needs Rubric, and Perception Grid Surveys. The findings supported that the sheltered content course component addresses the educational needs of ELLs through eight primary coding categories that emerged within the NVivo 8 coding process.

- **Native Language for Academic Development:** L1 is affirmed in the classroom for academic development and courses are provided in the L1.

- **Prior Knowledge:** background knowledge that each student possesses.

- **Expectations—Teachers:** refers to the expectations of teachers toward ELLs in the classroom.

- **Meaningful Activities:** instructional activities that are meaningful, or provide students with "real world" applications.

- **Courses Promoting Four Language Skills:** refers to courses that promote the four language skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

- **Vocabulary Acquisition:** when ELLs acquire vocabulary for linguistic or academic purposes.

- **L1 Used for Comprehensible Input:** when students' native language is used for understanding instruction.

- **Lesson Modification:** when teachers modify, or provide instruction that is comprehensible for ELLs.

These primary coding categories should be considered as key elements for applying the structural component of sheltered content courses to another setting. Most of these elements can be implemented within any high school classroom, though native language use might be limited with non-bilingual staff.

The classroom snapshot observations revealed that, overall, the social educational need was addressed the most and the academic need was addressed the least (see Table 10). The following courses exhibited the social need as the highest percentage found within the classroom snapshot observations: Beginning ESL, Spanish for Native Speakers, English III, Algebra I, and American History. When examining percentages, the lowest rankings revealed that the academic need was the least addressed. However, only two courses had the academic need as the lowest percentage; three courses had the affective need as the least addressed. Additionally, there were three courses that had the linguistic need as the least addressed educational need. The overall percentage from the observations resulted in a 76.97%, which might mean the sheltered content courses component is slightly above average but needs improvement (see Table 10). However, the researcher would suggest that the ESL Needs Rubric be used as a tool to explore which needs should be addressed to a greater extent. For example, within each course, teachers could examine which educational need was addressed the least and choose to work on improving that particular need.

The aggregated results from all participant groups within the Perception Grid Surveys revealed that there was a tie between the affective and academic needs as being addressed the most (with a 92.31% rating), while the linguistic need was addressed the least (with a 79.49% rating) (see Appendix F). Analyzing the sheltered content courses component as a whole and separating the results by participant group revealed that students gave the sheltered content courses component the highest overall ranking at 91.67%. The teachers ranked it the lowest at 86.11% (see Table 15). Perception Grid Survey results by each educational need and participant group revealed that the social and affective needs were ranked the highest by administrators with a 100% ranking. The linguistic need was ranked the highest by students at 86.67%, and the academic need was ranked the highest by students at 100% (see Table 15).

There was a correlation in the findings between the Perception Grid Surveys and student interview results within NVivo 8 for the sheltered content courses component. The academic need ranked in the highest category for both instruments, and the linguistic need ranked the lowest with both instruments. The overall percentage ranking for sheltered content courses, when combining all participant groups from the surveys, was 88.46% (see Appendix F). This high percentage indicates that the structural component of sheltered content courses is addressing the educational needs of ELLs.

Question Three: Teaming

To what extent does teaming in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

Participant perceptions of the teaming component were measured by the interviews within NVivo 8 and the Perception Grid Surveys. The findings supported that the structural

component of teaming addresses the educational needs of ELLs through five dominant coding

categories within the NVivo 8 coding process:

- **Interaction in a Safe Setting:** when students interact either in their L1 or L2 for
  instructional purposes within a safe instructional environment.

- **Role of Family and Community Members:** refers to the presence of family and
  community members in the classroom or school.

- **Safe Setting:** a learning environment in which students feel safe to participate.

- **Assist with Four Language Skills:** refers to teachers providing help for students within
  the language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

- **Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input:** when Team 7
  teachers—Mr. Track, Mr. Bond, Ms. Hermosa, Ms. Rivers, and the researcher—work
  together to provide comprehensible instructional activities for ELLs.

These primary coding categories should be considered as key elements for applying the

structural component of teaming to another setting. Again, most of these elements can be

implemented within any high school setting, although teacher training is essential for providing

comprehensible input for ELLs. Native language strategies can be implemented in the classroom,

despite a teacher's language limitation in the student's L1. If there is no formal teacher team, as

in Team 7 within this study, ESL teachers and coordinators can provide training for mainstream

content teachers in implementing important instructional elements that are essential in meeting

the educational needs of ELLs.

There was a minimal correlation within the teaming component, because the academic

need was found to be one of the highest needs addressed within the survey and NVivo 8 results.

However, there was a three-way tie for the highest ranking within the survey results between the

social, affective, and academic needs, while the linguistic need was the least addressed (see

Table 14). Yet, the NVivo 8 results revealed that the linguistic and academic needs were

addressed the most, while the social need had the lowest ranking. The overall percentage ranking

for the teaming component, when combining all participant groups from the surveys, provided a

result of 93.05% (see Appendix F). Thus, this high percentage indicates that the structural

component of teaming is addressing the educational needs of ELLs. Teaming is also the highest

overall ranking structural component within the surveys.

Question Four: Spanish for Native Speakers Courses

To what extent does Spanish for native speakers courses in an urban ESL program address the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

Participant perceptions of the Spanish for native speakers courses component were

measured by the interviews within NVivo 8, classroom observations through the ESL Needs

Rubric, and the Perception Grid Surveys. The findings supported that the structural component

of Spanish for native speakers courses addresses the educational needs of ELLs through eight

dominant coding categories within the NVivo 8 coding process.

- **Prior Knowledge:** background knowledge that each student possesses.
- **Safe Setting:** a learning environment in which students feel safe to participate.
- **Meaningful Activities:** instructional activities that are meaningful, or provide students with "real world" applications.
- **Practice and Corrections:** when students are provided opportunities to practice their L1 or L2 language skills and make corrections.
- **SNS Assist with Four Language Skills:** when a Spanish for native speakers course develops the four language skills—reading, writing, listening, and speaking—in the L1.

- **Vocabulary Acquisition in L1:** when ELLs acquire vocabulary for linguistic or academic purposes in their L1.

- **Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses:** when academic concepts are addressed by Spanish for native speakers courses (e.g., primarily when mainstream English course concepts are addressed in the SNS courses).

- **Correlations Between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks:** when similar benchmarks from other courses are addressed in the Spanish for native speakers courses.

This component can only be implemented in other settings if actual Spanish for native speakers courses are offered. It is ideal for the courses to support and correlate with other content-area courses, so that academic content can be attained in two languages.

The classroom snapshot observations revealed that within the Spanish for native speakers courses component, the social educational need was addressed the most (at a 100% ranking) and the academic need as addressed the least (see Table 10). The overall percentage from the observation revealed an 87.16%. It appears that this component is generally addressing each of the educational needs. However, one can use the observation tool to discover that the academic need could be addressed more, as it was the lowest ranking at 69.62%. Therefore, the teacher could review the rubric notes to discover which elements of instructional practices could be improved upon.

The aggregated results from all perception groups within the Perception Grid Surveys revealed that the social need was addressed the most (with a 100% rating), while the linguistic need was addressed the least (with a 86.67% rating) (see Appendix F). Analyzing the Spanish for native speakers courses component as a whole and separating the results by participant group revealed that the administrators gave the Spanish for native speakers courses component the

highest overall ranking at 95.83%, while teachers ranked it the lowest at 48.61% (see Table 15). Again, the primary reason for the low 48.61% is due to three teachers declining to offer their opinions on ranking the Spanish for native speakers courses from their lack of information on the component. Perception Grid Survey results by each educational need revealed that the social need was ranked the highest by students and administrators at 100%. The affective need was ranked the highest by administrators with a 100% ranking. The linguistic need was ranked the highest by students at 86.67%. Finally, the academic need was ranked the highest by administrators at 100% (see Table 15).

There was a correlation in the findings between the Perception Grid Surveys and student interview results within NVivo 8 for Spanish for native speakers courses, as the social need was ranked the highest overall in both instruments. In addition, both instruments indicated that the linguistic educational need was addressed the least. The overall percentage ranking for the Spanish for native speakers courses component, when combining all participant groups from the surveys, was 92.50% (see Appendix F). This high percentage indicates that the structural component of Spanish for native speakers courses is strongly addressing the educational needs of ELLs.

Lessons Learned: Addressing Findings and Assumptions

The focus of this research study was to uncover the extent to which an ESL program addresses the educational needs of high school ELLs in order to promote access to the curriculum in the quest for equity. Five primary lessons emerged from the data analysis. In the discussion that follows, the researcher explores these five themes in relation to the literature and the data collected, the possible meanings of these findings, and the conclusions the researcher drew as a result of identifying these five themes. The lessons learned in this study include:

212

1. Educational needs are not independent entities that can be addressed in isolation, as they are often interrelated to the other needs.

2. Utilizing the students' native language in various degrees is essential to promoting the educational needs of ELLs.

3. Walsh's (1991) four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—can serve as a scaffold for providing access to the curriculum for ELLs. Corresponding elements emerged from the study as specific manifestations of the four educational needs.

4. The ESL Needs Rubric and the Perception Grid Survey instruments can be used to analyze the extent to which an ESL program addresses the educational needs of ELLs.

5. A new program evaluation instrument evolved as a result of the study. Based upon the NVivo 8 findings, an ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist (see Appendix I) was designed for educators to utilize in gathering ESL program diagnostic data for program improvement.

Finding One: Interrelated Educational Needs

Educational needs are not independent entities that can be addressed in isolation, as they are often interrelated to the other needs.

The first finding that educational needs are interrelated is supported through Thomas and Collier's (1997) prism model. Thomas and Collier defined four major student needs that drive instruction for language acquisition—sociocultural, cognitive, linguistic, and academic. They mention that these needs are interrelated, as addressing one need affects other needs. In addition, Cummins (2000) emphasizes that although social language and academic language are conceptually different, it does not necessarily follow that they are developed separately. Simultaneous language development was evidenced in the current study through the coding

213

categories/elements that emerged within the analysis. Overlapping did occur, finding language development elements across educational needs.

Additionally, the components are related to each other in the sense that they depend upon each other. For example, the elements within student placement, such as courses promoting the four language skills in the L1 and L2, affect how students experience being in a sheltered content course.

> ELLs are frequently clustered into classes together so they are able to use their native language when they are working in a small group together, on a project, and then they're very good at social language in English. They can answer simple questions. But, when it comes to those higher level thinking skills, such as analysis or synthesis, they don't yet have that cognitive language and so it's really helpful for them to be able to use native language to work through issues like that.
> (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 5)

The teaming component monitors those student experiences and provides a means for teachers to discuss and implement key elements that address student needs. Spanish for native speakers courses allow for correlation with sheltered English courses in regard to standards and benchmarks, which addresses the educational needs of ELLs.

> Spanish for native speakers courses (as we have already stated) use the same SBIs [Standards, Benchmarks, and Indicators] as the English class. And so, they're working on those same concepts: character analysis, setting, plot, the individual parts of poetry, word analysis, etc. So, those kinds of academic concepts are taught in much the same way that the student will find them being taught in their regular English classroom. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, pp. 26, 27)

Naomi Pena mentioned that Team 7 teachers meet student linguistic and academic needs by explaining vocabulary terms and assignments from other classes. At times, the social and affective needs were met through reward parties, "because we do a great job in the work" (Naomi Pena Interview, 11/21/08, p. 4). Furthermore, Naomi's leadership skills are developed and her confidence increases when she has the responsibility to organize the parties, "I have to tell them [the other students] what to bring to the party" (Naomi Pena Interview, 11/21/08, p.4).

The social and affective needs are further promoted when "[Team 7] teachers help us, they make us feel like we are accepted in this country" (Pedro Fuentes Interview, 11/19/08, p. 7). Rosa Lugo commented that "in my Team 7 classes, I already know what I am supposed to do. And in my regular classes, I have a little bit more of trouble understand[ing]" (Rosa Lugo Interview, 12/10/08, p. 5). This could be interpreted to mean that Team 7 teachers are more cognizant of how to provide comprehensible instruction.

Overall, each of the structural components is grounded in the goal of attending to Krashen's (1981) i+1 hypothesis—providing students with comprehensible input plus one. In other words, the goal of the components is to assist in providing comprehensible input, so that ELLs gain knowledge of a new concept beyond their current level of understanding.

Finding Two: Essential L1

Utilizing the students' native language in various degrees is essential to promoting the educational needs of ELLs.

The second finding confirms previous research: utilizing students' native language in various degrees is essential to promoting the educational needs of ELLs.

> I don't think, unless you've had to go through that process yourself— you have
>
> no idea what a strain it is emotionally, physically, mentally—to be trying to work

215

the entire day, every minute of the day, in a language that's not your own language. And so, sheltered content courses give those students a place where they can relax and kind of let go of some of that tension. There (in many cases) it allows them to work together in their native language, in order to process information, or a problem and they can do that in a language with which they're familiar. Therefore, they have a much better chance of self checking their comprehension (e.g. Do they understand what they need to do?), formulating their answer, and then being able to feel confident that they can give that answer and it will be correct. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, pp. 6, 7)

Tania Iglesias captured the essence of how the affective need is addressed for Spanish speaking students, when she mentioned that the Spanish for native speakers classes "can act like a family" (Tania Iglesias Interview, 12/15/08, p. 11).

Each structural component possessed elements of the native language that emerged within the NVivo 8 analysis. Use of the native language within instruction assists with producing comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981). Student MAP scores revealed an above average improvement in reading scores of students who were placed in Spanish for native speakers, sheltered English courses, and sheltered ESL Read 180 courses. Therefore, one conclusion that can be drawn from a combination of the findings is that cultivating the native language addresses the educational needs of ELLs and improves their L2 reading skills. Cummins' (1981) common underlying proficiency (CUP) model reveals that the development of one language strongly aids the development of the second language. Other researchers also have found that proficiency in the student's L1 facilitates acquisition of the L2 (Bialystok & Hakuta, 1994; Collier, 1989, 1992; Hakuta, 1987; Krashen & Biber, 1988; Thomas & Collier, 1997; Wong-Fillmore, 1991).

Finding Three: Scaffold for Access to the Curriculum

Walsh's (1991) four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—can serve as a scaffold for providing access to the curriculum for ELLs.

The third finding was that Walsh's (1991) four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—can serve as a scaffold for providing access to the curriculum for ELLs. Corresponding elements emerged from the study as specific manifestations of the four educational needs and as a catalyst for ESL program improvement in the quest for access to the curriculum for ELLs.

> What's good teaching for our ELL students, is often good teaching for all students. And so, you know, when you get the sheltered content courses— we make a lot of use of visual aids, manipulatives, Kagan strategies so that we are all able to support and encourage students, as they're learning a new language. And this lowers that affective filter and promotes confidence within the students. (Ms. Lane Interview, 11/16/08, p. 7)

Krashen's (1981) concept of comprehensible input serves as the theoretical undergirding that addresses the educational equity issue and equates to providing access to the curriculum through these four educational needs.

This study addresses August and Hakuta's (1997) notion, that the education field needs studies that reveal how ELL educational needs are being met. For application purposes, educators should focus on implementing and strengthening the following key program elements that emerged from the data across all four educational needs: fairness, diversity, a safe setting, courses promoting the four language skills, clustering students in mainstream courses, accessing prior knowledge, high expectations, meaningful activities, vocabulary acquisition, lesson

217

modifications, involving family and community members, a teacher team that works together to implement comprehensible input, and time for student practice and corrections.

Additionally, the element of native language support includes promoting the following within the L1: comprehensible input, vocabulary acquisition, academic concepts, addressing the four language skills, and correlation of benchmarks between Spanish for Native Speakers and other content-area courses, particularly English. Lucas, Henze, and Donato (1990) implicitly confirm that many of the previously stated elements promote the school success of ELLs by placing value on ELLs' cultures and languages, holding high expectations for ELLs, providing a variety of courses, and promoting parental involvement of ELLs. Thus, the tangible elements that emerged in the study are a means for schools to promote educational equity for ELLs.

Finding Four: Instruments to Analyze an ESL Program

The ESL Needs Rubric and the Perception Grid Survey instruments can be used to analyze the extent to which an ESL program addresses the educational needs of ELLs.

The fourth major finding is that the ESL Needs Rubric and the Perception Grid Survey instruments can be used to analyze the extent to which an ESL program addresses the educational needs of ELLs. These instruments can be utilized as a guideline to improve the delivery of educational services to ELLs. August and Hakuta (1997) mention that research is needed to unveil how ESL programs meet the educational needs of ELLs and how these programs can be evaluated. This study addresses this matter by utilizing four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—to analyze an ESL program. These educational needs were defined by Echevarria and Graves (2007), Thomas and Collier (1997), Graves (1995), and Walsh (1991).

The ESL Needs Rubric is a functional instrument, based upon the four educational needs, that was developed to explore the extent to which sheltered content courses address the educational needs of ELLs. The ESL Needs Rubric is an instrument that can be employed in other settings, as teachers can use it to improve their own instructional practices to better meet the educational needs of ELLs. In addition, teachers can assist each other with analyzing their practices through peer evaluation. Outside evaluators can use the rubric as a guide to discuss strengths and weaknesses with teachers' instructional practices. Together, the teacher and the evaluator then can determine how to maintain strong instructional practices and improve upon weaker instructional practices. Use of the instrument in this way would support Murphy's (1999) notion of Whole-Faculty Study Groups within schools to implement staff development initiatives based on student needs. In this case, the needs for ELLs would be addressed, as "the groups [would] meet to study, reflect, and develop contextually sensitive strategies for providing equal educational opportunities for ESOL students" (Simons & Connelly, 2000, p. 175). Furthermore, the rubric could be used on a micro level within a single sheltered content course observation and/or it could be used to analyze an ESL program as a whole through an aggregation of observations. Overall, an aggregate of sheltered content course observations could be used to initiate discussion among educators within a school to seek specific solutions for addressing ELL educational needs.

The Perception Grid Survey can provide a starting point for exploring how students, administrators, and teachers perceive the ESL program in their own settings. It also could be used as a mid-year and/or an end-of-year evaluation tool to facilitate discussions on ESL program improvement, so that various participants could provide input regarding the education of ELLs. The researcher cautions decision makers who would use these tools as a means for

219

formal evaluations, however, because they merely yield perceptions that are not tied to specific contexts. Furthermore, participants taking the survey might not fully understand the defined criteria of the educational needs.

The researcher suggests that districts utilize the Perception Grid Survey by replacing the four structural components from this study with components that are relevant to their own setting. Next, students, administrators, and teachers should rate the components according to their perceptions of how each component addresses each educational need. Then, the results should be tallied, as the results facilitate discussions for improving ESL programming.

Finding Five: A New Instrument for Program Evaluation

A new program evaluation instrument evolved as a result of the study: an ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist.

The fifth finding involves an ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist (see Appendix I) that was developed as a result of the NVivo 8 analysis in this study. Key elements were extrapolated from the top coding categories across all three participant groups and combined across all four educational needs. The checklist is designed for educators to gather ESL program diagnostic data for program improvement. This information then can be used to cultivate discussions for program improvement between ESL program decision makers, administrators, and practitioners. These staff members can discuss how to implement practices that will enhance each of the elements within the checklist for the program improvement process. Again, this instrument also could be used on an ongoing basis, such as at the beginning of the year, mid-year, and at the end of the year, to facilitate discussions on ESL program improvement. Overall, this instrument offers specific elements to be used as a guideline for educators striving to increase access to the curriculum for ELLs.

Social Justice Theory Connection

The first four themes within Adams' social justice framework can be related to Walsh's four educational needs. The first theme of Adams' framework relates to Walsh's affective, linguistic, and academic needs. Adams' second and third themes, which pertain to students' prior knowledge and peer interactions, are primarily linked to Walsh's social needs. The fourth theme in Adams' framework also utilizes students' prior knowledge and, in that way, is connected to Walsh's social needs.

Theme 1: "Establish an equilibrium between the emotional and cognitive components of the learning process" (Adams, 2007, p. 15).

The first aspect of Adams' (2007) social justice framework, primarily applies to the first finding in this study that educational needs are not independent entities. Specifically, the affective, linguistic, and academic needs in this study are interrelated. If students' affective filters are low, then they will be more receptive to learning linguistic and academic content. The process of lowering students' affective filters is illustrated through Naomi Pena's observation that Team 7 teachers assist ELLs when they first arrive at Amos Heights.

> They [Team 7 teachers] talk to them [the students] and they say that they don't [need to] be scared. If the person doesn't understand what they say, they look for another person to translate in their language and help them to be…they don't be scared (Naomi Pena Interview, 11/21/08, p. 7).

As students improve their linguistic skills in the L2, they are able to develop their higher order thinking skills to eventually function in mainstream classes and multiply the amount of opportunities for their future. In turn, increasing linguistic and academic skills improves students' emotional outlook through increasing their confidence and providing hope for the future.

The structural component of teaming was instrumental in providing for the affective

needs of students was evidenced in the number of students that graduated from high school, in

keeping track of the students when they were not coming to school, and in reducing discipline

issues (Dr. Garcia, 11/15/08, p. 12). Specifically, the ESL teacher team fostered the emotional

needs of the students by "being there for the kids. The kids knew that this group of teachers was

there for them…they [the students] gravitated around those teachers. And the teachers gravitated

around the kids (Dr. Garcia, 11/15/08, p. 13). When problems arose for the students,

> the teachers of these kids would go to the defense of the kids, or would bring the
>
> problem to my attention. So it made all the sense in the world to have something
>
> [an official teacher team] for these children (Dr. Garcia, 11/15/08, p. 13).

To address linguistic and academic needs, Naomi Pena mentioned that Team 7 teachers

take the time to re-explain information for student comprehension of the content material,

whether it is math, science, English, social studies, or Spanish for native speakers. "They do

examples to help me to understand what they say [I should do] in the homework, or a project.

They [explain through] videos too, or computers, [or] books (Naomi Pena Interview, 11/21/08, p.

17).

Theme 2: "Acknowledge and support the personal and individual dimensions of

experience, while making connections to and illuminating the systemic dimensions of

social group interactions" (Adams, 2007, p. 15).

The second aspect of Adams' (2007) framework primarily applies to the second finding

in this study that utilizing the students' native language in various degrees is essential to

promoting the educational needs of ELLs. In this case, prior knowledge is the key concept that

binds these notions together. Prior knowledge is applied to personal and individual experience

222

within this social justice framework and within the students' prior knowledge of knowing their native language. Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) mentioned that the students' prior knowledge plays an important role in Spanish for native speakers courses, "because based on that, you can adjust the curriculum of the classes. If you don't have too much background, then you would have to reduce the content. The more you have, the more you can build on" (p. 20). Dr. Garcia (Interview, 11/15/08) continued, that the whole purpose of Spanish for native speakers courses is for students to develop their language skills. This should be accomplished through active engagement, "because the kids (and) teachers speak the language… you should have all of them active. If you don't, you are doing a lousy job" (p. 20)

When students actively interact with a bilingual aide in their L1, within their content classes, this assists with connecting students' personal experiences to social group interactions. This was specifically observed during an American History classroom observation (Mr. Rios Observation, 1/23/09, p. 4). Ms. Lane (Interview, 11/16/08) furthers this notion, when she discussed that students within the Spanish for native speakers courses are from various countries and that this "fostered a sense of respect of other Spanish speaking nations, their culture, and their contributions to the Spanish speaking society as a whole" (p. 10).

Theme 3 "Pay explicit attention to social relations within the classroom" (Adams, 2007, p. 15).

The third theme of Adams' (2007) framework primarily applies to the fourth finding that the ESL Needs Rubric and the Perception Grid Survey instruments can be used to analyze the extent to which an ESL program addresses the educational needs of ELLs. This was accomplished through using the newly developed instruments in this study (Perception Grid Survey and ESL Needs Rubric) as a means to investigate attention

to social relations within the classroom. The Perception Grid Survey revealed that the participants perceived that the social need was the educational need that was addressed the most. Birdie Lane and the researcher utilized the ESL Needs Rubric within each classroom observation.

Specifically, Ms. Hermosa incorporated social relations within the classroom through accessing the students' prior knowledge and using the students' L1 for vocabulary development by questioning, lesson modeling, and a Bingo game activity within the Spanish for native speakers course observation. (Ms. Hermosa Observation, 1/23/09, p. 7). In addition, the social need was addressed in the classroom when Ms. Hermosa provided Spanish instruction on correct verb forms within a Beginning ESL class (Ms. Hermosa Observation, 1/29/09, p. 2).

Mr. Track emphasized social relations within the classroom when he encouraged students of like language groups to work together and discuss how to solve problems in the L1 and L2 within a sheltered Algebra 2/3 course (Mr. Track Observation, 1/23/09, p. 2). Positive social relations between the teacher and students were realized when Mr. Rodriguez verbally affirmed a student when the student suggested an alternative solution to a math problem. The validation was complete when Mr. Rodriguez showed the class how the student had arrived at the alternative solution (Mr. Rodriguez Observation, 1/29/09, p. 2).

The social aspect within the classroom is encapsulated by a student, Tania Iglesias. She said that interacting with other students assists students in learning the material so that they can pass their classes (Tania Iglesias Perception Grid Survey Comment, 12/15/08).

Theme 4: "Make conscious use of reflection and experience as tools for student-centered learning" (Adams, 2007, p. 15).

The fourth aspect of Adams' (2007) framework applies to the first three findings. The use of reflection and experience for student-centered learning is grounded in the use of the students' prior knowledge and is substantially found in each of the first three findings.

Implications for Classroom Practice

There is an increasing obligation for schools to address the educational needs of ELLs, as classrooms become more linguistically diverse and schools become more accountable for the academic results of all students within NCLB legislation. A "sink-or-swim" attitude, also known as submersion, toward ELL educational practices is not acceptable, nor is it legal (*Lau v. Nichols*, 1974). Therefore, it is essential that policymakers, administrators, and educators become familiar with, and implement, effective educational practices that address the educational needs of ELLs.

Recommendations

1) Train Educators in Lesson Modification

All high school educators should be trained to modify lessons to ensure comprehensible input for ELLs. One way this is accomplished, is through providing more context-embedded instruction for secondary ELLs. To reiterate from the literature review, Davies-Samway and McKeon (2007) mention that elementary and secondary ELLs need contextualized instruction for comprehension. The variation occurs within the content, as "older school-age learners require

more sophisticated language skills that help them maneuver through complex social situations and challenging academic situations" (Davies-Samway & McKeon, 2007, p. 29).

Therefore, schools should provide ongoing training to teachers about how to modify lessons, since it is the responsibility of schools to ensure appropriate instructional practices for ELLs. Then, teachers must be held accountable with regard to how they implement these strategies within their own classroom settings. Specifically, within this study, the observation study results found that the linguistic need was addressed the least within the two classrooms in which the teachers were not involved in Team 7. Thus, it is assumed that other mainstream classroom teachers might need assistance with addressing the linguistic needs of ELLs within their content areas.

2) *Prepare Preservice Teachers in ESL Techniques*

All preservice teachers in universities should be required to demonstrate optimal knowledge of ESL instructional techniques. As the number of ELLs continues to increase in public schools, and as schools are being held more accountable for the learning of each student, it is essential that future teachers know how to address the needs of ELLs. They must be taught multiple techniques for providing comprehensible input to ELLs through lesson modifications.

3) *Inform Educators about the Value of the Students' L1*

Educators at all levels should be informed about the value of developing and supporting the students' native language within classroom practices. To achieve this, training needs to be provided to educate teachers regarding ways they can practically incorporate students' native language within lessons—from peer interaction with the academic content to utilizing bilingual print materials and technology.

4) Utilize Instruments in this Study to Promote Access to the Curriculum for ELLs

Schools should utilize the four educational needs in this study to promote access to the curriculum for ELLs through the ESL Needs Rubric, Perception Grid Survey, and ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist. Schools should use the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs to address access to the curriculum for ELLs in their own venues. Educators can use the ESL Needs Rubric to conduct their own classroom snapshot observations in order to see if ELL educational needs are being met, or if some needs are being addressed more than others. The ESL Needs Rubric can be used as a tool to initiate discussion about how teachers can improve instructional practices with simple modifications that are tailored to fit their own ESL program model or address student needs within mainstream classrooms. Administrators can join this discussion as they ponder how best to support the process of strengthening ESL instructional practices in their own districts and buildings.

In addition, the Perception Grid Survey could be tailored to other programs, and educators could substitute their own ESL program's key structural components for those in this study. Their components could be applied to the grid under each educational need, and the Likert scale could be applied to each component within each educational need. This would allow for program decision makers to gain insight into how various groups perceive each component and how the components address each educational need. Furthermore, the ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist could be used as a guideline to gather information on the degree to which an ESL program addresses specific program characteristics. This information could be used as a catalyst to promote quality discussions for program improvement within whole-faculty study group sessions.

5) Train Observers and Instructional Leaders in ESL Techniques

Outside observers and district-level instructional leaders should be trained in ESL techniques. These individuals need to know how to suggest appropriate lesson modifications for mainstream teachers to provide comprehensible input to ELLs. Educating ELLs should be addressed as a building-wide issue, because there is a wide range of language proficiencies within mainstream courses.

6) Collaborate to Provide Access to the Curriculum for ELLs

Educators from all levels must collaborate to provide access to the curriculum for ELLs through summits, symposiums, roundtables, and whole-faculty study groups. Finally, educators from all levels must gather together to promote innovation in providing equity and access to the curriculum for ELLs. Summits need to be held at the national level to provide practical information about educating ELLs. The primary purpose would be to impact policymaking in order to secure realistic educational standards for ELLs and more support for programs that positively impact ELLs. Educational symposiums should be held at the state level to discuss how to address the educational needs of ELLs and how to implement effective program practices to meet those needs. In addition, roundtable discussions need to be held at the district and building levels, as whole-faculty study groups within buildings would provide a means to implement effective educational strategies for ELLs. The overall purpose behind these suggestions would be to discuss how the district and buildings can cooperate to improve their current ESL program components and provide access to the curriculum for ELLs by addressing their educational needs.

Implications for Future Research

The topic of providing access to the curriculum through addressing the educational needs of high school ELLs is one that is only beginning to be addressed and requires further exploration. The current study offers support for research that has been conducted on the intersection of access to the curriculum and the educational needs of ELLs (e.g., Thomas & Collier, 1997; Walsh, 1991). There is also some correlation to studies conducted on effective educational practices (Lucas, 2001; Lucas, Henze, & Donato, 1990; Minicucci & Olsen, 1992; Thomas & Collier, 1997, 1998; Tikunoff et al., 1991).

Recommendations for Research Topics

1) ***How do ESL program structural components address the four educational needs in various settings?***

2) ***How are ELL educational needs met in various settings?***

3) ***How do ESL programs implement evaluation processes?***

4) ***How should equity issues be addressed for schools and ELLs?***

5) ***How should schools provide equal access to the curriculum for SLIFES?***

Future research needs to be conducted on structural components other ESL programs use to address the four educational needs—social, affective, linguistic, and academic. This study could be built upon by exploring how the components in this study are utilized in other settings. The elements in this study that emerged within the coding categories as specific factors in addressing the educational needs of ELLs should be applied and studied in other settings to strengthen the trustworthiness of the findings. These types of studies would address the appeal from August and Hakuta (1997) that the education field needs research investigating the specific

components of programs, ways ELL educational needs are met, and the evaluation processes of programs meeting those needs.

This study does not address the deeper issues of students with limited or interrupted formal education (SLIFE). These students have limited formal education and must simultaneously learn the test-taking culture, the school culture, and the English language (Cech, 2009). NCLB assumes that all students, including ELLs, can and should meet the same standards as native English-speaking students in the same amount of time (Cech, 2009). This severely affects schools with regard to how they are judged according to NCLB guidelines. Poor performances by ELLs on standardized tests lead to negative labeling of schools with large ELL populations "as unable to meet achievement goals under NCLB" (Cech, 2009, p. 5). In addition, there are various equity issues that must be addressed by policymakers, in conjunction with academia and practitioners that have implications for both schools and students. Therefore, the issues of how to provide equal access to the curriculum for ELLs who are also SLIFEs must be addressed.

Conclusions

Providing access to the curriculum for ELLs is a gargantuan task that requires foresight, commitment, resources, and support that is imperative at the federal, state, and local levels. The danger for secondary ELLs and schools lies in the lack of knowledge on the part of decision makers and practitioners at all levels, within unrealistic expectations and in limited provision of supports that are essential to increasing access to the curriculum for ELLs. In addition, the paradigm that there is only one type of program that is best for educating ELLs must be eradicated. Instead, the focus for providing access to the curriculum for ELLs must lie in addressing the educational needs of ELLs within the school as a whole.

Finally, the overarching themes discovered in this study can be used as guidelines for ESL program practitioners and decision makers at all levels. The four educational needs addressed in this study—social, affective, linguistic, and academic—can be used as a foundation for analyzing how high school ESL programs are designed and implemented within other schools. The specific elements gleaned from the coding categories can be implemented to strengthen program components for delivery of educational services to ELLs within other settings.

In general, the Perception Grid Survey can be utilized to capture initial perceptions of the extent to which the structural components of an ESL program are addressing the educational needs of ELLs within a particular school. Then, the ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist can be utilized more explicitly to explore how a program addresses key elements that promote meeting the educational needs of ELLs. These instruments could be used as catalysts within roundtable discussions or ongoing, whole-faculty study groups, as suggested by Murphy (1999), to involve the whole staff in overall program improvement.

In addition, the ESL Needs Rubric for classroom snapshot observations can be used more specifically as a tool for improving classroom instruction. The rubric highlights specific elements that can be applied to other instructional program settings. It allows a practitioner or outside observer to view how ELL educational needs are specifically addressed within a classroom setting. The researcher would suggest that various snapshots be taken throughout the year. Analysis of these observations can be used to guide educators to adjust their own instructional practices. Outside evaluators can assist teachers and program decision makers to adjust instructional practices and improve the quality of ESL program delivery of educational services.

Lucas, Henze, and Donato (1990) remind readers that it takes good leadership to advocate for and support ESL programming at the building level and that this leadership can include department chairpersons, teachers, principals, and program directors. Lucas et al. maintain that it is essential for schools to provide staff development that is explicitly designed to assist staff members in serving ELLs more effectively. However, real progress in providing equal educational opportunities for access to the curriculum for ELLs will only occur when practitioners across the content areas have a stake in the notion that educating ELLs is everyone's responsibility. This can be accomplished when educators are sensitive to addressing the educational needs of ELLs.

References

Abedi, J. (2004). The No Child Left Behind Act and English language learners: Assessment and accountability issues. *Educational Researcher, 33*(1), 4-14.

Abramson, S., Pritchard, R., & Garcia, J. (1993). Teacher education and limited English proficient students: Are we meeting the challenge? *Teacher Education Quarterly, 20*, 53-65.

Adams, M. (2007). Pedagogical frameworks for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 15-33). New York: Routledge.

Adamson, H. D. (1990). ESL students' use of academic skills in content courses. *English for Specific Purposes, 9*(1), 67-87.

Adamson, H. D., & Courtney, E. (2005). School and family. In H. D. Adamson, *Language minority students in American schools: An education in English* (pp.166-200). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Alexander, D., Heaviside, S., & Farris, E. (1999). *Status of education reform in public elementary and secondary schools: Teacher's perspectives*. Washington, DC: Educational Resource Information Center.

Anderson, J. R. (1985). *Cognitive psychology and its implications* (2nd ed.). New York: Freeman.

Auerbach, E. (1989). Toward a social-contextual approach to family literacy. *Harvard Educational Review, 59,* 165-181.

Auerbach, E. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly, 27,* 9-32.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Ayers, W., Quinn, T., & Stovall, D. (2009). *Handbook of social justice in education*. New York: Routledge.

Baker, C. (2001). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism* (3rd ed.). Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Banks, J. A. (1991). *Curriculum guidelines for multicultural education: NCSS position statement & guidelines*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.

Bell, L. (2007). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. Bell, & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice* (pp. 1-14). New York: Routledge.

Berman, P., Chamber, J., Gandara, P., McLaughlin, B., Minicucci, C., Nelson, B., et al. (1992). *Meeting the challenge of language diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English—Vol. 1, Executive Summary*. Berkeley: BW Associates.

Bialystok, E., & Hakuta, K. (1994). *In other words: The science and psychology of second language acquisition*. New York: Basic Books.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theories and methods* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Boyles, D., Carusi, T., & Attick, D. (2009). Historical and critical interpretations of social justice. In W. Ayers, T. Quinn, & D. Stovall (Eds.), *Handbook of social justice in education* (pp. 30-42). New York: Routledge.

Brisk, M. E. (1998). *Bilingual education: From compensatory to quality schooling*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

California State Legislature. (1998a). *English language in public schools. Initiative statute: Proposition 227-* Full text of the proposed law. (California proposition 227). Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved July 13, 2007, from http://primary 98.sos.ca.gov/VoterGuide/ Propositions/227text.htm

California State Legislature. (1998b). *Parental exceptions, article 3. English language in public schools. Initiative statute: Proposition 227-* Full text of the proposed law. (California proposition 227). Sacramento, CA: Author. Retrieved July 13, 2007, from http://primary 98.sos.ca.gov/VoterGuide/ Propositions/227text.htm

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J., & Herwantoro, S. (2005). *The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved July 13, 2007, from www.urban.org/url.cfm?ID=311230

Castañeda v. Pickard, 648 F.2d. 989 (5th Cir. 1981).

Castellanos, D., & Leggio-Castellanos, P. (1983). *The best of two worlds: Bilingual-bicultural education in the United States.* Trenton: New Jersey State Department of Education.

Cech, S. (2009, January 8). Weigh proficiency, assess content. *Education Week's Spotlight On ELL Assessment & Teaching.* Retrieved March 25, 2009, from www.edweek.org

Center, D., & Blackbourn, J. M. (1992). *Monopolistic educational bureaucracy (MEB): The disease destroying public education*. (Eric Document Reproduction Service No. ED358571)

Chamot, A. U. (2009). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive*

academic language learning approach (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1986). *A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content-based curriculum*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987, June). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly, 21*(2), 227-249.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1992). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. In P. A. Richard-Amato, & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (pp. 39-57). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Cohen, A., & Swain, M. (1976). Bilingual education: The "immersion" model in the North American context. *TESOL Quarterly, 10*(1), 45-53.

Collier, V. (1989). How long? A synthesis of research on academic achievement in a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 23*(3), 509-531.

Collier, V. (1992). A synthesis of studies examining long-term language minority student data on academic achievement. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 16(1-2), 187-212.

Crawford, J. (1991). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Crawford, J. (2000). Proposition 227: A new phase of the English only movement. In R. D.

Gonzalez & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement* (pp. 28-61). Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J., & Miller, D. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice, 39*(3), 124-130.

Cumming v. Board of Education of Richmond County, 174 U.S. 528 (1899).

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, 19,* 121-129.

Cummins, J. (1980). The cross-lingual dimensions of language proficiency: Implications for bilingual education and the optimal age issue. *TESOL Quarterly, 14*(2), 175-187.

Cummins, J. (1981). *Bilingualism and minority language children*. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and special education*. San Diego, CA: College Hill Press.

Cummins, J. (1989). A theoretical framework of bilingual special education. *Exceptional Children, 56*(2), 111-119.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Davies-Samway, K. & McKeon, D. (2007). *Myths and realities: Best practices for English language learners.* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

DeCapua, A., Smathers, W., & Tang, L. (2009). *Meeting the needs of students with limited or interrupted schooling: A guide to educators*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2007). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English-language learners with diverse abilities* (3rd ed). Boston: Pearson.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M. E., & Short, D. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Faltis, C. (1993, Autumn). Critical issues in the use of sheltered content teaching in high school bilingual programs. *Peabody Journal of Education, 69*(1), 136-151.

Faltis, C., & Arias, M. (1993). Speakers of languages other than English in the secondary schools: Accomplishments and struggles. *Peabody Journal of Education, 69*(1), 6-27.

Freeman, D. E. & Freeman, Y. S. (2001). *Between worlds: Access to second language Acquisition* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gagne, E. D. (1985). *The cognitive psychology of school learning*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Gallardo-Carter, Y. (2006). *Rhetorical structures of Spanish dominant third-grade student writers emerging into English literacy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Glazer, N., & Cummins, J. (1985). Viewpoints on bilingual education. *Equity and Choice, 2,* 47-52.

Glesne, C., & Peshkin, A. (1992). *Becoming qualitative researchers: An introduction.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Gong Lum et al. v. Rice et al., 275 U.S. 78 (1927).

Graves, A. (1995). Teaching students who are culturally and linguistically diverse. *Teacher*

Educator's Journal, 15(3), 32-40.

Hakuta, K. (1987). Degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability in mainland Puerto Rican

children. *Child Development, 58,* 1372-1388.

Haynes, J. (2007). *Explaining BICS and CALP*. Retrieved July 15, 2007, from

www.everythingesl.net/inservices/bics_calp.php.

House, E. (1979). Technology versus craft: A ten year perspective on innovation. *Journal of*

Curriculum Studies, 11(1), 1-15.

Howe, K. (1997). *Understanding equal educational opportunity: Social justice, democracy,*

and schooling. New York: Teachers College Press.

Jick, T. D. (1979, December). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in

action. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24,* 602-611.

Johannessen, B. G. (1993). *Equity aspects of bilingual education: Accessibility, comparability,*

and quality of instruction. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington,

Seattle.

Kim, S. (2007). *Exploring the self-reported knowledge and value of implementation of content*

and language objectives of high school content-area teachers. Unpublished doctoral

dissertation, Kansas State University, Manhattan.

Krashen, S. (1979). Age, rate and eventual attainment in second language acquisition. *TESOL*

Quarterly 13(4), 573-582.

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

Pergamon Press.

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

Pergamon.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman.

Krashen, S. (1987). Applications of psycholinguistic research to the classroom. In M. Long & J. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings* (pp. 33-44). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Krashen, S. (1996). *Under attack: The case against bilingual education*. Culver City, CA: Language Education.

Krashen, S. (2000). Bilingual education: The debate continues. In R. D. Gonzalez, & I. Melis (Eds.), *Language ideologies: Critical perspectives on the official English movement: Volume I education and the social implications of official language* (pp. 137-160). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use: The Taipei lectures.* Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann

Krashen, S., & Biber, D. (1988). *On course: Bilingual education's success in California*. Sacramento: California Association for Bilingual Education.

Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974).

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lucas, T. (2001). *What have we learned from research on successful secondary programs for LEP students? A synthesis of findings from three studies*. Oakland, CA: Multifunctional Resource Center. Retrieved December 19, 2001, from www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/symposia/third/lucas.html

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 60,* 315-340.

Lucas, T., & Katz, A. (1994, Autumn). Reframing the debate: The roles of native languages in

English-only programs for language minority students. *TESOL Quarterly, 28*(3), 537-

561.

Mace-Matluck, B., Alexander-Kasparik, R., & Queen, R. (1998). *Through the golden door:*

Educational approaches for immigrant adolescents with limited schooling. McHenry, IL:

Center for Applied Linguistics & Delta Systems.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (2006). *Designing qualitative research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks,

CA: SAGE.

McCarthy, L., & Whitlock, E. (2002, April). Review of the year's publications in social justice

education. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 35*(1), 79-85.

McKeon, D. (1987). Different types of ESL programs. *ERIC Digest.* Washington, DC: ERIC

Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics.

McLaren, P., & Munoz, J. (2000). Contesting whiteness: Critical perspectives on the struggle

for social justice. In C. Ovando & P. McLaren (Eds.), *The politics of multiculturalism*

and bilingual education: Students and teachers caught in the crossfire (pp. 23-49).

Boston: McGraw-Hill.

McLaughlin, B. (1978). *Second-language acquisition in childhood*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence

Erlbaum.

Miles, M.B., & Huberman, A.M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: A source book of new*

methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miles, M., & Weitzman, E. (1994). In M.B. Miles & A.M. Huberman (Eds.), *Qualitative data*

analysis: A source book of new methods (pp. 311-317). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Minicucci, C., & Olsen, L. (1991). *An exploratory study of secondary LEP programs* (Volume

V: Meeting the challenge of diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English). Berkeley: BW Associates.

Minicucci, C., & Olsen, L. (1992, Spring). Programs for secondary limited English proficient students: A California study. *NCBE Focus: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, 5.*

Miramontes, O., Nadeau, A., & Commins, N. (1997). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, C. U. (1999). Use time for faculty study. *Journal of Staff Development, 20*(2), 20-25.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (1993, Fall). *Applying elements of effective secondary schooling for language minority students: A tool for reflection and stimulus to change* (NCBE Program Information Guide Series, No. 14). Retrieved July 19, 2007, from www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/pigs/pig14.htm.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. (2008, February). *Georgetown University Bilingual Education Service Center*. Washington, DC: George Washington University. Retrieved June 28, 2008, from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/expert/glossary.html.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education and the Georgetown University Bilingual Education Service Center. (2001). *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Title I: Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged* (107th Congress, 1st Session). Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA). (1987, July). *Empowering minority students: Teacher training project for bilingual & English to speakers of other languages teachers* (Teacher Training Monograph No. 5). Washington, DC.

Office of English Language Acquisition. (2006, August). *Kansas rate of LEP growth 1994/1995-2004/2005*. Retrieved July 27, 2008, from www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/states/reports/statedata/2004LEP/Kansas-G-05.pdf.

Oller, J. (1981). Language as intelligence? *Language Learning, 31,* 465-92.

O'Neill, O. (1976). Opportunities, equalities, and education. *Theory and Decision, 7*(4), 275-295.

Ovando, C., Combs, M., Collier, V. (2006). *Bilingual & ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts* (4th ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Penfield, J. (1987). ESL: The regular classroom teacher's perspective. *TESOL Quarterly, 21,* 21-39.

Pipho, C. (2000). Governing the American dream of universal public education. In R. Brandt (Ed.), *Education in a new era* (pp. 5-19). Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Plessy v. Ferguson, 163 U.S. 537 (1896).

Porter, R. (1990). *Forked tongue: The politics of bilingual education*. New York: Basic Books.

Porter, R. P. (1994, May 18). Goals 2000 and the bilingual student. *Education Week.* Retrieved September 2, 2007, from www.edweek.org/ew/articles/1994/05/18/34porter.h13.html?tmp=680499548.

QSR International. (2009). *Qualitative data analysis software history*. Retrieved July 20, 2009, from www.qsrinternational.com/about-qsr_history.aspx.

Richard-Amato, P. (2010). *Making it happen from interactive to participatory language teaching: Evolving theory and practice* (4th ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education, Inc.

Richards, L. (2009). *Handling qualitative data: A practical guide (Reprinted).* Los Angeles:

SAGE.

Rossell, C. H., & Baker, K. (1996). The educational effectiveness of bilingual education. *Research in the Teaching of English, 30*(1), 7-74.

Rossell, C. H. & Ross, M. (1986). The social science evidence on bilingual education. *Journal of Law and Education, 15*(4), 385-419.

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. Los Angeles: Sage.

San Miguel, G., Jr. (2004). *Contested policy: The rise and fall of federal bilingual education in the United States 1960-2001*. Denton: University of North Texas Press.

Secada, W., & Lightfoot, T. (1993). Symbols and the political context of bilingual education in the United States. In M. B. Arias & U. Casanova (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Politics, practice, and research* (pp. 36-64). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Shuell, T. J. (1986). Cognitive conceptions of learning. *Review of Educational Research, 56,* 411-436.

Simons, J., & Connelly, M. (2000). *Quality ESL programs: An administrator's guide*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Skutnabb-Kangas, T. and Toukomaa, P. (1976) *Teaching migrant children's mother tongue and learning the language of the host country in the context of the sociocultural situation of the migrant family.* Helsinki: The Finnish National Commission for UNESCO.

Snow, M. A., Met, M., & Genessee, F. (1992). A conceptual framework for the integration of language and content instruction. In P. A. Richard-Amato & M. A. Snow (Eds.), *The multicultural classroom: Readings for content-area teachers* (pp. 27-38). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Stake, R. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensive input and comprehensive output in its development. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-257). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). (1997). *ESL standards for pre-K-12 students*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students* (NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (1998, January). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership, 55*(4), 23-26.

Thomas, W.P., & Collier, V.P. (2002). *A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-Term Academic Achievement* . UC Berkeley: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved October 25, 2009 from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item//j213pt.

Tikunoff, W. J., Ward, B. A., Van Broekhuizen, D., Romero, M., Castaneda, L. V., Lucas, T., et al. (1991). *Final report: A descriptive study of significant features of exemplary special alternative instructional programs*. Los Alamitos, CA: Southwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

United States Congress. (1776). *The Declaration of Independence: A transcription*. Philadelphia, PA: The United States National Archives & Records Administration. Retrieved July 7, 2007, from www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters.

United States Congress. (1865-1870). *The Constitution: Amendments 13-15*. (The Constitution:

Amendments 11-27). Philadelphia, PA: The United States National Archives & Records Administration. Retrieved July 5, 2007, from www.archives.gov/national-archives-experience/charters.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Walsh, C. (1991). Literacy and school success: Considerations for programming and instruction. In C. Walsh & H. Prashker (Eds.), *Literacy development for bilingual students: A manual for secondary teachers and administrators*. Boston, MA: New England Multifunctional Resource Center for Language and Culture in Education.

Wong-Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 6,* 323-347.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Sage.

Zion, S. (2007). *With the end in mind: Including student voice in school reform.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Denver.

Appendix A - Timeline of Events

Timeline:

May 2007   Submitted pre-proposal document and met with committee.

May 2007-   Worked with Dr. Vontz to prepare the dissertation proposal.
April 2008

May 2008   Met with supervisory committee to review and approve the dissertation

                      proposal.

May 2008   After supervisory committee approved dissertation proposal, submitted

                      materials to Kansas State University Committee for Research Involving

                      Human Subjects for review and approval.

Nov. 2008-   Collected data.
March 2009

April-June 2009   Analyzed data.

June-August 2009   Completed the writing of all chapters.

September 2009   Completed revisions of all chapters.

October 2009   Final exam (dissertation defense).

Appendix B - Administrator and Teacher Interviews

Interview script for all administrator and teacher interviews.

First, I will give you a general overview of the questions as the following questions are interview questions about the ESL program for the school involved in this study. Please just listen to them. Here's the overall question.

{Overall Question}

To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program promote the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of English Language Learners (ELLs)?

Secondary Questions

1) To what extent does *student placement* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

2) To what extent do *sheltered content courses* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

3) To what extent does *teaming* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

4) To what extent do *Spanish for native speakers courses* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

General Notes:

Student placement: refers to placing, or scheduling, students into classes

Sheltered content courses: refers to classes that only have ELL students in them

Teaming: refers to the ESL Team 7 that consists of a math, science, Spanish for native speakers, and two ESL teachers. In addition, the term "Team 7" often refers to sheltered content courses, or to teachers who teach sheltered content courses, as the terms are often used interchangeably.

Spanish for native speakers courses: refers to classes offered to native Spanish speakers

ESL: stands for English as a Second Language. It usually refers to a program in a school. However at this school, the term often describes the students. So ESL might be used to refer to English Language Learners (or ELLs).

The following section was only utilized in the special informant interviews after reading the previously mentioned section.

Interview Questions:

Specific Informants (Principal & Two Teachers)—contextual questions that are in addition to questions within the Administrators/Teachers section:

1. Would you give me an overview of the ESL program at the school of study— from the Spring of 1997, just prior to my arrival to the staff in the Fall of 1997?

    a. Could you describe the school climate in regard to educating ELLs?

    b. What type of support for ELLs was offered from the ESL program—including student placement, sheltered content courses, teaming, Spanish for native speakers support?

        i. How was placement into ESL classes handled?

        ii. Who did the scheduling of students?

        iii. Did you offer any sheltered content courses for ELLs?

        iv. Did you offer any form of teacher teaming?

        v. Was there any Spanish support for native speakers of Spanish?

    c. What type of support staff was available for ELLs?

        i. How many ESL teachers and bilingual aides were on staff?

        ii. Were there other support staff members?

2. Overall—What was your vision for the ESL program in the Fall of 1997 and how did it change over time?

a. How has student placement of ELLs changed over time?

    i. Describe the changes of student placement, from testing to scheduling,

       from 1997 until the current reality of placement today (or until your

       departure from the school).

    ii. How have sheltered content course offerings changed over time?

    iii. How has teaming change over time?

    iv. How has Spanish for native speakers support changed over time?

    v. How did the support staff for ELLs change over time?

3. The remaining questions will be asked from the "Administrators/Teachers" section.

The following section was utilized with all administrator and teacher informants, including the

special informant interviews. This section merely followed the previous section of questions for

the three special informant interviews.

Administrators/Teachers

Social Needs Defined: Thomas and Collier (1997) state that ELLs need to have their native language affirmed. They need to be able to interact with other students in their native language, take language courses in their native language, and use their native language for academic development. In addition, teachers should build upon ELLs' prior knowledge (Thomas & Collier, 1997; Walsh, 1991). I will extend this definition to include that the students need to use English (their second language) to interact with other students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule, as found in the sheltered content courses.

Placement / Social Needs:

1. How does student placement, in this school, foster/affect the social needs of ELLs?

    a. Specifically, how does student placement promote the use of native language for ELLs?

    b. What role do bilingual aides play within the student placement process, in regard to using native language for academic development?

    c. How does student placement promote interaction with other students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule?

d. How does student placement provide learning environments that promote intellectual and emotional fairness?

e. How does student placement consider the prior knowledge of ELLs?

f. Can you think of any other ways that student placement fosters the social needs of ELLs?

Sheltered Content Courses / Social Needs:
2. How do sheltered content courses, in this school, foster/affect the social needs of ELLs?

a. How do sheltered content courses promote the use of native language for academic development?

b. How do bilingual aides assist ELLs with academic development in sheltered content courses?

c. How do sheltered content courses promote interaction with other students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule?

d. How does student placement provide learning environments that promote intellectual and emotional fairness?

e. How do sheltered content courses incorporate the prior knowledge of ELLs?

f. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content courses foster the social needs of ELLs?

Teaming / Social Needs:
3. How does an ESL teacher team (known as Team 7), in this school, foster/affect the social needs of ELLs?

a. How does (or should) Team 7 promote the use of native language for academic development?

b. What role do bilingual aides play within Team 7, in regard to using native language for academic development?

c. How does (or should) Team 7 promote interaction with other students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule?

d. How does (or should) student placement provide learning environments that promote intellectual and emotional fairness?

e. How does (or should) Team 7 incorporate the prior knowledge of ELLs?

f. Can you think of any other ways that Team 7 fosters (or should foster) the social needs of ELLs?

Spanish for Native Speakers / Social Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers courses, in this school, foster/affect ELL social needs?

    a. How do Spanish for native speakers courses promote the use of native language for academic development?

    b. How do Spanish for native speakers courses promote interaction with other students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule?

    c. How does student placement provide learning environments that promote intellectual and emotional fairness?

    d. How do Spanish for native speakers courses incorporate the prior knowledge of ELLs?

    e. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers courses foster the social needs of ELLs?

Affective (Emotional) Needs Defined: Anne Graves (1995) and Echevarria & Graves (2007) offer ten specific affective factors including: (1) being responsive to cultural and personal diversity, (2) holding high expectations for all learners, (3) actively involving learners, (4) using alternate groupings, (5) providing constructivist reading and writing activities, (6) providing ample practice and careful corrections, (7) focusing on relevant background knowledge, (8) providing native-language support, (9) focusing on content and on activities that are meaningful to students, and (10) creating roles in the classroom for family and community members.

Placement / Affective Needs:
1. How does student placement in this school foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

    a. How does student placement assist the school in responding to cultural and personal diversity?

    b. How does student placement attempt to reduce the emotional "trauma" that beginning level ELLs face while being exposed to a new culture and language?

    c. Can you think of any other ways that student placement fosters the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

Sheltered Content Courses / Affective Needs:

2. How do sheltered content courses foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

    a. How do sheltered content courses promote cultural and personal diversity?

    b. What expectations should administrators have for ELLs within sheltered content courses?

    c. What expectations should teachers have for ELLs within sheltered content courses?

    d. How do sheltered content courses attempt to reduce the emotional "trauma" that beginning level ELLs face while being exposed to a new culture and language?

    e. How do sheltered content courses promote active engagement?

    f. How are alternate groupings utilized within sheltered content courses?

    g. How do sheltered content courses promote reading and writing activities for ELLs? Are there ample opportunities for practice and correction?

    h. What role does student background knowledge play in sheltered content courses?

    i. How do (should) sheltered content courses provide for native language support?

    j. How is content (should content be) made meaningful for students in sheltered content courses?

    k. What roles do family and community members play within sheltered content courses? (Or do they play any part?)

    l. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content courses foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

Teaming / Affective Needs:

3. How does teaming in this school foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

    a. How does Team 7 respond to cultural and personal diversity?

b. What expectations should administrators have for Team 7 teachers in regard to fostering the affective needs of ELLs?

c. What expectations should Team 7 teachers have for ELLs?

d. How does (should) Team 7 attempt to reduce the emotional "trauma" that beginning level ELLs face while being exposed to a new culture and language?

e. How does (should) Team 7 promote active engagement?

f. *Refer to the sheltered content course/affective needs category in items #2 f, g, h, i, j.*

g. How does (should) Team 7 promote the involvement of family and community members with ELLs?

h. Can you think of any other ways that teaming fosters the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

Spanish for Native Speakers / Affective Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers courses foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

a. How do (should) Spanish for native speakers courses respond to cultural and personal diversity?

b. What kind of expectations should there be for ELLs in Spanish for native speakers courses?

c. How do Spanish for native speakers courses attempt to reduce the emotional "trauma" that beginning level ELLs face while being exposed to a new culture and language?

d. How do (should) Spanish for native speakers courses promote active engagement?

e. How do (should) Spanish for native speakers courses promote reading and writing activities for ELLs? Are there ample opportunities for practice and correction?

f. What role does (should) student background knowledge play in Spanish for native speakers courses?

254

g. How does the school provide for native language support in Spanish for native speakers courses?

h. How is content (should content be) made meaningful for students in Spanish for native speakers courses?

i. What roles have family and community members played in Spanish for native speakers classrooms?

j. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers courses foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

Linguistic Needs Defined: Linguistic factors will be defined as developing proficiency in the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. This includes the acquisition of written and oral systems of students' L1 and L2 across the language domains of phonology, semantics, pragmatics, syntax, vocabulary, and discourse (Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Placement / Linguistic Needs:
1. How does student placement foster student linguistic needs?

a. Which classes are offered that promote reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills for ELLs?

b. Which classes promote the acquisition of written and oral systems within the domains of phonology, semantics, pragmatics, and syntax?

c. Which classes promote the development of the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking within a student's native language?

d. *[Specific Teacher Informant.] How is the placement of students determined in regard to linguistic needs? Specifically, how are students placed into ESL Read 180 courses and Spanish for native speakers courses?*

e. Can you think of any other ways that student placement fosters the linguistic needs of ELLs?

Sheltered Content Courses / Linguistic Needs:
2. How do sheltered content courses foster ELL linguistic needs?

a. *[For only two teachers, as specific informants.] How do sheltered content courses (such as Beginning ESL courses, ESL Read 180 courses, and English 3 courses) assist students with the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking?*
\

b. *[For specific informants.] How do sheltered content courses foster the development of written and oral systems within the domains of phonology, semantics, pragmatics, and syntax?*

c. How do sheltered content courses, such as Algebra or Physical Science, develop any of the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, or speaking? Are there certain language skills that are emphasized over others?

d. How do individual teachers address vocabulary acquisition for ELLs within sheltered content courses? / Specifically, how do you address vocabulary acquisition for ELLs within sheltered classes?

e. How are ELLs' native languages utilized within sheltered content courses?

f. How do individual teachers promote academic discourse/discussions in ELLs' first language and in English? / Or is it only in English?

g. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content courses foster the linguistic needs of ELLs? / Do you have any other opinions on this matter?

Teaming / Linguistic Needs:
3. How does teaming foster ELL linguistic needs?

a. How does Team 7 assist students with the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking?

b. How does Team 7 support the development of written and oral systems within the domains of phonology, semantics, pragmatics, and syntax?

c. How does Team 7 address vocabulary acquisition for ELLs as a team?

d. How does Team 7 foster the development of the four language skills in students' native languages?

e. How does Team 7 promote academic discourse (discussions) in ELLs' first language and in English? / Or is it only in English?

f. Can you think of any other ways that teaming fosters the linguistic needs of ELLs?

Spanish for Native Speakers / Linguistic Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers courses foster ELL linguistic needs?

    a. How do Spanish for native speakers courses assist students with the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking?

    b. Are there any correlations between developing the four language skills in students' native language and developing those skills in English?

    c. How do Spanish for native speakers courses foster the development of written and oral systems within the domains of phonology, semantics, pragmatics, and syntax?

    d. How do Spanish for native speakers courses promote vocabulary acquisition in ELLs' native language?

    e. How do Spanish for native speakers courses promote academic discourse in the students' native language?

    f. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers courses foster the linguistic needs of ELLs?

Academic Needs: Comprehensible input (Krashen, 1985) is the catalyst needed to develop content/subject matter, which provides access to the curriculum. Therefore, academic needs are defined as developing content/subject matter knowledge [through comprehensible input] within the coursework of mathematics, science, language arts, social studies (Thomas & Collier, 1997), and elective courses that are essential to the process of fulfilling graduation requirements.

Placement / Academic Needs:
1. How does student placement foster the academic needs of ELLs?

    a. What types of content classes are ELLs placed in?

    b. What is the rational for placing them into those particular classes, in regard to their academic needs?

    c. Which students are placed into Team 7 classes?

    d. *[For one specific teacher informant.] Could you explain the concept of clustering, within the structure of student placement, in regard to meeting the academic needs of ELLs?*

e. How does clustering students into content classes, with bilingual aides, foster the academic needs of ELLs?

f. *[For one specific teacher informant.] Could you explain the concept of layering within the structure of student placement, in regard to meeting the academic needs of ELLs?*

g. Can you think of any other ways that placement fosters the academic needs of ELLs?

Sheltered Content Courses / Academic Needs:
2. How do sheltered content courses foster the academic needs of ELLs?

a. How does the building provide sheltered content courses for ELLs?

b. How do teachers assist ELLs with attaining content knowledge within sheltered content classes? / Specifically, how do teachers modify (or scaffold) lessons in mathematics (science, etc.) in order to provide comprehensible input for ELLs and push students to learn new content? *[The specific class will depend on the informant.]*

c. How is the student's native language utilized in achieving comprehensible input within sheltered content classes?

d. How do bilingual aides assist in developing ELLs' academic needs within sheltered content courses?

e. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content courses foster the academic needs of ELLs?

Teaming / Academic Needs:
3. How does teacher teaming foster the academic needs of ELLs?

a. How does Team 7 achieve comprehensible input of content knowledge for ELLs and push students to learn new content?

b. How do Team 7 teachers work together to assist ELLs in attaining academic knowledge?

f. Can you think of any other ways that Teaming fosters the academic needs of ELLs?

Spanish for Native Speakers / Academic Needs:

4. How do Spanish for native speakers courses foster the academic needs of ELLs?

   a. What type of academic concepts do Spanish for Native Speakers courses attempt to address for ELLs?

   b. Are there any correlations between Spanish for native speakers course benchmarks and benchmarks with other content areas?

   c. How do Spanish for native speakers courses provide comprehensible input and push the students to learn new content? For example, are (were) there times when you had to scaffold material for students who were limited in their Spanish literacy skills?

   d. How does the building provide for Spanish for native speakers courses for ELLs?

   e. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers foster the academic needs of ELLs?

Overall:

1. How do you support the needs of ELLs? Rather, how have you been an advocate for ELLs?

2. What is your perception of how this school is doing in regard to meeting the four educational needs of ELLs, including social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs? / What areas need improvement?

3. Do you have any additional comments that you would like to make in regard to meeting the needs of ELLs?

4. Would you please fill out this grid, so that I can get your perception of how the ESL program is meeting the needs of ELLs?

Appendix C - Student Interviews

Interview Script for student interviews.

First, I will give you a general overview of the questions, as the following questions are interview questions about the ESL program for the school involved in this study. Please just listen to them.

Here is the Overall Question:

To what extent do the structural components of an urban ESL program promote the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of English Language Learners or (ELLs)?

The following questions are the Secondary Questions in this study.

1) To what extent does *student placement* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

2) To what extent do *sheltered content courses* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

3) To what extent does *teaming* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

4) To what extent do *Spanish for native speakers courses* in an urban ESL program foster the social, affective, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs?

There is some general information for you to understand during the interview:

Student placement: refers to placing, or scheduling, students into classes

Sheltered content courses: refers to classes that only have ELL students in them

Teaming: refers to the ESL Team 7 that consists of a math, science, Spanish for native speakers, and two ESL teachers. In addition, the term "Team 7" often refers to sheltered content courses, or to teachers who teach sheltered content courses, as the terms are often used interchangeably.

Spanish for native speakers courses: refers to classes offered to native Spanish speakers

ESL: stands for English as a Second Language. It usually refers to a program in a school. However at this school, the term often describes students. So ESL might be used to refer to English Language Learners (or ELLs).

Now, I will start asking you questions in order to answer the overall question and the secondary

questions. But first, I will give you a definition of each educational need before you give your

opinion about each need in detail.

The first need involves Social Needs:
Social needs will be defined by the following concepts.
~It's OK for ESL students to use their native language.
~ESL students should interact with other students in their native language (in your case, Spanish).
~ESL students should take language courses in their native language, like Spanish for native speakers classes.
~ESL students should use their native language (in your case, Spanish) for academic development.
~Teachers should use the prior knowledge of ESL students. Rather, the knowledge or information that you have learned in the past from your country (or in the U.S.) ~either in school, your home, or community.
~Students should also use English (their second language to interact with students and staff in a safe setting, free from ridicule, as found in the sheltered content courses (or the classes that you take from teachers on Team 7).

Now I will ask you about Student Placement in regard to Social Needs:
1. How does student placement, in this school, affect the social needs of ELLs?
   a. How does (did) being in the same classes with other ESL (ELL) students help you?

   b. Does (Did) it help you to talk about your assignments in English with other ESL students who do (did) not know your language?

   c. Would you rather take some classes (like math) with a teacher who normally does not have ESL students, or would you prefer to be in a math class from a Team 7 teacher?

      i. Why?

   d. Have you taken any classes when a bilingual aide was in the room with you?
      i. If yes, how did that help you?

e. Do (Did) you feel safe and free to speak up and participate in class with your Team 7 teachers?

f. Do (Did) you feel that your Team 7 teachers are (were) fair with you academically?

g. Did this school look at your transcripts (or grades/classes) from your home country before giving you a schedule at this school?

h. Can you think of any other ways that student placement (or being in classes with other ESL students) helps you or other ESL students with their social needs?

Next, I will ask you about Sheltered Content Courses in regard to Social Needs:
2. How do sheltered content courses, in this school, affect the social needs of ELLs?

a. Are you (Were you) allowed to talk in your native language with other students about your assignments in your Team 7 classes?

b. How does talking about assignments in your language with other students or bilingual aides help you?

c. Are (Were) you allowed to use bilingual dictionaries in your Team 7 classes?

d. Are (Were) you allowed to work in groups within your Team 7 classes?

e. Do (Did) you like to work in groups with other ESL students, even if they do not speak your language?

f. How do (did) your ESL teachers (or Team 7 teachers) help you?

    i. Do (did) they listen to you?

g. Do (Did) the Team 7 teachers treat you fairly?

h. Do you feel free to ask your Team 7 teachers questions?

i. Do (did) your Team 7 teachers sometimes ask you about your prior knowledge (or about the information that you already knew from your life experience or about information that you learned in school from your home country)?

j. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content classes help you with your social needs?

Now I will ask you about Teaming in regard to Social Needs:
3. How do Team 7 teachers, in this school, affect the social needs of ELLs?

a. Do you interact (or talk more about assignments) with other students and teachers in your Team 7 classes?

b. Do you feel safer (like people won't make fun of you) in your Team 7 classes?

i. Why or Why not?

c. [Refer to the sheltered content course/social needs category in items #1 a, b, c, d, f, g, h, i and placement/social needs category #1 c.]

d. Can you think of any other ways that teachers on Team 7 help you or other ESL students with their social needs?

Finally, I will ask you about Spanish for Native Speakers in regard to Social Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers courses, in this school, affect the social needs of ELLs?

a. Are (Were) you allowed to work with other students in groups in the Spanish language to improve your academic skills?

b. Do (Did) you feel safe (or free) to participate in Spanish for native speakers classes, without being worried of other students making fun of you?

c. Are/Were you treated fairly in your Spanish for native speakers classes?

d. Are (Were) you able to use your prior knowledge (the information that you already knew from your life experience, or information that you learned in school from your home country)?

e. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers classes help you or other ESL students with their social needs?

263

Let's move on to Affective or Emotional Needs.
Affective (Emotional) needs will be defined by the following concepts:
(1) The school is responsive to cultural and personal diversity.
(2) There are high expectations for all learners.
(3) Students are actively involved learners.
(4) Teachers use alternate groupings of students, when some students with better English skills are put with other students with lower English skills to work together.
(5) Students are provided with reading and writing activities to help them learn English.
(6) Students are given a lot of practice with the four language skills of –reading, writing, listening, and speaking, and they must make corrections in their writing.
(7) There is a focus on relevant background knowledge.
(8) The school provides native-language support (or Spanish in your case).
(9) The school focuses on content and on activities that are meaningful to students.
(10) The school creates roles in the classroom for family and community members.

Now I will ask you about Student Placement in regard to Affective (or Emotional) Needs:
1. How does being in classes with other ESL students (student placement) help you with your emotional needs?

       a. Is it helpful to have students from your country and other countries in your classes?

          i. Why?

       b. Do (did) your Team 7 teachers treat you differently than students from other countries?

          i. If so, why?

       c.   How does student placement (being in classes with other ESL students) attempt to reduce the emotional "trauma" that beginning level ELLs face while being exposed to a new culture and language? (In other words, how do the Team 7 teachers help ESL students when they first arrive at this school?)

       d.   Can you think of any other ways that student placement (or being in classes with other ESL students) helps you or other ESL students with their emotional needs?

Next, I will ask you about Sheltered Content Courses in regard to Affective (or Emotional) Needs:
2. How do sheltered content classes in this school foster (help with) the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

       a. Do (Did) you learn about other cultures in your sheltered classes?

       b. Do (Did) your sheltered content class teachers have high expectations for you to improve your reading, writing, listening, and speaking skills in English?

c. Do (Did) your sheltered content class teachers have activities for you to learn in class? (As opposed to just lecturing.)

d. Do (Did) you have opportunities to work in different groups with other students in your sheltered content classes?

e. Do (Did) your sheltered content class teachers provide opportunities for you to read and write in English and to make corrections when you made mistakes?

f. Do (Did) your sheltered content class teachers ask you questions about your relevant background knowledge (meaning, the information that you already know from your life experience or from school in your home country)?

g. How do (did) you use your language in sheltered content classes? (such as bilingual dictionaries, bilingual aides, etc.)

h. Do (Did) your sheltered content class teachers make your assignments interesting for you to learn?

i. Do (Did) your sheltered content teachers show you examples of how to do assignments?

j. How do (did) your sheltered content teachers (or Team 7 teachers), provide learning environments that promote intellectual and emotional fairness and security?
   i. Did you feel safe, or free to be yourself, in those classrooms?

   ii. Do (Did) your teachers want all of the ESL students to learn the material?

k. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content classes help you or other ESL students with their emotional needs?

Now I will ask you about Teaming in regard to Affective Needs:
3. How does teaming in this school foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

a. How do you feel when you go (or have gone) into your Team 7 classes—such as Algebra, Physical Science, Biology, ESL English, ESL Read 180, or Spanish for native speakers?

   i. Do (Did) you feel comfortable with those teachers?

b. Do all of the Team 7 teachers allow you to work with students from other countries?

i. Do they accept you (or think that it's OK) that you are from another country?

ii. Can you think of other ways that the Team 7 teachers make you feel comfortable in class?

c. What expectations should Team 7 teachers have for ELLs?

i. Do you think that they should expect ESL students to graduate from high school?

ii. Do they?

iii. Should they expect ESL students to go to college?

iv. Do they?

d. How do (did) Team 7 teachers help you learn about the school when you first came to this school?

i. How do (did) Team 7 teachers help you learn English?

e. How are your Team 7 classes in regard to instruction? (Do your teachers lecture the whole time, or can you work with other students on projects?)

f. Do (did) your Team 7 teachers have ESL students work together in groups sometimes?

i. Do they have you work on projects sometimes?

g. Refer to the sheltered content course category, within affective needs, in items #2 e, f, g, h, i. These questions will not be asked again, but will be referred to in the analysis.

h. Can you remember any times when students' family members or community members have come up to the school to help in any of your Team 7 classes?

i. Can you think of any other ways that the Team 7 teachers help you or other ESL students with their emotional needs?

Finally, I will ask you about Spanish for Native Speakers in regard to Affective Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers classes in this school foster the affective (emotional) needs of ELLs?

a. Does (did) your Spanish for native speakers teacher have high expectations for you to learn Spanish, to improve your reading, writing, listening, and speaking

266

skills?

    b. Does (did) your Spanish for native speakers teacher have activities for you to learn in class? (As opposed to just lecturing.)

    c. Do (Did) you work in groups with other students in your Spanish for native speakers classes?

        i.   If yes, what do you think about working in groups?

    d. Does (did) your Spanish for native speakers class provide opportunities for you to read and write in Spanish and to make corrections when you made mistakes?

    e. Does (did) your Spanish for native speakers teacher ask you questions about your relevant background knowledge (meaning, the information that you already know from your life experience or from school in your home country)?

    f. Are (Were) you able to relate the information that you learned from your Spanish for native speakers classes to your everyday life?

    g. Were there times when family or community members came into the classroom to help or talk to students?

    h. Can you think of any other ways that the Spanish for native speakers classes help you or other ESL students with their emotional needs?

Let's move on to Linguistic Needs.
Linguistic needs will be defined as developing proficiency in the four language skills of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. This includes the acquisition (or learning) of writing and speaking in the students' first and second languages across the language areas of grammar, vocabulary, and discussion skills.

Now I will ask you about Student Placement in regard to Linguistic Needs:
1. How does student placement promote student linguistic needs?

    a. Do you think that you are in classes that help you in learning English?

    b. Where do you learn the most English?
            i.   Which classes do you work on your reading skills?
           ii.   Which classes do you work on your writing skills?
          iii.   Which classes do you work on your speaking skills?
          iv.   Which classes do you work on your listening skills?
           v.   Which classes do you work on your English grammar?

    c. Which classes do you learn vocabulary words in your language and in English?

d. Which classes do you work on grammar in your language (such as Spanish)?

e. Which classes do you discuss lessons in your language?

f. Which classes do you discuss lessons in English?

g. Can you think of any other ways that student placement (or being in classes with other ESL students) helps you or other ESL students with their linguistic needs?

Next, I will ask you about Sheltered Content Courses in regard to Linguistic Needs:
2. How do sheltered content classes promote student linguistic needs?

    a. How do your Team 7 classes help you with your reading skills in English?

        i. Do you read in your language in Team 7 classes?

        ii. What kind of materials do you read?

    b. How do your Team 7 classes help you with your writing skills in English?

        i. Do you write in your language in Team 7 classes?

        ii. What do you write about?

    c. How do your Team 7 classes help you with your speaking skills?

        i. Do you have to give formal presentations?

        ii. Do you read out loud?

        iii. Do you speak in your language in Team 7 classes?

    d. Do you do listening activities in your language in Team 7 classes?
        i. How do your Team 7 classes help you with your listening skills? (For example: Did you listen to English videos, cassettes, the teacher, or other students?)

    e. Do you work on grammar skills in your language in Team 7 classes?
        i. How do your Team 7 classes help you with your grammar skills?

f. Do you learn vocabulary in your language and English in your Team 7 classes?

     i. How do your Team 7 classes help you learn vocabulary? (for example: pictures, activities)

g. Do you have discussions about your assignments in your language with other students or bilingual aides in your Team 7 classes?

h. Can you think of any other ways that sheltered content classes help you or other ESL students with their linguistic needs?

Now, I will ask you about Teaming in regard to Linguistic Needs:
3. How do Team 7 teachers promote student linguistic needs?

a. Do you like to have teachers that are on the same team (meaning Team 7) that work together?

     i. Why?

b. Do (Did) you learn English (including reading, writing, speaking, and listening) in all of your Team 7 classes—such as Algebra, Physical Science, Biology, ESL/Read 180 or English classes?

c. [Refer to the sheltered content course category, within linguistic needs, in items #1 a, b, c, d, e, f, g. These questions will not be asked again, but will be referred to in the analysis.]

d. Can you think of any other ways that Team 7 helps you or other ESL students with their linguistic needs?

Finally, I will ask you about Spanish for Native Speakers in regard to Linguistic Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers classes help you with your language needs (reading, writing, speaking, listening)?

a. What kind of materials do (did) you read in Spanish in your Spanish for native speakers classes?

b. What kind of things do (did) you write about in Spanish, in your Spanish for native speakers classes?

c. Do (Did) you have classroom discussions in Spanish, in your Spanish for native speakers classes?

d. Do (Did) you have to give formal speeches or presentations in the Spanish for native speakers classes?

e. What kind of things do (did) you listen to in Spanish? (For example: Did you listen to Spanish videos, cassettes, the teacher, or other students?)

f. How do (did) you learn new vocabulary words in Spanish?

g. How could the school help you more with your language needs—learning English and Spanish?

h. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers helps you or other ESL students with their linguistic needs?

Let's move on to Academic Needs:

Academic needs will be defined as how the school provides comprehensible input (or information that students can understand) so that students can learn new information to develop content or subject matter. This is done within the classes of math, science, English, social studies and elective courses that students must have to graduate. The idea is that this understandable information provides access to the curriculum, so that students can be successful in school and graduate.

Now I will ask you about Student Placement in regard to Academic Needs:
1. How does student placement promote student academic needs?

   a. What kind of content classes (such as math, science, English, social studies) have you been placed in?

      i. Have you taken classes in all of those subjects?

   b. Which Team 7 classes have you been placed in?

   c. Have you been placed into classes with bilingual aides?

      i. If yes, how did they help you academically?

   d. Is it easier to learn from your Team 7 teachers? (For example, is it easier to learn Algebra from an ESL Team 7 teacher, or with a mainstream math teacher?) *

   e. Do you think that you have been put into classes that help you academically?

   f. How could the school help you more with your academic needs—learning in all of your content classes?

g. Do you think that the school should provide more sheltered classes for ESL students?

h. Can you think of any other ways that student placement (or being in classes with other ESL students) helps you or other ESL students with their academic needs?

Next, I will ask you about Sheltered Content Courses in regard to Academic Needs:
2. How do sheltered content classes promote student academic needs?

a. How have the sheltered content classes helped you academically? (For example, how have Algebra classes with a Team 7 teacher helped you?)

b. Do (Did) your Team 7 teachers try to help you in different ways when you don't (didn't) understand the assignment?

i. If yes, how did they help you?

c. Do (Did) your Team 7 teachers show you examples of how to do your assignments?

i. Can you think of any other things that Team 7 teachers do to help you learn content matter like math, science, English, or social studies?

d. Do (Did) your Team 7 teachers ask you about what you already know about the information that you are learning in your assignments?

e. Are (Were) you allowed to use your native language (such as Spanish) in the sheltered content classes?

f. Can you think of other ways that sheltered content classes help you with your academic needs?

Now, I will ask you about Teaming in regard to Academic Needs:
3. How do Team 7 teachers promote student academic needs?

a. How have your Team 7 teachers helped you academically? (For example, how have they helped you learn the material in all of your Team 7 classes?)

b. Do you think that it is good to have a few teachers, who have the same ESL students in classes, work together?

i. Is it good for them to talk to each other about students?

ii. Do you think that this helps ESL students do better in their classes?

iii. If yes, how does this help students?

c. [Refer to the sheltered content course category, within academic needs, in items #2 a, b, c, d, e. These questions will not be asked again, but will be referred to in the analysis.]

d. Can you think of any other ways that Team 7 helps you or other ESL students with their academic needs?

Finally, I will ask you about Spanish for Native Speakers in regard to Academic Needs:
4. How do Spanish for native speakers classes promote student academic needs?

a. How have the Spanish for native speakers classes helped you? /

i. How does (did) the teacher help you improve your academic Spanish skills? **

b. Do (Did) you practice reading, writing, listening, and speaking in your Spanish for native speakers classes?

i. If yes, how did you practice these skills?

c. What part of the class helped you the most with practicing academic Spanish?

d. Could you understand the lessons being taught? [Comprehensible input.]

i. Did you already know the material?

ii. Did you learn something new?

iii. Or was it a combination, where you already knew some of the material and then you learned something new?

e. Did your Spanish for native speakers classes help you in learning material for other content classes like English?

i. If yes, how did the Spanish class help you with the other classes?

f. Can you think of any other ways that Spanish for native speakers helps you or other ESL students with their academic needs?

<u>Overall:</u>

1. What areas do you think that the school needs to improve upon in order to meet the needs of ELLs in this school?

2. Do you have any additional comments that you would like to make in regard to meeting the needs of ELLs?

3. Would you please fill out this grid, so that I can get your perception of how the ESL program is meeting the needs of ELLs?

Not mentioned~
{*For students who have had both ESL content courses and mainstream content courses.
**For students who have had Spanish for Native Speakers courses.}

Appendix D - ESL Needs Rubric: Classroom Snapshot Observation

ESL Needs Rubric				
Classroom Snapshots				
	N/A	**No**	**Somewhat**	**Yes**
	0	**1**	**2**	**3**
Social Needs—Evidence				
Native language affirmed in the classroom				
Interact with peers in native language				
Language courses in native language				
Native language for academic development				
Use of students' prior knowledge				
Interact with ELL peers in English				
Safe setting / no ridicule due to limited language proficiency				
Intellectual and emotional fairness				
Affective/Emotional Needs—Evidence				
Responsive to cultural and personal diversity				
High expectations for all learners				
Actively involved learners				
Use of alternate groupings				
Constructivist reading and writing activities				
Ample practice and careful corrections				
Focus on relevant background knowledge				
Native language support				
Meaningful content and activities for students				
Roles in the classroom for family and community members				
Linguistic Needs--Evidence				
Developing proficiency in the four language skills of:				
(1) Reading in English				
(2) Writing in English				
(3) Listening in English				
(4) Speaking in English				

	N/A	No	Somewhat	Yes
Phonology (pronunciation)				
Semantics (analyzing the interpretation of the meaning of words)				
Pragmatics (analyzing language in situational context)				
Syntax (grammar rules and sentence formation)				
Vocabulary (developed in content area)				
Discourse (academic discussions)				
Developing proficiency in the four language skills of:				
(1) Reading in native language				
(2) Writing in native language				
(3) Listening in native language				
(4) Speaking in native language				
Phonology (pronunciation)				
Semantics (analyzing the interpretation of the meaning of words)				
Pragmatics (analyzing language in situational context)				
Syntax (grammar rules and sentence formation)				
Vocabulary (developed in content area)				
Discourse (academic discussions)				
	N/A	**No**	**Somewhat**	**Yes**
	0	**1**	**2**	**3**
Academic Needs--Evidence				
Appropriate placement of students				
Content Course for graduation? (Specify below:)				
Cross-curricular concepts (i.e. Similar benchmarks. Specify below:)				
Comprehensible input:				
Lesson Modifications:				
Visuals				
Graphic Organizers				
Vocabulary introduction				
Starter sentences				
Audio support				
Examples of production				
Modeling				

Other:				
Native language for comprehension (How utilized? Specify below:)				
Bilingual Aides (Specify form of assistance below:)				
Other Notes of Observations:				

Appendix E - Perception Grid Survey

Perception Grid of Meeting the Four Educational Needs of ELLs

Please rate how you think the school performs in meeting the needs of ELLs by using the following scale: 1—needs improvement, 2—performs adequately, 3—performs excellently

Social	Affective	Linguistic	Academic
Placement 1 – 2 – 3	Placement 1 – 2 – 3	Placement 1 – 2 – 3	Placement 1 – 2 – 3
Sheltered 1 – 2 – 3	Sheltered 1 – 2 – 3	Sheltered 1 – 2 – 3	Sheltered 1 – 2 – 3
Teaming 1 – 2 – 3	Teaming 1 – 2 – 3	Teaming 1 – 2 – 3	Teaming 1 – 2 – 3
Spanish for Native Speakers 1 – 2 – 3	Spanish for Native Speakers 1 – 2 – 3	Spanish for Native Speakers 1 – 2 – 3	Spanish for Native Speakers 1 – 2 – 3

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix F - Perception Grid Survey Results

	Perception Grid Survey Results			
	Placement	**Sheltered**	**Teaming**	**SNS**
Social	94.87%	89.74%	94.44%	100.00%
Affective	87.18%	92.31%	94.44%	93.33%
Linguistic	79.49%	79.49%	88.89%	86.67%
Academic	82.05%	92.31%	94.44%	90.00%
Totals	85.90%	88.46%	93.05%	92.50%
Each Category:				
Highest	Social	Aff./Aca.	Soc./Aff./Aca.	Social
Lowest	Linguistic	Linguistic	Linguistic	Linguistic
Totals:				
Highest	Teaming			
Lowest	Placement			

Appendix G - ESL Needs Rubric: Classroom Snapshot Observation Results

		Social	Affective	Linguistic	Academic	Total	Highest	Lowest
Classroom Snapshot Totals								
Regarding: Sheltered Component								
		Social	**Affective**	**Linguistic**	**Academic**	**Total**	**Highest**	**Lowest**
Teachers								
Mr. Bond (B.L.)		70.00%	83.00%	88.89%	81.82%	80.93%	Ling.	Social
Mr. Bond		85.71%	70.00%	88.89%	83.33%	81.98%	Ling.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**77.86%**	**76.50%**	**88.89%**	**82.58%**	**81.46%**	**Ling.**	**Aff.**
Mr. Track (B.L.)		85.71%	95.83%	73.33%	77.78%	83.16%	Aff.	Ling.
Mr. Track		80.95%	91.67%	66.67%	69.70%	77.25%	Aff.	Ling.
Average Totals:		**83.33%**	**93.75%**	**70.00%**	**73.74%**	**80.21%**	**Aff.**	**Ling.**
Ms. Hermosa (B.L.)—ESL		80.95%	77.78%	76.67%	63.64%	74.76%	Soc.	Aca.
Ms. Hermosa		76.19%	70.00%	76.67%	71.79%	73.66%	Ling.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**78.57%**	**73.89%**	**76.67%**	**67.72%**	**74.21%**	**Soc.**	**Aca.**
Ms. Hermosa (B.L.)—SNS		100.00%	95.83%	86.67%	70.00%	88.13%	Soc.	Aca.
Ms. Hermosa		100.00%	88.89%	86.67%	69.23%	86.20%	Soc.	Aca.
Average Totals:		**100.00%**	**92.36%**	**86.67%**	**69.62%**	**87.16%**	**Soc.**	**Aca.**
Ms. Rivers (B.L.)--Eng. 3		85.71%	66.67%	73.33%	63.64%	72.34%	Soc.	Aca.
Ms. Rivers		85.71%	60.00%	76.67%	69.44%	72.96%	Soc.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**85.71%**	**63.34%**	**75.00%**	**66.54%**	**72.65%**	**Soc.**	**Aff.**
Ms. Rivers (B.L.) -- R-180		76.19%	66.67%	70.37%	69.70%	70.73%	Soc.	Aff.

Ms. Rivers		66.67%	63.33%	76.67%	63.64%	67.58%	Ling.	Aff.
Average Totals:		**71.43%**	**65.00%**	**73.52%**	**66.67%**	**69.16%**	**Ling.**	**Aff.**
Mr. Rodriguez (B.L.)		85.71%	70.37%	60.00%	72.73%	72.20%	Soc.	Ling.
Mr. Rodriguez		90.48%	56.67%	56.67%	72.73%	69.14%	Soc.	Aff./Ling.
Average Totals:		**88.10%**	**63.52%**	**58.34%**	**72.73%**	**70.67%**	**Soc.**	**Ling.**
Mr. Rios (B.L.)		90.48%	91.67%	70.83%	69.44%	80.61%	Aff.	Aca.
Mr. Rios		95.24%	91.67%	63.33%	69.44%	79.92%	Soc.	Ling.
Average Totals:		**92.86%**	**91.67%**	**67.08%**	**69.44%**	**80.26%**	**Soc.**	**Ling.**
TOTALS		*84.73%*	*77.50%*	*74.52%*	*71.13%*	*76.97%*	*Soc.*	*Aca.*

Appendix H - Collapsed Coding Categories

Academic Concepts Addressed by SNS Courses
Academic Discourse
Alternate Groupings
Appropriate Placement
Assistance
Attitude about Team 7 Teachers
Bilingual Aides Assist with Academic Needs
Building Provision of Sheltered Content Courses
Clustering
Comprehensible Input
Content Courses ELLs Placed In
Correlations Between Developing Four Language Skills in L1 and L2
Correlations Between SNS and Other Content Area Benchmarks
Courses Promoting Four Language Skills
Develop Four Language Skills
Diversity
Expectations
Fairness
Groups
Interaction
Layering Description
Lesson Modification
Materials in L1
Meaningful Activities
Native Language
Other
Practice and Corrections
Prior Knowledge
Procedures of Placement
Program Development
Program Suggestions
Purpose of SNS Courses
Rationale for ELL Placement
Role of Family and Community Members
Safe Setting

Similar Situation
Students Placed in Team 7 Courses
Team 7 Teachers Work Together for Comprehensible Input
Vocabulary Acquisition

Appendix I - ESL Program Diagnostic Checklist

ESL PROGRAM DIAGNOSTIC CHECKLIST

Key: 1 = Limited Existence   3 = Somewhat Exists   5 = Strongly Exists

L2 Program Characteristics:

Fairness

1   2   3   4   5

Diversity

1   2   3   4   5

Safe Setting

1   2   3   4   5

Courses Promoting the Four Language Skills

1   2   3   4   5

Clustering Students into Mainstream Courses

1   2   3   4   5

Accessing Prior Knowledge

1   2   3   4   5

High Expectations

1   2   3   4   5

Meaningful Activities

1   2   3   4   5

Vocabulary Acquisition

1   2   3   4   5

Lesson Modifications

1   2   3   4   5

Involving Family and Community Members

1   2   3   4   5

Teacher Team That Works Together to Implement Comprehensible Input for ELLs

1   2   3   4   5

Time for Student Practice and Corrections

1   2   3   4   5

L1 Program Characteristics:

Comprehensible Input

1   2   3   4   5

Vocabulary Acquisition

1   2   3   4   5

Academic Concepts

1   2   3   4   5

Addressing the Four Language Skills

1   2   3   4   5

Correlation of Benchmarks Between Spanish for Native Speakers and Other Content Area

Courses

1   2   3   4   5

Comments: