A CASE STUDY OF NEW MEXICO MIDDLE SCHOOLS: IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL

LANGUAGE POLICY FORMATION

by

PAUL CARLOS ANAYA

B.S., EASTERN NEW MEXICO UNIVERSITY, 1973
M. Ed., TEXAS TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY, 1995

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2006

Abstract

This was a case study of two middle schools in New Mexico. Using organization for instruction (Marks and Louis, 1997) as a crux, the purpose of the building level study was to explore the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program and to infer aspects of language policy. The needs threshold was based on the timeliness of reexamining linguistic diversity and on the importance of language concerns in education, principally as they related to ELLs and other linguistically diverse students. The problem stemmed from dynamic, culturally evolving changes in the environment of the two middle schools under study. Changes from economic factors, district leadership, immigration, and demographic shifts in the local area affected the two buildings' capacity to effectively deliver educational and language services. The significance of the study maintained that school level language planning was rapidly becoming a competing theme in the process of education and required attention in light of important environmental and sociological factors. Metaphor was employed to help symbolize increasing complexities (e.g., array of special interests, human and individual diversity, etc.) found in context of the school with reference to organization, leadership, instruction, and program.

Since the research was a case study, no hypotheses were formulated; instead a major research question and four sub questions were posed. A mixed method, multiple sources of information methodology was used in the collection and analysis of data. Twenty ($N = 20$) participants made up of building leaders (n = 4) and teachers (n = 16) were interviewed. Tables of student achievement scores were presented along with other demographic data. Although interviewees reported sensitivity to linguistic diversity, findings pointed to a lack of knowledge about language policy at all levels on the part of building leaders and teachers. Implications drawn described the important role language policy formation could play in educational structuring of middle school programs and instruction. A list of recommendations provided criteria to follow in making decisions about the feasibility of conducting school level language planning and made suggestions for further research. An extensive bibliography of relevant sources and transcripts of interviews were provided.

A CASE STUDY OF NEW MEXICO MIDDLE SCHOOLS: IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHOOL

LANGUAGE POLICY FORMATION

by

PAUL CARLOS ANAYA

B. S., Eastern New Mexico University, 1973
M. Ed., Texas Technological University, 1995

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2006

Approved by:

Major Professor
Dr. Charles Heerman

Abstract

 This was a case study of two middle schools in New Mexico. Using organization for instruction (Marks and Louis, 1997) as a crux, the purpose of the building level study was to explore the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program and to infer aspects of language policy. The needs threshold was based on the timeliness of reexamining linguistic diversity and on the importance of language concerns in education, principally as they related to ELLs and other linguistically diverse students. The problem stemmed from dynamic, culturally evolving changes in the environment of the two middle schools under study. Changes from economic factors, district leadership, immigration, and demographic shifts in the local area affected the two buildings' capacity to effectively deliver educational and language services. The significance of the study maintained that school level language planning was rapidly becoming a competing theme in the process of education and required attention in light of important environmental and sociological factors. Metaphor was employed to help symbolize increasing complexities (e.g., array of special interests, human and individual diversity, etc.) found in context of the school with reference to organization, leadership, instruction, and program.

 Since the research was a case study, no hypotheses were formulated; instead a major research question and four sub questions were posed. A mixed method, multiple sources of information methodology was used in the collection and analysis of data. Twenty ($N = 20$) participants made up of building leaders (n = 4) and teachers (n = 16) were interviewed. Tables of student achievement scores were presented along with other demographic data. Although interviewees reported sensitivity to linguistic diversity, findings pointed to a lack of knowledge about language policy at all levels on the part of building leaders and teachers. Implications drawn described the important role language policy formation could play in educational structuring of middle school programs and instruction. A list of recommendations provided criteria to follow in making decisions about the feasibility of conducting school level language planning and made suggestions for further research. An extensive bibliography of relevant sources and transcripts of interviews were provided.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the wonderful support received over the years from my many acquaintances in education, my friends and my family. A special recognition goes to my parents, Raymond and Rachael Analla, for their undying love and steadfast confidence in their son. Also, I want to acknowledge my wife, Sylvia, my sons, and daughter for their loyalty. A special thanks goes to Dr. Charles Heerman for his unfaltering guidance and his diligent commitment to perfection. "Dr. Heerman, thank you"! Also, I want to acknowledge Dr. Jerry D. Donnelly and his wife Jan (since deceased), who gave of themselves (and a meal or two) during those "formative" undergraduate years at ENMU. Of course, I also want to recognize the advancements made in communication technology and new age publishing (beats the old Olivetti and carbon copies), without which this endeavor may have taken a bit longer then it did.

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my younger brothers, Reynaldo Hilario Analla and John Timothy Analla, whom I lost to illness during this writing. Both were an inspiration to me. They are remembered for their courage and character by everyone they touched with their talent, intelligence, and beautiful ability to be human. As family and golden glove boxers, there wasn't anyone better. There is nothing like the "gray expectations" brothers have for each other.

CHAPTER 1-INTRODUCTION

Background and Rational for the Study: An Overview

This dissertation research consisted of a case study of two middle schools in the state of New Mexico, which is part of the Southwestern United States. The purpose of the study was to infer the language policy at work in the school district, which administered to the target schools. Programs and instruction helped determine the effectiveness of the educational process, which was demonstrated in terms of student performance and achievement. This study was founded on a general concern for the school's ability in meeting the unique needs of linguistic diversity in the school, in general, and of English language learners (ELLs), in particular.

The design was a case study exploring the three elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program. In hopes of drawing some implications-short and long term- for language policy formation, focus was on organizational and instructional considerations at the building level. Further, the organization for instruction (Marks and Louis, 1997) at each building was used as the crux for analyzing the three elements under study. Emphasis was placed on identifying processes and events that influenced the delivery and/or development of instruction, principally, as it affected linguistically diverse students. It was seen as a problem of national importance and one of current interest given the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act, as amended, legislation making English the national language, and the extraordinary increase in the number of school aged children who are influenced by a language other than English.

The study directed attention at the organization of two middle school buildings in hopes of understanding how instruction was planned and developed at the building level. Other influencing factors included federal-state policies, local aspects (cultural and social) of identified language communities, district policies, Board of Education make-up and policies, and the Superintendency and central administration. The case study research used mixed methods and multiple sources (Creswell, 2002) of information in order to conduct all research activities.

It was felt that the sine qua non of school language policy formation was language, and the role it played in the educational process. Noam Chomsky explained, "Language…is a product of human intelligence, created anew in each individual by operations that lie far beyond

the reach of will or consciousness" (1975, p. 23). Prior to the emergence of connectivity and neural cognitive science, the Chomskian "revolution" (1971,1975, 1977) had dramatically changed how we viewed and understood language. Furthermore, Chomsky believed by studying the properties of natural languages (structure, organization, and use) we gained an insight into human intelligence. More importantly, he held that no one mode should be given privileged status instead a plurality of modes should be the case.

Even though the arena of second language learning and language policy has been fraught with political argument and special interest every effort was made to adhere to the scientific character of educational research. Although the study was a building level study, it attempted to incorporate some of the more important psychological, philosophical, and pedagogical aspects of linguistic diversity into the design and analysis of results. Notably, this exploratory research was inspired by the words of Einar Haugen, who stated, "although this study doesn't purport to present a general theory or model or typology, which will give fuller understanding of the complex conjunctions of variables affecting the destinies of minority languages and languages at risk, it does attempt to represent the interests of language communities understudy" (1980, p.42).

Language communities and language policy were presented in light of an American "linguistic culture" (Schiffman, 1996). As a result, the public system of education, specifically the school district where data was collected, remained at the center of the study. The interest in national language legislation (legislation in the 108th Congress included the following bills and resolutions, HR 59, 280, 385, 969 and S. 86, 541, H.CON. RES.9, H.J.RES.16) has gained much attention during the last decade. In fact, as part of an immigration reform bill the Senate of the 109th Congress passed the Inhofe Amendment (S. AMDT 4064) making English the national language of the United States. If passed in a Senate and House compromise bill, the Salazar Amendment (S. AMDT 4073) would keep the language amendment from being a punitive measure. These debates over making English the national or official language of the U. S. have contributed toward our understanding of the pivotal role local initiatives (the district) have played in driving state statutes and federal law. Emphasizing this point, Fettus, (1997) argued for the need to stress building or school level planning in language matters. Similarly, Corson (1999) found that researchers in the area of language planning had paid little attention to the school as the basic setting for language change.

Furthermore, using the construct "organization for instruction" (Marks and Louis, 1997) as a crux, this study explored the three elements of educational leadership, instruction, and middle level program with the purpose of identifying and analyzing events in the school relative to linguistic diversity and school policy. Marks and Louis operationalized organization for instruction as professional community and collective responsibility for student learning. More specifically, they suggested that professional community entailed five features: shared norms and values, a focus on student learning, collaborative activity, de-privatization of practice, and reflective dialogue. They explained, "this captures the shared conviction among teachers that students-despite disadvantage and past failures-can and will learn with the opportunity and necessary support" (p. 2). Marks and Louis further elaborated, "where collective responsibility for student learning is strong, teachers respond to the challenge of instructing all students as a mutual endeavor marshaling their shared professional knowledge" (p. 249).

Further, Marks and Louis (1997) understood organization much like Chester Barnard (1938, cited in Donnelly, 1966), who in his seminal works on executive function, defined organization as an interpersonal system of coordinated human effort. In a similar fashion, teachers along with other educational personnel have worked endlessly to foster a culture of collaboration and cooperation in their respective buildings. In the process, they have helped to develop a sense of common purpose and shared responsibility. Theoretically and conceptually this has allowed them to improve their perceptions of the organization for instruction in their respective buildings and their sensitivity for linguistic diversity. Similarly, Miramontes, Nadeau, and Commins (1997) were convinced that, "attempts to improve schools that served linguistically diverse students are bound to fail unless an understanding and utilization of programs… becomes a shared, school wide responsibility" (p. 8).

This study was premised on the critical importance of educational personnel keeping abreast of changing demographics in society and in the school. Krawthwohl stated, "knowledge growth follows the ability to record, analyze, and measure phenomenon in the field" (1993, p. 234). Thus, it was considered as important that a study of the school's commitment to linguistic diversity be conducted. That is to say, the mere presence of linguistically diverse students has served to demonstrate a needs threshold recognizing the dynamic language differences evident in most of the 14,000 school districts across the nation. Notably, with particular reference to linguistically diverse learners, discussions of the study seriously considered and fully recognized

that non-language characteristics or variables (e.g., class size, time in homeroom, teacher preparation, etc) of instructional services (Laosa, 2000) offered a competing and plausible explanation of student performance and achievement.

From a school policy perspective, language planning in schools was seen as being hampered by the lack of communication between school administrators, educational personnel, and other stakeholders, in terms of, how to obtain adequate resources and support. The study suggested that although school language policy was often viewed as an elusive-both theoretically and empirically- construct, it was a useful strategy for improved schools. Corson (2001) maintained that language policy planning should go on in both elementary and secondary levels. The Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report (HLRPCR, 2000) argued that unless policies are based on consultation with all stakeholders a mismatch (incongruence) in heritage language development between needs and provision would occur.

The past two decades have witnessed a flurry of research activity on second language acquisition and on the effects of culture and language on the process of schooling (Garcia, 1991; Garcia, 2000; Miramontes, Nadeau, and Commins, 1997; Thomas and Collier, 1997). Policy decisions and practices at each level of the school organization have ultimately affected the quality of academic opportunity that limited English proficient students received (The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, 1999). Teacher perceptions (Herrera, 1995) should not be the sole arbiter for what course of action to follow in promoting instructional reform or improvement for linguistically diverse students. For example, Miramontes, Nadeau, and Commins (1997) have asserted that educator's underlying attitudes toward students' language, culture, and family significantly shaped instructional approaches. Moreover, Darling-Hammond (2000) found that teacher preparation and certification were by far the strongest correlates of student achievement.

Need for the Study

The steady increase of school-aged children whose home language is not English was a serious concern for many mainstream, regular, and Bilingual/ESL classroom teachers. These teachers have continually questioned their role in meeting the complex linguistic and cognitive needs of these students. Educational personnel at all levels have expressed concern about their responsibility – both ethical and legal - for educating linguistically diverse children. Teachers

have needed explicit direction in identifying and developing effective instructional strategies, based on "methods that work" for their English language learners (ELLs).

Furthermore, many content area teachers have had little or no training in second language theory and have been hard pressed to understand the complex educational needs of these students. Freire (1993) wrote that teachers needed skills to critically analyze exemplary pedagogy, and needed to translate teaching skills into "cultural and linguistic codes" for learning. For example, they needed guidelines for understanding the processes young children undergo as they learn a second language. It was estimated that more than 75% of language minority students are placed in classrooms where teachers lacked the necessary training (Fueyo, 1997). The case study was premised on this need and has maintained that a school language policy formation was in order.

Moreover, there was a need for research that informed policymakers and administrative leadership on language policy concerns at the middle school building level. Interesting examples have included studies conducted in the area of content literacy, which have served as an analogy for cultural and linguistic literacy. In one study, O'Brien, Stewart, and Moje (1995), suggested that the failure of the infusion model rested on the foundation of knowledge developed "outside" of the school context where the knowledge was applied. They asserted, "trying to show how strategies that predicted interactive processing are influenced and creatively shaped by social beings in an institutionalized school world was complicated" (p. 459). As a result, there was need for a study that informed research and practice by using data that focused on meshing building level considerations with the organization for instruction for a purpose that promoted language initiatives, which contributed towards school language policy formation. The focus of this building level research was on making a contribution toward filling the void between language and literacy for all students.

Statement of the Problem

Rapidly changing population trends and the growing number of ELLs in the schools (Herrera, 1995; Crawford, 1996; Parla 1994; Cushner, McClelland and Safford, 1996) have posed a problem of major proportion in the field of education. The problem was viewed as multifaceted and hinged on whether teachers provided learning experiences for all students in their classroom. Conventional wisdom held that practitioners included every student in achieving

success. The presence of linguistically diverse students in the school building and in more classrooms has presented a challenge to be taken up by teachers and other educational personnel concerned with the academic performance of their students. This case study maintained that issues concerning education and language were not only a pedagogical problem but also a school policy problem.

The problems associated with the needs of linguistically diverse students particularly second language learners at two middle schools in New Mexico were at the center of the case study. The problems at the study site are on the cutting edge of dynamic, evolving, and culturally changing population shifts being experienced in U. S society. The demographic profiles (refer to Ch. 4, Tables 4.1 through 4.3) of the state, county, city, and school district where the study was situated point to these immigration and population shifts. In addition to 44 % of the state population being Hispanic, 32 % speak Spanish with projected increases due to immigration from Mexico, Central and South American (refer to Ch. 2, U. S. Population Trends and the Notion of Linguistic Diversity).

In earlier days, the area where the exploratory research was conducted experienced significant growth, however, a Strategic Air Command (SAC) federal facility was shut down, which caused a loss of population. The city lost 15, 000 and went from 48,000 to 33,000, but it has rebuilt to 45,293. Because of the base closure, the area went into economic decline with a severe impact on the schools. In better days, the school district participated in a bilingual education project (1969-1973), which was funded under the newly created 1968 Bilingual Education Act. However, due to the economic decline and changes in demographics the area changed in terms of makeup and social economic status (SES) of the population. For example, the number of Hispanics increased with the majority coming from poorer families. In addition, the changes in immigration patterns further increased the number of English Language Learners (ELLs) in the school district and added to the number of students coming from lower SES communities. The researcher considered the area as a very dynamic, evolving research context with evolutionary changes that contributed to the problem statement.

The district hampered by changes in leadership (the superintendence) faced a serious leadership crisis that culminated with the forced resignation of the superintendent during the course of the research. Moreover, the reorganization plan for schools in the district found school leadership under pressure to close, consolidate, and realign, which resulted in a significant

increase in the number of Hispanics and lower social economic students at the two participating middle school buildings. The research problem also stems from low performance scores by special education, FRLP, and ESL students on state mandated academic assessments (please refer to student achievement data, Tables 4.4 through 4.9).

The area has continued to recover economically, however district politics, school law, and the social context have changed. The problems encountered were further compounded by the fact that ELLs are the fastest growing school aged population in the area. Research findings presented in the dissertation pointed out that educators are dissatisfied and are searching for answers; particularly teachers with linguistically diverse students in their classroom and building. The problem statement on which this case study was founded has proven to be a problem for policy and decision makers as well as for practitioners.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the elements of middle level school leadership, instruction, and programming with a focus on identifying linkages between linguistically diverse students (including their respective language communities and the school's organization for instruction using an exploratory case study design. Moreover, it was intended that the data would provide for implications to be drawn about aspects of language policy present at two middle school buildings. The notion that language policy was a factor in the educational process and could influence the school context was founded on extensive research. Much of it was conducted during the last thirty years, relative to the treatment of linguistic diversity and language differences in education (Garcia, 1991; Banks, 1994; August and Hakuta, 1997). In lieu of hypotheses, research question were formulated to guide the exploratory research.

Research Questions

This sub section presents the research questions used to guide research activities. The research questions include: one major research question and four sub questions.

Major Research Question

In what ways and to what extent does school context and the organization for instruction positively influence school language policy formation?

1. Leadership sub question.

In what ways and to what extent does leadership promote the needs of linguistic diversity in the school and what implications would this have for school language policy formation?

2. Instruction sub question.

In what ways and to what extent does instruction promote the needs of linguistically diverse students at the middle school and what implications would this have for school language policy formation?

3. Program sub question.

In what ways and to what extent does middle level program promote the needs of linguistic diversity in middle schools and what implications could be drawn for school language policy formation?

4. Language policy sub question

In what ways and to what extent can language policy be inferred or is discernable in the middle school environment?

Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1 displays the conceptual framework for the case study and provides an illustration of the domains on which the research design was developed. The framework served as reference for the design and development of the major research question and four sub questions above. The framework is presented in four parts: 1) Influencing Factors, 2) Focus of the Case Study, 3) Three Elements Under Study, and 4) Inferred Elements of Middle School Language Policy Formation.

Influencing Factors

The influencing factors section showed the government and policy factors that were part of the school district's environment. Federal and state polices included directives, standards and benchmarks. At the federal level, there was proposed legislation and the No Child Left Behind Act (2000). Emphasis at the state level was on the State's Public Education Department (PED) and Bilingual/ESL Education Unit, with reference made to PED Content Standards and

Performance Benchmarks. Other areas looked at as part of this section were local cultural, social, and language communities. This involved identification and analysis of the demography, history, and socio-cultural make-up of the county, city and school district. As external environmental factors, each was analyzed in terms of their influence at the middle schools and on school culture. School district policies provided data relevant to the provision of language service in the district. Board of Education leadership, membership, and policies were viewed as vital factors in establishing policy initiatives and setting direction for the school district with reference to the involvement of stakeholders. Central office provided an opportunity to look at the role the superintendence and his administrative support team played in establishing educational vision and mission for the district.

Focus of the Case Study

As a building level exploratory research, focus of research activities was on two middle school buildings in the Southwestern part of the United States. Focus was specifically placed on organizational and educational processes relative to the treatment of linguistic diversity and the education of English Language Learners.

Three Elements Under Study

The three elements under study were: educational leadership, instruction, and middle level program. These elements were explored using the organization for instruction at two middle school buildings. The element of leadership included building leaders, more specifically, the principal and assistant principal. Although this study was a building level inquiry, other leadership factors (e.g., board members, the superintendent, central office staff, etc.) were explored. The element of instruction included interviews of selected teachers at each middle school. Program and programs involved the review of public documents and records relative to support, auxiliary, and academic programs.

Inferred Aspects of Middle School Language Policy Formation

Lastly, aspects of language policy were identified and analyzed in context of the "linguist culture" (Schiffman, 1996) of the middle schools, school district, and community served by the school. Implications drawn and conclusions reached were based on the inferred aspects of language policy formation found at each middle school building.

Figure 1. 1   Conceptual Framework for the Case Study Research

```
                                           ┌─────────────────────────────┐
                                           │                             │
                                           │   INFLUENCING FACTORS       │
                                           │                             │
                                           └──────────────┬──────────────┘
                                                          │
┌──────────────────────────────┐                         │
│  INFLUENCING FACTORS:         │                         │
│                               │                         ▼
│    •  Federal and state       │         ┌─────────────────────────────────┐
│       policies.               │         │  THREE ELEMENTS UNDER STUDY:    │
│                               │         │    •  Middle school building    │
│    •  Local cultural, social, │         │       leaders and leadership.   │
│       and language            │         │    •  Middle school teachers    │
│       environmental factors.  │         │       and instruction.          │
│                               │────────▶│    •  Middle level school       │
│    •  School district         │         │       program and programs.     │
│       policies.               │         │                                 │
│                               │         └────────────────┬────────────────┘
│    •  Board of Education.      │                         │
│                               │                         │
│    •  The Superintendent.     │                         │
│                               │                         ▼
│    •  Central Office.         │         ┌─────────────────────────────────┐
│                               │         │  INFERRED ASPECTS OF MIDDLE     │
└──────────────────────────────┘         │  SCHOOL LANGUAGE POLICY         │
                                          │  FORMATION                      │
                                          └─────────────────────────────────┘
```

Definition of Terms

Language policy. Language policy was strictly inferred from the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level programs. It referred to decisions (rules, regulations, guidelines) about the status, use, domains, and the rights of speakers of a language.

Language. Schiffman (1996) proposed a four-point guideline: 1) language as a rule governed human communicative system; 2) language proper, individually named varieties and their sub varieties (dialect, jargon, slang, argot); 3) language as a cultural system; and 4) language as the functions that it performs (symbolic, instrumental, lingua franca, etc.).

Linguistically diverse. Students whose first language is other than English or who have influences of another language in the home. Also, used to refer to students who speak a non standard variety of English or any other language.

Linguistic culture. Concept coined by Schiffman (1996) that identified the language dynamics of groups of speakers from local to national. Primary reference was to the " linguistic culture" of the school district's language community viz., school community.

Language community. Where more than two people converse in a common variety or sub variety of language. Language community was viewed viz., school community.

School language policy. A written or unwritten (understood) statement that helps administer the treatment, use, and function of language in context of the school.

Explicit-Implicit language policy. A dichotomy used to describe two levels of language policy formation. Explicit refers to social decision making in context of the lives of the speaker and implicit refers to decision making by social groups or state administrations.

Overt-Covert language policy. A dichotomy used to describe two levels of language policy formation. Covert refers to what is happening on the ground or grassroots level and overt refers to an attempt to make decisions or rule making about language (s) based on covert dynamics.

Leadership. It was derived from assigned responsibilities of designated educators in a school building. These responsibilities included things such as enforcing policy, financial decision-making, supervision of students, supervision of teachers, evaluation of instruction, and the supervision of curriculum (including the need and rationale for implementing changes).

New leadership. This referred to educational leaders who were aware of the need for visionary leadership that was well versed on the needs of a rapidly changing global order and an increasingly complex virtual environment.

Transformational leadership. It was first advocated by J. McGregor Burns (1978), it referred to leadership that engaged in critical reflection and had the ability to transform educational personal into "moral agents".

Supportive educational leadership. This referred to providing direction, guidance, support, and resources for the improvement of instruction.

Instructional leadership. It referred to promoting and contributing toward the improvement of teaching and learning.

Leadership capacity. The school's ability to develop an "organizational mindset" used to deal with the growing pressure from special interests and other relevant issues.

Organization for instruction. The construct was operationalized by Marks and Louis (1997) and referred to teachers' sense of professional community and shared responsibility for student learning. It can also refer to a general feeling of cooperation and esprit de corps.

Instruction. Giving meaningful direction to student learning for specific purposes. The focus of instruction in this study was its influence on language choice and use.

Instructional system. Using Reigeluth's (1987) description, in this study, it refers to the processes of instruction established for the school district.

Instructional design. Using Reigeluth's (1987) description, in this study, it referred to the process and practices used by educational personnel and classroom teachers to help develop the instructional system of the school.

Instructional development. Using Reigeluth's (1987) description, in this study, it was used to refer to the approaches used by the classroom teacher to deliver instruction particularly in relation to the treatment of language.

Instructional technology. Using Reigeluth's (1987) description, in this study, it referred to the systematic (systemic) strategies and techniques employed by the classroom teacher in the solution of instructional problems, principally, as these problems related to language instruction.

Program. Referred to middle level school curriculum, extracurricular activities, and other student support or special programming.

Adolescent youth. Refers to, "students moving from the 'concrete' stage (able to think logically about real experiences) to the 'formal' stage (able to consider, what ifs', think reflectively, and reason abstractly). Generally, this stage begins at age 12 and is not firmly established until approximately age 15. Students may even shift back and forth from the concrete to the abstract, although…not all young adolescents achieve this capacity" (Irvin, 1998, p. 25).

ESL program. English as a second language or English language development (ELD) services that address the developmental, linguistic, and academic needs of ELLs.

Diglossia and ethoglossia. These constructs were used to capture aspects of language policy at work, with reference to the language communities viz., the school community. Both constructs represent language in terms of community as opposed to individual language (s). Diaglossia (Ferguson, 1959) in this case principally referred to the predominately Spanish-speaking community served by the two middle schools. Diaglossia was viewed as part of the prevailing "linguistic culture" (Schiffman, 1996) of the school district's service area and of the two school buildings under study.

Speech communities. Ferguson (1959 cited in Haugen, 1972) defined speech communities as a group of individuals with similar attitude about the language of the community, languages, and language in general.

National origin. It is a provision in the 14th amendment intended to protect the rights of all citizens sharing a distinct nationality. The Statute provided legal guidelines for school districts to follow for the implementation of language services for students.

Resource and human capacity. This refers to the availability of personnel and material resources, which included number of teachers and curricular programs and educational personnel's willingness, skill, and ability (training and educational preparation)

Significance of the Study

Institutional trends in education have initiated considerable change in what gets done at the school district level and at the school building level with reference to competing themes in making schools more effective. Because of our immigrant tradition as a Nation, the concept of bilingualism has pretty much predated all other themes. In other words, the U.S. system of public education has historically provided educational services to a variety of bilingual and second language communities. As part of our bilingual tradition on local levels, programs have been

implemented for these bilingual and second language populations from diverse cultural and ethnic groups.

In the 1960's, poverty became an issue and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 initiated programs for students from poverty backgrounds. In the 1970's, programming for special needs populations in the name of Special Education were introduced into the schools. Then, in the 1980's the concept of school improvement was introduced into the schools and the building became the unit of change. Certainly, federal and state mandates have continued to be significant. Even the classroom teacher as a unit of improvement has continued in importance, however, with the school building at the forefront we have focused on the total school program and how teachers could work to support building improvement efforts. Similarly, the onset of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act was viewed as a standards-based assessment program with implications for school continuance. In other words, the provisions of NCLB set requirements that schools with low assessment scores would be closed and students transferred to another school in the district.

Furthermore, a significant compounding demographic was recognized in the name of "baby boomer" retirements. To offset this loss of productive workers, the U. S. has sought to use immigrants and to import foreign workers. Thus, this exploratory research represents one of a number of studies conducted in order to better understand our schools, and how they function in the midst of competing themes and programs in the schools (e.g., language differences, poverty, special education, and school improvement). Further, these programs were viewed in the face of changing U. S. population trends and increases in immigration with particular reference to school language policy formation. Therefore, the significance of the research was presented in terms of human diversity, cultural diversity, and linguistic diversity with a focus on the role schools played in producing world-class students and a workforce geared to meet the needs of increasing globalization and a technological society.

Delimitations

The focus was at the building level (two middle schools) in the school district that served as the case for this study. Consequently, this limited the generalizing of results to those middle schools in districts with similar demographic profiles and socio-cultural environment. In addition, the research problem was worthy of being a long-term instructional reform study,

however, time and resource constraints (Krathwohl, 1993 referred to this as marginal utility or opportunity cost) posed real delimitations on this study and the results reported.

Summary of Chapter 1

Chapter 1 presented an overview of the case study that included a background and rational for selecting the problem under study. The dissatisfaction of teacher was highlighted in a school policy perspective with reference to linguistic diversity and the fact that ELLs are the fastest growing school aged population nationally and locally. The chapter included a statement of need for the exploratory research concerning the organization for instruction and linguistically diverse students with a focus on school language policy formation. A statement of the problem posed by current population trends, immigration reform, and the increases in ELLs were highlighted with particular attention given to the area (i.e., county, city, school district) where the study was conducted. Sociological factors (e.g., economic decline, increases in low income families, immigration, etc.) and demographic trends in the school district were elaborated.

The purpose of the study highlighted issues addressed in the research and presented a list of research questions. Since no hypotheses were formulated as part of the design, one major research question provided the foundation for the exploratory research with four sub questions added for focusing of research activities. A graphic model and narrative of the conceptual framework used to frame the exploratory research was presented. A section on definition of terms defined key terminology and described constructs employed. The significance set the study in relation to current themes in public education and introduced the importance of addressing concerns about school language policy as a theme in the process of education. The delimitations of the study were also addressed with reference to the two New Mexico middle schools that participated in the exploratory research.

CHAPTER 2-REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter presents a review of related literature in four major sections: 1) Metaphor is the Message, including the following five subsections: a) Metaphor and School Organization, b) School Leadership as Metaphor, c) Instruction as Metaphor, d) Middle Level Program: A Need for Metaphor, and e) Summary of Metaphor is the Message: 2) Language Policy, with four subsections, a) U. S. Population Trends and the Notion of Linguistic Diversity, b) Language Community: Meaning and Scope, c) Dimensions of Language Policy, and d) Summary of Language Policy, 3) Literature Underlying the Research Methodology, and 4) Summary of Chapter 4. Each section, including subsections, contributed to the theoretical and conceptual nexus pertaining to the exploratory research. Even a cursory review of the literature showed that the problem of language and education was an important concern, which pointed to the need of evaluating the treatment of linguistic diversity in the school. As such, it was considered a field worthy of study, and one that would inform policy and decision makers and educational practice.

Metaphor is the Message

Eco (1990) noted that the controversial nature of metaphors in the language process had provoked much debate on their value and use. He pointed to two differing ideologies that had emerged concerning metaphors. The ideologies were: a) language was by nature, and originally, metaphorical and the mechanism of metaphor established linguistic activity, and b) language (and every other semiotic system) was a rule-governed mechanism, a predictive machine that said which phrases could be generated and which could not. As a result, the researcher presented metaphor as the tool for elaborating the review of literature. Similarly, Garth Morgan (1998) suggested in his book, *Images of Organizations*, that all organization and management theories were based on images or metaphors.

The *Random House Dictionary of the English Language* defined metaphor as, "The application of a word or phrase to an object or concept which it does not literally denote, in order to suggest comparison with another object or concept, as in 'A mighty fortress in our God'" (Stein, 1966, p. 901). As a result, metaphor in a school context has taken center stage in this section on Metaphor is the Message. The notion of organization in school context lead the researcher to look at metaphor as a viable mechanism for comprehending control and operation of the schools. Metaphors such as culture, culture of collaboration, community, and stakeholders

all described vital processes in context of the school. Examples of metaphors for the four elements under study included: the metaphor "individual cooperation for organization", the metaphor "culture for leadership", the metaphor "professional community for instruction", and the metaphor "integrated curriculum for program".

This section introduced the use of metaphor for the purpose of exploring the elements of school organization, school leadership, instruction, and middle level programming. These four domains have provided a useful point of departure for researching the influence (s) that linguistic diversity has on the formation of language policy in a school environment. In this process, metaphor was viewed, not only as a helpful literary tool, but also as an important explanatory approach in describing the phenomenon under study. The researcher held that metaphors could be used to help educators grapple with individual diversity in manageable terms. The following five subsections provide an elaboration of Metaphor is the Message: a) Metaphor and school organization, b) School leadership as metaphor, c) Instruction as metaphor, and d) Middle level program: A need for metaphor and e) A Summary of Metaphor is the Message.

Metaphor and School Organization

School organization as applied to middle level schools (in this case two middle schools) provided the context for understanding events that related to the treatment of linguistic diversity in the school and to the education of linguistically diverse students. Our understanding of school organization, which was considered a relatively new phenomenon, had traditionally relied on the fields of business and the behavioral sciences for its theories on organization and administration. For example, one of the pioneers in the study of administrative thought was Chester I. Barnard (1938, 1949, cited in Donnelly, 1966). The crux of Barnard's theory of cooperation and organization was based on assumptions about: 1) the individual, 2) cooperative systems, and 3) elements of formal organization. He observed, "organization, simple or complex, is always an interpersonal system of coordinated human efforts" (Donnelly, 1966, p. 94). More recently, Morgan had elaborated on the use of metaphor:

Management theory and practice is shaped by a metaphorical process

that influences virtually everything we do…Metaphor, to use a metaphor,

acts as the genetic code of management, producing all the detailed theories

and ideas…When managers appreciate the significance of metaphor in

shaping their practice, they can master the fundamental code of organization

and management instead of being at the mercy of detail. (1998, p. xii)

Although Morgan (1998, 1988) introduced the power of using metaphors, he also explained some of the disadvantages. The disadvantages included: ignoring the human aspect, being biased, and elevating the importance of the rational and structural dimensions. Morgan explained that organization was not a machine and could never be realized as an inanimate object. He proposed that metaphors could, "intellectually, develop the traditions pioneered by writers such as Pepper (1942) and Kuhn (1970) on the impact of root metaphors and cognitive paradigms on how we understand the world around us" (Morgan, 1998, p. 379). Likewise, Cohen and Rosenberg suggested that as analytical tools, metaphoric connections served to illustrate that human action and social organization could be understood as "expressive qualities" (1977).

Morgan (1998) used the metaphor of "reading organization'" to explain how the hermeneutic approach to social analysis viewed social life as a "text" that had to be interpreted and read. He explained, "Just as Wittgenstein (1958) has shown that language is a social activity, I view metaphor (taking the domain of organization theory as a reference point) as an active, constitutive force that leads us to enact the world in a particular manner" (p. 427). Similarly, Senge, Kleiner, Roberts, Ross, Roth, and Smith (1999) used the metaphor of the organism, as opposed to a mechanistic perspective, and described the functions of organization.

Similarly, Pentland (1995) developed the idea that metaphors, the grammar metaphor (i.e., using parts of speech as metaphors for events in a system of production), could be used to describe organizational processes. He observed, "grammatical models provide a natural way of describing the layering and nesting of actions that typify organizational processes" (p. 2). Similarly, Mineau (1998) reported the need for the description of processes and the need for processes to be represented. Mineau used the metaphor "dynamic knowledge" to describe transformations of objects and processes. Hunt (1998) introduced "process mapping" as a metaphor for strategies to improve understanding about particular organizations. Likewise, Schein (1988) proposed "process consultation" as a metaphor that underlined the broader concept of organization development as a key philosophical underpinning.

Educators, inundated by varying special interests and the realities of diversity, have strived to identify effective metaphors for organization that would be of some import in a school setting. The dominant metaphor used in the literature was organization as culture (e.g., Senge, 1994; Schein, 1999; Morgan, 1998; Bolman and Deal, 1997, 1984). The use of the culture

metaphor was viewed as quite useful in education and was used consistently to promote theories on the culture of the school, teacher culture, and student culture. The culture construct naturally lent itself to study and analysis when the culture metaphor was employed.

Conversely, Mawhinney (1999) critiqued our view of the school, "it is far from clear that there is a conventional conception of school organization" (p. 1). Nonetheless, metaphors have played a dominant role in the organizational scheme. Everhart (1988) found that one of the problems in doing fieldwork on educational administration and organizational issues concerned the examination of ongoing educational phenomenon as part of the larger picture. For example, all that "happens" in institutions of public education happen within a larger organizational context. He observed that fieldwork's chief function was to structure the social world. Everhart stated, "it contributes to an ongoing discourse about social reality and, like all discourses, does not reduce disagreements but elaborates on them and generates new ones" (p. 723). In another vein, Bacharach and Mundell (1995) contended that the current debate over how to reform education (specifically the debate about school restructuring) was inevitably a debate on the strategy of organizing or reorganizing (cited in Baldridge and Deal, 1975).

In summary, this subsection presented a view of organization in light of the use of metaphor. The works included were by contemporary authorities in the fields of education, organization theory, and administration. Organization was highlighted because it implied a sense of individual cooperation, shared vision, and common purpose. It was hoped that the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program would be viewed with reference to and in light of organization in context of the school. Based on the preceding, leadership in the following section was also treated as an important variable that determined the mood and direction of policy shifts in education. Leadership along with the building leaders was seen as instrumental in giving vision to our inclusion of language and school policy in the educational equation.

<div align="center">School Leadership as Metaphor</div>

School leadership was viewed as an important element in informing professional practice and supporting a collaborative school culture. Again, each middle school's organization for instruction and the role of building leaders were central to the case study . In this subsection, school leadership was presented as vital to the development of the metaphor culture of collaboration and could itself be used as a metaphor for change.

Leadership was seen as germane to the question of language policy formation and the school. Spillane and Thompson (1997) observed, "the local education agency's capacity to support ambitious instruction consists to a large degree of LEA leaders' ability to learn new ideas from external policy and professional sources and to help others in the district learn these ideas" (p. 185). Moreover, they believed new social context and the rapidly changing culture of the school forced stakeholders to question traditional perspectives on leadership and to demand "new leadership" in providing vision and direction. For example, Keley (1997 cited in Barnitz, 1997) suggested, "The changing demographics and increasing linguistic diversity of many school communities will place increased pressure on administrators, particularly monolingual English speakers, to assume a more dynamic role in instructional leadership activities" (p. 89). In his pioneering work, Sarthory (1994) presented a synthesis intended to promote leadership behavior in districts and state agencies. He suggested that the question remained, whether it was that programs addressing diversity in the school need leadership or that they needed a certain type of leadership behavior?

Interestingly, Sergiovanni (1990,1992,1994, 2002) argued that what was needed was new leadership, not more. He proposed value-added moral leadership, building community, and a creative understanding of supervisory authority. J. McGregor Burns (1978 cited in Bennis and Nanus, 1985) described transformational leadership as the ability to work for the common good with followers converted into leaders and leaders into moral agents. Sergiovanni's call for moral leadership stressed the "head, the heart, and the hand" as the necessary values, which helped build from the "voices" and "strengths" of any given school. Over time, educational personnel learned to "value structural support that facilitated their efforts to bring about not only classroom, but also program and school change" (Borba and Ligon, 2001, p. 1). Maxcy (1991) developed a democratic, participatory model for leadership at all levels aimed at cultural reform. Lashway (2002) argued that the greatest paradox in current restructuring efforts were leadership styles. Likewise, Richard Elmore (2000) strongly believed that school change was inherently a leadership question.

Many factors have contributed to the success of reform efforts including the existence of adequate resources and supportive leadership. Bennis (1989) asserted, "an unconscious conspiracy in contemporary society prevents leaders…from taking charge and making changes" (p. xii). Whereas, Borba and Ligon (2001) maintained that in order for school reform to succeed

instructional delivery systems needed to change, especially in schools with large percentages of students with diverse needs. They explained supportive educational leadership meant providing direction, guidance, and resources for the improvement of instruction that focused on academic standards.

J. McGregor Burns (1978) stated, "our shortcomings in making sense of leadership isn't from a lack of effort, it is one of the most observed and least understood phenomenon on earth" (p. 3). King (2002) described instructional leadership as what leaders do to improve teaching and learning. This would mean instructional leadership looked different from district to district and community to community. According to Goldberg (2001), leadership had many forms and characteristics. He stated, "the problem is that there is no algorithm for success in educational leadership, it's just too complex, too varied, and subject to change for any singular answer"(p. 37). Maxcy (1991) preferred to treat educational leadership not as a form of business but as a relational phenomenon.

Lipsitz and Mizell (1997) suggested districts making progress in middle level reform are led by superintendents whose vision translated into mobilizing rhetoric and enabling action. The implementation stage of any policy initiatives, principally ones that addressed diversity, needed strong leadership from top down. District change required leadership and support from central office and the role central office played determined success or failure. Winpelberg (1987) suggested forging linkages between intermediate administrators and other educational personnel at the school and community level. The metaphor "team" was consistently used to describe organizational cooperation. As a team, central office has played an instrumental role in assuring quality schools (Glasser, 1990) by assuming a leadership as opposed to a management focus.

In one decade, superintendents and principals have gone from being bureaucratic executives to humanistic facilitator followed by instructional leader (Beck and Murphy, 1993, cited in Lashwaay, 2000). Deal and Peterson (1994) believed a paradox existed where the role of the school administrator had to be seen as a technical leader and at the same time as an authoritative leader. Further, Stronge (1998) described the different roles a principal was required to fill. These included: defining the school's vision and mission, managing curriculum and instruction, promoting positive climate, fostering healthy school-community relations, serving as change agent, promoting high expectations, managing fiscal resources, and contributing to the overall effectiveness of the school. McPherson and Crowson (1987 cited in

Lane and Walberg, 1987) pointed to the principal as being inundated with responsibility and lacking in resources, authority and respect. Importantly, the lack of respect in most secondary schools was seen as profound (Wagner, 2001).

Smylie, Hawley, and Evertson (1985) contended that teacher leadership was a crucial element of school improvement and professional development and of the teacher work force. Further, Smylie, et al. explained that our understanding of teacher leadership has changed from individual empowerment and role-based initiatives toward more collective, task oriented, and organizational approaches. Guiney (2001) proposed the use of change and content coaches in fostering leadership among teachers who rarely see themselves as leaders. In an interesting study, Goldring and Greenfield (2002 cited in Fullan , 2002) suggested that the context of educational systems, as complex, dynamic, and fluid organizations, had necessarily influenced the way leadership was defined and how it operated. With reference to the school as context, Elmore (2000) pointed out that the real work of leadership ultimately occurred in the classroom. He noted, "In the classroom is where teachers interacted with students…while holding the organization together" (p.23).

Rallies (1990 cited in Mitchell and Cunningham, 1990) maintained that traditional perspectives of school organization and structure separated school personnel from each other and from the school's service environment. In these situations, teachers were isolated physically and were forced to develop instruction on their own. Bergmann, Hurson, and Russ-Eft (1999) introduced a "grassroots model of leadership" where the customer drove the organization. The Carnegie Corporation called for schools to be restructured and for teachers to become active leaders, especially at the middle-school level (Mitchell and Cunnigham, 1990). King (2002) reported that in school organizations where instructional leadership existed it became a part of how a school worked, lived, and learned.

According to trait theory, a leader demonstrated drive, motivation, cognitive ability, persistence, initiative, insight, and sociability to promote goal achievement (Millward, 1998). Bergmann, Hurson, and Russ-Eft (1999) presented a list of leadership characteristics, which included: integrity, ethics, setting a vision, managing change, etc. Likewise, Goldberg (2001) identified five qualities of leaders, 1) bedrock belief, 2) courage to swim upstream, 3) social conscience, 4) seriousness of purpose, and 5) situational mastery. McGowan and Miller (2001) held, "although we cannot teach people the effective leadership qualities of courage, empathy,

and commitment we can develop the kind of organization, culture, and systems that encourage and support these qualities" (p. 4).

Lindsey, Robins, and Terrell (1999) presented a compelling argument for administrators and teachers to become culturally proficient in order to meet the needs of diverse populations. From a policy perspective, federal and state governments and institutions of higher education needed to work together in order to ensure that training programs were designed to meet the needs of a changing school population. Lashway (2002) cited the work done by the Interstate School Leadership Licensure Consortium (ISLLC). In addition, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) had aligned its accreditation standards for leadership training with ISLLC. Lashway also found that the State Action for Educational Leadership Project identified some important and critical areas were states could assume the lead in providing leadership in schools.

In summary, this subsection on school leadership as metaphor presented an overview of the literature on leadership and treated the culture of collaboration as a metaphor for leadership. In addition, school leadership was seen as a viable part of effective school organizations with reference to the following aspects concerning leaders and leadership: facilitate effective implementation of policy and help others understand them, thrive in changing demographics, provide moral and structural support, recognize the need for new instructional systems, reflect the local cultural values, mobilize rhetoric and enable action, promote a Teaming concept with collective task oriented team method, see the classroom as the ultimate location for leadership in action. It was felt by the researcher that without viable leaders and leadership, the needed changes at the building level would not enjoy much success with reference to promoting the adoption of "best" educational practices in servicing the educational and language needs of linguistically diverse students.

Instruction as Metaphor

Jerome Bruner once noted that the essence of education was what to teach and to what end. Learning theories and instructional design models (Mergel, 1998) have provided the basis on which teachers plan how learning was to be advanced on the part of the student. Regarding discussions on instruction, Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock (2001) discussed how the art of teaching had rapidly become the science of teaching. Similarly, Brophy and Good (1986 cited in

Marzano, et al.) argued, "the myth that teachers do not make a difference in student learning has been refuted" (p. 2).

Teachers provided for the design and development of instruction, and thus, for its representation as "dynamic knowledge" (Minuea, 1998) in the process of learning. Trimble's works on middle level schools viewed that:

> The research base for young adolescents repeatedly tells us that achievement gains are associated with greater implementation of both academic and caring processes focused on student learning. The conditions and structures aligned with these processes consist of quality instruction in the classroom and in schools…supported by the school's capacities for change. (2002, p.12)

Abbott and Grose (1998) stated, "Good teaching emerges through the teachers' solid convictions, identification of a goal, and adherence to that goal through the flow of classroom life" (p. 181). Given the large number of instructional theories, models, methods, and approaches (Saskatchewan Education, 1993), instructional metaphors such as learning environments and learning communities (Wilson and Myers, 1999) provided a framework for understanding events and processes of education in the school building and in the classroom. Metaphors for instruction such as process, product, and systems allow educators to see instruction as an array of interrelated parts. For example, Reigeluth (1987) used metaphors for instruction, which included process, discipline, science, and reality. Further, Reigeluth (1998) introduced a new paradigm for instruction (i.e., industrial age to information age) as a response to powerful societal and technological changes.

In discussing the difference between learning theories, Wilson (1995) introduced metaphors for instruction such as product delivery, instructional strategies, learning environment, and community. Wilson felt that we needed to try out different metaphors for all scenarios. Merrill (2000) introduced instructional transaction theory (ITT), which had as its goals effective, efficient instruction and learning environments. Likewise, O'Bannon (2002) reiterated that instructional methods fell into two categories, teacher-centered approaches and student-centered approaches. At the same time, Duchastel (1999) asserted that at issue in theory building for instruction was the pluralism factor -was there one best way? Importantly, Huitt (2003) maintained teachers made decisions about "best educational practices" and connected practices with outcomes.

Langlois and Zales (1992) reviewed over 700 research papers to describe a profile of an effective classroom teacher, which considered best practices in technology integration. As teachers of linguistically diverse students, the impact that micro- computers and hyper-media needed to be addressed with particular emphasis on helping these students catch up and stay up. Clark (2003) stressed the importance of cognitive processes and instruction in multimedia technologies. He focused on cognitive load (overload and architectures), learner's attention, memory support, integration of graphics an audio, practice, encoding techniques, effective retrieval form long-term memory, and cognitive apprenticeship.

Moreover, Surry and Farquhar (1996) held that technology and society were inseparable. They believed that social factors must be incorporated into the instructional development process. The Florida Department of Education (1996) provided examples of instructional strategies that educators used to provide useful and engaging educational experiences.

On the other hand, Sulzen (1998) distinguished a difference between the cognitive mind and the emotional mind. Because humans communicate with each other in a socio-cultural context, communication became a vital link in the process of instruction. In an interesting study, Funderstanding (2001) proposed the use of ten different theories on instruction, which could easily be adapted to the needs of linguistically diverse students. Furthermore, Wilson (1997) described postmodern theories, which were premised on humanistic and philosophical virtue. When these ideas were applied in the classroom a more descriptive v. prescriptive approach was developed. He also explained how "condition of learning models" rested on a loosely defined knowledge base such as psychology, instructional research, systems theory, and information theory. More specifically, Hill and Schrum (2002) maintained that for learners to develop cognitively flexible processing skills and to acquire content knowledge structure to support them flexible learning environments were required. Similarly, Spiro, Feltovich, and Coulson (1992) proposed using cognitive flexibility theory on the design of hypertext learning.

Notably, Wilson and Myers (1999) argued for the use of situated cognition (SitCog) as a research approach that would relate social, behavioral and psychological, and neural perspectives of knowledge and action. SitCog emphasized the web of social activity systems within which authentic practice took shape. In diglossic situations, the two traditions of SitCog, which focused on the individual mind and with an external focus on community, may prove to be effective in addressing linguistic diversity. A view of institutionalized schooling relied on formal lines of

authority for the perpetuation of the formal and informal organization, which in turn caused an organizational de-emphasis on instruction (Meyer, Scott, and Deal, 1977). Meyer, et al stated, "When some areas are delegated beyond the responsibility of the organization, schools develop few policies of greatest significance for their central goals and purposes" (p. 422). Meyers, Scott, and Deal (1977) strongly suggested that direct control over instruction introduced arbitrariness and uncertainty into organizational life. They felt that many school districts were overly reliant on the institutional strength of their system, which caused a de-emphasis on instructional activities. Accordingly, instructional strategies and techniques needed to be developed in a classroom context, which was not disjointed from the rest of the school. This leads us to the instruction of linguistically diverse students.

Instructional Applications for Linguistically Diverse Students

De Avila (1997) stated, "the primary instructional vehicle in the schools is language" (p. 1). With reference to immigrant children, Laosa (2000) posed the following questions, "What instructional services do public schools provide to immigrant children? How do schools structure and organize instruction for new arrivals"? (p. 1). Fueyo (1997) advocated the use of research to address critical instructional issues, which faced many schools with increasing numbers of linguistically diverse students. On the other hand, Franquiz and De La Luz Reyes (1998) described the mismatch of the home language and the language of instruction. Their theoretical orientation was based on language as an integral part of the socio-cultural context (infrastructure) of the local community.

Garcia (2000) felt teachers tended to focus mostly on basic skills and repetitive drills rather than on high-level content and language and comprehension skills. Rather, he suggested that teachers use approaches that engaged linguistically diverse students in modeling and simulation, which could be carried out in cooperative learning settings. Research on cooperative learning (Slavin, 1995; Kagan, 1995; Cazden, and Mehan, 1989) focused on student achievement levels. Similarly, Snodgrass and Bevenino (2000) asserted that collaborative and cooperative learning was an effective instructional method, which improved achievement at the middle school. Simich-Dudgeon and DiCerbo (1998) advocated Collaborative Academic Talk (CAT), which was characterized by face-to-face discussion and question-response feedback. For instruction, there was a balance between teacher – directed activities and individual and small groups using predictable consistency (Simich-Dudgeon, McCreedy, and Schleppegrell, 1989). In

another interesting study, Thomas, and Collier (1997) maintained that students who participated in classes that were interactive, based on discovery learning, and students working cooperatively did better than those in traditional classes.

Clearly, an instructional priority was to ensure that linguistically diverse students gained the proficiency and competency levels necessary to function in an all-English classroom. Although program types had an impact on language instruction (Crawford, 1997), Hopstock, (1995) warned, "Stop worrying about how to compare programs with experimental precision…and be more concerned about what instructional practices will reduce the large achievement gap…" (p. 74). In short, there was variation in the type of instructional program to which children were being exposed (Thomas and Collier, 1998; Gander, Maxwell-Jolly, Garcia, Aston, Gutierrez, Tritium, and Curry, 2000).

Nonetheless, CALLA cognitive academic language learning approach (Chamot and O'Malley, 1994) was an instructional approach that integrated academic language development with content area instruction and learning strategies. It provided academic language skills that enabled students to use English as a tool for learning and could be adapted by regular classroom teachers to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students. A similar approach was SADIE (Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English), which was developed on science content and used transitional pedagogy for students (Roach, 2001). The goal for teachers of linguistically diverse students was to make content comprehensible (Kristen and Terrell, 1983 cited in Romero and Perrine (1994).

Recently, dual language instruction (Cloud, Genesee, and Mahayana 2000; Thomas and Collier, 1998) has gained much attention, in terms of, serving as an option or an add on to bilingual education methods. Likewise, planned alternation of languages (PAL), the systematic use of two languages for instruction - both within content areas and across time – has gained attention within the total instructional program (Romero and Perrine, 1994). PAL consisted of two paradigms, one focused on grouping as the dominant form of instruction, and the other on teacher directed lessons. In an instructional context, Pease-Alvarez (1993) wrote about language maintenance and shift of Mexican-descent children moving in and out of bilingualism. Regarding discussions on language, Kristen (1996, cited in Romero and Perrine, 1994) suggested that student abilities develop best in classrooms where the language was necessary for the purposes of communication and functioning.

Active learning (Angstrom and Wilcox, 1998) was proposed as an effective instructional method for linguistically diverse students. This approach helped structure an environment in which students learned content, developed conceptual knowledge, and acquired language through a discovery-oriented approach, which also promoted whole-group teacher-directed instruction. Sheller (1994) suggested that instructional activities maximized opportunities for language use, involved students, supported students' understanding, and instructional content utilized student diversity. Also, Tomlinson (1995, 2000) argued that a challenge for middle school teachers was being able to differentiate or adapt instruction to respond to diverse student needs, such as, those found in regular and ESL classrooms. She explained, "A differentiated classroom offers a variety of learning options designed to tap readiness levels, and learning profiles" (p. 3).

Other factors that impinged instruction both content and language included parental involvement (Nathenson-Mejia, 1994; Minaya-Rowe, 1996) and teacher preparation (Constantino, 1994; Parla, 1994; Anstrom, 1998; Artiles, and McClafferty, 1998) including knowledge of language and pedagogy. With reference to staff development, teachers should deliver an instructional program that provided "abundant and diverse opportunities…along with scaffolding to help guide linguistically diverse students through the learning process" (Garcia, 1992, p. 79 cited in Milk, Mercado, and Sapiens, 1992). Staff development programs (Hamayan, 1990; Wilde, 1996; Saavedra, 1996) for improving the instructional competence of mainstream classroom teachers were needed. Decision-making was also related to the instruction of linguistically diverse students and was an important element in the organization for instruction. From a school policy perspective, Nadeau (1997) insisted that decisions on instruction be systemic, visionary, involve all stakeholders and ensure high standards.

In this subsection, the metaphors for instruction included: learning environments, learning communities, process, product, system, discipline, science, reality, product delivery, instructional strategies, technology integration, and professional community. Aspects of instruction presented in this section emphasized language as a vehicle for learning, modeling and interacting in cooperative groups, the need to choose instruction the reduces the achievement gap, the importance of the CALLA approach in teaching ELLs, active learning, and other factors such as parents, teacher preparation, and staff development. This subsection emphasized the role of the element of instruction in this case study, especially, when considering the kind of

instruction (i.e., emphasis on instructional requirements and not program types) needed in addressing the complex needs of linguistically diverse students. The instructional applications for linguistically diverse students are premised on a thirty-eight year window of dedicated scholarly work in the area of language and education. This work continued our bilingual tradition as a Nation in providing bilingual and second language communities with educational services. Therefore, the following section reviewed the area of program and includes a description of programs designed to support linguistic diversity at middle level schools.

Middle Level Program: A Need for Metaphor.

Middle school programs, in terms of academic and auxiliary programs, were presented as an important feature of students' learning experiences at the middle level particularly due to students' young adolescent stage of development. Some of the metaphors that aptly described middle level (intermediate, middle, junior high) school programming included "process" and "school culture". Considered a relatively new phenomenon, the terms "middle level school" and "middle level education" were first used extensively in the early 1980's (George, Stevenson, Thomason, and Beane, 1992). Even though research on grade configuration and quality education was inconclusive (McEntire, 2002), middle level programming followed prescribed developmental and grade requirements. McEntire noted two significant changes from 1971 to 2000, 1) 6-8th grade configurations have increased from 16% to 59%, and 2) 7-9th grade configurations have decreased from 45% to 5%.

Lounsbury (1996) stated: "developmentally responsive middle school programs must take into account all that is known about young adolescents and the cultural context in which they live" (6). Banks (2003) noted that viable middle school programs had the following instructional and organizational features: 1) interdisciplinary teaming; 2) advisory programs; 3) varied instruction; 4) exploratory programs; and 5) transition programs. The National Middle School Association (NMSA) believed that developmentally responsive middle level schools were characterized by: a shared vision; educators committed to young adolescents; a positive school climate; an adult advocate for every student; partnerships; and high expectations for all (1995 cited in NMSA, 1997a).

"The purpose and functions of exemplary middle school programs centered on the intellectual, social, emotional, moral, and physical developmental needs of young adolescents" (Clark and Clark, 1993 cited in NMSA, 1997c, 1). More specifically, Reed and Rossi (2000 cited

in Banks, 2003) identified three developmental needs of middle school students: 1) the search for personal identity, 2) life in school, and 3) life and health. Furthermore, lifelong developmental tasks such as forming a positive self-concept, acquiring social skills, gaining autonomy, and developing character and a set of values are a vital part of middle level school programs (Irvin, 1995 cited in NMSA, 1997c). Wilson and Corpus (2000) asserted that middle school programs provided an appropriate balance for adolescent students to develop both intrinsic motivation and internalized extrinsic motivation or goal orientation. They believed that effective strategies along with positive teacher attitudes helped young adolescents develop a sense of competence and achievement.

On the other hand, some critics charged the middle schools with focusing on social and emotional development issues at the expense of offering challenging academic programs (Banks, 2003). Further, calls for accountability and improved test scores, heightened by provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act, have forced middle level educators to seek ways to develop and improve programs resulting in student achievement (Trimble, 2002). Banks cited Williamson and Johnston (1998) who expressed concerns that middle school program characteristics had become of primary importance, while student success had become secondary. Also, there was a need to articulate reasons for middle school programs as opposed to listed standard program characteristics. Williamson and Johnston (1998) recommended:

· Abandoning orthodoxy in favor of a renewed commitment to the education of middle school learners.

· Offering both a traditional junior high school academic program and a middle school concept team-based program in one school.

· Accepting accountability and appreciating diversity.

· Discussing achievement while modifying curriculum and instructional practices.

· Building transition bridges with elementary and high schools.

Turning Points: Preparing American Youth for the 21st Century conducted by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development recognized the need to strengthen the academic core of middle school programs and establish caring, supportive environments. The report stated the goals of the middle school curriculum were to, "help students improve written and communication skills, develop problem-solving strategies, conduct research, increase critical and

creative thinking skills, understand principles of democracy and economics, and enhance mathematical conceptual and computational skills" (1989 cited in Banks 2003, p.10).

In a related view, Wood and Fisher (2000) identified "developmental assets" as positive influences that helped adolescents think and make decisions. From a program perspective, Flowers, Mertens, and Mulhall (2000) wrote about interdisciplinary teams in terms of implementation and follow up. Their study identified and explained the types of practices and interactions that teams engaged in to influence instruction and student learning.

At the same time, Vars and Beane (2001) examined curriculum integration (CI) as a way of organizing "the common learning or life skills considered essential for all citizens in a democracy"(1) They maintained that curriculum integration responded to the increasing pressures for "accountability" and "standards based reform," which were accompanied by high-stakes testing, a standardized, subject-centered curriculum, and sometimes even scripted teaching lessons. More specifically, Vars and Beane asserted that integrated curriculum would have to deal with societal expectations, as spelled out in standards and state tests, while still giving primary emphasis to student needs.

Another question that warranted attention was the potential impact of new technologies in middle level schools and programs. Quinn and Valentine (2002) pointed to the impact of technology at middle level schools as congruent with what we know about developmentally appropriate programs for middle level students, in terms of, cognitive and non-cognitive outcomes. Simon, Salinas, Epstein, and Sanders (2000) proposed technology and networking to help develop programs of school, family, and community partnerships. Also, innovative and exemplary parent education and involvement programs were key to the successful learning experience of middle school students. In addition, there continued to be a big push for middle level after school programs including "latch key" students. In 1994, Congress authorized the 21st-Century Community Learning Centers program to open up schools for broader use.

NMSA (1997a) highlighted outcomes used by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) in a comprehensive study of middle level leaders and schools. The three outcomes, 1) student outcomes; 2) teacher outcomes; and 3) climate variables are typical of outcomes used to measure middle level program effectiveness. As Marshak (1995 cited in NMSA, 1997b, p.13) found, "Our experience suggests that focused, rigorous program assessment…can help to develop school cultures where continuous improvement is the

watchword not only for students but also for educators." Some studies have compared whether middle schools resulted in higher achievement than junior high schools (NMSA, 1997a).

In terms of what programs worked in middle-grades school reform, "there are ample observational studies of efforts to reform middle level schools; however, we have surprisingly little quantitative information to satisfy the demands of thoughtful practitioners and policy makers for assessment of these efforts" (Lipsitz, Jackson, and Austin, 1997, p. 2). Lipsitz et al. argued that middle grades reform efforts focused heavily on developmental responsiveness and the accompanying changes in school climate and organization. They believed that middle-level reform was not a series of disconnected projects involving scheduling, teaming, or advisories, but that reform was a source of energy and inspiration to create high-performance schools that fostered all students' academic achievement and healthy development.

This subsection described the developmental and academic basis on which middle level school program (s) served the needs of curriculum and instruction designed for students in this young adolescent stage. Although middle schools were not rich in metaphor, processes and the culture of the school were introduced as metaphors to describe characteristics of middle level school programs. Similarly, constructs that served a metaphorical function in this section were interdisciplinary teaming, advisor-based programs, varied programming, and transition programs. Given that the model for middle level program is about thirty years old reflects the need for a serious program upgrade and a return to content. The lack of significant metaphors for middle level program (s) also points to a clear need for middle school program development. In short, the element of middle level program was viewed as an important process variable in the case study and in future studies on middle schools.

Summary of Metaphor is the Message

This section presented the rational behind using metaphor to symbolize the dynamics of the educational process with a focus on organization and the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program. As an important mechanism, metaphors such as culture, community and stakeholders, and collaborative help explain vital processes in our system of education. Particular reference was given to linguistic diversity, ELLs, and language policy. The four subsections that followed provided an overview of the exploratory research with reference to the elements under study. For example, school organization provided metaphors for understanding school context and the organization for instruction. Leadership presented

metaphors such as culture as leadership, professional community, and technical-executive to describe the importance of leaders and leadership in promoting school improvement. Next, instruction gave a richer use of metaphor to describe teaching and learning. Metaphors such as process, system, art, science, product delivery, discipline, learning community, and professional community were introduced to emphasize the element of instruction. Although middle level program was not as strong in the literature in producing a wealth of metaphors, the metaphors process and school culture served to frame programming at this level. The next section, Language Policy, presents the conceptual and theoretical framework for understanding the nuances of education and language, the notion of linguistic diversity, and aspects of language policy within context of the school.

Language Policy

Language policy was presented as instrumental in helping to provide a view of linguistic diversity and language differences within the school organization. Subsections included: a) U. S. population trends and a notion of linguistic diversity, b) Language communities: their meaning and scope, c) Dimensions of language policy, and d) Summary of Language Policy.

U. S. Population Trends and the Notion of Linguistic Diversity.

This first subsection introduces heritage language (HL) speakers, changing population trends, and linguistic diversity as vital factors in the process of school language policy formation. Emphasis was on the increase in the number of immigrants-legal and undocumented-counted in U.S. Census 2000 reports. "Setting aside the lower socio-economic status of immigrants, no nation has ever attempted to incorporate more than 28 million newcomers into its society" (Camarota, 2001, p. 21). More recently, pending legislation in the 109th Congress relative to immigration reform has endeavored to address this vital issue.

Linguistic diversity represented the many speakers of languages other than English in the American "linguistic culture" (Shiffman, 1996) where the dominant language continued to be English. Pluralistic thought, of which linguistic diversity was a part, has faced many challenges in social, political, and educational circles. For example, regarding the linguistic adaptation of heritage language speakers and new immigrants, the final report of the Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference (HLRPC) stated:

Research shows…that as a rule within two or three generations most non-

English-speaking immigrants to the USA will have lost or almost lost their

heritage languages…The causes of this language loss are complex. Most

researchers see the major reasons as related to the power and international

status of English…(2000, p.3)

Nonetheless, there are large numbers of children from "immigrant stock" identified as heritage language speakers in our society and in the schools. Focusing on a pedagogical research agenda, Valdés (2000) proposed the following definition for heritage speaker:

The term "heritage speaker" is used to refer to a student who is raised in

a home where a non-English language is spoken, who speaks or merely

understands the heritage language, and who is to some degree bilingual

in English and the heritage language. (cited in HLRPC Report, 2000, p. 4)

Necessarily, if we considered our diversity as strength, then we would value heritage languages as a resource to the nation. Brecht and Ingold (1998) noted that more than 150 languages other than English are used in this country and that heritage speakers possessed linguistic and cultural skills only very rarely attained by non-heritage speakers (Cited in HLRPC Report, 2000, p. 3). Accordingly, the Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference Report stated that at the heart of the language and education dialectic was the question of how to provide meaningful instruction to linguistically diverse students.

The growing concern over the number of English Language Learners in our public school system has its genesis in the number of citizens of immigrant stock and people of new immigrant status. Consequently, there are groups and organizations (e.g., The Center for Immigration Studies (CIS), Numbers USA, The Center for Applied Linguistics and Federation for American Immigration Reform-FAIR) concerned over the high levels of immigration-legal and illegal. Similarly, Leon Kolankiewtez (2000) elucidated on the "ominous" effects of the 2100 population projections released by the Census Bureau on January 13, 2000. As a result, concerns about the doubled U.S. population and high levels of immigration have spawned debate over the need to implement immigration control measures to protect our borders. FAIR, CIS, Numbers USA, and The Social Contract Press have written extensively on this volatile issue of immigration and border control.

In May 1997, The National Research Council published an extensive study on the impact of immigration on the United States, *The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal*

Effects of Immigration. An important highlight of the study was that immigrants and their descendants who will arrive between now and 2050 would add 80 million people to the U.S. population. Also, by the year 2050 the U.S. population will increase to 420 million largely because of today's mass immigration (FAIR, 2002).

Furthermore, between January 2000 and March 2002 3.3 million immigrants had arrived in this country (Center for Immigration Studies, 2003). Simply, immigration will account for 65 percent of the growth in the U.S. population over the next 50 years (Camarota, 2000, p. 2). Also, the Federation for American Immigration Reform (2004) elaborated on a strategic look at current population and immigration statistics. For example, of the U.S. populations count in 2004 of 294 million, 33.1 million were foreign-born (by far the most ever recorded), and 55 million were of immigrant stock (Census 2000). In addition, it was estimated (some estimates are even higher) that there are from 9 to 11 million illegal aliens residing in the U.S. (Immigration and Naturalization Service est., 2000 cited in FAIR, 2002). As Kolankiewicz emphasized:

> This unprecedented growth in the immigrant population, a 43 percent
> increase since 1999, has produced and will continue to produce dramatic
> shifts in our ethnic and racial composition. More specifically, although
> the non-Hispanic white percentage of the U.S. population will decline
> from 72 percent to 40 percent and will continue to fall after 2100, the
> Hispanic share will jump from 12 percent to 32 percent (and continue to
> rise), Asians from 4 percent to 13 percent, and non-Hispanic blacks from
> 13 percent to 15 percent (In the 1980 census, Hispanics and Asians together
> accounted for only 8 percent of the population). (2000, p.6)

As a result, these population trends have contributed to the growth and number of ethnic enclaves in metropolitan, urban, and even rural regions of this country. These enclaves have produced the dynamics that have maintained linguistic diversity in our schools and society. Einar Haugen (1972), who coined the term the melting pot, referred to the U.S. polyglot landscape as the ecology of language. He and other notables (e.g., Jespersen, 1933, 1964) pioneered research on language and immigration. Further, Haugen, McClure, and Thomson (1980) suggested that often a language, which was a 'minority' language of a nation, could be a majority language of the population of a region or enclave of the same nation, for example, the Spanish-speaking communities in the Southwestern United States.

In a seminal work, Kloss (1998) noted that a contributing factor was that prior to the post modern epoch (before 1970) the Americas and Africa favored language shift to reduce the number of tribal tongues, but today, many nations have moved in the direction of greater freedom for the maintenance and use of native languages. He argued that lingual assimilation was considered to have been the result of a purposeful assimilation policy on the part of the state (refer to Schiffman's ideas on language policy). He showed that non-English groups (e.g., German immigrants) were "Anglicized" not because of nationality laws unfavorable toward languages, but in spite of nationality laws favorable to them.

In a related view, Schiffman (1996) elaborated on how issues like Ebonics and other societal debates, made language the "ground and vehicle" for discussion on social and public policy. For example, he believed that societies often neglected their responsibility to come to terms with the deployment of language power within society. As used in this study, non-standard varieties were also interpreted as part of a prevailing notion about linguistic diversity. Lebov's (1972a, 1972b) and Smitherman's (1986, 1992) studies compared Black American vernaculars of English, and other varieties and provided the linguistic community with fresh insight into non-standard varieties. It was emphasized, herein, that teachers needed to be more 'critically' aware of standard and non-standard varieties. In a related view, Corson (1997) maintained:

> Formal educational policies for the treatment of so called non-standard
> varieties in schools are conspicuous by their absence in most educational
> systems. In any language community, including all monolingual societies,
> there was a range of non-standard varieties that are used by closely knit
> social or ethnic groups…The absence of formal policies supporting non-
> standard varieties actually creates a tacit language policy that legitimizes
> the standard variety. (p. 101)

Moreover, the issues of language maintenance and language revival were perceived as germane to the question of linguistic diversity in the schools. Accordingly, the school as the principal socializing agent in society has had to invariably assume the responsibility of educating linguistically diverse students, including heritage language speakers and immigrant children both legal and undocumented. The Center for Applied Linguistics (2000) estimated that 90 percent of recent immigrants came from non-English speaking countries, principally, from Asia, Latin America, and Mexico. Moreover, Macias (2000) asserted that, "language revival, language

learning, and identity movements have not been much explored as a factor of socio-linguistic analysis with regards to language maintenance or language policy, except in occasional studies of language revival among Amerindians" (p. 74). He stressed the need for the development of a comparative framework across languages and language minorities.

Not only was equal educational opportunity at stake when discussing how best to educate linguistically diverse and immigrant students, but also, the legal principals of equal protection and due process as enumerated in the United States Constitution. Although the Constitution is "silent" on the issue of language, language rights continued to be protected under the National Origin Clause of the 14th Amendment (Meyer v Nebraska,1923; Espinoza v Farrah, 1973; Lau v. Nichols, 1974; United States v Tex., 1982; Jones v United Gas Imp. Corp, 1975; Carino v University of Oklahoma Board of Regents, 1984; Gutierrez v. Municipal Court, 1988; United States ex rel Negron v New York, 1970; Yniguez v. Mofford, 1990). In addition, when linguistic minorities have turned to the courts for protection of their rights, judgments were often based on the Fourteenth Amendment, Title VI of the "Civil Rights Act of 1964, and the Equal Educational Opportunities Act of 1974 (EEOA). In fact, Crawford (1992) contended the Supreme Court treated language discrimination as similar to national-origin discrimination. In any case, Mackey (1983) asserted that the constitution reserved enough power to the states to make possible, if voters so decided, the creation of a Spanish state, a French state, or another ethnic polity.

Furthermore, Chen (1995) argued, "language minorities are a prime example of a 'discrete and insular minority' (United States v. Caroline Products Co., 304 U.S. 144,152, n.4 (1938), who deserved heightened judicial protection under the Equal Protection clause" (p. 6). Language rights are understood in two ways (1) the right of freedom from discrimination on the basis of language; and (2) the right to use your language (s) in activities of communal life (Macias, 1979, cited in Crawford 2000, p. 98). Indeed, Crawford (2000) emphasized that the Native American Language Act was the most explicit statement on language rights issued from Congress where you have "language about language." Nonetheless, the judiciary has stopped short of ruling that a group's language rights are a right protected by the Constitution. Indeed, Crawford (1992) held that the central question of U.S. language policy was how we should respond to current trends and demographics.

In summary, this subsection presented a composite of the notion of linguistic diversity, language community viz., school community, heritage language speakers, population trends and

immigration. More importantly, it introduced nuances of ethnic (national) rights as construct pertaining to legal requirements of the school in terms of language and language legislation. These factors provided the foundational drive and set the stage for understanding the centrality of language policy formation for the schools. As part of this study, the researcher focused on two middle school buildings where student linguistic diversity was apparent with reference to the language community served by the schools. It is the assumption of the researcher that the middle schools under study were in some fashion addressing the needs of linguistically diverse students.

<div align="center">Language Community: Meaning and Scope.</div>

In the previous section, a snapshot view of heritage language speakers and increases in U.S. immigration were presented for the purpose of highlighting the notion that linguist diversity was prevalent in our American "linguistic culture" (Schiffman, 1996). Schiffman used the term lingustic culture to refer to the fabric of language behavior in any given area. According to Schiffman, linguistic culture included the beliefs that a speech community had about language including literacy in general and its language in particular. In this second subsection, the researcher operationalized the construct of language community viz. the school community, as an entity characterized by the particular language spoken by its members.

Haugen (1972) held that in a language community the most important bond of cohesiveness was the common language. The researcher's intent was to show that people tended to establish political, social, and economic community bonds within the larger linguistic culture on the basis of a common language. In this light, language community referred to Supreme Court Justices discussing case law, university faculty departmental meetings, community forums, neighborhood or family gatherings, or even a group of individuals curb kicking on the street corner (i.e., the symbolic manifestation of professional and local registers). Nonetheless, the domain of language community was represented as a socio-cultural phenomenon, which positively influenced the operation and control of the school. More specifically, the focus of the study was on language communities viz. school community, whose members spoke a language other than English in the home and at school.

Since the beginning of the postmodern era (early 1970s), theoretical and applied linguistics have contributed significantly toward an understanding of socio-cultural aspects of language varieties and speech communities (Fishman, 1972a and 1972b). As a result, sociolinguists have broadened the scope of the language and education debate, which has

impacted on the school in terms of language policy planning and the organization for instruction (Marks and Louis, 1997). Accordingly, language community referred to those "entities" served by the school district with specific references made to the Spanish-speaking community.

Ferguson (1959 cited in Schiffman, 1996) wrote that in every speech community attitudes and beliefs were current about the language of the community as well as about other languages and language in general. Notably, Ferguson's diglossia (refer to Ch.1 Definition of Terms) was an important concept and one that was applied by socio-linguist in circumstances where language communities spoke a language other than the one used in schools. Diglossia, as described by Ferguson, was viewed as a community feature in that it was a characteristic of a linguistic group rather than of individuals. It was the opinion of the researcher that most large ethnic enclaves (e.g., Spanish-speaking barrios, Black and Chinese American neighborhoods, and Native American reservations) represented diglossic situations. Likewise, Peñalosa (1969) wrote about Chicano diglossia and Lebov (1972a, 1972b) elaborated on diglossia found in Black American neighborhoods.

Similarly, Cobarrubias (1997 cited in Cobbarubias and Fishmen, 1983) introduced the concept of ethoglossia (refer to Ch. 1 Definition of Terms) as a 'descriptor' of language function and communicative status. As Cobarrubias described it, ethoglossia can be used to distinguish language function with regard to the private intent of an individual. Cobarrubias' concept of ethoglossia can also be viewed as the expressive power of a language (i.e., the communicative strength), which was determined by the number and quality of functions a given language performed relative to the social structure and the speech community. This can refer to the relative importance the school culture places on the home language of linguistically and culturally diverse students. Ethoglossia can replace prestige and was similar to Haugen's (1980) reference to language norms in terms of language status. Furthermore, ethoglossia helped describe specific functions of a language regardless of whether the community of users is monolingual or multilingual.

Macias (2000 cited in HLRPCR, 2000) maintained that indigenous groups in the Americas were like the national minorities of other nations. He noted that in the process of acculturation there was a shift from a neighborhood-based speech community to a family-based speech community. "The notion of English-language assimilation in three generations was created and reinforced by studies and other works on immigrant adaptation and assimilation"

(p.63). However, Macias held that Spanish-speakers, principally those in the Southwestern states, were an exception. His thesis was grounded in the fact that the geographical, social, and historical relationship that Mexico enjoyed with the United States had produced a unique set of variables and socio-cultural dynamics. This contributed toward the maintenance of distinct geographical entities (i.e., barrios), a community centered speech, and language communities (intact socio-cultural infrastructure).

In a related view, Einar Haugen (1972) felt that a language community should be analyzed for its relation to the surrounding community along with a mutatis mutandis between immigrant groups. Cobarrubias and Fishman(1983) described a speech community as "the socio-cultural linguistic context, which reflects the communicative status of the language as a geographic entity". Escamilla (1994) found that community involvement, including parent participation, was a crucial element in promoting an effective socio-linguistic environment for schools serving linguistic diverse students. Likewise, Magnet (1990) argued:

> The right to utilize a language is absolutely empty of content unless
> it implies a linguistic community which understands the speaker and
> with whom that speaker communicates….Language rights are collective
> rights…They are exercised by individuals as part of a collectivity or a
> group. Legal protection of language rights, therefore, means protection
> of that linguistic community. (p. 293, cited in Crawford, p. 99)

In summary, this subsection presented some discernable parameters relative to the construct language community viz. school community. It also attempted to show there are entities, within the American linguistic culture, whose community bonds are characterized on the basis of sharing a common language. These language communities were described in a socio-linguistic context and were seen as processes, which could have an impact on school governance. The current ecology of language (Haugen, 1972) has produced a virtual environment within which the school operated with respect to these language communities. In this process, formation of language policy has become a necessary element in the safe and productive operation of the school's "linguistic" culture. Specific emphasis was placed on the Spanish-speaking community in the middle schools under study, but references were made to other language communities as used herein.

Dimensions of Language Policy.

   In this third subsection, the dimensions of language policy were presented. These dimensions were viewed in terms of the dominance of the English language vis-à-vis other varieties and sub varieties. Primary focus was on the evolution of language policy in practical terms and how this influenced the formation of school policies about language in general and linguistically diverse students in particular. With reference to federal law, Crawford (1997) held that the U.S. had no language policy national in scope and administered for the benefit of the general populace. Recently, however, in the 109th Congress, the Senate's version of the proposed Immigration Reform Bill (S2611) passed an amendment (the Inohoff amendment) making English the national language with another amendment (the Salazar amendment) requiring that the Inohoff amendment would not be punitive in nature. Nevertheless, from a school policy perspective, this subsection focused on community and school level language policy initiatives.

   With passage of the 1968 Bilingual Education Act (BEA), debates over how to provide services to bilinguals and language communities became part of the ongoing educational discourse. As delineated above, the unprecedented influx of new immigrants simply added to the growing social and educational debate. It was suggested here that educators and policy makers have had to take their lead from the field of applied linguistics (e.g., Hymes, 1964, 1971, 1974; Chomsky, 1971, 1975, 1979; Jespersen, 1933, 1964; Haugen, 1972; Fishman, 1972a, 1972b; Cobarrubias and Fishman, 1983).

   As Heath and Mandabach (1983) argued, "the English laissez-fair attitude concerning language policy, which was reflected in the Constitution, had produced a state of virtual omission in the approach to language planning and change in the United States" (pp. 87-88). They maintained that where there wasn't a written language policy, institutions and society created an unwritten policy, which became the legacy of the English language. Mackey (1983) examined some interesting comparisons between Canadian and U.S. experiences in the making of language policy. He observed that both nations had similar language patterns, the North American English variety, and the type of distribution of language minorities (i.e., an Amerindian substrata and a super imposition of immigrant languages). In addition, both Canada and the U.S. coexisted with former colonial language groups, the French and the Spanish. His compelling description of the Spanish presence in the U.S. presented an undeniable reality for language planners.

Ricento (1997) explained that language policies were derived from the following sources: official enactments of governing bodies or authorities, such as legislation, executive directives, judicial orders or decrees, or policy statements; and non-official institutional or individual practices or customs. Policies also evolved from grass roots movements and become formalized through laws, practices, or some combination of both. Schiffman's first law of language policy was that there is no such thing as no language policy. It provided the guiding force of the case study . He began his studies by "wondering whether language policy can in fact be managed by human beings in an explicit interventionary way" (1996, p. 3). He believed that if there doesn't seem to be an explicit language policy, the policy is implicit. The basic tenet of his book was that language policy was grounded in linguistic culture (the set of behaviors, assumptions, cultural forms, prejudices, folk belief systems, attitudes, stereotypes, ways of thinking about language, and religious-historical circumstances of the language).

Further, Schiffman (1996) pointed out the trickle down effect of policies at the federal or national level, which had little effect at the local or school district level. Gessingerf (1980) posited a difference between explicit and implicit policy in the following way:

> Explicit language policy is social decision making which is directly geared
> toward those contexts of the lives of the speakers that are transmitted by
> language, whereas, implicit or structural language policy denotes those actions
> of social groups or state administrations…assumption of the political fabric and
> modus operandi of the state. (cited in Shiffman, 1996, pp. 22-23)

In addition to explicit-implicit language policy, another dichotomy used to explore language policy could be overt-covert. Coincidentally, an interesting note made by Schiffman (1996) was that overt policy was seen as a later attempt to make sense of earlier cultural rule making. He argued that it was in the covert areas that we needed to seek the origins of overt facets of a language policy, not vice versa. In his view, overt policy formulations ignored what was actually happening down on the ground or at the grassroots level.

Schiffman (1996) maintained that the covert language policy in the U.S. was not neutral. It favored the English language, and although it did not overtly discourage the use of any other language, it could be perceived as wrong to use a language other than English. Schiffman (1996) further explained that notions of a bilingual or multilingual citizenry were for the most part unproven (i.e., finding societies where the majority of the population speak two or more

languages). He observed, "researchers of language policy have often confused language policies with multilingualism itself and have often attempted to map both on the same symbolic representation, with the result that neither the policy not the fact of multilingualism emerge clearly" (p. 34).

Further, in an interesting study, Rothermund and Simon (1986) focused on gemeinschaft, in terms of the structure and culture of communities, in hopes of, locating and identifying language policy as part of the community processes served by the school. There needed to be some congruence between policy and what the local community and school district considered important in their daily lives. For example, Kloss (1998) made the point that symbols of policy and symbols of multilingualism should always be set so that there was a fit of policy to the observable socio-linguistic reality. That was to say, when policy formation and reality were considered, it was much more effective during policy implementation to have a policy that reflected the realities of varieties and sub-varieties in any given sector of society. To this end, Pierre Bourdieu, Basil Bernstein, and William Labov contributed towards considering sub varieties and nonstandard forms in educational policy planning and instructional practice (Corson, 1995).

Similarly, Ruiz (1995) developed a distinctive orientation on language planning, which provided a lens for framing language issues and policies. This orientation included three options, (1) language-as-problem, (2) language-as-right, and (3) language-as-resource. Likewise, Bugarski (1992) looked at language planning as a function of policy:

> The term language policy here refers to the policy of a society in the area of
> linguistic communication...Language planning is understood as a set of concrete
> measures taken within language policy to act on linguistic communication in a
> community, by directing the development of languages. (cited in Schiffman, 1996, p. 58)

Cobarrubias and Fishman (1983) noted that neither Kloss's distinction (i.e., corpus vis status) nor Haugen's four-fold model, nor a combination of the two, did the job of sound language planning theory. The authors stated, "our discipline remains largely descriptive and has not reached a stage of explanatory adequacy'' (p.5). Ferguson (1959 cited in Haugan, 1972) wrote that the nation was the basis for networks of educational systems and language planning. He felt there could be planning for diversity as well as for uniformity, for change as well as for stability. At the same time, Cobarrubias and Fishman believed language planning within a

speech community responded to: (a) economic forces, (b) degree of technological advancement, and (c) deep basic ideological principles. In a related view, Ricento (1997) had written that research in language planning was under the headings of processes, agents, and goals.

With reference to language policy legislation, the Hayakawa Amendment in the 1980's to make English the official language of government signaled the beginning of serious efforts by the "English Only" movement (Baron, 1990; Gallegos, 1994; Amonoo, 1989; Fishman, 1988; Marshall, 1986; Macias, 1987; Ovando and Combs, 1992; Adams, and Brink, 1990; Zentella, 1988) to make English our official language. Supporting this notion, in chronological order, were the Official English states of: Nebraska (constitutional amendment, 1920); Illinois (statute, 1969); Virginia (statute, 1981); Indiana, Kentucky, and Tennessee (statutes, 1984); California (constitutional amendment, 1986); Arkansas, Mississippi, North Carolina, North Dakota, and South Carolina (statutes, 1987); Arizona, Colorado, and Florida (constitutional amendments, 1988); Alabama (constitutional amendment, 1990); New Hampshire, Montana, and South Dakota (statutes, 1995); Georgia and Wyoming (statutes, 1996); and Alaska and Missouri (statutes, 1998). Arizona's Proposition 106 (Article 28) was struck down as unconstitutional in 1998 (Crawford, 2000, p.28). Other significant events were amendments being proposed in Colorado and other states to make English the "official" language of instruction.

This subsection on the dimensions of language policy described the evolution of language policy and how school language policy and planning were both important in addressing issues about language and education. Along with the constructs diglossia and ethoglossia, two dichotomies (explicit-implicit and covert-overt) were given to describe levels of language policy formation. This was done with reference to the dominance of the English language in relation to other varieties and sub varieties. The legal implications of language policy were presented in terms of state and federal language legislation. The works of Schiffman (1996) on language policy were used to highlight the covert-overt implications of language policy in the society. The focus of this section was on the need for language policy and planning in the school with reference changing demographics and immigrant trends in U. S. society.

Summary of Language Policy

In summary, the importance of assessing the need for a policy initiative on language and language use in context of the school was stated. This section on Language Policy presented an explanation of language policy and language planning as important factors in the middle school

environment with reference to linguistic diversity and to the language community viz., school community served. The three subsections taken together framed the construct school language policy with reference to population trends, linguistic diversity, language communities, and dimensions of language policy. The subsections were written in light of Schiffman's (1996) concept of "linguist culture", in terms of, working toward a safe and productive linguistic culture for the schools. The constructs diglossia and ethoglossia and the two dichotomies, explicit-implicit and covert-overt, were presented to help identify and analyze levels of language policy formation at work in the classroom and school building. The legal implications of language policy were presented in light of state and federal language legislation.

The exploratory research looked at whether the language policy aspects at the two buildings were stated or implied. The implications for language policy were drawn mostly from what was being done –or not being done. The researcher focused on two middle school buildings where student linguistic diversity was apparent. When discussing language policy in this section specific emphasis was placed on the Spanish-speaking community, but references were made to other language communities. It is only fair, however, to make reference to the dominance of the English language in relation to other varieties and sub varieties. Key constructs introduced included: the notion of linguistic diversity, language community viz., school community, heritage language speakers, and population trends and immigration. All constructs in this section were used to identify and assess aspects of language policy and how language policy was being implemented at the middle school buildings.

More importantly, language policy looked at the nuances of ethnic (national) rights as administrative customs pertaining to legal requirements of the school in terms of language and language use. These factors and the constructs identified above provided the foundational drive and set the stage for understanding the centrality of language policy formation for the schools. It is the assumption of the researcher that the middle schools under study were in some fashion addressing the needs of linguistically diverse students. The focus of this section was on language policy highlighting the importance of language planning at the building level with particular reference made to changing demographics and the immigrant explosion in U. S. society.

Literature Underlying Research Methodology

Schatzman and Strauss (1973) believed the field researcher took on a number of methodological and philosophical issues. As such, the researcher made commitments to "the nature of the enterprise" and to the research site. Also, the skills necessary for establishing viable field relationships are founded on a concern for a better education for all children and a need to further improve the profession. These skills included professional ethics, understanding the school organization and administrative structure, community information, researchers role, schedule of events, and participant rapport.

Strauss and Corbin (1990) contended that the initial decisions for the theoretical collection of data were based only on a general perspective, and on a general problem area. They held that qualitative research was founded on the notion that valid theoretical and empirical data can be obtained from non-traditional sources. Sometimes this required the researcher to venture into what Biklen (1998) referred to as the qualitative point of view, which was considered "thinking naturalistically." Such an approach required researchers to understand how individuals perceived the meaning of the world around them (Krathwohl, 1993). He suggested that much of the emphasis in educational research emphasized statistical and "hard" data such as achievement scores. Krathwohl further maintained, "Unconcealed participant observation is the role preferred by most researchers in data gathering. This role allows access to the important places and people while still in character" (p.318).

Schatzman and Struss explained negotiating entry, "It may be quit subtle, even implicit, or take the form of hard bargaining, in either case, this negotiation is not between contending parties" (1973, p. 28). Lincoln and Guba (1985) believed the best the investigator could do was to supply only that information about the studied site that may make possible a judgment of transferability to some other site. Similarly, Janesick (1998) wrote, "Researchers must be prepared to challenge all philosophical, historical, social, and contextual levels of understanding and of comfort and be prepared to shift the center of the world-both empirical and intellectual-from the dominant, Eurocentric tidiness of "we" and the "other," to embrace a world, the essence of which is the difference of voice, of race, of ethnicity, of gender" (1998, p. 124). Tolman and Braydon-Miller (2001) observed, "participatory and interpretive methods are already contributing to the fields of education and the social sciences and provided a diverse set of models for researchers on how they might adopt such methods into their work" (2001, p. 1).

There was considerable debate as to the extent observation played in doing ethnographic fieldwork. Bodgan and Bilken (1998) suggested that situational constraints dictated the extent of participation the researcher may partake in the classroom while observing. In addition, balancing participation and observation was key to the effectiveness of the researcher in obtaining "rich thick data". Tolman and Braydon-Miller (2001) wrote that participant observation was premised on the role of narrative, which was documented in the form of field notes and reflective journals, for the purpose of organizing human experience. They also recognized that there were multiple layers of meaning in experiential narrative. These were sensitive to the relational nature of research and how researchers negotiated their own and their participants' perspectives.

The data collection phase was driven by two approaches: mixed methods and multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2002). Creswell also referred to these approaches as multi sources of information methods (1998). Although the exploratory design maintained a qualitative theme, mixed methods appeared to offer "both quantitative and qualitative advantages in terms of understanding of the problem" (Creswell, 2002, p. 569). Multi source methods suggested the use of methods such as observations, interviews, records and documents, and audiovisual. Yin (1998, cited in Creswell, 1998) recommended six types of information gathering procedures: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participate observations, and physical artifacts. Berge wrote that it was supposed that combining several lines of sight, which was sometimes referred as triangulation, helped researchers obtain a better, more substantive picture (Berg, 1995). He noted that triangulation was first used in the social sciences as a metaphor describing a form of multiple operationalism.

Berg (1995) defined interviews as simply conversation with a purpose. He explained how the questions on the interview protocol were designed not only to give "voice" to the participants but also to provide structural insight of organizational processes based on participant responses. Goffman (1967, cited In Berg, 1995) saw interviewing as an "encounter" and Babbie (1983, cited in Berg, 1995) described it as a "face-to-face performance." Bogdan and Bilklen (1998) stated, "Field notes can provide any study with a personal log that helps the researcher keep track of the project development, to visualize how the research plan has been affected by the data collected, and to remain aware of how he or she has been influenced by the data" (p. 108). Similarly, Emerson, Fritz, and Shaw (1995) believed that writing field notes encouraged researchers to observe more finely and systematically. Likewise, Schwartz and Jacobs (1979)

stated, "In many ways tape and film represents microscopes of human interaction" (p. 83). Bogdan and Biklen (1998) pointed out that the reflective journal was designated as a notational convention, which included observer's comments.

Bogdan (1972) further argued that analysis was ongoing and although it was after the data collection phase that analysis was taken seriously, it was a constant process through the duration of the research. He maintained that data obtained from qualitative inquiry was subjected to a process of analysis based on inductive reason. Lincoln & Guba (1985) stated that inductive data analysis bared remarkable similarities to content analysis, a process aimed at uncovering embedded information and making it explicit. The coding scheme involved developing coding frames or categories from interview transcriptions, field notes, videos, and other unobtrusive data. Morgan (1998) contended that using metaphors (even multiple metaphors) gave us the capacity to, 1) approach the same situation in different ways, metaphors extend insight and suggested actions that may not have been possible before, 2) observe how insights generated by different metaphors were not just theoretical, but practical, and 3) marvel at metaphors that lead to new metaphors, creating a mosaic of competing and complementary insights. Berg (1995) elaborated on the approach, "the criteria of selection, explicit rules, used in a given content analysis must be sufficiently exhaustive to account for each variation of message content and must be rigidly and consistently applied so that other researchers or readers, looking at the same messages, would obtain the same or comparable results" (p.175). The conventional criteria for trustworthiness were internal validity, external validity, reliability, and objectivity (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Further, Lincoln and Guba presented a set of questions underlying the establishment of these criteria in naturalistic inquiry.

Summary of Literature Underlying the Research Methodology

In summary, this section concerned itself with presenting a framework for understanding the research methods and methodology used in the case study . Given that exploratory research can be either or both quantitative and qualitative, the methodology was premised on conducting a field study using mixed method and multi source of information data collection devices. As exploratory research, reliance was on mixed methods to ensure a better understanding of the problem, however, qualitative served as the main theme. Included in this section was an elaboration of negotiating entry, use of interviews and site observations, field notes, and coding of data collected. The interview of building leaders and teachers provided a central focus for data

gathering and analysis. The prerequisites of exploratory research often times don't give any indication of the work required in conducting an exploration of a complex topic at hand. Therefore, this section reported the literature on the methodology used in designing and conducting the research.

<center>Summary of Chapter 2</center>

Chapter 2 provided a review of the literature relevant to the problem and purposes addressed in the exploratory research. The review was organized into three major sections. Taken together the sections provided a source for identifying and analyzing aspects of language policy and how this phenomenon played out in the middle school. The crux for exploring the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program was the organization for instruction as discussed by Marks and Louis (1997). Using the concept of metaphor, the intent was to draw some discernable "institutional" parameters pertinent to exploratory design. Language policy formation, principally as it related to linguistic diversity, language communities, and school context, was the focus of the exploratory design.

Metaphor is the Message presented the reader with an overview of the importance of using metaphor to describe the complex social and cultural milieu that characterizes our public system of education. Metaphors were used to drive instruction in general and for instructing diverse learners in particular. The section had four subsections, which reviewed related literature on school organization, school leadership, instruction, and middle school programs. School organization was viewed as an evolving culture and not a fixed bureaucracy. Similarly, leadership concepts were seen as driving school change as part of this evolving culture (school context). It was found that metaphors for program were limited in the literature, and that there was a need for better metaphors for middle school programs.

Language Policy with its three subsections gave the reader an operational definition of the dimensions of language policy. With reference to language policy, capturing speech communities and language community viz., school community was key to the execution of the exploratory design. This section also gave the reader a look at language policy in terms of language planning, and language (also referred to as ethnic or nationality) rights. The first subsection, U.S. Population Trends and the Notion of Linguistic Diversity, highlighted the major impact of immigration, the presence of heritage speakers, and other language groups. In turn, the

second subsection, Language Community: Meaning and Scope, helped to substantiate language communities as viable elements in the tapestry of U.S. society. Its focus was on developing a working definition and meaning of language community. The third subsection, Dimensions of Language Policy, provided a conceptualization of language policy and emphasized local or community level policy initiatives and the need for language policy planning at the school building level. The characteristics (implicit and explicit, overt and covert) were defined in this section. Also, it was found that demographics drove the need for language policy and for understanding language communities. Lastly, Literature Underlying the Research Methodology, presented related literature that helped guide the research methodology used in designing and conducting the case study .

In sum, Chapter 2 presented a framework for understanding the specific nature of the exploratory research reported. The purpose of the literature selected was to explain important constructs (metaphor, linguistic diversity, language community, etc.), with the intent of establishing clear domains (language policy, middle schools, ELLs, etc.) for the research. The literature provided a basis for design of the research as a field study with data collection, entry into the field, observation criteria, use of field notes, and coding of data considerations. The use of mixed methods with qualitative as a main theme was a focus of the methods and methodology used. It does not purport to be an exhaustive list of references, but the chapter does provide an extensive array of authorities in each area presented.

CHAPTER 3-METHODOLOGY

This case study was an exploration of three elements: school leadership, instruction, and middle level program with implications for school language policy formation. The study looked at macro level processes in the school organization, as opposed to, micro level cognitive factors involved in the process of teaching and learning. But, as part of data collection methods (e.g., site visits, anecdotal documents and records, etc.) some micro interactions between administrators and educational personnel in the school organization became part of the study design. As presented, the design and methodology were premised on the philosophical and scientific notions expressed by Noam Chomsky in his conversations with French writer, Mitsou Ronat. Chomsky (1977) stated:

> You can collect butterflies and make many observations. If you like butterflies, that's fine, but such work must not be confounded with research, which is concerned to discover explanatory principles of some depth and fails if it does not do so…The search is for discovery of intelligible structure and for explanatory principles… In our conception of social structures, we have all sorts of tacit and complex knowledge concerning our relations to other people, perhaps we have a sort of universal grammar of possible forms of social interactions. (pp. 54-56)

The methodology included use of the construct organization for instruction (Marks and Louis, 1997) as a crux to explore the three elements mentioned above and to draw implications on how language policy played out at the building level. In their works, Marks and Louis (1997) operationalized "organization for instruction" as professional community and collective responsibility for student learning. It was intended to use organization for instruction in context of the school as a critical point in assessing the degree of commitment to concerns about linguistic diversity and ELLs in each school building. The construct was also used to refer to the esprit de corps, general level of cooperation, and/or the degree of collaboration on the part of faculty and staff with reference to meeting the needs of linguistically diverse students. Furthermore, this study explored how the three elements (i.e., school leadership, instruction, and middle level program) impacted on the provision of educational services to linguistically diverse students who were, in turn, considered representatives of their particular language or speech community. These communities were referred to as "diglossic situations" (i.e., where the

language community viz., school community speaks a language different from the language used at the school). Diaglossia (Ferguson, 1959) in this case, principally refers to the predominately Spanish-speaking community served by the two middle schools that participated in this case study research (refer to Definition of Terms Ch.1 and p. Chapter 2). Diaglossia was viewed as part of the prevailing "linguistic culture" (Schiffman, 1996) of the school district's service area and of the two school buildings under study.

As a building level case study, focus was on inferring aspects of language policy at work and on drawing implications for language policy formation. Attempts were made to analyze middle level school dynamics with reference to the three elements used in this study. Using the school organization as context the study identified discourse situations through observations and interviews and applied them toward inferring the language policy at work at each building. In addition, data obtained was used to assess the influence of language policy on the three elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level program. The researcher's professional and personal experience in working with linguistically diverse students provided the source of sensitivity needed to interpret the theoretical and conceptual nexus of the study's design.

A Restatement of Research Questions.

In place of hypotheses, a major research question and four sub questions were posed in order to explore the implications of school language policy on the organization for instruction at two middle school buildings. The questions are:

Major Research Question

In what ways and to what extent does school context and the organization for instruction positively influence school language policy formation?

Research Sub Questions

1. Leadership sub question.

In what ways and to what extent does leadership promote the needs of linguistic diversity in the school and what implications would this have for school language policy formation?

2. Instruction sub question.

In what ways and to what extent does instruction promote the needs of

linguistically diverse students at the middle school and what implications would this have for school language policy formation?

3. Program sub question.

In what ways and to what extent does middle level program promote the needs of linguistic diversity in middle schools and what implications could be drawn for school language policy formation?

4. Language policy sub question.

In what ways and to what extent can language policy be inferred or is discernable in the middle school environment?

In line with the major research question and four sub questions, the study used the following research methodology and mixed methods (Creswell, 2002).

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted at a junior high school in a small rural community in the Southwestern part of the United States. The results of the pilot study helped refine the purpose of the study, research questions, and methodologies for the extant case study . It was conducted in a New Mexico school district, that was instrumental in establishing legal precedence with reference to the provision of programs for linguistically diverse students, principally, Mexican American. Serna v. Portales (1974) was the first time a judge at the State Appeals Court required that the district implement a prescribed bilingual curriculum. The site afforded an opportunity for field-testing of participant observation strategies, interview protocol, and audio taping equipment. The pilot study helped the researcher gain some valuable experience in establishing rapport with gatekeepers and in developing field relationships. But, most importantly, it allowed an opportunity to work out problems in decision-making.

Development of Field Relationships

Guided by the dictates of the University's Institutional Research Board (IRB), it was incumbent on the researcher to ensure that the highest ethical standards be maintained at all levels and at every stage of the study. Furthermore, the researcher assumed the ethical responsibility of minimizing, to the extent possible, any adverse effects both social and personal to all involved in the study. Being an educator made it easier for the researcher to understand the dynamics of the middle school site, school environment, building relationships, and prevailing

teacher culture. Thus, field relationships were developed within a context of reciprocity. The researcher made his time available to building leaders and to educational personnel at each middle school building. For example, he offered to help with committee meetings, to be put on the substitute teacher list, and volunteered at the school site to help out in any way. Furthermore, entry to and exit from the field were key elements in this study design.

Middle School Sites and Participants

The school district's reorganization plan, which was implemented in 2004-2005, changed the boundaries for 12 elementary and 4 middle schools. With the implementation of a pure feeder system for the district three elementary schools would feed each of the four middle schools. Previously, middle schools had received students from up to 12 elementary feeder schools. In addition to the increase in total number of students caused by moving the 6th grade to the middle schools, student populations of the two middle schools were represented by a larger percentage of Hispanic and low income students (refer to tables in Chapter 4). This required that each middle school building increase its capacities (e.g., more teachers and the addition of portable buildings) to meet the addition of the 6th grade to its grade configuration (6-8). The grade configuration at the time of the study was 7-8.

Middle School X started construction in early 1957 and opened its doors for the 1958 – 1959 school year on September 2. It was built to relieve some of the overcrowding at the two other junior high schools. It initially started as a junior high school and housed 7th, 8th, and 9th grades during the late fifties and early sixties (Huckabee and Class, 1996). Middle School X became a middle school in the late sixties when the 9th grade was moved up to the high school and the 6th was moved into the building. However, by 1972 it housed only the 7th and 8th grades, but changed again with the 6th grade moving up in the 2004-2005 school year. Whereas, Middle School Y opened in the 1965-66 school year and was initially designed as a middle school for 7th and 8th graders. However, the two middle schools do share some similarities. For example, both schools are situated in a semi-rural environment on the outskirts of town. Middle school X was built in the semi-rural eastside of town; Middle School Y was located on the semi-rural west side of town.

The participant sample was drawn from educational personnel at two middle school buildings. As a building level study, data gathering activities focused on three elements, 1)

leadership, 2) instruction, and 3) program at each school site. For the element of school leadership, interviews were conducted with the building leaders at the middle schools. The interviewees for the element of leadership included two (2) principals and two (2) assistant principals (Middle School X [n = 3], Middle School Y [n = 1]).

During the formative phase of the study, it became necessary to change the scope of the study with reference to focusing and bounding requirements (Miles and Huberman, 1994). Changes were made in terms of the number and subject area of participants. Initially, the focus of the interviews was on the areas of math and science. The rationale behind this was that these subject areas were "gate way courses" to academic and professional advancement. However, because of the brewing turmoil engendered by the district's reorganization efforts and the controversial administrative style of the new superintendent (refer Crisis of Leadership section in Chapter 4), the researcher did not have much success in obtaining enough participants from the originally planned subject areas.

Therefore, it became necessary to include participants from other teaching areas in the middle school's curricular program. Accordingly, data for the element of instruction was generated by interviewing teachers in the following six areas: 4 math teachers, 4 science teachers, 3 language arts teachers, 1 English as a second language (ESL) teacher, 2 technology teachers, and 2 Special Education teachers. In terms of percentages of interviewees, eight (50%) were from the areas of math and science, three (18 %) from language arts, one (6 %) from ESL, two (13 %) from technology, and two (13 %) from special education, for a total of 16 (100 %) participants for the element of instruction (Middle School X [n = 9], Middle School Y [n = 7]).

Of the total number of participants involved in the study 4 interviewees were for the element of leadership and 16 interviewees for the element of instruction (total of 20 interview participants) from two middle school buildings in a school district comprised of 13 elementary, 4 middle, and two high schools. Quantitatively, tables (Tables 4.5 through 4.9) were provided for each middle school building profiling 7th and 8th grade student performance on academic achievement tests. In addition, Table 4.4 gives a demographic profile of the two middle schools (Middle School X and Middle School Y).

Researcher's Role

The researcher's role was key to the exploratory research. The researcher assumed the responsibility of documenting and reporting the findings in an ethical context. In context of the school, an honest look at language (s) and language differences was viewed as key in the development of school policy and instructional improvement for linguistically diverse students. The researcher also endeavored to understand what part language (varieties and sub varieties including non standard forms), with particular reference to language groups and speech communities, played in fostering linguistic diversity in the school (Corson, 1999, 2001). This understanding was applied toward exploring how the construct "organization for instruction" at each middle school building promoted a culture of collaboration geared toward meeting the needs of linguistic diversity in the school, principally, the needs of E LLs.

Data Collection

Data collection devices included school site visits with particular reference to mixed methods, which are designed to provide both a qualitative and qualitative advantage in terms of understanding of the problem (refer to Statement of the Problem Ch.1) of the case study (Creswell, 2002). Multiple sources of information and multiple perspective methods (Creswell, 1998) were also used direct and participant observation in lieu of triangulation. The sources of data included: direct and participant observation, interviews, field notes, documents (public and available records), and technology use.

Direct and Participant Observation

This study was conducted on site using direct and participant observation at the building level. A three-pronged observation process was employed. The first observation looked at leadership as decision-making and emphasized the fit between policy formation and implementation. The second observation emphasized frontline participants, teachers, and focused on instruction. The third observation concentrated on programs, plans, policies, and practices. Primary focus was at the building level with particular emphasis on processes and events in context of the school. Cursory observations were conducted on documents found on site (refer to documents section and research protocol below). These documents were used for background information and as markers for interview question design. In addition, a 10-item Likert Scale

served as a confirming observation instrument in assessing aspects of language policy prevalent during each interview (refer to Appendix 2).

Interviews

Interviews conducted at each building with leaders and teachers were an important data collection method used in the case study. Interviews concentrated on obtaining participant responses to a series of questions (refer to Research Protocol below). Questions were designed to elicit comments from building leaders (leadership) and teachers (instruction) with a focus on language use, instruction, school organization, professional development, and aspects of language policy. The interviews were structured and administered on an individual basis. The interview phase and the actual interviews were conducted in a systematic manner and guided by a written research protocol. Written transcriptions of the interviews (refer to Appendix A) provided perspectives on leadership, teachers, and other organizational processes relative to middle level education. Also, the interviews aimed to understand linguistic diversity in an institutional context, the school, and to draw some implications for school language policy formation.

Field Notes

Copious field notes were taken. Every effort was made to ensure the integrity of the research and to minimize the effects of opinions, biases, and other prejudices on the data. In addition, field notes and other observer comments were made as deemed necessary. Field notes were used to carefully chronicle the events as delineated in the Crisis of Leadership in Chapter 4. Also, field notes were taken during site visits and used to organize and report the section on middle level program (s) in Chapter 4-Results.

Documents

Public and available documents, including anecdotal and other records, were previewed and provided the background knowledge for conducting interviews and making site observations in line with data collection processes. On each site visit, the researcher conducted a cursory observation of anecdotal and other available records. These documents and records were evaluated on the basis of their accuracy, practicality, and value. The practicality and usefulness of each document was guided by the following procedures: 1) documents that informed the

background of this study, 2) documents that informed the attributes of the research site, 3) documents that guided the formation of interview question, and 4) documents that specifically informed program structure. Site observations were guided by the use of available documents.

Technology Use

The audio taping of individual interviews were conducted using a portable cassette recorder and audiotape cassettes for each session. Every effort was made to exploit the use of available technology at each stage of the case study . Audiocassette recordings of interviews were conducted and transcribed with written transcriptions included in Appendix A.

Research Protocol

Collection of Data for the Research Setting.

The researcher has described in some detail the research setting in order to determine if there are factors, which may form the basis for development of language policy for the school. Data collected for describing the research setting were taken from public and available documents. The data collected for the purpose of describing the research setting included:

1. Square mile area of the county.
2. Population size of the county and of the city.
3. Race-ethnicity distribution in the county and in the city.
4. Reporting of major employers in the city.
5. The socio-economic orientation of the city including major employers and employment patterns.
6. The demographics for the district schools included:
    a. Number and type of schools in the district.
    b. Numbers of students enrolled in the schools.
    c. Income distribution of parents of students of students enrolled in the two middle schools.
    d. Race-ethnic distribution of students in the two middle schools.
    e. Estimate of number and percent of students who are English Language Learners (ELLs).

f.　　　Description of the physical characteristics of the two middle school buildings, When built; Facilities; General condition of school buildings.

Collection of Data from Building Leaders (Leadership).

Data collection represented a two-part process:

The first part of the process was the collection and use of public and available documents for each building. These documents were used to provide background knowledge for conducting the interview process for the element of leadership. Some of the documents used to accomplish this process included, but were not limited to: Copies of faculty-student handbooks, curriculum guides and materials on instruction, school improvement and student success education plans, available documents which address students' linguistic diversity, copies of any instructional directives from office of instruction and/or building Principal, district, state and federal standards, benchmarks and other requirements for program and curriculum development.

The second data collection process stemmed from interviews and results of interviews of building administration (leaders) at the two middle school buildings. Subject to a signed informed consent permission form, each administrator was asked the following questions:

1.　　　What significant changes have occurred in the city and the county over the last 5 years that may have contributed to an increase in linguistic and cultural diversity among students and faculty in the building?

2.　　　How will reconfiguration of the middle schools into a 6-8 grade configuration affect the building's capacity to meet the needs of linguistic and cultural diversity among students?

3.　　　What are your perceptions of the rich cultural and linguistic diversity among the students at your school and in the community it serves? Describe these perceptions at some length.

4.　　　The students reflect considerable cultural and linguistic diversity at your school. What do you believe are the critical factors at work with this diversity that will ensure all students achieve success in the school program?

5.　　　What are the community and parent perceptions of cultural and linguistic diversity in the building's student population? Do you feel that parents and community care about these factors?

6. Do you feel that federal and state level program requirements, that the school must meet, help or hinder, the success of linguistically diverse learners?

7. How do linguistically diverse students fit into the general scheme of instruction, and non-curricular activities here at your school?

8. What role do you think the building principal or school administrator plays in planning, developing, and implementing instructional guidelines for linguistically diverse students?

9. What would it require to get building stakeholders (ESL and core content teachers, parents, and community members) regularly involved when planning, and developing instructional practices for linguistically diverse students?

10. What strengths do your faculty and staff have in organizing and designing instruction for linguistically diverse students?

Collection of Data from Teachers (Instruction).

Data collection represented a two-part process:

The first part of the process was the collection and use of available documents for teaching the subject matter. These documents and records were used to provide background knowledge for conducting the interview process for the element of instruction. Some of the documents used to accomplish this process included, but were not limited to: Textbooks and other instructional materials, course outline and syllabus, manuals and copies of standards that specify what's to be taught in the course. Source of the documents or records were from the building, the district, the New Mexico Public Education Department, the federal government, or from scholarly sources such as math organizations and science organizations.

The second data collection process stemmed from the interviews and analysis of results of interviews from teachers at two middle school buildings. Subject to a signed informed consent permission form, each was asked the following questions:

1. How will reconfiguration of the middle schools into a 6-8-grade configuration affect the building's capacity to meet the needs of linguistic and cultural diversity among students?

2. What limitations and problems do you observe occurring in your classes when linguistically diverse students attempt to study and learn your subject? In your

opinion, what learning difficulties constitute a language problem? To whom would you refer a pupil with a language problem?

3. What additional support programs do you believe need to linked to your classroom to further the success of linguistically diverse students?

4. Does language play a part in your instruction? If so, which are the linguistic elements you pay attention to while planning and developing instruction?

5. In order to make ongoing instructional decisions, what process do you follow in analyzing student characteristics and learning behaviors? Are the processes the same for making decisions for linguistically diverse students?

6. What provisions do you make in your instructional planning to ensure that linguistically diverse students develop conceptual understanding of the content being covered in class?

7. Have you collaborated with other educators in the building to modify assessment and instruction for linguistically diverse students?

8. What do you consider to be your language policy in your   classroom?

9. What would you estimate the school's language policy to be?

10. Have you participated in staff development opportunities for meeting the learning needs of linguistically diverse students? Do you have additional professional development needs regarding linguistically diverse students?

Collection of Data for Variable of Program.

This process was used to describe and analyze middle level programs at the two buildings and it was a standard analysis of the buildings' organization of the school. This was approached through the following program descriptions, lists, and guiding questions collected during site visits and interviews.

1. Describe how curriculum was organized for the core subjects (math, science, social studies, language arts, etc.)?

    a. Is it a departmental organization?

    b. Is it a team organizational variation of the departmental structure?

    c. Is it a block schedule arrangement?

2. Explain grade and enrollment requirements at the school regarding core and elective classes.

3. Was there a level of cooperation, coordination, and teamwork among school staff relative to the organization for instruction (or instructional activities) in the district or school?

4. Describe extracurricular activities. What is the nature of these offerings? Exclusive? Inclusive?

5. Describe special programming made available in the middle school curriculum (e.g., Special education, English as a second language, bilingual education, Title I, programs for at risk students, etc.).

6. What after-school (includes night and weekends) programming are part of the schools program? Does the building operate with what is called, "alternative programs?"

7. Does the school acknowledge and support students' bilingualism and promote an interest in their language among all students?

8. Is there a satisfactory system within the school for identifying students who need help with English as their second language, for providing this help and for monitoring their progress?

9. Are the program and teaching resources for English as a second language sufficient to meet the needs of the students in the school and organized so that students have access to them in a range of subject areas?

Analysis of Data

Because the volume of data was neither burdensome nor overwhelming, the analysis of data did not warrant the use of a state-of-the-art software program (e.g., QualPro, Ethnograph, Nudist, etc.). Instead, data analysis was accomplished by using a personal computer and many hours of meticulous reading and rereading of all written material. Interview tapes were transcribed and systemically coded within appropriate coding schemes. In addition, anecdotal records and other available documents were scrutinized and systematically filed for use. These procedures allowed for identification and analysis of all data related to the elements of school leadership, instruction, and middle level programs at the two middle school buildings under study.

Summary of Chapter 3

Chapter 3 Methodology described research issues, design, and the mixed method and multi source of information (Creswell, 2002) approach used in conducting the case study . A mixed method design (use of quantitative and qualitative, qualitative being the main theme in this case) was determined to be the most appropriate with respect to understanding the problem as stated in Chapter 1 (refer to Statement of the Problem). The chapter was organized into the following eight major sections: A Restatement of Research Questions, Pilot Study, Development of Field Relationships, Middle Schools and Study Participants, Researcher's Role, Data Collection, Research Protocol, and Analysis of data. Collectively, each section and relevant subsections provided a framework for understanding the research methodology used in the design and implementation of a study of two middle school buildings. Significant reporting of data and findings used the following methods: descriptive reporting, historical reporting, sociological-demographic reporting, and qualitative interviews. The next chapter, Chapter 4 Results, presents the findings and results of the collection and analysis of data.

CHAPTER 4-RESULTS

Chapter 4 presented the following sections with subsections: 1) Research Setting: Demographics, Data, and Profiles, with three subsections, 2) Interviews for the Element of Leadership, with two subsections, 3) Interviews for the Element of Instruction, with two subsections, 4) Multi-Item (10) Likert Scale Results, and 5) Program Element for the Middle Schools, with two subsections, and 6) Summary of Chapter 4.

Participant information used in the major sections for the elements of leadership and instruction was coded for confidentiality. Taped interviews gathered during the data collection phase were transcribed in written form and used in the analysis of data. Results from a review of available anecdotal records and other documents were used as data and subsequently presented for the element of program. These activities were conducted in line with criteria as delineated on the research protocol (refer to Research Protocol in Chapter 3). The results from data collected are presented below.

Research Setting: Events, Demographics, Data, and Profiles

This major section has four subsections: a) A Crisis in Leadership, which attempted to put the research setting in a current perspective by presenting events that transpired in the district during the course of the research, b) The Setting with Demographics: State, District, and Schools, which presented an overview and description of the state, the school district, and the two middle schools used in conjunction with this study, c) Data and Profiles, which was an analysis of student achievement data and profile of interviewee characteristics for participants from the two middle school buildings, and d) Summary of Research Setting.

A Crisis in Leadership

In the subsection, data used on the timeline of significant events were excerpted from archived local newspaper files on the WEB. The more significant dates and events relative to the hiring, tenure, and firing of the Superintendent were included. It was hoped a pattern would emerge that shed light on the nature of relationships between the community, the schools, the school board, and the office of the Superintendent.

The dates on the time line chronicled significant events, which refined the case for this study in the district. Initially, data was to be collected during the months of September through

December of 2002, but the researcher did not experience much success in obtaining the necessary number of interviewees or cooperation from faculty at either middle school. There was a major district wide conflict over control of decisions made concerning administrative functions and district reorganization. The conflict extended for a time making it impossible to get interviews with faculty and principals. Ultimately, events culminated with the Superintendent's firing. Nonetheless, data was ultimately collected during the 2003-2004 school year. It was felt the intervening controversies, which surrounded the tenure of the newly hired superintendent, productively impacted the tenor of taped interview data and added an important dimension to the study with reference to establishing field relationships. Similarly, the dates and events were viewed as significant. They added important insights into decision-making and reform initiatives within the district. Therefore, it was decided to include this crisis of leadership as part of the results. The dates and events are presented as follows:

January 24, 2002. A consultant firm was hired by the Board of Education to conduct a search for a new Superintendent. Some community members voiced their disapproval of the Board's decision not to renew the contract of the outgoing superintendent. There were hints of "reverse" discrimination and racial overtones noted during the Board meeting.

April 26, 2002. Parents of students at one elementary school were notified that they had the option of moving their children to another school, because their child's school was targeted for closure according to the school district's two-year plan.

May 5, 2002. A district judge ruled that the allegation of misconduct made against two Board members was unfounded. The judge ruled the issue "moot" because persons signing the complaint did not live in the Board members' district.

May 16, 2002. A meeting with parents of the elementary school targeted for closure was held. A State Representative from the district where the school was located and the outgoing Superintendent were in attendance. The parents expressed their concerns that the Board of Education was not listening to the Spanish-speaking community. The outgoing Superintendent assured the audience that translators would be provided at the next meeting.

May 21, 2002. A general meeting to discuss the closure of one elementary school and to announce the name of the new Superintendent was held. Two members from the state's Public Education Department (PED) were present and stated that they had not recommended any schools in the district for closure. The outgoing Superintendent explained the school closure was

part of the district's two-year plan. One Board member expressed her feelings about the elementary school being a neighborhood school and home to three to four generations of community members who went to school there. Another Board member stated, "The neighborhood residents view their school as a rock solid touchstone of their community." A building principal from another elementary school in the district expressed that there were serious issues with kids who lived in poverty, some were at risk, and some had a high transient rate. She reaffirmed her concern that the needs of low-income students should be given more attention by the district. The newly hired Superintendent, also present, stood up and reassured the crowd that the targeted school would not be closed.

July 7, 2002. The new Superintendent, on the job as of July 1, expressed that he was up to the challenge. He advocated strong community links, close relationship with business and commerce, and improved test scores.

July 28, 2002. The Superintendent introduced the district to the QSP program, which was designed for data driven instructional decision-making. Also, Board members approved use of LightSpan, which was a continuous assessment WEB-based program. The Superintendent explained two directives, 1) the principal at each school was required to spend 35% of their time in the classroom, and 2) all teachers were required to keep class profiles on every one of their students. The most important element of the new instructional program was the continuous assessment of students.

August 27, 2002. The new Superintendent, introduced as "the captain of our ship", briefed the Parent Council on the reorganization plan for the district, which included realignment of elementary and secondary schools. He reported that the district's full inclusion plan and monitoring of student progress were in line with the number one goal of improving student learning and achievement.

October 2, 2002. The Superintendent's instructional program was not well received by the district's teachers. It was considered too time consuming, and it was a confusing process with too much paper work. The local NEA representative conveyed teachers' wants concerning compensation for extra work required. The representative threatened the Superintendent with a class action suit. He vehemently stated, "Quit intimidating our staff and give us the respect we desire and deserve".

October 3, 2002. With only two months into the new school year, the Board asked for calm from the overflow crowd at their monthly meeting. At the meeting, the Superintendent addressed significant gaps in test scores. He pointed out that for the last three years there was a 20-point difference between Hispanics and Caucasians, as well as between African American and Caucasians, at every level from 3rd grade and up.

October 11, 2002. A series of six public forums were organized by the district's administration to gain community involvement in reorganization efforts, which addressed enrollment, operational costs, and student achievement.

November 5, 2002. It appeared parents and teachers were on a collision course with the district's management team. An overflow crowd attended the monthly Board of Education meeting where parents and teachers expressed their concerns. Local NEA representatives accused the Superintendent of violating two articles of the teacher's contract. He maintained that if appropriate compensation wasn't provided to teachers, NEA would file a class action suit. The teachers said they were working over 125 hours, including weekends, in excess of their contact.

November 19, 2002. The upcoming election asked voters to select two members for the Board of Education, vote on a $15 million general obligation bond, and vote on a capital improvements property tax of $2 per each $1,000 assessed valuation for the years 2003-2006.

December 4, 2002. The new instructional program (The Baldridge Plan) was in place and foci strategies implemented at each of the district's 22 schools. Again, the local NEA requested additional compensation for teachers for long hours and extra work involved in implementing the new educational approach. Also, NEA requested more input from teachers in the formulation of the new instructional program's structure.

December 12, 2002. One elementary school principal resigned and teachers walked out in support of their principal. Locks on doors to principal's office were changed and the principal's computer was confiscated. The local NEA representative accused the superintendent of intimidation of teachers and other educational personnel and threatened to file a formal grievance.

December 15, 2002. Parents gathered signatures petitioning the Board of Education to reinstate the elementary school principal who resigned and to fire the Superintendent. Board members explained that one of the preconditions for hiring the Superintendent was that he would be in charge of the hiring and firing.

December 20, 2002. A second elementary school principal resigned her position. Again, Board members reiterated that it was a personnel matter. The problems with dual language program funds were cited as causes for principals' resignation. Despite receiving money for the past two years to fund a Title VII dual language program, two elementary schools were now struggling to organize dual language classes, staving off the loss of federal funds and a charge of racism. It was charged that when one of the principals, who resigned, was asked by an outside evaluator if he knew of any materials in Spanish and English, the principal stated that he had not considered it important to validate the language and culture of the language minority children at his school. At the other elementary school, the decision not to conduct dual language classes was labeled as "covert racism" by the outside evaluator.

January 1, 2003. Teachers at two elementary schools disputed the claims and accusations made by the external evaluator and the Superintendent. The two schools were accused of overt and covert racism and mismanagement of federal funds. In rebuttal, it was pointed out that 80 percent of the teachers at one elementary school were Hispanic. In addition, teachers felt the Superintendent did not "protect his teachers".

February 4, 2003. A community group, friends of teachers, presented a list of concerns against the Superintendent at monthly Board of Education meeting. Also, the Board was to decide if they would hold a hearing to discuss items on a grievance signed by more than 50 teachers. The Superintendent reiterated the three goals the Board had put in his charge, 1) to improve student learning, 2) to reorganize the district and 3) to conduct accountability.

February 11, 2003. The Board of Education rejected a grievance filed by 54 members of the local NEA. The grievance concerned issues of work hours, dignity, and the Superintendent's respect for the members of the collective bargaining unit. The local NEA affiliate decided the grievance would be submitted to an arbitrator. If the district and NEA were not able to mutually agree on an arbitrator, then, it would go to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service.

February 11, 2003. The Parent Council organization drafted a resolution not to oppose the proposed school district reorganization plan.

February 26, 2003. The State Legislature and the Public Education Department mandated a 6% pay increase for teachers in 2004-2005. The mandatory increase in pay for teachers caused additional budget planning problems for the district. The district's administration presented a proposal for school closures to be voted on by the Board of Education.

March 18, 2003. The Teacher Accountability Task Force and the Community Coalition for Excellence in Education distributed a petition that asked for the Superintendent to resign because of his continual violation of Board of Education policy and contractual obligations.

March 20, 2003. The Board approved closure of three elementary schools, realignment of two other schools, and moving the 6th grade to the four middle schools during its monthly meeting in the conference room at the Administrative Building.

April 15, 2003. The state's Public Education Department (PED) denied a request from district's administration to implement school closures by August 2003. The PED maintained, "The district did not provide compelling evidence of educational benefits expected from the reorganization." PED staff agreed to work with the district in amending the request.

April 23, 2003. The Parent Council, the Finance Committee, and the local NEA affiliate asked for the Superintendent's resignation. They presented 1500 signatures on a petition that enumerated 10 violations of Board of Education policy by the Superintendent.

May 21, 2003. The Superintendent implemented major changes in the reorganization of the district's schools, which included moving principals from middle to elementary school coordination positions in 2003-2004. The school district was feeling a severe economic crunch brought on by a projected $1.7 million shortfall.

September 25, 2003. The school district received approval from the state's Public Education Department for the school closure proposal. The Board of Education and district administration prepared for school closures or realignment.

March 3, 2004. The Board of Education approved the use of seven member (2 parents, 2 community members, 2 school employees and the building principal) advisory, site-based, councils at each school building to work with the principals.

April 28, 2004. An elected State Representative called for the Board of Education to answer the public's questions about the school district's upcoming reorganization. Community members emphasized they wanted to be part of the process that would ultimately affect their children's future.

June 16, 2004. At a rally staged at the Board of Education's monthly meeting, parents and teachers protested the Superintendent's new instructional policies.

June 17, 2004. Amid calls for a vote of no confidence from parents and teachers, the Board of Education conducted its' yearly evaluation of the Superintendent's performance.

June 23,2004. A group of 40 teachers and concerned residents, wearing "fire him" badges, gathered at the district's Administrative Complex Building to get the Board's attention prior to their executive meeting. The Board of Education's meeting was held to discuss the fate of the Superintendent. District administrators and teachers signed a petition that asked the Board to cancel the Superintendent's contract.

June 30, 2004. During the Board's monthly meeting, more than 200 teachers, parents, and concerned citizens rallied outside the district's Administrative Complex Building. They carried signs, "fire him," "spare the kids," and "we support the principals." They demanded a vote of no confidence by the Board of Education against the Superintendent.

July 23, 2004. About 18 district administrators and principals signed a vote of no confidence in the Superintendent's performance and stated that they would leave the district if the Superintendent didn't resign.

July 28, 2004. The Board of Education voted unanimously to accept the resignation of the Superintendent. More than 300 people, at a tailgate party outside the Board meeting, "bid the Superintendent goodbye" and another 500 were inside. It marked the first time in 99 years that a district Superintendent had resigned. (Events were excerpted from archived local newspaper on the WEB)

In summary, the events as delineated above point to clear differences in how authority was defined with reference to who had the control to implement district reorganization and school change. These differences were primal in terms of administrative and organizational practices, which include-or exclude-stakeholders at every level of the educational hierarchy. In this case, the question was, "Who had the power to continue, close, or restructure schools"? The culmination of events or the way the conflict was administratively adjudicated demonstrated that the critical factors of parents, neighborhoods, buildings, building principals, contracts with teachers and other school related concerns were also important and viable parts of school language policy formation. Further, the conflict in the district placed unexpected pressures on all involved, including the research, which extended the time for data collection, in terms of, scheduling interviews, reviewing available records, and conducting site visits. Because of the nature of the conflict, it was included in the study and it has resulted in added insight into decision-making and reform initiatives within the district relative to the case study.

The Setting with Demographics: State, District, and Schools

This subsection was presented in three parts: The State of New Mexico, The School District, and The Two Middle Schools. It includes narrative descriptions, demographic information, student achievement data, and school profiles. City and county data are interfaced with state and district narratives and tables of data. A descriptive-sociological-demographic research approach was used to gather and report the following.

The State of New Mexico

The state of New Mexico has enjoyed a rich history of diversity and cultural blending. Since its inception as a state in 1912, the state's multicultural population has long respected language differences and diversity. In fact, there were more Spanish speakers then English speakers when the state became part of the Union. Furthermore, there were over 25 ancestries identified in the 2000 Census with reference to State, County, and City population statistics. The major groups (ethnic/cultural) found in each subdivision were English, German, Irish, Spanish, Scottish, Italian, French, United States or American. Also, foreign-born percentages of the total population were noted as follows: nationally 11 %, state 8 %, county 11 %, and city 11 % (Census 2000). Furthermore, of the 316,143 students enrolled in the state during 2001-2002, 64,254 (20 %) were identified as limited English proficient (LEP) (USDE Survey, 2002). Of these LEP students, the groups with the highest percentages were comprised of speakers of the Spanish and Navajo languages.

Table 4.1 presents the major languages spoken in the State, County, and City in terms of percentage(s) of the population. These three government entities were considered significant with reference to the school district where research was conducted. Table 4.1 presents languages that have a large percentage of speakers within identified categories. These categories are: English Only, Other than English, Spanish, and Other. Historically, the state's northern counties reported larger numbers of Spanish-speakers. Today, however, current population trends and high levels of immigration (documented and undocumented) have significantly increased the percentage of Languages Other than English (Spanish accounted for over 95 % of this category) spoken in all counties, particularly, in the county and city where this case study was conducted. Percentages for County and City now mirror those for the State (i.e., almost identical). There were about 25 other languages spoken within these governmental units. There was a slightly higher percent (32 %) Spanish speakers in the County and City in comparison to the state (29 %).

Table 4.2 displays a profile of race and ethnicity in terms of percentages of population totals for the state, county, and city. The race and ethnicity categories include African American, Asian, Caucasian (Not of Hispanic descent), Hispanic, and Native American (U. S. Census 2000). Percentages for the three categories of Asian, African American, and Native American range from 1 % to 2 %. The percentages for Caucasians are practically the same (e.g., 51 %, 51 %, 50 %) across state, county, and city. Similarly, the percentages for Hispanics, many of which are Spanish-speaking, are identical (e.g., 44 %, 44 %, 44 %) across the three units of government. A historical circumstance that may account for the large percentage of Hispanics is the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, which ended the Mexican American War and brought the New Mexico Territory and its people into the union of American states. An article in the treaty gave Mexicans the option of remaining in the territory after the War, thus, becoming U.S. citizens. This core Spanish-speaking population has grown significantly in number. The population totals for the city have improved since the area experienced a Strategic Air Command base (SAC) closure in 1967. The base closure caused the city to lose approximately 15,000 residents (from 48,000 to 33, 000). Presently, the population count for the city is 45,293.

Table 4. 1   Major Languages Spoken by Percent of Population per Governmental Entity

Languages	State %	County %	City %
English only	64	67	67
Other than English	37	33	33
Spanish	29	32	32
Other	2	1	2

Note. Speakers of Spanish and/or speakers of other languages may be bilingual (English plus) in varying degrees.

Source.U.S. Census 2000.

Table 4. 2   Percentages of Population by Race and Ethnicity per Governmental Entity

Category	State %	County %	City %
African American	2	2	3
Asian	2	1	2
Caucasian	51	51	50
Hispanic	44	44	44
Native American	1	2	1
Total	100	100	100

Note. Race/ethnic numbers should be read as percentages (%) of total population for: State (1,819,048), County (61,382), and City (45,293).

Source.U.S. Census 2000.

Summarily, the part on the State of New Mexico presented a demographic profile in terms of language spoken and major cultural groups in the state. In addition, a breakdown of population by race and ethnicity per governmental entity was presented. Large percentages of Hispanics, thus Spanish-speakers, pointed to the impact of immigration.

The School District

The school district consolidated county schools, not part of a governmental unit (i.e., village, town, etc.), in 1982. The county covered an area of approximately 6071 square miles. The five largest employers in the district's service community (city/county) were identified as: 1) school district, 2) branch college, 3) hospitals, 4) city, and 5) Wal-Mart (telephone conversation with Chamber of Commerce staff, September 28, 2005). Of the 16,582 employed civilian population 16 years and older 73 % were private wage and salary, 19 % government, 8 % self-employed, and .5 % unpaid family workers (Census, 2000). Poverty levels for the city included 23% of individuals and 23% of families. Census 2000 set the per capita income (dollars) for the county as 14,999 and for the city 14,589.

The school district served as a partner in one of the first bilingual education projects funded under the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. It was believed that this thirty-year span provided an "institutional" window for viewing a situation with legally mandated language services for linguistically different students as part of its educational program. Simply, this situation allowed for an opportunity to work within a bounded system with a mandate for providing for the teaching of English to non-English speakers.

Table 4.3 displays state and district disaggregated data for the 2003-2004 school aged population. These profiles included disaggregated numbers and percentages in the categories of Male, Female, Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific, and Native American, ELLs, Special Education, and Migrant. The large percentage of Hispanics in the state (52 %) and the district (59 %) was considered significant. Here again, percentages for the state and district mirrored each other in most categories. The exceptions were that the state had 11 % Native Americans, and the district had 0 %. Also, the state had a significantly larger percentage (17 %) of ELLs than the district, which had 6 %. Conversely, the district had a slightly larger percentage of Special Education (20 %) and Caucasians (37 %) than the State, which had Special Education (16 %) and Caucasian (33 %).

Table 4. 3   2003-2004Demographics by Number and Percent of School Aged Population for State and District by Category

Category	State		District	
	n	%	n	%
Female	156,715	49	4,598	49
Male	166,351	51	4,761	51
African American	7,833	2	270	3
Asian/Pacific	3,833	1	58	1
Caucasian	105,823	33	3,436	37
Hispanic	169,453	52	5,560	59
Native American	36,124	11	35	0
ELL (instructed)[a]	54,528	17	548	6
Special education	51,111	16	1,827	20
Migrant	2,382	1	74	1

[a]"instructed" refers to identified ELLs receiving language services in a prescribed program of instruction.

Source. New Mexico Public Education Department 2004-2005 District Report Card on the PED WEB site.

Summarily, this part presented a snapshot view of the district in which the two middle school buildings were situated. A main first impression would be the presence of a diverse student aged population and the large percentage of Hispanic students and lower social economic status students. Further, the district shared some similarities with the state, but the state reported larger percentage of ELL students (17 % for the state versus 6 % for the district) in terms of ELLs being instructed.

The Two Middle Schools

The two middle school buildings housed educational programs in appropriate campus facilities that provided an educational environment conducive for learning. Middle School X was located in the semi-rural eastside of town. The building showed some wear and was in need of renovation as were many of the older school buildings in the district (i.e., during 1954-1958, ten new schools were constructed). There were four portable classrooms behind Middle School X, which provided room for special services, the GEAR-UP program, and a school health clinic. There was an outdoor football practice field, an outdoor track, a multipurpose room with food distribution capabilities and snack bar. Middle School Y was located on the extreme west side of town and was in fact on the outskirts of the city. The building housed offices, a public reception area, a modern gym (2 locker rooms), cafeteria, kitchen, and a commons area with stage, library, technology lab, shop, home economics classroom, band room, and an orchestra/chorus room. There were 22 classrooms, a special education classroom, and two portable classrooms at behind the building.

Table 4.4 presents a demographic profile of two middle schools buildings. The profile of Middle School X and Middle School Y shows the number of building leaders, teachers, students enrolled by race/ethnicity, and sub groups. A significant difference between the two middle school buildings was: 1) the number of Caucasians enrolled as compared to Hispanics, and 2) the number of Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRLP) students. For example Middle School X had enrolled 327 (85 %) Hispanic and 46 (12 %) Caucasian students and Middle School Y had enrolled 106 (30 %) Hispanic and 246 (69 %) Caucasian students. Also, the FRLP numbers for Middle School X showed that it had 331 (86 %) and Middle School Y had 132 (37%). Middle School X showed a higher number of special education students (100).

Table 4. 4   Demographic Profile by Category of Two Middle School Buildings

Category	Middle school X		Middle school Y	
	N	n	N	n
Building leaders	2		2	
Principals		1		1
Asst. principals		1		1
Teachers	31		27	
African American		1		0
Caucasian		18		22
Hispanic		12		5
Students enrolled	385		357	
African American		5		4
Asian/Nat. American		7		1
Caucasian		46		246
Hispanic		327		106
Sub groups	454[a]		191	
FRLP		331		132
ESL students		23		5
SPED		100		54

Note. Acronyms are: FRLP-Free and Reduced Lunch Program (also used as an indicator of low income students), ESL-English as a second language, and SPED-Special Education.

[a] Number larger than students enrolled because some students may be in more than one category.

Summarily, this part described the two school buildings that participated in the case study . The buildings and campuses shared some significant environmental similarities (i.e., both situated in semi-rural areas and unfenced). Middle School X demonstrated a larger number of Hispanics and FRLP (low income) students then Middle School Y. However, with the implementation of the school reorganization plan both schools would experience a significant growth in both categories with particular emphasis on FRLP students. In short, both middle schools had a high concentration of low-income students. Immigrant trends are reflected in the increasing number (percentage) of Hispanic indicating a growing ELL student aged population compounded by students from lower social economic families.

Data and Profiles

This subsection presents the reader with: a) performance profiles of 7th grade and 8th grade students from Middle School X and Middle School Y respectively on state mandated achievements tests, and b) interviewee characteristics of participants from both middle schools. The subsection was presented in two parts: Student Achievement Data, and Interviewee Characteristics.

Student Achievement Data

In March 2003, the school district, in line with requirements of the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB), as amended, and the Public Education Department's (PED) Achievement Assessment provisions, administered a battery of TierraNova CAT (California Achievement Test) and Standard Based Assessment tests to 1278 middle school students (700 7th grade and 578 8th grade). District staff prepared a report, District Assessment Report 2005, of results, which attempted to answer the following questions: 1) What is the academic performance of students in the district? 2) How does academic performance vary among special populations in the district?

Table 4.5 shows test results for 104 Middle School X and 174 Middle School Y 7th grade students (Total = 278). It presents the median scores by content area category for the two middle school buildings. The table shows that Middle School X, with higher percentages of Hispanic and low-income students, scored up to 10 points lower in science than Middle School Y. It is pointed out here that median scores instead of mean scores were used to report test results. Although this is a common statistical treatment of data, it tends to represent gaps between groups

as smaller than what they really are with reference to positively and negatively skewed data sets. The differences in median scores between students at Middle School X and Middle School Y and the volatility of data are also reported. For example, the table shows that Middle School Y students scored up to ten points higher in science and seven points higher in social studies and reading then Middle School X students. In addition, Middle School X scored below the 40th percentile in two subject areas social studies and science.

Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 show test results for 104 Middle School X and 174 Middle School Y 7th grade students (Total = 278) by subgroup, as per, NCLB and Public Education Department guidelines. The two tables display disaggregate scores by content area and by subgroup for Middle School X and Middle School Y respectively. These scores were disaggregated on the basis of Race/Ethnicity and Special Populations for each middle school building. Table 4.6 and Table 4.7 show that students in the three categories of ELL (English Language Learner), FRLP (Free and Reduced Lunch Program), and SPED (Special Education) demonstrated significantly lower scores in each subject area when compared to the general categories of Caucasian and Hispanic. Table 4.6 showed that Middle School X Hispanic students scored significantly lower in each subject area then Caucasian students. Table 4.7 displayed significant differences in the data and showed mixed trends between Caucasian and Hispanic categories with reference to subject areas, that is, Hispanics higher in Social Studies, Caucasians higher in Science, Caucasians higher in Math, Hispanics higher in Language Arts, and Caucasians higher in Reading. Here, on both tables (4.6 and 4.7) SPED students scored significantly lower than students in all other categories including ELLs and FRLPs.

Table 4. 5   2003-2004 7th Grade TerraNova CAT Median Scores by Content Area and Middle School Building

Category	Middle school X	Middle school Y
Social studies	37.5	44.7
Science	33.0	43.3
Math	48.3	52.0
Language arts	54.8	59.7
Reading	43.3	50.3

Note. The NMPED established the 40th percentile as the cut off score for identifying schools that meet state standards.

Scores are given for up to one decimal point because the source reported them as such.

Source. School district achievement report card on district's WEB site.

Table 4. 6   2003-2004 7th Grade TerraNova CAT Median Scores by Subject Are and by

Subgroup for Middle School X

Subject area	Subgroup				
	Caucasian	Hispanic	ELL[a]	FRLP[a]	SPED[a]
Social studies	49.0	35.7	25.0	30.1	19.0
Science	58.0	31.3	9.0	28.5	19.0
Math	59.0	47.7	19.0	41.0	12.0
Language arts	64.7	53.7	25.0	47.0	22.0
Reading	62.0	41.3	19.0	36.0	17.0

Note. The NMPED established the 40th percentile as the cut off score for identifying schools that meet state standards.

Scores are given for up to one decimal point because the source reported them as such.

[a]Acronyms used to denote special populations are: ELL-English language learners, FRLP-Free or Reduced Lunch Program (also used as an indicator of low- income students), and SPED-Special Education.

Source. School district achievement report on district's WEB site.

Table 4. 7   2003-2004 7th Grade TerraNova CAT Median Scores by Subject Area and
Subgroup for Middle School Y

	Subgroup				
Subject area	Caucasian	Hispanic	ELL[a]	FRLP[a]	SPED[a]
Social studies	43.0	45.2	29.0	37.0	15.5
Science	49.0	40.0	17.0	34.8	14.0
Math	54.0	51.5	30.0	43.8	17.3
Language arts	54.5	61.7	32.0	50.0	21.5
Reading	51.0	48.0	26.0	44.1	20.0

Note. The NMPED established the 40th percentile as the cut off score for identifying schools that met state standards.

Scores are given for up to one decimal point because the source reported them as such.

[a]Acronyms used to denote special populations were: ELL-English language learners, FRLP-Free or Reduced Lunch Program (also used as an indicator of low-income students) and SPED-Special Education.

Source. District achievement report card on district WEB site.

There were 165 Middle School X and 188 Middle School Y 8th graders who took the Standards Based Assessment (Total = 353). The results for Language Arts and Math are reported on the following two tables (4.8 and 4.9). Results from 2003-2004 assessments were to be used to establish a baseline for inclusion of science and social studies in the following school year's (2004-2005) assessments. Instead of using actual scores, results were reported as percentages, which placed students in four performance levels, 1) beginning step, 2) nearing proficiency, 3) proficient, or 4) advanced and included % at or above proficiency in the content areas of Language Arts (LA) and Math (M) by subgroup (Race/Ethnic and Special Populations). The percentages represent the number of students from the total enrollment at the two middle school buildings in each performance level.

Tables 4.8 and 4.9 report percentages for 8th grade students from Middle School X and Middle School Y respectively. Percentages for groups of less than 10 (e.g., African American, Asian and English language learners) were not given. The differences between schools include that Middle School X had significantly lower percentages in the overall % At or Above Proficiency in each subgroup except in the subgroup Caucasian in math (both middle schools were at 60%). Percentages for Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRLP) and for the category All at Middle School X were "exactly" the same in each performance level. Probable explanation would be that Middle School X was a Title I Provision 2 School, which means that all students qualify for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. In the % At or Above Proficient category, Caucasians at Middle School X and Middle School Y had the same percentages (60%) except in Language Arts (72%). Generally, Middle School X had higher percentages of students at lower levels (e.g., Beginning and Near proficiency) in each subgroup than did Middle School Y. Here again, it was pointed out that SPED students scored significantly lower than students in all other categories including ELLs and FRLP students. This does not mean, however, that low income is not a significant variable when evaluating student performance and academic achievement.

Table 4. 8   Percent of 2003-2004Middle School X 8th Grade Students in Four Performance Levels for Language Arts and Math by Total Student Enrollment and by Subgroup

Category	Beginning		Near proficiency		Proficient		Advanced		At/Above proficient	
	LA %	M %	LA %	M %	LA %	M %	LA %	M %	LA %	M %
All	24	38	31	24	36	36	2	1	39	38
Caucasian	15	20	25	20	50	55	10	5	60	60
Hispanic	25	42	40	25	34	31	1	2	36	33
FRLP	24	38	37	24	36	36	2	2	39	38
SPED	60	72	30	17	11	09	0	2	11	11

Note. Numbers should be read in terms of percentages (%) of students in each category. Acronyms were used to denote the following: LA-language arts, M-math, FRLP-Free and Reduced Lunch Program, and SPED-Special Education.

Source. District achievement report card on district's WEB site.

Table 4. 9   Percent of 2003=2004 Middle School Y 8th Grade Students in Four Performance Levels for Language Arts and Math by Total Students Enrolled and by Subgroup

Category	Beginning		Near proficiency		Proficient		Advanced		At/Above proficient	
	LA %	M %	LA %	M %	LA %	M %	LA %	M %	LA %	M %
All	14	30	27	19	49	46	9	5	58	51
Caucasian	7	16	20	13	57	58	16	13	72	60
Hispanic	18	36	32	22	44	31	5	1	50	41
FRLP	16	39	32	16	43	36	3	1	52	45
SPED	57	71	21	11	18	9	0	0	21	18

Note. Numbers should be read in terms of percentages (%) of students in each category.

Acronyms were used to denote the following: LA-language arts, M-math, FRLP-Free and Reduced Lunch Program, and SPED-Special Education.

Source. District achievement report card on district's WEB site.

In summary, the subsection on student achievement data showed the 2003-2004 results of the state mandated yearly assessment of student progress for the two middle schools (Middle School X and Middle School Y). The results presented were for 7th grade and 8th grade students. The reason for having two sets of tables was that 7th grade took the TerraNova CAT (California Achievement Test) and sub-tests, and 8th grade took the Standard Based Achievement Tests and subtests. The differences in scores between Hispanic and African American students as compared to Caucasian students (20 points or more for the last three years) was a source of concern for the Board of Education and district administration. It was pointed out as a priority area in the district's plan for improvement of student achievement (refer to A Crisis in Leadership October 3, 2002). This phenomenon was not only reported as a district problem, but one that confronted school districts statewide, especially, those with large numbers of Spanish-speaking students. In addition, the performance of SPED students cannot be understated while these students continue to score significantly lower scores than all other students including ELLs and FRLP students. However, low income continues to be a significant variable when talking about SPED, FRLP, and ELLs achievement scores. Although race and ethnicity are important factors, lower social economic status was seen as an overriding consideration. ELLs and SPED students contribute to the problem but the income variable was considered as most powerful.

As a consequence of 7th grade and 8th grade performance and scores on the tests, Middle School X did not meet "average yearly progress" (AYP), as delineated in the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA), neither in 2004 nor in 2005. Therefore, it was designated a School Improvement I school. Middle School Y met AYP in 2004, however it did not meet AYP in 2005. No designation was given. Incidentally, the school district, also, did not meet AYP for either the 2003-2004 or the 2004-2005 school year. The volatility (e.g., discrepancies in subgroup performances) of data displayed and the dynamic evolution of the research setting (increase in Hispanic and low income students, economic problems, immigration concerns, district turmoil, growing ELL population, etc.) are seen as contributing to the problem. For example, the student mix at the two middle school buildings was viewed as significant in terms of the high percentage of Hispanics along with the large number of students participating in the Free and Reduced Lunch Program. Although language and learning problems contributed to the problem, income continued to be the most powerful indicator of success. Because the identified ELL student count was low, language policy implications were driven by other factors, such as,

language variety and nonstandard varieties as reflected in the degree of linguistic diversity found at the two middle school buildings.

<center>*Interviewee Characteristics*</center>

This subsection presents key demographic characteristics of interview participants (teachers and building leaders) from Middle School X and Middle School Y.

Table 4.10 displays the interviewee characteristics in terms of building, gender, race and ethnicity, years of teaching or experience in public education, and educational unit or subject area. The first column presents the categories listed in the previous sentence. The second column gives the number (n) in each sub category. Column three gives the total number (N) in each category. In addition, column four gives the percentage (%) of the number for each sub category. The fifth column gives the total percentage (%) for each category. The interviewee characteristics displayed were used in the analysis and presentation of findings from the interview process for building leaders and teachers. The table displayed an excellent and representative interviewee group, which provided key categories for the organization and interpretation of data. The excellent characteristics displayed a balance of gender (50 % male and 50% female), a balance of Race (50% Caucasian and 50% Hispanic), a well distributed group in terms of teaching experience, and a good representation of subject areas with 40% from math and science and 15% from language arts.

Table 4. 10   Demographics of Interviewees From Two Middle School Buildings

Category	n	N	%	Total %
Building Participants				
Middle school X	13		65	
Middle school Y	7		35	
Total		20		100
Gender				
Male	10		50	
Female	10		50	
Total		20		100
Race/Ethnicity				
Caucasian	10		50	
Hispanic	10		50	
Total		20		100
Years Teaching				
0-5 years	4		20	
6-12 years	7		35	
13-20 years	2		10	
21 plus years	7		35	
Total		20		100

Table 4.10   *Continued (page 2)*

Category	n	N	%	Total%
Educational unit				
Language arts	3		15	
Math `	4		20	
Science	4		20	
Technology	2		10	
ESL[b]	1		5	
SPED[b]	2		10	
Administrators	4		20	
Total		20		100

[b]Acronyms used are: ESL-English as a second language, SPED-Special Education.

Summary of Research Setting

This section presented a snapshot view of the area in which the school district serving as the case for this extant case study was situated. The three subsections, a) A Crisis in Leadership, b) The Setting with Demographics: State, District and Schools, and c) Data and Profiles All contributed toward providing a snapshot view of the research setting.

For example, the Crisis in Leadership section and the time line of events demonstrated issues of operation and control of the district's schools. With the district in turmoil and the area experiencing significant changes this section was considered a marker in understanding the problem, in terms, of redevelopment effort, economic issues, immigration, changing demographics and what impact these have on the schools. In addition, population profiles were given for State, County, District, and Middle Schools. These profiles included a breakdown by Race-Ethnic and Special Populations, as delineated above. Further, in hopes of capturing the essence of the educational process and taking a candid look at student scores, a series of tables (4.5 through 4.9), which demonstrated student performance on state mandated achievement tests, were included in this section. The tables served to highlight the significance of economic variables and special education consideration when analyzing student performance and academic achievement. The tables showed the scores of 7th grade and 8th grade students from Middle School X and Middle School Y on achievement assessments mandated by the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED). In addition, a profile of interviewee characteristics was given and served to put the findings for leadership and instruction in perspective. The profile of characteristics was used in presenting the results for the multi-item Likert scale, in terms of, providing clear and concise categories for identification and analysis.

Taken together the section and subsections reported important data relevant to the purpose of the case study . The implications for school language policy were reported in terms of leadership with reference to the operation and control of district schools, the unique characteristics of the setting with reference to student make up, particularly, the high percentage of Hispanic and low income student, and student performance on achievement assessments. The interviewee characteristics presented provided another facet for drawing implications for school language policy based on building level analysis. As reported herein, the composition of both the student population and educational personnel at each middle school building were presented as variable in the process of language policy development.

Interviews for the Element of Leadership

This section presents the results of the data collection phase of the case study for the element of leadership. It included the following three subsections: a) Documents: Anecdotal and Other Available Records, b) Interview Questions and Findings for Building Leaders, and c) Summary of Interviews for the Element of Leadership.

Documents: Anecdotal and Other Available Records

Although triangulation was not a central feature of this exploratory design, the study was framed using mixed methods (qualitative as the main theme) with an understanding of the importance of the use of multi source information and multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2002). The review of anecdotal and available records was conducted in order to build background knowledge for the interview of building leaders and to put the site in perspective. On each site visit, the researcher conducted a cursory observation of anecdotal and other available records. These documents and records were evaluated on the basis of their accuracy, practicality, and value. The results were used to inform data collection and interview procedures (refer to Interview Protocol Chapter 3) and to refine questions used during interviews. The following documents were reviewed with particular emphasis on conducting the interview process for the element of leadership: faculty and students handbooks, school improvement plans, organizational structure of school and building, documents that addressed school and student diversity, copies of directives from Superintendent and central office staff, and building principals.

Interview Questions and Findings for Building Leaders

In this section, 10 interview questions taken from the research protocol (refer to Research Protocol in Chapter 3) for the element of leadership and findings are presented below. The purpose for restating interview questions was: a) for ease of reader reference, and b) for added clarity. Findings were generated and abstracted from written transcripts of taped interviews with building leaders (principals and assistant principals) (refer to Appendix A).

Question 1. What significant changes have occurred in the city and the county over the last 5 years that may have contributed to an increase in linguistic and cultural diversity among students and faculty in the building?

There was consensus among the four administrators concerning the shift in the demographic profiles of the city and the county. For example, both the city and county had

experienced an increase in their Hispanic population and a decrease in the Caucasian and Black population. City, county, and state population profiles mirrored each other in that the majority (i.e., over 50 %) of the population was Hispanic. Another change was the board-approved reorganization of the district's schools, which was to be implemented in the following school year 2004-2005. The reorganization process caused chaos among the community, administrators, teachers and parents in the district, but particularly among stakeholders at each of the schools designated for closure (refer to Crisis of Leadership above).

There was concern that some schools could experience a marked increase in low income and Hispanic students. It was reported that at Middle School X the poverty level would probably rise from 87 % to 98 % and the Hispanic population would increase from 85 %-90 %. Likewise, there would be an increase in both populations at Middle School Y, low-income from 35 % to 71% and Hispanic from 27 % to 62 %. Some respondents believed, because of their closeness to Mexico and an increase in the immigrant population, provisions had to be made to meet the particular needs generated by this movement. One respondent reported that not only had the school and service community increased its awareness of cultural and language differences, but most significantly, had begun to do something about it. It was noted that the linguistic challenges faced by students and faculty not only included respecting home culture and native language, but the more serious challenge to learn English. More importantly, one interviewee felt the large percentage of Hispanic students (e.g., 80 %-95 %) at his building had a significant influence on the degree of diversity found in the building. The possibility of an inverse effect was noted (i.e., more of any one group [Hispanics in this case] could lead to less diversity).

In summary, all four administrators interviewed pointed to changes in demography, cultural makeup of the district's service community, and reorganization of the district's schools as significant changes. Respondents reported that the increase of low income and Hispanic students at their respective buildings was significant enough to warrant attention. Respondents felt that the community's awareness of cultural diversity and parent participation was improving and would serve to increase the buildings capacity in meeting any additional student needs resulting from the changes implemented by the district.

Question 2. How will reconfiguration of the middle schools into a 6-8 grade configuration affect the building's capacity to meet the needs of linguistic and cultural diversity among students?

School leaders reported that each building already had the necessary capacities to provide appropriate educational services for maintaining linguistic and cultural diversity in their building. However, additional portable classrooms at each middle school campus would help offset the need for additional classroom space. A main concern reported by three out of the four respondents was the need to educate parents on transitional programs (for students moving from 6th to 7th and those moving from 8th to high school). It was reported as a major factor that could help the school succeed. The language barrier and parents comfort level were also viewed as areas of concern. One of the schools hired an extra bilingual receptionist to accommodate for this factor. It was felt that regardless of the language if parents didn't understand what was done at the front office they would feel access to the school restricted. As a result, their comfort level would be lowered. Another area of concern reported was parent involvement and student behavior. It was noted that students with the most problems were from parents who were least involved.

The number of bilingual teachers at each building, particularly, those with appropriate training in bilingual/ESL/TESOL methods was reported as a human capacity concern in terms of staff needs to meet the projected increase in linguistically diverse students. Cultural knowledge and awareness were key factors in this area, which had an effect on how parents and students perceived teachers. Spanish was recognized as the "community language" of most linguistically diverse students and their parents. One respondent felt that middle schools were "withdrawing" from recognizing students' language differences, primarily because tests, materials, and instructions are in English and they felt students had to learn that. With reference to monolingual teachers, it was pointed out that most spoke English and they expected to be spoken to in English and demanded high levels of English competencies. As a result, language had become an important concern of the school.

In summary, it was generally reported that with the grade reconfiguration there would be an increase in the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students. School leaders were in agreement that building capacities were already in place to meet added numbers and needs – except for additional teachers and more space. Respondents reported additional human capacity needs as including parent transitional programs, teacher training, and student language needs.

Question 3. What are your perceptions of the rich cultural and linguistic diversity among the students at your school and in the community it serves? Please describe these perceptions at some length?

This question was designed with the purpose of obtaining a clear picture of building leader's perception concerning cultural and linguistic diversity in general and diversity in their building in particular. Parent involvement was reported as vital to the effective operation of the school and for student success. The researcher observed that respondents demonstrated a willingness to work with parents of linguistically diverse students. Each respondent valued the contributions of stakeholders whom they considered an important part of the diverse community served by the school. One respondent reported that many times parents sent their kids to school and expected educators to give them everything. Another concern reported was that if reciprocity prevailed between educational personnel and parents from different cultural groups, their school program would be stronger.

Building leaders reported a common concern that working with the community and reaching out to ask for contributions (economic) and participation was important. Community support was vital to the success of the school. Each of the four respondents believed that it was necessary for schools to make an effort to promote the cultural and linguistic diversity already in the school. One reported that the cultural background and the language of their students should be strengthened, although, it was not something her school particularly worked on.

In summary, parent and community participation in the educational process of the school was reported as being important. A main concern was that parent and teacher cooperation needed to be strengthened. Working with the community with reference to resources and issue resolution was a necessary process for administrators, principally, when it came to working with parents of linguistically diverse students.

Question 4. The students reflect considerable cultural and linguistic diversity at your school. What do you believe are the critical factors at work with this diversity that will ensure students achieve success in the school program?

This question was designed with the purpose of providing some building level parameters on how leaders perceived cultural and linguistic diversity with reference to student success. One respondent reported that once teachers took responsibility for all students, in terms of, "these are my kids" they would begin to recognize student needs, wants of parents, and student

background. It was felt that the relationship engendered became the most important factor in ensuring that all students experienced success in accomplishing stated curricular and teacher goals. Another respondent pointed at teacher awareness and sensitivity of the cultural and historical experiences of the student. However, it was reported that the importance of acquiring English was a vital factor, given the growing importance of English on the global market and on the World Wide Web.

It was also reported that the state's decision to discontinue the use of timed tests was something that would be of some benefit to linguistically diverse students. It was generally recognized that students whatever language they spoke read and computed math problems at varying speeds. One respondent felt the essence of program success for linguistically diverse students was content knowledge and not reaction time, although reaction time was important in some situations. This was linked to a cultural difference.

Another interviewee emphasized the need to recognize and celebrate racial, cultural, and ethnic differences. He encouraged or invited participation of students, faculty, and staff in all facets of community and school life. Generally, building leaders expressed concern about the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements, with reference to implementation, funds for monitoring, and assessment. It was felt that a good thing was the disaggregating of data, which allowed for more individualized instructional and educational planning. One leader thought No Child Left Behind affected teachers to the point where they had to buy in, in terms of, what the teachers planned to do for the students, including special population students. Further, teachers would be under more pressure where before it was the school. This would affect successful implementation of new programs, student learning, and the need for improved language skills.

In summary, although only four building leaders were interviewed comments obtained showed significant differences. The critical factors reported were caring teachers, recognizing students' diversity, teacher-student relationship, curricular adaptations, and testing accommodations. Active participation of stakeholders in community and school activities was seen as important to student success. Also, the impact of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) on teachers and English language learners was improved English language skills. Consequently, ESL students could feel greater pressure to learn English, and teachers would be held more accountable for student performance.

Question 5. What are the community and parent perceptions of cultural and linguistic diversity in the building's student population? Do you feel that parents and community care about these factors?

There was some concern that parents of linguistically diverse students did not feel strongly enough about their culture. It was felt that only a small percentage of parents and members of the language community worked to preserve Mexican cultural and Mexican family values. Conversely, another building leader reported that parents cared, but that their perceptions were focused on graduation and doing well in programs provided by the school. Respondents believed that the community - both language groups felt that bilingualism and culture were important factors in doing well in school. One respondent reported that it was the parents and community members whose children had more formal education who expressed their concerns and pushed for their children's education. Similarly, parents of students who started their formal education in their home country wanted their children to continue and pushed for that.

In summary, building leaders' perceptions differed with reference to the amount of community and parental concern about cultural and linguistic diversity. There was some concern about the role that parents of linguistically diverse students play in the on going operation of the school. Students do generally reflect the linguistic and cultural diversity of the school's community.

Question 6. Do you feel that federal and state level program requirements, that the school must meet, help or hinder, the success of linguistically diverse learners?

This question had the purpose of probing building leaders perceptions of local, state, and federal relationships in education. It was reported that the way building leaders interpreted state statutes and federal law to their faculty, staff, and students was key to successful implementation. One interviewee thought that state and federal policy directives hindered linguistically diverse students, not so much in their focus, but in the time and money spent on making new regulations work. Another respondent pointed to how assessment requirements and teacher accountability took into account culture. It was reported that changes in policy at the state and national level changed some of the dynamics at the district. The state, more than the federal government, provided the "right" leadership and made things work.

One building leader with 43 years experience in public education believed that government was responsive to the needs of linguistically diverse students. Nonetheless, he had

some serious reservations about No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements. One was that by 2013-2014 every child in each district at all grade levels had to read and speak English at grade level and on working math at grade level. He stated, "nobody bats 1000," and this was going to put pressure on students, especially ESL students, to learn English. Further, there would be unintended consequences on the student and on the teacher for not teaching. Alternatively, this interviewee thought pressure should be placed on students and parents for the student not learning. His criticism was that NCLB took the grade level concept and confused that with absolute progress. In short, state and federal requirements should leave room for individual diversity. The problem was when students were asked to achieve. We inadvertently placed our standards of achievement on them and assessed them accordingly.

In summary, building leaders' perceptions varied from criticizing state and federal agencies for inadequate funding to questioning the plausibility of No Child Left Behind, particularly, as it impacted on English language learners (ELLs). Respondents reported a concern that linguistically diverse students were hindered by government policy and regulations. However, building leaders maintained that faculty efforts were instrumental in motivating student, parent, and community participation.

Question 7. How do linguistically diverse students fit into the general scheme of assessment, instruction, and non-curricular activities in your school?

Respondents were candid in their responses and emphasized the role of parents. One interviewee believed that students were left behind, but that was not the fault of the school system. He placed blame on the parents for giving up too easily and not pushing their children enough. This leader felt students wanted to participate more fully, but needed motivation from parents and teachers. There was a concern that schools did try to get their students involved. One interviewee pointed out that at the elementary there was more parent involvement, but as they progressed into secondary students didn't want parents around. There was concern that parents did not participate enough in the education of their children. Concern was expressed that building leaders and faculty didn't push enough to get more parent and community involvement. All in all, building leaders felt the doors were open and that parents of linguistically diverse students were invited to participate in planning instruction and assessment, but most of the time they don't come to the school.

It was reported that students and parents do well on assessment participation, primarily because central office has some good people who try to keep everyone informed. This was especially true where accommodations had to made for special populations, which included ELLs. This interviewee believed teachers pushed students to get everything done no matter if they were from out of the country or out of state. He knew teachers at his building pushed all students, regardless of linguistic experiences, to do non-curricular activities and to fit in.

In summary, building leaders differed on who was responsible for increasing stakeholder participation, especially those from linguistically diverse communities. Two respondents strongly felt parents should assume more of a role in encouraging their children to participate in all school activities. Another respondent reported the importance of teachers in helping motivate students and parents to become more involved.

Question 8. What role does the building administrator play in planning, developing, and implementing instructional guidelines for linguistically diverse students?

Question 8 was posed in order to identify and analyze the central role the principal played in providing leadership for the school's organizational and instructional processes. Respondents reported agreement that the principal had a very important role as the hub of contact for the building. One building leader believed if the principal was behind a proposal it was going to fly. One respondent reported that the principal along with the faculty and staff assumed more responsibility for working with students on values. It was reported that school had become more of a socializing agent, whereas, in the past parents had done more in the home.

One respondent felt the building principal served as the liaison with the administration or "higher ups" at central office. The principal in turn informed educational personnel in the building on what needed to be done as far as instruction, curriculum, testing, assessment, and other matters of importance. Another interviewee believed the central role of the principal was as facilitator, which required the building leader to spend a good amount of time with educational personnel and students. It was reported that if teachers were provided enough information, they made the right decisions, because it was their fiber as teachers. As facilitator, the principal worked to coalesce educational personnel as a group and then served as a catalyst. As one respondent reported it was the building principal's role to facilitate, monitor, and support.

Some reported that it was the assistant principal who did most of the discipline. However, the assistant principal did some planning, developing instruction, and implementing policy with

certified teachers. For example, one respondent worked with the ESL director at central office and with teachers in the building on matters concerning limited English proficient students mostly non-English speakers (NES). This building leader sat in on departmental meetings and worked with teachers on vertical (i.e., one grade to the next) and building (i. e., one subject to the next) alignments. She worked closely with departmental chairs. After all was done the building leaders oversaw the work done in the building and worked closely with central office in acquiring resources.

In summary, the technical and administrative role leaders played at each building was a very important one. Some of the descriptions included serving as a hub, socializing agent, liaison, facilitator, monitor, supporter, organizer and overseer. The principal and assistant principals worked closely with faculty/staff.

Question 9. What would it require to get building stakeholders (ESL and core content teachers, parents, and community members) regularly involved when planning, and developing instructional practices for linguistically diverse students?

It was reported that schools needed to be structured to include a wider variety of input on instructional matters. A suggestion made by one building leader was the forming of groups, much like school improvement teams, who meet on a regular basis and included parents, community members, teachers and administrators. It was important to have dialogue on how to improve instruction or learning in the classroom. He felt that parents and the community needed to be involved because it was their children's education, which was at stake. Another interviewee thought the district was doing a good job and there was more involvement then in the past.

There was some concern that the turn over in superintendents hadn't helped because the consistency in leadership was not there. This caused a situation where the community wanted to go in one direction, and leadership wasn't strong enough to provide the necessary vision for the benefit of every student and for the good of the community. This respondent thought if they had a superintendent for 10 to 12 years it would make a real difference. He felt the district's central office staff worked in the best interests of the students and they did the best they could for culturally and linguistically diverse students, but pointed out that the Superintendent was a vital part of it.

One principal thought No Child Left Behind (NCLB) improved involvement particularly at the middle school level. At middle school, teachers developed a secondary philosophy, which

was that they no longer taught students; they taught subject areas. "They teach to a defense reaction". He believed NCLB placed outside pressure on teachers to start thinking of special population students as their students and not think of them as belonging to the ESL or special education department. It was felt if teachers took ownership of all their students, this would improve students' chances for success, especially when the district's full inclusion policy was considered. Stakeholders saw the residual effect of this ownership produced more involvement. For example, teachers requested assistance from central office, increased parental involvement, and community participation.

Another building leader voiced the need for mechanisms that would make it convenient for stakeholders to get together. She stated the problem was that schools only got a small percentage of participation from stakeholders, primarily because stakeholders felt they would be responsible for anything that happened. It was suggested that educational personnel do some pavement pounding and door knocking. If parents, community members, and business owners were made to feel comfortable, they would come to the school and share their ideas. Another idea presented was hiring a community liaison person who knew the community.

In summary, building leaders were optimistic about the possibilities of getting more stakeholders involved. Their approaches were varied, which included forming groups to work with the school, making it convenient, follow up on the residual effects of No Child Left Behind, pavement pounding and door knocking, and hiring a liaison person. All comments voiced appeared to benefit linguistically diverse students.

Question 10. What strengths do your faculty and staff members have in organizing and designing instruction for linguistically diverse students?

One building leader believed the school was their strength. It gave faculty and staff support in dealing with students with language differences or language problems. In addition, a strength the faculty had was their volition and cooperation in attending in-service training designed to inform educational personnel on the needs of linguistic diverse students. Another interviewee felt conferences attended helped strengthen instruction. It gave teachers a chance to know what was done around the country and what testing companies were doing. This knowledge was their strength. He expressed the observation that faculty in the building had an ability to address the needs of different students in different classrooms in different ways. One

respondent reported the use of vertical articulation kept faculty on the same page and provided a source of strength for language instruction.

Another interviewee felt faculty and staff had the sensitivity to know which students didn't speak English or were limited in their English abilities. He voiced the observation that it did not mean they were doing anything about it or that they were aware of non-standard varieties. That is, his teachers expected English language learners or English as a second language teachers to do something about the problem. Teachers hadn't taken ownership of linguistically diverse students in their classroom. He felt sensitivity to a problem to be a strength, but it did not mean teachers accepted the language problem as their problem. However, it was reported that if a student was a native English speaker and couldn't speak English, they took ownership of that. This leader commented that faculty believed the reason students weren't learning was because they didn't speak English. He further stated the reason teachers were hired was to teach students English. So, if students aren't learning English, how should a principal respond? He thought the school system hadn't gotten that far yet.

Summary of Interviews for the Element of Leadership

In summary, this section presented the findings of interviews with four (4) building leaders at two middle school buildings (refer to Table 4.10, Interviewee Characteristics). It provided the responses to ten (10) questions included on the interview protocol used for data collection. Concerns reported included the role of the school, the importance of in-service and attending conferences, taking ownership, sensitivity, teacher's ability to adapt to different situations, vertical articulation, and school system accountability for the teaching of English.

School leaders interviewed felt the local school community was in the midst of a cultural evolution. The economy, declining student population, demographic changes, immigrant documented and non documented trends, all pointed to an evolving dynamic educational context. The leaders reported an increase in the need for second language instruction, increases in poverty, need to increase parent involvement, and the need for additional resources. They reported that the faculty in each middle school building had the sensitivities need to work with linguistic diversity, but lacked adequate resources. Leaders shared a consensus that English was the path to school success and that NCLB was competing with the promotion of linguistic diversity in the school. NCLB was seen as a source of added pressure for teachers to teach English and for students to learn English. For example, one leader reported the need for all

teachers to accept ELLs as their students and the teaching of English as part of their job responsibility. It was reported that the high percentage of low-income students at the two middle schools was significant enough to warrant attention. Although not all Hispanics need second language services or are all low-income, these students do require special services as ELLs.

The role of building leaders played in providing leadership at both the policy development stage and the implementation stage was reported. The dynamic evolution of the research setting suggested that the building leaders interviewed were confident in their ability and skills in meeting the challenges. However, few substantive strategies were voiced, which indicated that they were still in the starting blocks when cultural evolutionary changes were concerned. It was reported that many of these limitations were a result of instability in the office of the Superintendence. In the end, the building leaders were trying to rebuild their schools and stakeholder support after school closure and realignment, in hopes of doing better on NCLB requirements.

Interviews for the Element of Instruction

This section presents the results from the data collection phase with reference to the element of instruction. It was organized into the following two subsections, a) Documents: Anecdotal and available, b) Teacher interview questions and findings for instruction, and c) Summary of Interviews for the Element of Instruction.

Documents: Anecdotal and Other Available Records

Although triangulation was not a central feature of this exploratory design, the study was framed using mixed methods (qualitative as the main theme) with the use of multi source of information and multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2002). The review of anecdotal and available records was conducted in order to build background knowledge for the interview of teachers. The results were used to inform data collection and interview procedures (refer to Interview Protocol Chapter 3) and to refine interview questions for the element of instruction. The following documents were reviewed with particular reference to background knowledge for the element of instruction: textbooks and other curricular materials, course outlines and syllabi, manuals and copies of content standards and benchmarks, other student performance criteria, federal, state, and district achievement reports, and curriculum and instructional program guides.

Interview Questions and Findings for Teachers

In this section, ten (10) interview questions for the element of instruction, taken from the research protocol (refer to Research Protocol in Chapter 3), and findings for each question are presented. The purpose for restating the interview questions was: a) for ease of reader reference, and b) for added clarity. Findings were generated and abstracted from written transcripts of taped interviews with teachers (refer to Appendix A).

.   Question 1. How will reconfiguration of the middle schools into a 6-8 grade configuration affect the building's capacity to meet the needs of linguistic and cultural diversity among students?

The teachers' responses to this question were varied and were heavily influenced by the district reorganization approved for the 2004-2005 school year. Linguistic and cultural diversity were important concerns. Some stated that there would be a need for increased numbers of teachers who were bilingual. Related was the fact that the number of ELL teachers available was unknown. Since the sixth grade was to be added to the building, there were fears expressed that these new teachers would not be bilingual and may not be familiar with teaching methods designed for ELLs. Importantly, the teachers hoped that the Spanish-Language Arts program would be retained and possibly expanded. It was emphasized that the Special Education teachers were limited in the number of students that they could serve. By increasing the enrollment at the middle schools, the impact on special educational services could be compromised.

Respondents were concerned about the sixth grade adding 200 students to the middle schools as a result of grade reconfiguration (e.g. to a 6-8 grade configuration). Space and configuration of the school organization were stated as challenges in terms of the ages of the buildings, which had been built for middle school departmental use. It was anticipated that the sixth grade would be in a self-contained structure, and it was unclear to these teachers how the existing classrooms would be utilized. One stated that the plan to put the sixth graders into mobile units would segregate students. In contrast, another stated that sixth graders needed considerable supervision and would not be ready for the responsibilities of changing teachers seven times per day as would be the case with a departmental structure.

In summary, when asked about their ability to meet the needs of linguistic and culturally diverse students populations these teachers acknowledged challenges from an increased student population, the need for bilingual teachers, the need for ELL competent teachers, and the

possible modification in the physical facility to accommodate both the increased population and special needs of self-contained sixth grade classes.

Question 2. What limitations and problems do you observe occurring in your classes when linguistically diverse students attempt to study and learn your subject? In your opinion, what difficulties constitute language problems? To whom would you refer a pupil with a language problem?

Question 2 was represented by three separate probes, which focused on limitations and problems, language problems, and referrals. The researcher reports below a summation of the teachers' responses to the three questions separately.

Subpart 1 of question 2. What limitations and problems do you observe occurring in your classes when linguistically diverse students attempt to study and learn your subject?

In the setting of the academic classrooms, the limitations and problems reported by the teachers were pretty uniform. If students are limited in their English language abilities, communication was compromised. When this occurred ELL students may become silent, do not ask questions, and complete little work. Teachers without any Spanish language capabilities were also compromised in their ability to teach. Immediately, ELL students fall behind in their work. In some cases, their native English-speaking counter parts may tease ELL students. Now, the student's English language limitations were not viewed as student disabilities. They were explained as disadvantages or as obstacles, which could be overcome. This perception was true from both the regular and special education teachers' points of view.

Subpart 2 of question 2. In your opinion, what difficulties constitute language problems?

Here the teachers spoke knowledgeably and in some depth about how limitations played out into specific language issues. A main concern reported was that too many students do not have language ability for 7th and 8th grade academic performance. This was true of spoken English and of print English in the mode of reading. Where Spanish language equivalent materials were available, there was still a need to provide instruction for Spanish speakers. Spoken English was the immediate concern in the classroom; however, the long-term problem was with reading English language textbooks.

Some of these teachers were bilingual and felt that they were successful in teaching students bilingually, however, the district emphasized a fairly rapid learning of English which conflicted with the bilingual approach to teaching subject matter information. English language

was said to be hard to learn. Vocabulary was an issue, as well as, homophones, homographs, and multiple meaning of words. There was the problem for some teachers that spoke Spanish, and that is, the formal versus the social register. Some Spanish-speaking parents complained when bilingual teachers used the formal register in Spanish while other Spanish-speaking parents complained when bilingual teachers used the social, or informal register. In the area of science, English language concepts may be necessary. Spanish language equivalents for these concepts were not readily available. Even then, Spanish equivalent terminology may not be viewed as accurately representing the science concept.

Subpart 3 of question 2. To whom would you refer a pupil with a language problem?

Here the teachers did not immediately speak of referrals for ELL students. Many spoke first of the interventions they used. Collectively, they spoke of the availability of Spanish language translations from Internet sources, however, if they are not planned in advance, it was very hard to get them and use them on the spot in the classroom within a single period. The Spanish Language Arts Program was cited as a useful part of the curriculum. When confronted with linguistic differences, some of the teachers spoke of using a hands-on, concrete approach with students. One special education teacher explained the use of English sight word and sight phrase instruction. An English-Language Arts teacher reviewed comprehensively, vocabulary instruction, homophone and homograph instruction, oral language development, graphic organizers, cooperative learning, accelerated reader, journalizing, panel discussions, and debates as a package of instructional tools. Also, a prevalent use of peer tutors, and use of students as translators and elaborators was mentioned. All of the respondents used referral paths for referring ELL students, and these included the Family Center program, the bilingual teacher, the ESL teacher, the middle school M newcomers program for immigrants, special education teachers, the counselor, the social worker, and the tutoring program.

This was a robust part of the interview schedule and produced significant insight, however, the researcher did not want to over generalize. While the teachers were informative in their perceptions of language problems and the need for language interventions, there were substantial differences in perceptions about the nature and magnitude of the needed interventions. Math teachers and technology teachers felt their subject areas, being more concrete, enabled them to better cope with language differences. Differences among teachers in terms of their backgrounds, second language competence, teaching experience, and abilities to

deliver language based instruction in subject areas also accounted for differences among the interview group. Special education teachers stated that they contributed to language learning; however, they conformed to the requirements of the linguistically diverse and emotionally disturbed missions.

The researchers observations from this section of the interview schedule were twofold. First, there was significant special programming available in these two middle schools for ELL students, however, some aspects of it possibly were not cohesive and this could very well be due to the nature of the specializations involved. These helping programs appeared to be well managed, supervised, and staffed with competent teachers, however, a common theme or mission was not apparent. Also, the dual approaches of ESL and bilingual presented some conflicting elements. Second, these teachers appeared to be dedicated professionals who possibly were in need of additional staff development and training. This was not reported in a critical sense, rather their dedication reflected professionals open to instructional and reading methods.

Question 3. What additional support programs do you believe need to be linked to your classroom to further the success of linguistically diverse students?

This question was designed to identify educational services and to quiz teachers on their knowledge of programs and resources for linguistic diversity within a whole school context. It was felt that the provision of educational services to linguistically diverse students required teachers to exploit resources, not only in their buildings but, also, in the district and community. The mentoring program had a positive impact on student performance and focused on the need for tutoring and after school activities. A family center after school program was available to students and parents at one school. There was agreement that the bilingual and dual language programs were doing a good job. However, it was felt that, in addition to these programs, a program (e.g., non-curricular activities) that addressed the specific language needs of all students, regardless of the language spoken, was needed.

Similarly, it was reported that in- service training should focus on ways to make students comfortable and feel they had that extra support to be successful in their educational endeavors. Some alternatives reported included use associates in their classroom, and the availability of a full time resource teacher, bilingually endorsed, to help with ESL students. Another suggestion given was the use of a Spanish-speaking teacher in each building who was knowledgeable about languages, registers, and dialectical differences. It was pointed out that a licensed professional

should be assigned to every building much like a bilingual diagnostician, similar to the services provided by the special education department. Also reported was the need for resources and training in the creative use of language based instructional technology and the need to utilize computers in the classroom. A plethora of reading programs (e.g., Accelerated Reader, Success For All, Academy of Reading, etc.) were in use at each school. Respondents believed they needed to come up with another program that would help them meet the needs of linguistically diverse students.

In summary, the major concern reported was the need for resources and educational services that would ease teacher responsibility for linguistically diverse students, particularly, non-English speakers. Some of the educational services included, but were not limited to peer tutoring, after school centers (multi-functional services), language mentors, in house teacher resources, continuing education for teachers, more effective ESL-bilingual program types, and more importantly, effective reading approaches and consolidated programs.

Question 4. Does language play a part in your instruction? If so, which are the linguistic elements you pay attention to while planning and developing instruction?

This particular question was included in the research protocol to place emphasis on the association between language and instructional planning with a focus on discernable linguistic elements. It is presented in two separate probes focusing on the role language plays in development instruction and on linguistic elements reported in that process. Each is presented separately to give the reader a clearer view of the question.

Subpart 1 of question 4. Does language play a part in your instruction?

It was reported that language was often taken for granted when instruction was planned and delivered in the classroom, and that both first and second language learners required that instruction be delivered in a language they could understand. The respondents reported unanimously (16 out of 16) that language did play a role in their instruction. Further, vocabulary, pronunciation, and communication skills seemed to be mainstays in the regular English and ESL classrooms. The ESL teacher at one middle school felt that language was vital in classrooms where you had students from Mexico and other Latin American countries, principally, because of dialectical differences. Another respondent believed language was the foundation leading to higher thinking and was the basis of critical thinking. Another felt that it was a platform that prepared students for growth.

It was generally believed that the way instruction is delivered in the classroom was importantly influenced by language choice and language use. It was felt that because of its numerical qualities math was often times not influenced by language, however the need to understand the language of instruction was seen as important when problems were presented as statements. It was also suggested that visualizing and verbalizing was an effective method. Science teachers felt that language played a part in their instruction because of the amount of new vocabulary the students are exposed to. However, respondents reported that they paid particular attention to the languages spoken by their students when planning instruction.

Subpart 2 of question 4. If so, which are the linguistic elements you pay attention to while planning and developing instruction?

The concept of linguistic elements was considered an abstraction in context of the classroom. It was reported that linguistic elements were considered in their planning, but mainly due to the fact that students spoke a language other then English. Of course, respondents that didn't speak Spanish did not focus much on language differences or specific linguistic elements of either language. However, most felt they provided for the needs of limited English speakers. Some stated that in preparing and presenting any lesson, linguistic elements came into play. It was mentioned that some students had a learning disability or a comprehension problem and needed materials presented in a number of different ways, which required specific planning. Respondents in the special education department believed linguistic elements associated with speech were given attention in the development of instruction. English department interviewees stated that language and linguistic elements were part of their stock in trade. Their planning and development of instruction focused on using language and identifying the various linguistic elements (e.g., prefixes, roots, word origin, parts of speech, etc.).

In summary, respondents believed that language was an important variable in providing instruction to their students, particularly, to linguistically diverse students. Its principal importance was in the presentation of concepts and in developing these concepts well enough for the students to understand the material covered in class.

Question 5. In order to make instructional decisions, what processes do you follow in analyzing student characteristics and learning behaviors? Are the processes the same for making decisions for linguistically diverse students?

Two separate probes, which focused on characteristics and behaviors in general, and those of linguistically diverse students represented question 5 in particular. The researcher reported a summation of the teachers' responses to the two questions separately.

Subpart 1 of question 5. In order to make instructional decisions, what processes do you follow in analyzing student characteristics and learning behaviors?

Respondents initially had difficulty relating to the question. Most agreed the primary learning characteristics they looked for were whether students were oral, visual, auditory, or kinesthetic learners. One used Gardner's multiple intelligences in diagnosing students in order to help them succeed. Another reported using Gardner as a process in lesson planning, because she felt that kids had a lot of strength that contributed socially and intellectually. In the area of math, teachers looked at whether students could do the work, but did not follow any certain process other than working one-on-one. Special education respondents were in agreement that characteristics and behaviors were spelled out on the Instructional Evaluation Plan (IEP) with individual diagnosis made at the beginning of the year. Processes followed included observing students in class to figure out learning traits and characteristics, looking at learning behaviors such as writing ability, reading levels to determine "in what direction they are going" in their learning, and focusing on classroom management, such as, which students are in class and who had trouble comprehending.

One respondent was concerned that he did not understand why he was assigned students with the lowest reading level (2nd and 3rd grade) and those at the lowest quartile of the Criterion Referenced Test (CRT). Another stated that her process was basically to get to know students, then, to know their learning styles. In some cases (e.g. in technology) "flexibility" was used as a process for addressing the students learning characteristics and as a way of setting expectations high enough for students to feel challenged.

Subpart 2 of question 5. Are the processes the same for making decisions for linguistically diverse students?

In general, respondents believed the processes were the same for linguistically diverse students. However, emphasis was placed on linguistically diverse students' skill level and reading level. For special education students, teachers were given a list of linguistically diverse students' problem areas and a list of processes to follow. If it was believed they had an influence of a language other then English in the home, then they were referred to the ESL component for

further testing and evaluation. It was noted that non-Spanish-speaking teachers "worried" about whether the students could understand them and what kind of learners they were. One interviewee didn't think of linguistically diverse students, as such, and did not follow any specific process other than knowing she would have to approach instruction in different ways. The ESL interviewee looked at length of residency, previous formal education ("academically sound"), and exposure to English. Conversely, one interviewee stated she did not like to identify ESL learner characteristics because she did not want to "call attention" to students.

In summary, interviewees used an array of processes to analyze student characteristics and behaviors. Some of these included learning styles, Gardner's multiple intelligences, individual learning styles, student abilities, and making classroom observations. Most interviewees believed the processes used were the same for linguistically diverse students. However, not all respondents felt they had to identify or address linguistically diverse student needs differently.

Question 6. What provisions do you make in your instructional planning to ensure that linguistically diverse students develop conceptual understanding of the content being covered in class?

In the majority of cases teachers attempted to recognize students' needs and adjusted their instruction accordingly. Classroom considerations included using oral approaches in place of textbooks, overheads, and other visuals. In this way, language wasn't seen as being much of a problem because students could identify or visualize the concepts presented. One stated that he broke the concepts down to key concepts, and another used native language support, in this case Spanish, in order to speak with the students and make sure they understood enough of the material to complete the assignment. Some of the Spanish speaking interviewees used both languages so students could get the content presented in class "in a language they could understand." In the area of technology, some worked individually with students, encouraged asking and answering questions, and others felt it was important to go over things like highlighting and selecting to make sure everybody had the basics. Getting them the help when they needed it was the important thing. Special education teachers felt the first thing you had to do was to find out if the young person was linguistically diverse and to be on the same page as the teacher. If it was a language barrier then their job was to bring in someone who helped the

students and the teacher. Here effective language support helped to internalize information and to comprehend it well enough to build on it.

Respondents reported working one-on-one, focused on individual students having difficulty with the language, or trouble with the concepts. In some cases, peer tutors were used, focus was placed on learning style, and assessments were used to determine learning style. Others preferred to try different ways to explain things, or letting students explain the material to other students at their own level. It was reported that using different approaches and methods during the year helped with the curriculum and course content. In the area of science, teachers used visuals in both languages, Spanish and English. Also, using videos made the concepts easier to understand. Science respondents emphasized building a language base in English by using vocabulary builders and comprehension strategies. Further, the use of questions periodically to find out if they were following along with what was going on in class was suggested. In some cases, the increased use of new technology in the classroom was seen as a remedy.

In summary, interviewees used an array of methods and adaptation in their delivery of instruction to linguistically diverse students. These included conceptualization, native language support, individualizing instruction, visuals, focus on vocabulary, oral development, and silent reading. However, all in all, very little evidence was found which pointed toward serious consideration of students' linguistic diversity in instructional planning.

Question 7. Have you collaborated with other educators in the building to modify assessment and instruction for linguistically diverse students?

This question was designed with the purpose of refocusing the study from instruction and planning to elements of "organization for instruction at each building." It was hoped that a clear pattern of cooperation and professional community would begin to emerge. Focus was placed on identifying teachers' participation in instructional support groups and/or other organizational entities charged with the responsibility of improving instruction. Generally, teachers at each building collaborated with each other to come up with ideas on how to help linguistically diverse students succeed. It was felt that teachers needed to use each other as resources. Simply, some believed in using whatever resources were available. One respondent emphatically believed, "gone is the day when you can just take out the teacher guide and teach".

Some felt that, in lieu of organized instructional groups, communication was key to interdepartmental cooperation. It was reported that at departmental meeting, teachers

brainstormed ideas on how to help high-risk students, not just linguistically diverse students. In some cases, it was felt staff worked well together and did a good job in coalescing as a group. Although the TEAM approach was good at the middle level, it had its limits.

Teachers worked well with ESL resources and used them to help linguistically diverse students. The ESL teacher at the middle level coordinated language services and worked with the ESL office at central administration. A main concern expressed was that although teachers talked with other faculty, they did not sit down as a group to discuss concerns relating to the needs of linguistically diverse students nor did they cross departmental-lines. Some teachers collaborated and gave each other ideas, looked at problems, determined who needed what, how resources were to be obtained to deal with certain situations, and pointed teachers having problems with their students' needs to the counselor, the ESL staff, etc. The School Advisory Committee, an at large group, provided assistance and planning for the whole school, but necessarily on issues relating to linguistically diverse students. Here bilingual teachers, not only served as the unofficial bilingual resource teacher in the building, but also provided most of the language assistance for ESL students. In most cases, teachers in each building served as resources to each other. For a new teacher everything was done to make life easier and classes go smoother. For example, if a particular teacher was having trouble in the classroom, then, he/she should go to colleagues to ask for help.

In summary, although there were no formal instructional support group meetings at either school building both faculties participated in departmental and TEAM meetings, which encouraged collaboration and communication between teachers. Along with in house resources (e.g., ESL teacher, bilingual faculty, resource teachers), communication was seen as the most important factor in adapting instruction for linguistically diverse students.

Question 8. What do you consider to be your language policy for the class?

This question was included as part of the research protocol as a probe to explore teachers' understanding of language use and functions. Because of the large percentage of Hispanics at each school building, emphasis was on the needs of Spanish-speakers. In some cases, teachers did not understand the implications of this question, primarily due to the fact they didn't have a clear understanding of how language was defined within the scope of the study. Nonetheless, teachers' suggested they were knowledgeable and culturally aware of the role language played in their classroom. Some stated they did have a language policy, but that it was unwritten (no one

claimed to have a written classroom language policy available for review). In some cases, respondents spoke of it, in terms of what they expected from their students. Some thought it was to respect the students' language because it was a source of identity. Others preferred to have standards and encouraged students to use appropriate vocabulary (academic as opposed to social language).

Some respondents reported to achieve language proficiency for all students they would expose students to different words, build a strong vocabulary base, respect student differences, make students proficient in English in order to grasp concepts presented in class. This collective, in their minds, was the prevailing language policy. In the language arts, teachers reported that the policy was English since that was what was taught. One special education teacher was candid when stating, "please don't take this as racist, but it is English." The main concern in the math area was not to limit students' language abilities, but to encourage them to understand a broader vocabulary, and not only to talk in terms of math.

In some cases, respondents did not know if they had a language policy or hadn't given it much thought, but did come to the realization that they did have one. Some didn't mind students opening up, because they wanted students' language development to continue, in terms of the way they used language. In one case the interviewee felt his policy was to be flexible, but couldn't articulate flexibility in terms of a classroom language policy. One respondent reported, "Not really, I do the best I can and they do the best they can, if I have someone to translate for me I am happy." Likewise, another teacher felt that she had no policy in her classroom.

In summary, interviewees differed in terms of, 1) their understanding of classroom language policy, 2) whether they had a language policy, and 3) if they did, how they defined their classroom language policy. Most interviewees believed teacher expectations for students' proficiency in English was central to having a viable classroom language policy. Others respected language differences and did what they could to encourage student performance. There were some who didn't know if they had a language policy.

Question 9. What would you estimate the school's language policy to be?

This question was intended to elicit teacher comments about the extent of their knowledge concerning a district, but more specifically a building level school language policy. A main concern was the gap between teachers' awareness of the existence of a school language policy and knowledge about the role that language played in the day-to-day functioning of the

114

school. Respondents were in agreement that the building's language policy was implicit and tacitly promoted proficiency in English. It was generally recognized that building administrators, at both middle school, promoted a free and open school environment. They encouraged teachers and students to improve their English language proficiencies and at the same time allowing them to express themselves in ways that promoted a productive and safe school climate.

Some felt that language policy was set by the benchmarks and standards of the state. Others did not know if the school had a language policy except for the student handbook, which prohibited foul and offensive language. In some cases, respondents believed the standards were written in the faculty handbook. Some thought if the school had a language policy it was similar to their classroom policy. Here, although English was probably the covert language policy in the building, teachers who were bilingual conducted parent meeting in both Spanish and English. With reference to linguistic diversity, it was felt the school's language policy was to create bi-literate and language awareness at the building level. Diversity at each building was evidenced by the students' language abilities. Some were bilinguals, others spoke only English, and, there was one Vietnamese girl, and a couple of German speaking students. No respondents reported any school personnel who discouraged the use of Spanish on school grounds or in the classroom. A main concern was that the school's language policy was too lax, because of the foul language heard out in the halls where they used whatever goes.

In summary, Interviewees thought that question 9 was a hard question to answer. They believed whatever the state or district mandated (i.e., standards and benchmarks, Bilingual/ESL policy initiatives) that was the school's language policy. The majority of comments made showed teachers were reliant on the district and state for direction on policy initiatives, which concerned students' language use and cultural norms. In short, most believed the school's policy to be similar to their classroom policy, in that it required English and being flexible.

Question 10. Have you participated in staff development opportunities for meeting the learning needs of linguistically diverse students? Do you have additional professional development needs regarding linguistically diverse students?

It was reported that pre-service and in-service teachers were encouraged to participate in additional training and education during and after their formal teacher-training program. The responses to question 10 were varied, primarily, due to the fact that the 16 teachers who participated in this study represented six different areas of the school organization. Although,

respondents had linguistically diverse students in their classrooms, not all were provided the opportunity of attending additional training or education emphasized on servicing the needs of these students. The comments made demonstrated a clear needs threshold for providing additional training to regular-classroom, ESL, and special education teachers.

Of the 16 interviewees seven stated that they had attended the ESL training. Others had participated in staff development activities, but not ones that addressed linguistically diverse students or ESL learners. In the special education area, teachers had not attended any ESL training because as one interviewee stated "they want me to deal with behavior more than with language." With reference to additional professional development needed, one interviewee voiced the feelings of a majority of teachers, in that, she knew she had additional needs, but "do I know what they are"? No! In some cases teachers needed "tools to work with" and to be kept abreast of the latest trends, philosophies (political), theories, and methods relating to the education of these students. In some cases, respondents followed a central theme and addressed the following points, 1) there would always be people who know more about the topic at hand, 2) the wants of ESL students and the general population of learners were increasing, 3) school personnel wanted to stay current, and 4) the national culture was becoming more diverse. The main concern was that teachers wanted to be enabled and needed the "book" on reaching linguistically diverse learners. One respondent reported, "We have to be on the same page."

In sum, other professional development needs voiced included more course work in languages, in this case Spanish, more work in methods and strategies designed for ESL students, and more advanced degrees. The full inclusion policy adopted by the district affected all teachers with linguistically diverse special education students assigned to their classrooms, in terms, of additional professional development. For example some interviewees expressed the need for additional in-service on how to incorporate the speech, hearing, oral, and learning problems of linguistically diverse students. In short, although respondents, due to the proclivities of their content areas, attended different training and education sessions, all 16 expressed the need for additional professional development. A needs threshold for additional development in this area was clear. In most cases, respondents reported their willingness to participate in further in-service and pointed to the continuing and future needs (e.g., increasing numbers of immigrants) of teachers in all areas.

Summary of Interviews for the Element of Instruction

This section presented the findings of interviews with 16 teachers from five areas in the curriculum at two middle school buildings (refer to Interviewee Characteristics above). There was a problem in that it was found that most teachers could not respond coherently, because of a lack of knowledge and understanding about language policy, to the concept of language policy for the district, the building, or the classroom. Nonetheless, comments and observations reported were diverse and voiced a general concern for students' language needs. In addition, teachers expressed a clear need for instructional support and in-service (training and education), particularly, in the area of linguistic diversity.

In addition, teachers reported that students did demonstrate a language deficit with reference to academic performance and achievement. The mounting pressures of teaching all students English were further exacerbated by the requirements of NCLB and teaching of ELLs. Teachers reported that they did exploit available resources and special programs for remediation, but their thinking was fragmented in terms of competing specialization for remediation or what methods worked best. Evidence of a well-organized coordinated organization for instruction was not evident at either of the two buildings. Therefore teachers deployed a multitude of adaptive instructional techniques that were grounded in everything from special education to bilingual education and TESOL/ESL. Although collaboration was a central theme and structures for collaboration were present at each building, the effects of collaboration with reference to the needs of linguistically diverse students did not get into the classroom instruction.

An immediate first impression of the data reported by teacher interviewees, clearly demonstrated that teachers depended on available educational personnel (e.g., district and building level) when marshaling resources to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students. The findings support the corollary that teachers do understand linguistic diversity in the school, but addressed those needs in fragmented ways in that a coordinated theme for the treatment of linguistic diversity was not evident in either middle school building. With reference to the organization for instruction teachers lacked a common purpose in terms of coordinating their efforts in structuring the educational context for meeting the needs generated by linguistically diverse students. It was found that different missions, different funding sources, and different learning theories drove teachers. Consequently, teachers didn't seek to engage in meaningful efforts to participate in a viable organization for instruction. Teachers reported communication

and being on the same page were key variables in promoting effective instruction. In lieu of having a well-articulated evenly structured school language policy, it was suggested that teachers could assume a greater responsibility for linguistically diverse student performance and achievement by promoting an effective organization for instruction (i.e., professional community, shared responsibility for learning) (Marks and Louis, 1998).

Multi-Item (10) Likert Scale Results

This section displays the results from a multi-item (10) Likert scale, which was used in conjunction with the interviews of building leaders and teachers. The scale (refer to Appendix B) was employed to evaluate elements of language policy at work during each interview session (N 20 [$n = 4$, $n = 16$]). The scale was designed using 10 specified traits as criteria for sensing interviewees' proclivities toward linguistic diversity and to infer implications for school language policy formation. The researcher served as the rater and performed the evaluations immediately following each interview. The ratings were on a scale of from 5 to 1: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Fair, and 1 = Poor. The two categories of observation included school leadership, and instruction. Ratings for each interview were tabulated per item and means, standard deviations, and variances computed per item and category for each level of observation (leadership and instruction). Table 4.11 presents the data obtained from the administration of the scale and subjecting the data to SSPS statistical treatment. The data displayed was generated from a series of ratings assigned by the researcher during interviews with building leaders and teachers at the two middle school buildings. The total number of participants interviewed was 20 (Middle School X [$n = 13$] and Middle School Y[$n = 7$]). Of these participants ($N = 20$), four were building leaders and 16 were teachers from their respective buildings.

Table 4.11 presents the mean and standard deviation per item (10) for the two levels of observation (i.e., leadership and instruction) at both middle school buildings ($N = 20$). The M and SD for the 10 items are followed by a computation for the totals of the means and standard deviations for the elements of leadership ($n = 4$) and instruction ($n = 16$). The ten items were rated on a basis of from of from 5 to 1: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = satisfactory, 2 = fair, 1 = poor. The means for the element of leadership ranged from 2.00 to 3.50. The means for the element of instruction ranged from 2.13 to 3.13. A similarity is that the highest rating for leadership (3.50) and the highest rating for instruction (3.13) were both for item 1-General

feeling of tolerance or permissiveness of language difference. Further, the lowest rating for leadership (2.00) and the lowest rating for instruction (2.13) were both for item 5-Degree of language alternation observed. The largest difference (.56) in mean scores between leadership and instruction was for item 10-Administration resource capacities.

Leadership displayed five items (1, 2, 6, 7, and 10) that rated "satisfactory" and five items (3, 4, 5, 8, and 9) that rated "fair." The element of instruction had two items (1 and 6) that were rated "satisfactory" and eight items (2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, and 10) that were rated "fair." The mean of the means for leadership totaled 2.80 and for instruction it was 2.69, which rates both elements as "fair." Although the element of leadership had more ratings (5) of "satisfactory," both elements (leadership and instruction) had low total mean scores.

Table 4. 11   Per Item (10) Means and Standard Deviations for the Elements of Leadership and Instruction (*N* =20)

Likert scale item	Leadership (*n* = 4)		Instruction (*n* = 16)	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Item 1-General feeling of tolerance or permissiveness of language difference.				
	3.50	0.57	3.13	0.96
Item 2-An environment that promotes linguistic diversity.				
	3.00	0.00	2.63	0.72
Item 3-Overt manifestations of language use.				
	2.75	0.96	2.88	0.50
Item 4-Covert manifestations of language use.				
	2.25	0.50	2.19	0.55
Item 5-Degree of language alternation observed.				
	2.00	0.50	2.13	0.72
Item 6-Orientation towards language in operation.				
	3.00	0.00	3.06	0.68
Item 7-Organizational responsiveness.				
	3.00	0.82	2.94	0.78
Item 8-Observed functions ascribed to language use.				
	2.50	1.00	2.63	0.72
Item 9-Community responsiveness.				
	2.75	0.50	2.63	0.88
Item 10-Administration resource capacities.				
	3.25	0.96	2.69	0.48
Totals (Items 1 through 10)				
	2.80	0.77	2.69	0.76

Note. Items on the multi-item (10) Likert scale were rated on a basis of from of from 5 to 1: 5 = excellent, 4 = good, 3 = satisfactory, 2 = fair, 1 = poor.

Summary of Multi Item (10) Likert Scale Results

In summary, this section presented data from a multi-item (10) Likert scale, which was used as an observation and analytical tool during interviews with building leaders and teachers. Its purpose was to evaluate manifestations of linguistic diversity at work in the building and in the classroom. Table 4.11 displayed the means and standard deviations for scale items with reference to the elements of leadership and instruction per item. First indicators showed that there were variable differences between and among interviewees in terms of the rating given per item in each category. The scores indicate a low to moderate rating (ranged from 2.00 to 3.50) for both elements. For example, the element of leadership had five items that rated satisfactory (3.00) and the element instruction had two items that rated satisfactory. The mean totals for each element demonstrated little significance difference (e.g., Leadership 2.80 and Instruction 2.69) both totals were in the fair category. This clearly implied that the notion of linguistic diversity in the building or in the classroom was not significantly addressed.

However, the highest mean rating for both elements was Item 1-General feeling of tolerance or permissiveness of language difference. Ironically, the two elements also shared the lowest mean score with Item 5-Degree of language alternation observed. This phenomenon may be explained by what was reported by one teacher, that Hispanics invariably bring their language and culture into the building whereas other minorities don't. In reference to the other items of the scale, the moderate scores assigned stemmed from the lack of resource capacity, which was not observed in the classrooms or in the building. This indicated a degree of permissiveness on the part of building leaders and teachers. It also meant that building leaders and teachers understood the needs of linguistic diversity, but were not able to rise to ratings of 4 or 5 because of limited resources, the demands of NCLB, and competing themes. Implications found for language policy formation in terms of policy planning, formulation, and implementation were not obvious, but the foundation (s) for building a language policy were visible (i.e., student mix, Spanish speakers, diversity initiatives) in each middle school building.

Program Elements for the Middle Schools.

This section presents the results of the data collection phase for this study with reference to the element of middle level program. It is organized into the following three sub sections, a) Middle School Program b) Overall Middle Level Program with a descriptive lists of terms and

affected programs, and c) Summary of Program Elements for the Middle Schools. The primary sources of data were the interviews with building leaders and teachers and the secondary sources are the demographics where applicable and other terminology (e.g., Likert scale).

Middle School Program

Although the function of this section is triangulation, the exploratory design was framed using mixed methods (qualitative as the main theme) with an understanding of the importance of multi source of information and multiple perspectives (Creswell, 2002). The review of anecdotal and other available records was conducted in order to build background knowledge for the element of program to be used during on site visits and during the collection of data. On each site visit, the researcher conducted a review of anecdotal and other available records found at each school building. The results were used to inform on site visits, data collection, and document review procedures (refer to Interview Protocol Chapter 3). The following documents were reviewed with particular reference to the element of program: school publications, course schedules and descriptions, master schedules, teacher and other educational personnel assignments, student publications, lists and other information on student clubs and organizations, newsletters and school annuals, news paper clippings of school and student achievements, other available records of school success, and descriptions of special and auxiliary programs.

Overview of Middle Level Program

In terms of middle level program, each middle school studied was structured to meet the overall academic, emotional, and social needs of students in the young adolescence stage of development. As a result, educational personnel were guided by the intellectual and hormonal growth that accompanied adolescent youth. Therefore, middle level programming was viewed as something structured quite differently from elementary, intermediate, junior high, or high school. The questions about these differences addressed the academic outcomes of students in junior high schools that are organized in a manner similar to large comprehensive high schools with departmentalization, as compared to, middle schools using various degrees of the five endorsed practices considered essential to the middle level model of schooling: teaming, exploratory courses, co-curricular programs, adviser-advisee arrangements, and intramural activities (NMSA, 1997).

The reporting of middle level program used the question format delineated on the Research Protocol for element of program. The series of nine questions are stated with findings described under each question.

Program question 1. Describe how curriculum was organized for the core subjects (math, science, social studies, language arts, etc.)? Is it a departmental organization? Is it a team organizational variation of the departmental structure? Is it a block schedule arrangement?

In the past, both middle level schools had used the TEAMS approach to the school's curriculum and instructional governance. However, staff at Middle School X voted to discontinue the use of this approach and opted to implement a school advisory committee along with its departmental structure. The school advisory committee worked with the student advisory team (SAT) committee and department chairs to provide advise on instructional and curricular matters. Middle School Y had continued its use of the TEAMS approach during the 2003-2004 school year. At this building, there were two teams for each grade, 7th and 8th, with four teachers from different content areas on each team. In addition, Banks (2003) described the following features of the middle level school curriculum: challenging, integrative, and exploratory; varied teaching/learning approaches; assessment and evaluation that promoted learning; flexible organizational structures; programs and policies that fostered health, safety, and wellness; and comprehensive guidance and support. One middle school had tried the 4 x 4 block scheduling, but had not experienced much success with it so it was changed back.

Program question 2. Explain grade and enrollment requirements at the school regarding core and elective classes.

Middle School X started construction in early 1957 and opened its doors for the 1958 – 1959 school year on September 2. It was built to relieve some of the overcrowding at the two other junior high schools. It initially started as a junior high school and housed 7th, 8th, and 9th grades during the late fifties and early sixties (Huckabee and Class, 1996). Middle School X became a middle school in the late sixties when the 9th was moved up to the high school and the 6th was moved into the building. However, by 1972 it housed only the 7th and 8th grades, but changed again with the 6th grade moving up in the 2004-2005 school year. Whereas, Middle School Y opened in the 1965-66 school year and was initially designed as a middle school for 7th and 8th grades.

Academic programs at the two middle schools under study were inadvertently based on requirements mandated by the state's Content Standards and Benchmarks. This legislative approach (Trimble, 2003) has determined competencies, benchmarks, and consequences, as per No Child Left Behind, in terms of, curriculum and instructional design. In this case, the district's office of curriculum and instruction assumed the responsibility for recommending which core and elective classes would be offered for 7th and 8th grades at the middle schools. Classes for each building were scheduled on a departmental based seven period regular curriculum. The 7th grade was offered a list of required core classes to choose from. These included language arts, English, mathematics, world geography/state history, life science, and physical education. In addition, 7th grade students were given the option of taking one elective period per day. Elective classes offered were family consumer science, art, foreign language (Spanish), music (choir, band, jazz band, and orchestra), computer skills, and physical education.

Similarly, the 8th grade curriculum was also composed of core and elective classes. Again, core classes included language arts, English, mathematics, social studies, and life science (beginning and advance). Electives (two periods) included family consumer science, technology, art, foreign language (Spanish), music (choir, band, jazz band, and orchestra), aide (office, teacher, or library), and tutorial practicum. In addition, an honors program was offered for both 7th and 8th grades in the areas of English and language arts. Reading programs used to supplement the language arts curriculum included Accelerated Reading, Morgan Reading, and the Academy of Reading. Also, an accelerated math program was offered at each school. Other special programs included English language acquisition, special education, small group instruction, consultation, mental health support, and speech, hearing and language. One building, Middle School X, provided English as a second language (ESL) and Spanish Language Arts (SLA) classes for all identified students.

Program question 3. Was there a level of cooperation, coordination, and teamwork among school staff relative to the organization for instruction (or instructional activities) in the district or school?

The faculty and staff at the two middle school buildings worked in a collaborative effort to meet any problems relating to language within the school organization. A consistent theme reported was that teachers exploited each other as resources (e.g., Spanish speaking teachers in the building, bilingual or TESOL/ESL certified, content area teachers, or anyone with any

experience with language problems) when confronted with language problems in their classroom. Although there didn't seem to be a visibly organized, coordinated, purposeful organization for instruction at either building, faculty and staff were sensitive to the needs of linguistically diverse and ELL students. There was evidence of a sense of professional community and collaboration and teachers did utilize the committee structure to solve new or resurgent language problems.

Program question 4. Describe extracurricular activities. What is the nature of these offerings? Exclusive? Inclusive?

A sports program was available for 7th and 8th grade boys and girls. The sports offered included boys' football, boys' and girls' basketball, boys' and girls' track, and girls' volleyball. In addition, middle schools offered every student the opportunity to participate in intramural sports, clubs (e.g., Spanish Club, Math Club, Travel Club, and Science Club), and organizations. All students were encouraged to participate in extracurricular activities at the two middle school buildings in an inviting and inclusive way.

Program question 5. Describe special programming made available in the middle school curriculum (e.g., Special education, English as a second language, bilingual education, Title I, programs for at risk students, etc.).

Qualified students could participate in Title I programs at both buildings, and on the campus of Middle School X, a school clinic was available to all students in the district. The Title I program also provided for Supplemental Educational Services (i.e., tutoring) for students at Middle School X under the No Child Left Behind Average Yearly Progress (AYP) provisions. Middle School X was a Provision 2 school, which meant that all students qualified for the Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRLP).

No evidence was found which documented a clearly articulated and well-coordinated program for parent involvement or business and community participation (other than teacher parent conferences and individual fund-raising). Although there was evidence of transition activities (e.g., parent conferences, school visits, and counseling), there wasn't a well-defined comprehensive transition program for upcoming 6th graders or for 8th graders moving up to high school. The school district had an ESL director whose responsibility was to provide language services to students enrolled in the district. There were other programs, reading programs, and phonics programs, after-school based programs that students could be placed in to help them

learn phonics (refer to List of Affected Programs). The GEAR Up, a federally funded program, provide college preparation tutoring in math and science for middle level students targeting 7th graders. The school district had a Special Education Director and the middle school provided special education services with a committee and chair for that department. The district had also implemented a full inclusion program for the district.

Program question 6. What after-school (includes night and weekends) programming are part of the schools program? Does the building operate with what is called, alternative programs?

The school district had an After School Office and a Director for After School Programs. One of the programs administered by the district was the New Mexico 21st Century Community Learning Centers (21st CCLC) program. This State-administered program provides five-year grant funding to establish or expand after school programs that provide students, particularly students who attend schools in need of improvement, with academic enrichment opportunities and supportive additional services necessary to help the students meet state and local standards, in the core content areas. Although neither of the two middle schools participating in the exploratory research were designated a Learning Center, their students had the opportunity to utilize the services and technology provided by the 21st CCLC program.

This question inadvertently included athletics and extra curricular programs (e.g., music, orchestra, drama, chorus, etc.) because of their very nature for meeting after school and performing in the evenings or on weekends. The GEAR UP program provided after school tutoring services for students and parent counseling. Middle School X also housed a Family Center on its campus. The center provided parental involvement, counseling, and tutoring services to students enrolled in district schools. There weren't any alternative programs for at-risk students, low achieving or low performing students, or for dropouts on either campus.

Program question 7. Does the school acknowledge and support students' bilingualism and promote an interest in their language among all students?

During the interviews (refer to written transcripts Appendix A), both building leaders and teachers acknowledged that they were aware of and sensitive to their students' linguistic diversity, particularly Spanish speakers. The results of a Likert scale (refer to Table 4.11) were interpreted as a positive marker for building leaders' and teachers' sensitivity and support for students' linguistic diversity at a fair to moderate level. There wasn't any evidence of punitive rules being enforced relative to language use in or out of the classroom. In general, educational

personnel in each middle school building were sensitive to language differences and acknowledged that they supported linguistic diversity, but were fragmented as to what to do.

Program question 8. Is there a satisfactory system within the school for identifying students who need help with English as their second language, for providing this help and for monitoring their progress?

All students who enroll in the school district fill out a home language survey, which is part of the enrollment procedures. The survey asks the student if there is any language influence other than English in the home. Once a student is identified as having a second language influence, students are given a language proficiency assessment the New Mexico English Language Placement Assessment (NM ELPA) to determine their proficiency in English only. Where applicable the Language Assessment Scales (LAS) are used to determine Spanish language proficiency. New Mexico now uses this standardized language proficiency assessment (NM ELPA), which replaces all other language assessments. A placement test can be given any time during the year when the student enrolls to determine a student's English proficiency. If a student is not fluent English proficient, the student is placed in a classroom that will provide language services, such as a dual language program, a bilingual program, or in a general class that provides ESL strategies. Middle School X provides all ESL language services for the four middle schools. Once identified students are bused to the school site to participate in the ESL program available for them. In April, all children that are classified as ELLs and have not passed a language proficiency rank of Advanced will take the standardized NM ELPA. The NM ELPA is given to students in grades K-12th. The assessment proficiency classifications are emergent, early intermediate, intermediate, early advanced, and advanced. Emergent through early advanced identifies students as non-English proficient, while Advanced is the English proficient classification. It is a satisfactory system and is used in all of New Mexico's schools providing language support services.

Program question 9. Are program and teaching resources for English as a second language sufficient to meet the needs of the students in the school and organized so that students have access to them in a range of subject areas?

The school district's reorganization plan, which was implemented in 2004-2005, changed the boundaries for 12 elementary and 4 middle schools. With the implementation of a pure feeder system for the district three elementary schools would feed each of the four middle schools.

Previously, middle schools had received students from up to 12 elementary feeder schools. In addition to the increase in total number of students caused by moving the 6th grade to the middle schools, student populations of the two middle schools were represented by a larger percentage of Hispanic and low income students (refer to tables in Chapter 4). This required that each middle school building increase its capacities (e.g., more teachers and the addition of portable buildings) to meet the addition of the 6th grade to its grade configuration (6-8). The grade configuration at the time of the study was 7-8.

Both school leaders and teachers felt that their respective buildings already had the necessary program capacities to provide appropriate language services for ESL or second language students. However, during the data collection phase of the research there were concerns and needs expressed that impacted on the provision of ESL services. The concerns generated from the present and projected increases in the number of Hispanic, thus, Spanish speaking students that made up the student population at the two middle schools. Building resources, both human and material, assigned to a comprehensive, well-defined ESL program were considered to be minimal. The number of bilingual teachers, particularly those with appropriate training in bilingual/ESL/TESOL methods was seen as a concern, particularly with the added number of Hispanic 6th grade students moving up to the middle schools as a result of school reorganization. Cultural knowledge and awareness were key factors, which affected on how parents and students perceived teachers and how teachers perceived their role in the provision of language services.

Middle School X served as the ESL program site for the four middle schools with identified ESL students bused to the site for educational and language services. Two bilingually endorsed full time teachers staffed the ESL program. A three-strand curriculum (i.e., students were categorized as needing 1, 2, or 3 hours of language services as mandated by the state's PED Bilingual Education Unit) provided ESL courses in beginning, intermediate, or advanced ESL, English Language Development, and Spanish Language Arts. In addition to native language support during instruction some students were given the opportunity to enroll in a Spanish I for Native Speakers class. At Middle School Y teachers relied on their culture of collaboration (e.g., support from teachers in the building who were bilingual, students who spoke the language, or teachers who had experience with similar problems) as a resource program in meeting the educational needs of second language students. This was also the case at Middle School X, but teachers at that building could utilize the ESL teachers as resources.

In summary, this part presented middle level program in line with the social, emotional, and academic needs of young adolescents. Middle level school program and middle school programming are earning much attention with reference to the complex needs both academic and emotional of students in this stage of development. Language concerns during this crucial stage of development (i.e. formal operational) are pivotal to the middle school students' overall development. The curriculum and program of study at the two school buildings was dictated by the requirements of NCLB and emphasized traditional curricular offerings focusing on math, language arts, and the sciences (social and natural). Linguistic diversity was being addressed at both building in that building leaders and teachers were sensitive to and aware of the needs of all students. This aspect served to reinforce and support curricular and non-curricular offering. Program concerns reported by interviewees included structuring or restructuring the curriculum to allow for more time for language related scheduling. For example, instead of the two-hour block of classes (i.e., one hour for English and one hour for Literature) ELLs and ESL students could take up to four out of seven hours of language specific instruction.

Descriptive List of Terms and Affected Programs

In this subsection was presented a descriptive list of terms and programs that were mentioned in the text of chapter 4 and in the written interview transcriptions. It was intended to give the reader key vocabulary and program names that were associated with the provision of educational services to linguistically diverse students. The list included names of course offerings, program names, instructional approaches, and other pertinent resources.

Spanish Language Arts (SLA). A curricular offering used in the provision of language services to ELL students qualifying for a one, two, or three-hour program for learning English. Primarily employed in educational programs that utilized native language support for Spanish-speakers as part of their language-learning instruction. Also referred to as Spanish for Native Speakers.

English as a Second Language (ESL). In conjunction with the policy shift at the national level toward learning English in 3 years, this approach was expanded in the district. For example, the title of Bilingual Education Director was changed to ESL Director. It was a mainstay in the curriculum and was being used to provide language services to limited English proficient and ELL students. This program model can be used in combination with other approaches.

Spanish as a Second Language (SSL). This course was being offered to students at the elementary level and was used as an approach to teach Spanish to elementary school students.

Bilingual Education. This model used the students' 1st and 2nd language as the medium of instruction in a well-planned program, which utilized methods based on sound scientific research. In this case study the primary emphasis was on Hispanic students, mostly of Mexican heritage, whose 1st or home language was Spanish and who were learning English as their 2nd language.

Spanish Instruction. Instruction in Spanish was provided in two ways: students were offered an introductory course in Spanish and teachers with a fluency in Spanish were allowed to develop a bilingual format in their classroom for the delivery of materials and instruction.

English Language Learner (ELL). A student who has an influence of another language in the home and can benefit from a well-designed program of English instruction in combination with other language services.

Dual Language. This program model provided for instruction to be delivered to elementary students in two languages, in this case, Spanish and English. In theory, all students can qualify for the program, whose aim was to provide dual language instruction in order to produce students who can operate in two languages. It was considered a developmental enrichment approach. The dual language model began instruction at 90% Spanish and 10% English in the 1st grade and gradually increased instruction to Spanish 50% and English 50% by the 6th grade.

New Comers Program. This 90-day program was instituted by the district and was housed at one elementary school. The school served as the center for students in grades 1-6 who were recent arrivals to the school district. Students enrolled in the program had from 1 week to 3 months in the country. The program can be categorized as an ESL total immersion program where students speak only in English and have 90 days to learn enough English to be mainstreamed into the regular curriculum.

Middle school M Program. One of the four middle schools in the district served as the center for the provision of language services to recent immigrant and/or linguistically diverse students identified as non-English speakers (NES) or limited English proficient (LEP). Once identified students were tested and placed in a one, two, or three-hour program of services.

Language Assessment Scales (LAS). LAS was the test of choice used by the school district in the identification, testing, and placement of ELL students into an appropriate language services program. The NM Public Education Department was in the process of designing and implementing a language assessment test, which would be used by all school districts. For identification purposes this test would replace LAS and any other test presently used.

Specially Designed Instruction (SADIE). An English as a second language method developed by Ron Rorch, a California educator, who taught science at the secondary level for many years. He developed the instructional design for his science classes, but it has applicability in other subject areas.

Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). This approach used methods that teach English to speakers of other languages more as a foreign language, as opposed to, teaching English as a second language (ESL).

Spanish WEB sites. There were an increasing number of WEB addresses that provided access to sites that were rich with Spanish language resources. Teachers considered utilizing these sites in their planning of curriculum and instruction designed to meet the needs of linguistic diversity.

Gear-Up Program. A federally funded project whose goal was to identify potential college students as early as the 7th grade. Principal areas of interest were in math and sciences. Project activities provided for a comprehensive program of identification, counseling, tutoring, and academics.

TEAMS. Teaming was an approach used principally at the middle level, which organized the school organization into teams composed of representatives from building leaders, teachers from various subject areas, and sometimes included students.

Morgan Reading. The Morgan Dynamic Phonics program was an adaptation of the Orton-Gillingham program, a multi-sensory structured approach. It was based on phonemic and phonological awareness. The program used humorous, interactive and meaningful decodable reading text designed to keep the students' interest and to be fun. It was especially effective with students who have learning disabilities.

Academy of Reading. This K-12 program was used as a comprehensive reading remediation tool. It is a computer-based program designed to help underachievers develop

reading skills and become better readers. Academy of Reading is data driven with its own management information system. Its major selling point is that it also has a Spanish Tutor.

Accelerated Reading. Initially developed by Renaissance Learning, Inc. as a data driven computerized information system designed to motivate students and to improve reading comprehension. The program had three steps: the student selects a book to read, student takes a computerized quiz, and both student and teacher obtain feedback.

Success For All (SFA). SFA was geared for total school improvement and was designed as a program for disadvantaged students pre-K through five. Its strengths included organizing instructional and family support resources within the classroom. SFA grew out of a partnership between the Baltimore City Public Schools and the Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools (CREMS).

Johnny Can Read/Spell/Write. The program, a phonics based approach, was used to teach reading, spelling, and writing with emphasis on penmanship, spelling, vocabulary, grammar, conventions of writing, and sentence composition.

Family Center. Middle School X had a family center on its campus. It housed a family literacy project, provided tutoring for students, and scholastic skills for both parents and students.

Health Center. Middle School X also was the site that housed a school health center for the district. It provided basic primary health care for students and referral services for parents and/or guardians.

After School Program. The district staffed an after school program office, which coordinated recreational and educational activities at various schools sites. Tutoring, counseling, computer instructions, and recreational activities were made available for students at two middle school sites. Most of the resources made available were provided through a federal grant and/or by private donations.

Light-Span. An individualized user-friendly computer based test used in the district to improve student performance on subject matter content and test taking skills. The test was timed and could be administered on an individual basis or to a group of students.

Student Assistance Teams (SAT). A committee composed of educational personnel in the middle school building whose purpose was to review students' performance and to provide recommendations for the improvement of student learning and achievement.

Individual Educational Plan (IEP). IEP conferences are used to evaluate special education students' progress and to suggest accommodations that regular classroom teachers can utilize to improve student performance. IEP meetings were conducted by the Special Education Department and included input from other educational personnel. IEP meetings were seen as pivotal in identifying and addressing the instructional needs of linguistically diverse students.

Summary of Program Elements for the Middle Schools

In summary, this section has attempted to give the reader a clear understanding of middle level program in general and programs available at the two middle school buildings in particular. Given were the full range of curricular offerings, and the wide array of special and auxiliary programs available to students. Also included was a list of terms and programs affected by the provision of educational services to linguistically diverse students. A main first impression of data presented was the clear distinction made between the developmental and academic needs of students at the young adolescent stage of development. The implications for addressing school language policy at the middle level were driven by the large percentage of Hispanic students and the presence of linguistically diverse (i.e., includes students who speak other varieties, sub varieties, and non standard forms) with reference to students' stage of development (e.g., formal operation). The organization for instruction was viewed as a viable function in context of the schools in terms of a 'shared responsibility for student learning' with reference to all students at both middle school building.

Summary of Chapter 4

Chapter 4 presented the results from the data collection phase of the case study of two New Mexico middle school buildings. The chapter was divided into five major sections with subsections in each. The major sections included: 1) Research Setting: Demographics, Data, and Profiles, 2) Two- Part Data Collection Process for the Element of Instruction, 3) Two-Part Data Collection Process for the Element of Leadership, 4) Multi-Item (10) Multi-Item (10) Likert Scale Results, and 5) Program Elements for the Middle Schools. The reporting techniques used in presenting the results included descriptive reporting, historical reporting, sociological-demographic reporting, and qualitative interviews. In hopes of a better understanding of the statement of the problem, a closely integrated combination of qualitative and quantitative reporting was employed (mixed methods with qualitative as the main theme).

The crisis of leadership in the district set the stage and productively impacted the tenor of the interview process, which added an important dimension to the study with reference to establishing field relationships. The chain of events surrounding the hiring, administration, and ultimate firing of the superintendent was a sign of differences in decision-making in terms of who had ultimate control of proposed changes in the operation of the schools. One of the important pieces of data presented was the chronicled time line of events, which transpired in the school district during the data collection phase of this case study research. The events were considered central to the theoretical and conceptual nexus of the exploratory design in reference to issues of leadership, reorganization of schools, Board of Education, school organization, and stakeholder participation. Moreover, they provided a backdrop for the analysis of data gathered.

A description of the setting used mixed methods or a blend of qualitative and quantitative data to a present demographic profile of the setting (i.e., the state of New Mexico, the county and city, and the school district) where the study was conducted. A descriptive-sociological-demographic reporting method was used to present data relative to the research setting. Of importance was the large number and percentage of Hispanics and speakers of languages other than English, including speakers of Native American languages (speakers of Spanish and Navajo comprise the highest percentage of this category). County and city descriptions in conjunction with the sociological profile of the immediate area (refer to Chapter 1 Statement of the Problem) presented a realistic view of the geopolitical environment of the district where the study was situated. Also as part of the setting, data relating to the two middle schools buildings participating in the study was presented. At the time of data collection (2004-2005 school year), the two buildings shared some significant differences. For example, in the categories of Caucasian, Hispanic, and Free and Reduced Lunch Program (FRLP), Middle School X had 12% Caucasians, 85 % Hispanic, and 86 % FRLP. Middle School Y had 69% Caucasian, 30 % Hispanic, and 37 % FRLP. The setting was seen as dynamic, evolving culturally and on the cutting edge of demographic (e.g., cultural and sociological) changes in U. S. society. It was seen as a poor community with high rates of poverty and low per capita income, in short, there was evidence of a high concentration of low-income students.

Tables and narratives on student achievement data and interviewee characteristics were presented to lend a quantitative facet to the data and profiles displayed. Student performance scores on state mandated academic achievement assessments were presented for 7th and 8th

grade students from both middle schools. Here, it is important to point out the significantly low scores of special education students in poorer performing areas at both middle schools. The volatility of scores and the mixed trends (i.e., Caucasian and Hispanic) demonstrated by students at Middle School Y served as a marker with reference to the significance of employing Hispanic as a moderator variable. It was the contention of the researcher that performance scores reflected the dynamic evolution of the researching setting with reference to environmental and sociological factors such as low socioeconomic status, incidences of poverty, immigration, economic considerations, changing demographic patterns.

The results of interviews for the elements of leadership (principals and assistant principals) and instruction (teachers) demonstrated a corps of dedicated educational professionals who are in many ways meeting the language and educational needs of their students. An attribute of both building leaders and teachers was their sensitivity to linguistic diversity in their respective building. Their respect for language communities viz., school community and their concerns about parent involvement in the operation of the school was reported. Nevertheless, both lacked a clear understanding and knowledge about the realities of language policy in the school. Building leaders were seen as skilled professionals and struggling to get their buildings on the right track in the midst of all the changes and therefore may not have the energy and resources to entertain the concept of language policy. Teachers reported their concern for their linguistically diverse students and described the many adaptations they used to meet the needs of ELLs in their classrooms. However, most of the respondents expressed that they had very little idea how language policy worked in the classroom, building, or district. Respondents also reported a clear need for additional professional development and in-service on matters pertaining to linguistic diversity and second language learners.

Middle level school philosophies and programming were presented as vital to the design of effective programs for young adolescents. Overview of Middle Level Programs demonstrated an array of curricular and extracurricular activities available to students at the two middle school buildings. Sections and subsections were complimented by a series of tables, which provided valuable data with reference to the scope of this case study . For informational purposes, a descriptive list of terms and affected programs was given. The list was developed from middle school programs identified during the interviewees as having a bearing on the provision of services to students. The large percentage of Hispanic and low income students represented a

marker for a revaluation of program offerings in terms of meeting the needs of linguistically diverse students. The policy implications for each school building and classrooms were drawn from the very nature of the middle school program and young adolescent student experiences (e.g., meshing standard based accountability with language development and linguistic diversity).

CHAPTER 5-SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Case Study Research

The research consisted of a case study of two middle schools. The purpose of the building level research was to use mixed methods to explore the elements of school leadership, middle level instruction, and middle level program and to infer aspects of language policy at work in a bounded system. The study was founded on a concern about the school's ability in meeting the needs of linguistic diversity in general and of English language learners (ELLs) in particular. In hopes of drawing implications for school language policy formation, the organization for instruction at two middle school buildings was used as a crux for analyzing the three elements mentioned above.

From a school policy perspective with reference to the Bush Administration's No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, the study was premised on the critical importance for educational personnel keeping abreast of changing demographics, best educational practices, and ways to improve student performance, principally, as these affected ELLs and other linguistically diverse students. The needs threshold was based on a need to reexamine linguistic diversity in the school with a focus on the steady increase of school-aged children who are influenced by a language other than English in the home. There was a need for a study that informed policy and decision makers on the concerns of education and language at the middle level by using data that focused on meshing building level educational structures with the organization for instruction. The case study maintained that concerns relating to linguistically diverse students were a school policy problem as well as a pedagogical problem.

The conceptual framework for the case study was structured in three major parts: influencing factors, focus of the study (three elements), and inferred elements of middle school language policy. Since the research was framed as a case study, no hypotheses were formulated as part of the design; instead a major research question and four sub questions were posed. The research questions were used to explore the three elements and to draw some implications about school language policy formation and the organization for instruction in context of two middle schools.

Data collection devices consistent with mixed methods and multiple sources included: site visits with direct and participant observation, interviews with building leaders and teachers,

taking field notes and journaling, examining public documents and available records, and the use of appropriate technologies. A research protocol was used to guide all data collection activities and was organized into four main parts: Collection of Data for the Research Setting, Collection of Data from Building Leaders (Leadership), Collection of Data from Teachers (Instruction), and Collection of Data for Variable of Program. Site visits and interviews were at the center of the case study.

<div align="center">Research Questions: Findings, Discussion, Implications, Conclusions</div>

This section presents the research questions along with findings and discussion relevant to each question. The four sub questions were answered using data from the survey results and findings. The major research question was addressed based on research results and conclusions reached on research sub questions. The implications drawn and conclusions reached demonstrate the pivotal nature of school language policy formation in addressing concerns about linguistic diversity and ELLs at two middle school buildings.

<div align="center">Four Research Sub Questions</div>

This section presents a restatement of the four sub questions used in the case study. The sub questions are followed by a narrative discussion addressing the nature, with reference to school language policy formation, of each question using the results and findings as delineated in Chapter 4. It was the intent of the researcher to provide the reader with plausible answers to the four research sub questions along with implications and conclusions.

<div align="center">*Leadership Sub Question 1*</div>

<u>In what ways and to what extent does leadership promote the needs of linguistic diversity in the school and what implications would this have for school language policy formation</u>?

In this case study, the superintendence was viewed as the traditional source of leadership at the community, school district, and building level. It was the superintendent who was responsible for providing vision and setting direction for the instructional program, principally, as it affected linguistic diversity and the education of ELLs. The importance of the superintendent and central office team was not to be underestimated in terms of developing resource capacity at the building level. The Crisis of Leadership section clearly points to the

importance of viable leadership in getting things done. The conflict over who had the authority to make decisions affecting the district was chronicled in the series of events delineated above, which culminated with the firing of the Superintendent. It was seen as a fundamental question of, "Who has control over the operation of the schools?"

The principal and assistant principal served the important role as the hub of contact in the district for the school building. The principals worked tirelessly to get their buildings on track in the midst of change and NCLB requirements. Without the principal's support very little got done if he/she didn't get behind the proposed projects. The building principal's organizational functions were described as: facilitating, monitoring, and supporting. With reference to linguistic diversity the building leaders worked with faculty and staff in providing leadership on instructional and program matters.

Building leaders provided the leadership necessary to increase educational personnel's language and cultural awareness, but most importantly to find the resources to do something about the growing needs generated by current demographic shifts (e.g., ELLs are the fastest growing segment of the school-aged population). The task at hand was not only to help students and teachers respect home culture and native language, but to accept the serious challenge of teaching and learning English. The leadership required in recognizing and promoting the diversity students bring to the school building and into the classroom was found to be of importance. The building leader at one middle school strongly felt that leadership took a different direction when the student population was predominately Hispanic. In this case, it could significantly influence the degree of diversity found at the school building (i.e., a sort of ethnic isolation effect may develop). In these situations, it was important for building leaders to emphasize the importance of diversity for all students. This was a necessary ingredient in developing an organizational culture that respected difference and invited parent participation.

It was found that it took strong building leaders with vision to increase parental involvement and provide curricular diversity while at the same time promoting student academic performance, as per federal and state mandates. At the middle school, language has become an important concern. Many times, however, there was a "withdrawal" from recognizing students' language difference, primarily, because student performance most often was based on English language skills and abilities. Leaders at the middle schools often referred to leadership as important in addressing language barriers and promoting parents' comfort level when visiting the

building. It was seen as a win- win situation to have a willingness to work with parents of linguistically diverse students and with stakeholders from the diverse communities served by the school. Building leaders were concerned about the involvement and role that parents of linguistically diverse students played in the on-going operation of the school. It was found that parents can also be passionate about education and can provide vital leadership by encouraging their children to pursue their education and to respect their own diversity.

Linguistically diverse students needed effective leadership and instructional efficacy if they were to meet the rigorous expectation placed on them. The unintended consequences of No Child Left Behind on ELLs placed added pressure on students to learn English and on teachers for students to learn English. The central focus of leadership in the school building was viewed as paramount in helping teachers meet their own personal expectation in working with ELLs from diverse communities. It was important for teachers to have the freedom to recognize and celebrate diversity in all its forms. In all its diversity, effective building leader encouraged and invited the participation of students, faculty, and staff in all facets of community and school life.

Building leaders also provided the leadership needed in "power brokering" of federal law and state statutes at the local level, particularly, in each middle school building. Building leaders interpreted and implemented policy in ways that improved the school and didn't hinder linguistically diverse students' progress and school success. Instructional leadership was seen as vitally important in promoting student achievement and improved performance for linguistically diverse students, especially ELLs. It was reported that schools needed to be structured to include a wider variety of input on instructional matters, which included more participation by stakeholders. Developing mechanism that made it easier for stakeholders to get together and to have dialogue on how to improve instruction and learning in the classroom were also found to be important.

Teacher leadership was also seen as a crucial link in informing professional practice and in improving instruction for all students. In classroom situations, teachers can be isolated physically and forced to develop instruction and classroom language policy on their own. It was found that teachers often have sensitivity to the problems associated with linguistic diversity, but were fragmented as to what best practices to follow. Without leadership, it was difficult for them to accept linguistically diverse students as their own (e.g., to teach them English). This was a critical factor, particularly, where the schools served a diverse student population and where the

external environment was composed of diglossic language communities (i.e., speak a language other than the one used in the school).

School leadership (principal, teacher, students, and parents) was found to be a viable component of effective school organization. Effective leadership was seen as a crucial element in the successful implementation of effective, but appropriate, instruction and programs designed to service "linguistic diversity" in the school. It was felt by the researcher that without viable leadership, the development of an effective organization for instruction at the building level would not enjoy much success with reference to promoting the adoption of "best" educational practices as essential elements in the education of ELLs and other linguistically diverse students.

Implications.

The implications drawn for school language policy formation included developing leadership, not more but informed leadership, at every level of the school organization. Another implication drawn referred to technical and authoritative leadership able to address the professional development needs of educational personnel at the middle school building level. This included identifying and analyzing pedagogical knowledge about language and languages (varieties and sub varieties and non-standard forms). Another implication for school language policy formation related to the building leaders role in the treatment of linguistic diversity and the degree to which parents of linguistically diverse students are made to feel comfortable when conducting school business. The implications for leadership and language policy formation in promoting parental involvement and academic performance are important parts of the middle school experience. School language policy formation can be implied as part of the administration's leadership style and vision for education in the district. Leadership style and educational vision for the middle school viz., school community influenced perceptions of language policy formation.

Conclusions.

Conclusion 1. The findings from this case study research support the need for viable and effective leadership in reassessing linguistic diversity and for determining the appropriateness of school language policy formation.

Instruction Sub Question 2

In what ways and to what extent does instruction promote the needs of linguistically diverse students at the middle school and what implications would this have for school language policy formation?

As one of three elements in the case study, the role of instruction was found to be central to addressing critical issues relating to the provisions of educational services to linguistically diverse students. Instruction, in tandem with leadership and organization for instruction, remained central to the case study. Clearly, an instructional priority was to ensure that linguistically diverse students gained the proficiency and competency levels necessary to function in an all-English classroom and to perform at grade level on academic achievement tests. It was found that there are many challenges for educational personnel in meeting the instructional needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students. Many of the challenges at the two middle school buildings emanated from the significant increase in Hispanic and Title I students (low income) resulting from the district's reorganization plan, which was implemented during 2004-2005.

In order for ELLs to receive culturally competent instruction, there was an urgent need for additional bilingual and ELL competent faculty, which was reported as a priority. Although there were differences (e.g., backgrounds, second language, teaching experience, abilities in developing language sensitive instructional plans, etc.) among teachers there was consensus that language problems did exist and adequate instructional remedies needed to be implemented to improve students' academic achievement. This included incompatibilities brought on by students' home language and the language of instruction, which posed significant instructional planning and language policy concerns. The language problems that these students brought into the classroom and the proclivities for falling behind were of concern to teachers, in terms of the instructional program at the middle level. Although spoken English continued to be of concern, the long-term problem was with teaching students to read English language textbooks at grade level, or for second language learners to read at or near native English speaker proficiency.

It was also found that the degree and use of the first language as native language support continued to be a concern in instructional planning and delivery. Significant special programming was found to be available; however, some aspects of it possibly were not cohesive, which could very well be due to the nature of the specialized interventions involved.

Respondents reported that they used an array of methods and adaptation in their delivery of instruction to linguistically diverse students. These included conceptualization, native language support and reinforcement, individualizing instruction, visuals; focus on vocabulary, oral development, and silent reading. However, little evidence was found that pointed to serious consideration of students' language in instructional planning. Although they were sensitive to linguistic diversity, respondents interviewed expressed that they hardly ever considered language variety or linguistic aspects when preparing lesson plans or in delivery of material. Nonetheless, respondents believed that language was an important variable in providing instruction to their students, particularly, to linguistically diverse students. Teachers were knowledgeable in their perceptions of language problems and the need for language intervention, however there were substantial differences in perceptions about the nature and magnitude of the needed interventions. The importance of language sensitive instruction was in the presentation of concepts and developing concepts well enough for students to understand the material covered.

Along with instruction, resources and educational services that served to ease teacher responsibility for linguistically diverse students, particularly, non-English speakers were considered important. Some of the educational services available at the two middle school buildings included peer tutoring, after school centers (multi-functional services), language mentors, in house teacher resources, continuing education for teachers, more effective ESL-bilingual program types, and more importantly, effective reading approaches and consolidated programs. Although no evidence was found with reference to formal instructional support group meetings at either middle school building, both faculties participated in departmental and team meetings, which encouraged collaboration and communication between teachers. Along with "in house" resources (e. g., ESL teacher, bilingual faculty, and resource teachers), communication and being on the same page were found to be important factors in adapting instruction for linguistically diverse students.

In order to improve instruction, professional development needs were voiced, which included more course work in languages, in this case Spanish, more work in methods and strategies designed for ESL students, and more advanced degrees. It was a found that language needs of students changed as they moved through the curriculum. The full inclusion policy adopted by the district affected all teachers with linguistically diverse special education students assigned to their classrooms, in terms, of additional professional development needed. This was

especially significant when linguistics and language were considered as important processes or variables in the design and delivery of instruction. For example some interviewees expressed the need for additional in-service on how to incorporate the speech, hearing, oral, and learning problems of linguistically diverse students. It was found that in most cases, respondents were willing to participate in further in-service and professional development. They pointed to the continuing and future needs (e.g., increasing numbers of immigrants) of teachers in all areas.

At this point, it was reemphasized that there was a critical need for looking at instructional requirements and not just program types when instruction was being designed and developed for linguistically diverse students. In a bilingual instructional context, it was suggested that student's abilities develop best in classrooms where language (1st language, 2nd language, etc.) was a necessary part of the instructional process. A challenge for middle school teachers was being able to differentiate or adapt instruction within an integrated curricular program that responded to diverse student needs. Findings pointed out that the needs of English language learners do not differ from those of other young adolescent students at the middle school except for, maybe, specific cultural and linguistic differences. In the process of instruction, differences were identified as students' learning characteristics and given consideration in lesson planning.

Other factors, which impinged on instruction, included parental involvement and teacher preparation including knowledge of language and pedagogy. An immediate first impression clearly demonstrated that teachers depended on available educational personnel (e.g., district and building level) when marshaling resources to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students. The organization for instruction along with leadership was presented as the critical point in the school organization where educational personnel could collaborate on instructional concerns and assume a collective responsibility for the needs of linguistically diverse students. The development of a viable and effective organization for instruction played an important role in professional development and organizational responsiveness to the needs of linguistically diverse students. Likewise, it was found that decision-making on instructional matters was also related to the role that instruction played in the education of linguistically diverse students and was an important element in the organization for instruction.

Implications.

The implications drawn are significant in terms of fostering a learning climate that addresses linguistic diversity in the classroom. An important implication drawn was the need to

involve of all teachers in the provision of educational services to ELLs and second language learners. The implications for the organization for instruction was that teachers reported communication and being on the same page as key variables in promoting effective instruction, and this had further implications for the development of a school wide language policy formation. The implications for language policy formation suggested that teachers assume a greater responsibility for student's language development in terms of producing world-class students with linguistic abilities for meeting the needs of globalization.

Another planning implications for language policy formation were that fact that interviewees differed in terms of, 1) their understanding of classroom language policy, 2) whether they had a language policy, and 3) if they did, how would they define their classroom language policy. Most interviewees believed teacher expectations for students' proficiency in English were central to having a viable classroom language policy. Others respected language differences and did what they could to encourage student performance. There were some who didn't know if they had a language policy. In addition, respondents believed whatever the state or district mandated (i.e., standards and benchmarks, Bilingual/ESL policy initiatives) that was the school's language policy. The majority of comments demonstrated that teachers were reliant on the district and state for direction on policy initiatives. In short, most believed the school's policy to be similar to their classroom policy, in that it required English and being flexible.

Conclusions.

Conclusion 1. The findings of the case study suggest that teachers can benefit from pedagogical knowledge about language and language use in the instructional process.

Conclusion 2. The findings support that teachers lacked knowledge and understanding about what role linguistic diversity played in the school and about language policy in their classroom and/or building.

Program Sub Question 3

In what ways and to what extent does middle level program promote the needs of linguistic diversity in middle schools and what implications could be drawn for school language policy formation?

Middle level curricular programs were in many ways similar except for school governance (e.g., use of Teams or departmental committees). Programs were designed and

structured to meet the overall academic, emotional, and social needs of students in the young adolescence stage of development. At this age (12 to 14) students are in the process of developing their personal and social identities. Identity was seen as a vital factor in the overall development of second language learners. Linguistic elements, although difficult to understand, continued to be of interest to program planners and other educational personnel responsible for program planning. The significance of designing and developing appropriate middle level programs was found to be vital in servicing the unique and complex needs of linguistically diverse students at this very formable stage of growth and development. Educational personnel (building leaders and teachers) at the two middle schools generally felt that students with language differences, including non-standard forms, needed encouragement and warranted adaptations as part of their regular program. Interviewees were sensitive, aware, and expressed concern for linguistically diverse students in their classrooms, which influenced their program.

Structuring or restructuring the organization of the school and curriculum to fully address the language needs of all students was found to be most significant. One building leader reported that the first thing he did when he became principal was to structure the curriculum where students were exposed to 4 out of 7 periods of language instruction or support. Similarly, because the student population at his middle school was 85% Hispanic, additional ESL teachers were brought on board and student schedules were changed to ensure they received the language and reading support they needed. Even then, only comments that a large percentage of students at both middle schools were Spanish-speaking were expressed. Rarely were the needs of other foreign languages expressed, which may have been a result of Spanish being the dominate other language spoken in the buildings. Here, a point to be made was that large percentages of any one group, in this case Hispanics, could serve to limit diversity of programs in the school.

Respondents believed that their experiences with parent participation proved to be a key to middle school programs and to students' school success. Moreover, although language communities viz., school community of each middle school were viewed only as influencing external factors, the individual diversity produced by differing lifestyles in those communities was found to be a source of diversity on school grounds and in the school building.

The student achievement data on tables 4.5 through 4.9 demonstrate seemingly poor performance on the part of 7th and 8th grade students with confounding scores for Hispanics as compared to Caucasian students. The data point to the need to seriously examine programs and

programming at the middle school with particular reference to the achievement levels of linguistically diverse students. It was found that a common criticism of middle level programs was that too much emphasis was placed on social and psychological factors at the expense of academic considerations. This was of special significance for middle level programs designed for educating linguistically diverse students, because they are in a continual game of "catch up" in their academic proficiencies, especially ESL and second language learners.

Implications.

The implications for school language policy were implied by the multicultural make up of the state, district, and middle schools, which provided the setting for the case study. Other implication asked, "How to teach all students English well enough to be successful in their formal educational experiences"? Another implication was how to include, and how much, native language support to include in the process of providing educational services. The literature on language and education substantiates the belief that approaches in education have allowed for more native language support. We are, in fact, encouraging members of other language groups to maintain strong ties to their home culture and native language. But, effective middle level program (s) required that students be well versed in the English language in order to perform on achievement assessments. Standards based accountability has forced administrators and teachers to look at middle level curricular programs that meet federal, state, and local requirements.

Decision-making implications about program included: How will these program decisions be made? Who will inform the school organization on the need for language planning and language policy decision- making in the design of middle level programming and program? Does program imply that teachers are responsible for the amount of English that their students learn at the middle school? What type of middle level program would result in learning on the part of the student, principally linguistically diverse students? Will stakeholders and parents of students in the middle school be actively involved in planning and structuring programs for middle level schools? What implications would language program have on the needs of middle school students in order to produce world-class students, address linguistic diversity, and ensure successful transition into high school?

Conclusions.

Conclusion 1. The findings of the case study suggest that the middle school programs reviewed needed educational structuring to better service the language experience and educational needs of ELLs and other linguistically diverse students.

Conclusion 2. The findings of the case study support the observation that programs at the middle level need to be evaluated with reference to the treatment of linguistic diversity and the degree of linguistic diversity of students with reference to school language policy formation.

Language Policy Sub Question 4

In what ways and to what extent can language policy be inferred or is discernable in the middle school environment?

Language policy, an often-misunderstood social phenomenon, was interpreted as something neglected at every level of human endeavor. This was particularly the case in schools and in local communities where people interacted and developed close relationships with one another. Like most policy initiatives language policy was designed to serve the interests of individuals and organizations in need of direction and guidance in matters of human conduct. Important constructs used in the exploratory research were language, the school, and language policy. In hopes of maintaining a safe, productive middle school linguistic culture, educational personnel have strived toward meeting the language needs of all students by structuring an effective learning environment. In the process of identifying elements of language policy, the unique character of the middle school environment was given special consideration. This was especially important when metaphors such as culture, the school plant, and learning community were used to describe the middle school building. Middle school environments, albeit each school's distinctive socio-cultural character, were viewed as microcosms of U.S. society with respect to the degree of human and individual diversity found. It was estimated that 98% of ELLs at the two middle schools studied already spoke English well enough to function on school grounds, but they lacked academic language skills and proficiencies. In this study, the school language policy formation considered the school environment as a place where teaching and learning took place.

Another element of language policy, forces educators to question, "Why should linguistic diversity receive special treatment in the school?" The question also expresses a concern about what the middle schools are doing to promote students' English language skills given the

emergence of English as a world language, the need to improve student academic performance, and the critical importance of students improving their English language and reading skills. With reference to language policy formation, findings included concerns about what we have done, need to do, and what we will continue to do with reference to middle school students' identity formations and academic achievement. As was described in the problem statement of this case study, educational personnel and teachers remained in a quandary about their responsibilities-both legal and ethical-in remedying the situation. This was an element of language policy found at the two middle school buildings.

Linguistic diversity as an element of language policy was looked at in terms of the varieties, sub varieties, and non-standard forms evident in each middle school building. Primary focus on sub varieties and non-standard forms in this study was limited to those expressed in English. Thus, the emphasis on variety (language) as used in this case study was partially determined by the large percentage of Spanish-speaking students at both middle schools (refer to Table 4.4). An interesting finding with reference to language use on school grounds was that there was a clear difference between Hispanic and Black students and the use of vernaculars in the building. Hispanics were prone to use Spanish in all its forms, on the bus, on the playground, in the building, and in the classroom. But, black students were more reserved and used standard forms of English to communicate with each other and for learning purposes in the classroom. They did not use nonstandard forms such as Ebonics or Black English on school grounds as readily as Hispanics used Spanish.

Moreover, when asked about the school's and their own classroom language policy respondents remained at a loss. It was found that building leaders wanted students to maintain order and contribute to a safe learning environment. English teachers felt that their job was to teach English, so in effect that was what their policy was. Math teachers believed that if their students knew enough English to work the problems, especially the word problems that would be their emphasis. In short, no one really had considered having a written language policy for the building or the classrooms, other than, the use of appropriate language on school grounds as spelled out in faculty and student handbooks, and references to languages and the use of language delineated in the Public Education Department's standards and benchmarks and performance criteria. So, the element of whether the middle schools needed a written school language policy received serious consideration by building leaders and teachers.

It was also found that student makeup at the two middle school building presented an element of language policy that demonstrated a need to address students' language base (e.g., rural, multilingual, Native American languages, Spanish-speakers, etc.). The linguistic diversity engendered by the middle school student population was found to a significant element in reaching a needs threshold with reference to the feasibility of school language policy formation. The case study found that these elements of language policy were identified in the form of the language communities that produce students with unique linguistic abilities and diversity.

Implications.

The implications of who has the political will to address issues of language and education, in terms of building level planning and policy formation, was seen as important in addressing language needs at the middle school. The findings implied empowerment issues and the philosophic underpinnings needed to address concerns about the feasibility of a school language policy formation. The implication of school language policy to the community of the school includes not only the treatment of linguistic diversity in the school but also the linguistic diversity of the students and their respective language communities. Language policy also implies the variables that education personnel can control and those they can't control in context of the school. For example, how social and public policy influence the operation and control of the schools in terms of the strategic importance of language education and services. Implied the need of addressing important concerns of the community of the school viz., language and speech communities. The implied and explicit purposes of a school language policy were considered the work of the total school community, which should include all stakeholders.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1. The findings of the case study suggest that the middle school building level was where serious discourse about language planning and language policy formation should take place.

Conclusion 2. The findings further support the existence of discernable aspects concerning language policy formation in the middle school environment.

Major Research Question

<u>In what ways and to what extent does school context and the organization for instruction positively influence school language policy formation</u>?

The exploratory research used the organization for instruction at each school building as a crux to study the elements of middle school leadership, instruction, and program in context of the school. The three elements taken together provided the educational structure for identifying the need for and purpose of school language policy formation. In context of the school, the three elements operated in tandem with the district's system of instruction in the delivery of language and educational services. Along with school language policy formation, the treatment of linguistic diversity and the needs of English language learners were a focus of the study.

Within the context of the school, it was found that effective leadership steeped in efficient management principals and a viable organization for instruction was an important function in the operation and control of the school. For example, the section on Crisis of Leadership chronicles the conflict for control of how decisions were made with reference to district business. The events had their genesis in power or who has the power to decide what gets done and how (e.g., reorganization of district schools). These events not only impacted on the ongoing operation of the district but also on the schools, in this case, the two middle schools.

The organization for instruction in context of the school provides the esprit de corps and could empower teachers in decision-making concerning linguistically diverse students' academic performance and achievement. It was found that teachers and other educational personnel in the building needed to buy into the educational process and consider all students as their students. For example, in context of the school, the teaching of English to ELLs can be an educational process shared by every member of the faculty. In addition, educational personnel in the building could serve as interlocutors in the acquiring of English by middle school students. The priority is to teach these students enough English to function in an all-English classroom and to perform at grade level. It was found that the context of the middle school provide an excellent opportunity for assessing the important role that organization for instruction could play in addressing the curricular and instructional needs of linguistically diverse students.

A significant finding was that middle school programs could be structured for the effective provision of language services to linguistically diverse students. It was also found that in order to keep the momentum of the educational enterprise moving forward every member of

the school organization, including students, needed to exert effective organizational and leadership skills within context of the school. In this context, educational structures can empower all participants in the process of education to work toward understanding of the educational mission. Although building leaders and teachers expressed their full support for linguistic diversity, it was found that their role in structuring the school context for language learning was actually determined by state and federal accountability systems. Nonetheless, educational structures within the school context can be driven by a committed organization for instruction dedicated to instructional development and reform.

The educational organization of the school context with the participation of stakeholders provides an excellent opportunity to focus on concerns about how to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students. Although building leaders provided for scheduled meeting of school faculty, it was found that the teachers at the two middle school buildings did not have a clear focus on what a well articulated language policy was or how a viable organization for instruction could be effective in the planning and delivery of language services. The end result of language policy formation could help establish some parameters for teachers and other educational personnel to use in marshalling of resources and developing building capacity. The process of language policy formation and implementation can be used to put the important role that language plays in the process of education into perspective with reference to the wide array of individual and linguistic diversity found at the middle level. Because the research was exploratory, implications drawn and conclusions reached were tentative and additional research was suggested. However, at this point, it can safely be stated that both the context of the school and the organization for instruction can positively influence the process of seriously assessing the need for a school language policy formation.

Implications.

The major implications drawn are as follows:

- In reference to school context, what was implied was a safe, productive linguistic culture as part of the middle school environment.
- The implications drawn for empowering teachers and students at the building level were also an important consideration in terms of developing an organization for

instruction focused on the needs of linguistically diverse students in context of the school.

- Implications for restructuring the curriculum and instructional processes at the middle school to better meet evolving and culturally dynamic changes at the middle school.

- Implications for inclusion included individual linguistic diversity and specific language needs of low performing and SPED students.

Conclusions.

Conclusion 1. The findings of the case study support the need for an assessment of linguistic diversity and language policy formation in context of the school.

Conclusion 2. The findings suggest that a viable organization for instruction can be instrumental in addressing the concerns of linguistically diversity at the middle school.

Recommendations Drawn from the Case Study Research

Recommendations for decision makers and stakeholders to follow in assessing the plausibility of a school language policy are delineated below. The recommendations were developed and directly stem from the findings of the case study research. An emphasis of the recommendation focuses on the need for further research on language matters pertaining to the middle schools. Also, recommendations suggest that available scientifically based research on the needs of linguistically diverse students be consulted in language planning and policy development.

List of Recommendations

Recommendations from the exploratory research focus on the organization of the school context and additional research needed. These recommendations are as follows:

1. That all stakeholders be included in the planning and formation of a school (building) language policy formation from the ground floor and at each stage in the design, development, and implementation. .

2. That effort be made to enhance the compatibility between home, community, and school, with reference to the languages and linguistics of the school community.

3. That the following criteria be used for assessing aspects of language policy formation found at the middle schools and in the classroom:

- General impression of tolerance for language differences.
- Specific support materials (e.g., lesson plans, program document, curriculum standards) aimed at language policy formation.
- Evident leadership capacity for language policy formation.
- Building or district resource capacity for language policy formation.
- Assess language use and other socio-linguistic variables found at the middle schools, such as, covert-overt manifestations (e.g., diglossia, privilege, language norms, status variables, etc.) of langue use and function.
- Assess the overall school organization (e.g., educational personnel and support staff) responsiveness to the concept of a school language policy formation.
- Observed school and external factors, which proactively promote linguistic diversity.
- Perception of community responsiveness to linguistic diversity and students' language use and proficiencies (Spanish and English).

4. That educational research on all facets of language (varieties, sub varieties, and non-standard forms) be conducted and properly evaluated and utilized in language planning at the middle school.

5. That addition research be conducted in identifying the unique characteristics and needs (e.g. socioeconomic, cultural, personal, etc.) of English language learners (ELLs), principally second language learners at the middle schools.

6. That research on instructional approaches and strategies at the middle level be conducted and used to meet the needs of linguistically diverse students and the growing number of English Language Learners.

7. That the school district study and define the competencies they want middle schools to have in all dimensions of their lives and how school, teacher, and student culture are influenced and affected.

8. Focus groups with parents in the language community to define what they desire for their children in terms of language competence.

9. Focus groups with community powerbrokers to see what the economic future of the city and county will be.

10. Focus groups with private sector organizations to see what they desire for adult and

students language competence.

11. Internal studies to determine how auxiliary and support programs at the middle schools can be de-fragmented and consolidated to help the linguistically diverse student population.

12. Hire teachers who are Spanish-English Bilinguals.

13. Revisit and reevaluate effectiveness of the organizational components of the middle school program (block scheduling, Teams, etc.) What is best for language competence?

14. Establish a significant language based instructional and resource capacity in the community (adult education, church-based, private sector).

15. Reconsider the language elements in technology and how technology can be configured to maximize language development (i.e., the software and Internet; rather than the hardware.

16. School organizations such as clubs for teachers and students who seek to teach in bilingual or dual language settings.

17. That a school language policy for the building or classroom include some or all of the following considerations: a) should specify the languages (e.g., Spanish and English), b) should include one priority on English academic reading competence, c) should include apriority on Spanish (or any other target language) listening speaking competence, d) should explain the rights and responsibility of language users, and e) should specify the assessments used to determine language competence.

18. That further research appropriate to the middle schools be conducted with reference to the findings and recommendations of this research.

Bibliography

Books and Journal Articles.

Abbott, S., & Grose, C. (1998). "I know English so many, Mrs. Abbott": Reciprocal discoveries in a linguistically diverse classroom. *Language Arts*, 75 3, (March 1998).

Adams, K. L., & Brink, D. T. (Eds.). (1990). *Perspectives on official English: The campaign for English as the official language of the USA*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Aguirre, A., & Turner, J. H. (1995). *American ethnicity: The dynamics and consequences of discrimination.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Aguirre, A. (1981) *A sociolinguistic survey of a bilingual community: Implications for bilingual education*. Los Angeles, CA: National Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

Amorose, T. (1989). The official language movement in the United States: Contexts, issues, and activities. *Language Problems & Language Planning,* 13, 264-79.

Artiles, A. J., & McClafferty, K. (1998). Learning to teach culturally diverse learners: Charting change in pre-service teachers' thinking about effective teaching. *The Elementary School Journal,* 98(3), 189-220.

August, D., & Hakuta, K. (Eds.). (1997*). Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Bacharach, S. B., & Mundell, B. (Eds.). (1995). *Images of schools: Structures and roles in organizational behavior.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Baldridge, V. J., & Deal, T. E. (1975). *Managing change in educational organizations: Sociological perspectives, strategies, and case studies*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Banks, J. A. (1994). *Multiethnic education: Theory and practice* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Barnard, C. I. (1949). *Organization and management: Selected papers.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Barnitz, J. G. (Ed.). (1997). Linguistic perspectives in literacy education: Emerging awareness of linguistic diversity for literacy instruction. *The Reading Teacher,* 51(3), 264-265.

Baron, D. E. (1990). *English-only question: An official language for Americans?* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Berg, B. L. (1995). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (2nd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bergmann, H., Hurson, K., & Russ-Eft, D. (1999). *Everyone a leader: A grassroots model.* New York: Excellence Publishing.

Bennis, W. & Nanus, B. (1985a). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Bennis, W. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead: The unconscious conspiracy continues*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bogdan, R. (1972). *Participant observation in organizational settings*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1998). (3rd Ed.). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and Leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Cazden, C. B. & Mehan, H. (1989). Principles from sociology and anthropology: Context, code, classroom, and culture. In M. C. Reynolds (Ed.), *Knowledge base for beginning teachers*, (47-57). Oxford, England: Perganon Press.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The calla handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Chomsky, N. (1971). *Problems of knowledge and freedom: The Russell lectures*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Chomsky, N. (1975). *Reflections on language.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Chomsky, N. (1977*). Language and responsibility*. New York : Pantheon Books.

Chomsky, N. (1979). *Language and responsibility* (2nd ed). New York: Pantheon Books.

Cloud, N., Genesee, F., & Hamayan, E. (2000*). Dual language instruction: A handbook for enriched education*. Boston, MA: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

Cobarrubias, J. (1983). Progress in language planning. In J. Cobarrubias & J. Fishman, (Eds.). (1983), *Contributions to the sociology of language*. New York: Mouton Publishers.

Cobarrubias, J., & Fishman, J. (Eds.). (1983). *Contributions to the sociology of language*. New York: Mouton Publishers.

Cohen, D., & Rosenberg, B. (1977). Functions and fantasies: Understanding schools in capitalist America. In J. V. Baldridge & T. Deal (Eds.), *The dynamics of organizational change in education* (383-408)*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation

Constantino, R. (1994). A study concerning instruction of ESL students comparing all-English classroom teacher knowledge and English as a second language teacher knowledge. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students,* 13, 37-57, (Spring 1994).

Corson, D. (1988). *Oral language across the curriculum.* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Corson, D. (Ed.). (1995). *Discourse and power in educational organizations*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Corson, D. (1997). Non-standard varieties and educational policy. In R. Wodak & D. Corson (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of language and education, Vol. 1; Language policy and political issues in education,* 99 -109, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Corson, D. (1999). *Language policy in schools: A resource for teachers and administrators.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Corson, D. (2001). *Language diversity and education.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Crawford, J. (1992). *Hold your tongue*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Crawford, J. (1997). *Best evidence: Research foundations of the bilingual education act.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Crawford, J. (2000). *At war with diversity: US language policy in an age of anxiety*. Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters LTD.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc..

Creswell, J. W. (2002). *Educational Research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating* quantitative and qualitative research. Columbus OH: Merrill Prentice Hall

Cushner, K., McClelland, A., & Safford, P. (1996). *Human diversity in education: An integrative approach* (2nd ed.). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement: A review of state policy evidence. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 8(1) (January1, 2000).Tempe AZ: Arizona State University Press.

Deal, T. E., & Peterson, K. D (1994). *The leadership paradox: Balancing logic and artistry in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Donnelly, J. D. (1966). *The basic theoretical contribution of Chester I. Barnard to contemporary administrative thought.* Unpublished Dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Eco, H. (1990). *The limits of interpretation.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Elmore, R. F. (2000). *Leadership and learning: Principal recruitment, induction and instructional leadership in community school district #2, New York City.* Paper presented at the University of Pittsburgh, Learning Research and Development Center, High Performance Learning Communities Project.

Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (1995). *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Escamilla, K. (994). A sociolinguistic environment of a bilingual school: A case study introduction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 18, 21-47.

Fishman, J. A. (1972a). *Sociolinguistics: A brief introduction.* Rowley, MA: Newberry House Publishers.

Fishman, J. A. (Ed.). (1972b). *Readings in the sociology of language.* The Hague, Paris: Mouton and Co. N.V. Publishers.

Fishman, J. A. (1988). 'English only': Its ghosts, myths, and dangers. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language,* 74, 15-40.

Franquiz, M. E. & De La Luz Reyes, M. (1998). Creating inclusive learning communities through English language arts: From chanclas to canicas. *Language Arts*, 75(3), 211-220, (March 1998).

Freire, P. (1985). *The politics of education: Culture, power, and liberation.* South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey Publishers.

Fueyo, V. (1997). Teaching language-minority students: Using research to inform practice. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 30(1), 16-22.

Fullan, M. (2002b). The change leader. *Educational Leadership* (May 2002), 59(8), 16-21.

Gagne, R. M., Briggs, L. J., & Wager, W. W. (1992). (4th Ed.). *Principles of instructional design.*

New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich College Publishers.

Gallegos, B. (Ed.). (1994). *English-our official language*? New York: H. W. Wilson.

Gandara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., Garcia, E., Asato, J., Gutierrez, K., Stritikus, T., & Curry, J.
(2000). *The initial impact of proposition 227 on the instruction of English learners.*
Davis, CA: UC Linguistic Minority Research Institute Education Policy Center
University of California, Davis.

Garcia, E. E. (1991). *Education of linguistically and culturally diverse students: Effective
instructional practices* (Educational Practice Report 1). Santa Cruz, CA: University of
California.

Garcia, G. N. (2000). Lessons from research: What is the length of time it takes limited English
proficient students to acquire English and succeed in an all English classroom? *Issue &
Brief NCBE,* 5 (September 2000). Washington, DC: NCBE Center for the Study of
Language and Education.

Gardner, H. (2004). *The unschooled mind: How children think and how schools should teach*
(2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books, A Member of the Peseus Books Group.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for quality
research*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company

Glasser, W. (1990). *Quality school: Managing students without coercion.* New York: Harper
Perennial-A Division of Harper Collins Publishers.

Haugen, E., Mc Clure, D. J., & Thomson, D. (Eds.). (1980). *Minority languages today*.
Edinburgh, England: Edinburgh University Press.

Haugen, E. (1972). *The ecology of language*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Heath, S. B., & Mandabach, F. (1983). Language status decisions and the law in the United
States. In J. Cobarrubias & J. Fishman (Eds.). (1983), *Contributions to the sociology of
language*. New York: Mouton Publishers.

Herrera, S. (1995). *Junior high school teachers and the meaning perspectives they hold
regarding their Mexican American students: An ethnographic case study*. Unpublished
Manuscript,
Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University.

Hill, J. R., & Schrum, L. (2002). Theories on teaching: Why are they so hard to find? *Tech
Trends,* 46(5), 22-6, (Sept./Oct.2002).

HLRPC-UCLA Center for Applied Linguistics (2000). *A Report on the Heritage Language Research Priorities Conference*. Los Angles, CA: UCLA University Press.

Hopstock, P. J. (1995). *Recommendations on student outcome variables for limited English proficient (LEP) students* (Report by the Written Focus Group). Development Associates, Inc. Research, Evaluation, and Survey Services Division. Washington, DC: OBEMLA

Holmes Group (1990). *Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group.

Huckabee, H. H., & English Class (1996). *Making tracks vol. 1.* Roswell, NM: Pioneer Printing.

Hunt D. V. (1996). *Process mapping: How to reengineer your business processes*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Hymes, D. (1964). Introduction: Toward ethnographies of communication. *American Anthropologist*, 66(6), 1-35.

Hymes, D. (1971). On linguistic theory, communicative competence and the education of disadvantaged children. In M. Wax, S. Diamond & F. Gearing (Eds.), *Anthropological perspectives in education*. New York: Basic Books.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinuistics: An ethnographic approach*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Irvin, J. L. (1998*). Reading and the middle school student: Strategies to enhance literacy* (2nd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Janesick, V. J., (1998). *Stretching exercises for qualitative researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Jespersen, O. (1933). *Language its nature development and origin* (4th ed.). New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Jespersen, O. (1964). *Mankind, nation and individual: From a linguistic point of view*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

King, D. (2002). The changing shape of leadership. *Educational Leadership* 59(8), 61-63, (May 2002).

Kloss, H. (1998). The American bilingual tradition. *Language in education: Theory and practice*, 88. ERIC Document ED 423706. McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc.

Krathwohl, D. R. (1993). *Methods of educational and social science research: An integrated approach*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Lane, J. J., & Walberg, H. J. (Eds.). (1987). *Effective school leadership: Policy and process.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Laosa, L. M. (2000). *Non-Language characteristics of instructional services for language-minority students.* Washington, DC: Center for the Study of Language and Education at George Washington University.

Lebov, W. (1972a*). Language in the inner city.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lebov, W. (1972b). *Sociolinguistic patterns.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Lindsey, R. B., Robins, N., & Terrell, R. D. (1999). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

MacGregor-Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership.* New York: Harper and Row, Publishers.

Macias, R. F. (2000). Language politics and the sociolinguistic historiography of Spanish in the United States. In J. K. Peyton, P. Griffin, W. Wolfram, and R. Iasold (Eds.), *Language in Action*, 52-83. Gresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.

Macias, R. F. (1987). *Official languages in the United States: Policies, polemics, and politics.* Paper presented at the Annual National Hispanic Media Conference (5th, Los Angles, April 25, 1987), Claremont, CA: Tomas Rivera Center.

Mackey, W. F. (1983). US language status policy and the Canadian experience, In J. Cobarrubias and J. Fishman (Eds), *Contributions to the sociology of language*. New York: Mouton Publishers.

Marks, H. M., & Louis, K. S. (1997). Does teacher empowerment affect the classroom? The implications of teacher empowerment for instructional practice and student academic performance*. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 19(3), 245-275, (Fall 1997).

Marshall, D. F. (1986). The question of an official language: Language rights and the English language amendment. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, 60, 70-75.

Maxcy, S. J. (1991). *Educational leadership: A critical pragmatic perspective*. New York: Bergin and Garvey Publishers.

Meyer, J., Scott, R. W., & Deal, T. (1977). Research on school and district organization. In J. V. Baldridge & T. Deal (Eds.), *The dynamics of organizational change in education* (409-425)*.* Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Milk, R., Mercado, C., and Sapiens, A. (1992). Re-thinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools. NCBE FOCUS: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education, 6 (Summer 1992).

Minaya-Rowe, L. (1996). Bilingual teachers involving parents in the teaching-learning process: A practicum experience. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 16, (Summer 1996). Bosie, ID: Boise State University.

Mineau, G. W. (1998). From actors to processes: The representation of dynamic knowledge using conceptual graphs. In M. L. Mugnier & M. Chein (Eds.), *Conceptual structures: Theory, tools and applications*. Berlin: Springer.

Miramontes, O. B., Nadeau, A, & Commins N. L. (1997). *Restructuring schools for linguistic diversity: Linking decision making to effective programs*. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Mitchell, B., & Cunningham, L. L. (1990). *Educational leadership and changing contexts of families, communities, and schools* (Part II). Chicago: NSSE Distributed by the University of Chicago Press.

Morgan, G. (1998). *Images of organization: The executive edition*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Morgan, G. (1988). *Riding the waves of change: Developing managerial competencies for a turbulent world*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Nadeau, A. (1997). Linguistic diversity and reform: Can practices be identified? *Directions in Language and Education NCBE,* 1 (10), (Winter 1997).

Nathenson-Mejia, S. (1994). Bridges between home and school: Literacy building activities for non native English speaking homes. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 14, 149-164, (Winter 1994).

No Child Left Behind Act (2000). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

O'Brien, D. G., Stewart, R. A., & Moje, E. B. (1995). Why content literacy is difficult to infuse into the secondary school: Complexities of curriculum, pedagogy, and school culture. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 30(1), 442-465, (July/August/September 1995).

Ovando, C. J., & Combs, A (1992). "*English only movement: Confrontation with language diversity*". Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association for Bilingual Education (17th, Houston, TX, April 21-May1, 1988).

Parla, J. (1994). Educating teachers for cultural and linguistic diversity: A model for all teachers. *New York Association for Bilingual Education Journal,* 9, 1-6, (Summer 1994),

Pease-Alvarez, L. (1993). Moving in and out of bilingualism: Investigating native language maintenance and shift in Mexican-descent children. *National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning: Research Report 6.* Santa Cruz, CA: University of California.

Penalosa, F. (1980). *Chicano sociolinguistics: A brief introduction.* Rowley, MA: Newbury House Publishers.

Reigeluth, C. M. (Ed.). (1987). *Instructional theories in action: Lessons illustrating selected theories and models.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Reigeluth, C. (1998). *Instructional design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory* (Vol. II). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ricento, T. (1997). Language policy and education in the United States. In J. Wodak & D. Corson (Eds.), *Language policy and political issues in education,* 137-148. Boston:Kluwer.

Rohac, R. (2001). *Specifically designed academic instruction in English (SADIE).* Riverside, CA: Rohac Educational Solutions.

Rothermund, D., and Simon, J. (1986). *Education and the integration of ethnic minorities.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Romero, M., and Parrino, A. (1994). Planned alternation of languages (PAL): Language use and distribution in bilingual classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students*, 13, 137-161, (Spring 1994).

Ruiz, R. (1995). Language planning considerations in indigenous communities. *The Bilingual Research Journal*, 19(1), 71-81, (Winter 1995).

Sarthory, J. A. (Ed.). (1974). *Educational leadership, renewal and planning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Saavedra, E. (1996). Teachers study groups: Contexts for transformative learning and action. *Theory Into Practice,* 35(4), 271-277, (Autumn 1996).

Schwartz, H., & Jacobs, J. (1979). *Qualitative sociology: A method to the madness.* New York: The Free Press.

Schatzman, L., & Strauss, A. (1973). *Field research.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Schein, E. H. (1988). *Process Consultation, Vol. 1: Its role in organization development* (2nd ed.). New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Schiffman, H. F. (1996). *Linguistic culture and language policy.* New York: Routledge.

Senge, P. M., Kleiner, A., Roberts, C., Ross, R., Roth, G., & Smith, B. (1999). *The dance of change: The challenges of sustaining momentum in learning organizations*. New York: Currency Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1990). *Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1994). *Building community in schools. San Francisco*: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. J., & Starratt, R. J. (2002). *Supervision: A redefinition* (7th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education-A Division of the McGraw-Hill Companies.

Simich-Dudgeon, C., & DiCerbo, P. A. (1998). Classroom strategies for encouraging collaborative discussion. *NCBE Directions in Language and Education,* 12, (Summer 1998), Washington, DC: NCBE George Washington University.

Simich-Dudgeon, C., McCreedy, L., & Schleppegrell, M. (1989). Helping limited English proficient children communicate in the classroom: A handbook for teachers. *NCBE Program Information Guide Series,* 9, (Winter 1988-89). Washington, DC: NCBE George Washington University.

Smylie, M. A., Hawley, W. D., & Evertson, C. M. (1985). *A conceptual framework for the mission of the NIE Research and development center for teacher quality and effectiveness.* Nashville, TN: George Peabody College for Teachers

Smitherman, G. (1986). Talkin and testifin: The language of black America (2nd ed.). Detroit, MI: Wayne State University Press.

Smitherman, G. (1992). Black English, diverging or converging?: The view from the national assessment of educational progress. *Language and Education,* 6, 47-61.

Snodgrass, D. M., & Benevino, M. M. (2000). *Collaborative learning in middle and secondary schools: Applications and assessments*. Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education, Inc.

Spillane, J. P, & Thompson, C. L. (1997). Reconstructing conceptions of local capacity: The

local education agency's capacity for ambitious instructional reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19(2), 186-203, (Summer 1997).

Stein J. (1966). The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (The Unabridged Edition). New York: Random House.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, NJ: SAGE Publications.

The George Washington University Center for Equity and Excellence in Education (1996). *Promoting excellence: Ensuring academic success for limited English proficient students.* Arlington, VA: George Washington University.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: NCBE The George Washington University Center for the Study of Language and Education.

Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (1998). Two languages are better than one. *Educational Leadership*, 23-26, (December 1997 - January 1998). Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Tolman, D. L., & Brydon-Miller, M. (Eds.). (2001*). From subjects to subjectivities: A handbook of interpretive and participatory methods.* New York: New York University Press.

Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Winpelberg, R. K. (1987). The dilemmas of instructional leadership and a central role for central office. In W. Greenfield (Ed.). (1987), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Yin, R. SK. (1989). Case study research: Design and method, Cited in J. W. Creswell (2002). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc..

Zentella, A. C. (1988). Language politics in the USA: The English-only debate. In J. Graige (Ed). *Literature, language, and politics.* Athens: University of Georgia Press.

Electronic Media

Anstrom, K.(1998). Preparing secondary education teachers to work with English language learners: English language arts. NCBE (August 1998),

[On Line]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/ells/language.htm

Anstrom, K., & Silcox, B. (1998). Active learning and the limited English proficient student. Directions in Language Education NCBE, 1(2).

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/directions/02.htm

Banks, R. (2003). Middle school web guide: Questions-frequently requested information. ERIC-EECE Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education,

[On-Line]. Available: http://ericeece.org/faq/middle.

Borba, J., & Ligon, C. N. (2001). Supportive educational leadership: A requirement for rethinking and improving instructional delivery. *National Form of Educational Administration & Supervision Journal*, 17E, 4(9),

[On-Line] Available: http://www.nationalforum.com/25BORBA.htm

CAL Center for Applied Linguistics (2000). *Immigrant education,*

[On-line]. Available: http://www.cal.org/topics/immigrnt.htm

Camarota, S. A. (2001).*Immigrants in the United States—2000: A snapshot of America's foreign-born population.* Center for Immigration Studies,

[On-line]. Available: http://www.cis.org/articles/2001/back101.html

Camarota, S. A., & Bouvier, L. (1999). *The impact of new Americans: A review and analysis of the National Research Council's The new Americans: Economic, demographic, and fiscal effects of immigration.* Center for Immigration Studies,

[On-line]. Available: http://www.cis.org/topics/currentnumbers.html

Chen, E. M. (1995). Statement on civil liberties implications of "Official English" legislation before the US House of Representatives Committee On Economic and Educational Opportunities Subcommittee On Early Childhood, Youth and Families. American Civil Liberties Union Freedom Network,

[On- line]. Available http://www.aclu.org/congress/chen.html

Clark, R. C. (2003). Macromedia authorware: Authorware, multimedia, and instructional methods, [On-Line].

Available: http://www.macromedia.com/support/authorware/basics/instruct/index.html

CC-Contexts of Communication (2001). Dr. Scott Chadwick's homepage,

[Online]. Available: http://chandwick.jlmc.iastate.edu/theory/contexts.html

De Avila, E. (1997). *Setting expected gains for non and limited English proficient Students*

(NCBE Resource Collection Series No. 8). Washington, DC: Center for Applied

Linguistics,

[Online]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/resource/setting/index.html

Duchastel, P. (1999). *Prolegomena to a theory of instructional design*. Paper for discussion on

ITForum, [Online]. Available. Retrieved 3/27/03

http://itech1.coe.uga.edu/itforum/paper27/paper27html

FAIR United States (2001). *Immigration affects the whole country*,

[On-line]. Available: http://www.fairus.org/html/042us604.htm

Florida Department of Education (1996). *Learning and teaching: The unique perspective

of applied technology strands,*

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.flstw.fsu.edu/Online6/lrnteach.htmFlowers, N.,

Mertens, S. B., & Mulhall, P. F. (2000). Research on middle school renewal: What makes

interdisciplinary teams effective? *Middle School Journal Research Articles*,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/res_articles-march2000.htm

Fullan, M. (2002a). Leadership and sustainability. NASSP *Principal Leadership* (December,

2002), 3(4), 1-5,

[On –Line]. Available: http://www.nassp.org/news/p;_leadsustain_1202.html

Funderstanding (2001). Instruction: How should learning be designed?

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.funderstanding.com/instruction.cfm

George, P. S., Stevenson, C., Thomason, J., & Beane, J. (1992). The middle school-and beyond.

The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/books/george92book.html

Goldberg, M. F. (2001). Leadership in education: Five commonalities. *Phi Delta Kappan*

June, 2001, 82 100, 757-761,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k0106gol.htm

Guiney, E. (2001). Coaching isn't just for athletes: The role of teacher leaders. *Phi Delta Kappan*

(June, 2001), 82(10), 740-743,

[On-line]. Available: http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/ko106gui.htm

Hamayan, E. V. (1990). *Preparing mainstream classroom teachers to teach potentially English

proficient students*. Proceeding of the First Research Symposium on Limited English

Proficient Student Issues. OBEMLA,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwuedu/ncbepubs/symposia/first/preparing.htm

Huitt, W. (2003). *Classroom Instruction. Educational Psychology Interactive*,

    [On-Line]. Available: http://chiron.valdosta.edu/whuitt/col/instruct/instruct.html.

Kagan, S. (1995). We can talk: Cooperative learning in the elementary esl classroom. *ERIC L & L Digest* (May 1995). Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, [On-Line]. Available:http://www.cal.org/ericcll/digest/kagan001.html

Kolankiewicz, L. (2000). *Immigration, population, and the new census bureau projections*. Center for Immigration Studies,

    [On-line]. Available: http://www.cis.org/articles/2000/back600.html

Langlois, D. E., & Zales, C. R. (1992). Anatomy of a top teacher. Education Digest, 57(5), 31,

    [On-Line]. Available: http://www.gsu-edu/~wwwdls/its/best_practicees/LangZales.htm

Lashway, L. (2002). Trends in school leadership. *ERIC Digest* 162, (078), 1-5, (November 2002), [On-Line]. Available. http://eric.uoregon.edu/publications/digests/digest162.html

Lipsitz, J., & Mizell, M. H. (1997). Middle grade school state policy initiative (MGSSPI*). Phi Delta Kappan* 78(7), 527-530, (March, 1997).

    [On-Line]. Available:http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/kfels973.htm

Lipsitz, J., Jackson, A., W., & Austin, L. M., (1997). What works in middle-grades school reform. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 78(7), 517, (March, 1997).

    [On-Line]. Available: http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/klip973.htm

Lounsbury, J. H. (1996). Key characteristics of middle level schools. *ERIC-EECE Publications – digests*. ERIC-EECE Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education, [On-Line]. Available: http://ericeece.org/pubs/digests/1996/louns96.html

Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research-based strategies for increasing student achievement*. McREL, [Online]. Available:http://www.ascd.org/readingroom/books/marzano01

McGowan, P., & Miller, J. (2001). Management vs. leadership. AASA *School Administrator* Web Edition (November 2001),

    [On-Line]. Available: http://www.aasa.org/publications/sa/2001_11/mcgowan.htm

McEntire, N. (2002). *Grade configuration in k-12 schools*. ERIC-EECE Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education,

    [On-Line]. Available: http://ericeece.org/faq/gradeconfig.html

Mawhinney, H. (1999). Rumblings in the cracks in conventional conceptions of school

     organizations. *Educational Administration Quarterly* 35(4), 573-593, (Oct. 1999),

     [On-Line]. Available: http://newfirstsearch.oclc.org

Mawhinney, H.(1998). School wars or school transformation: Professionalizing teaching and

     involving communities. *Peabody Journal of Education,* 73(1), 36-55,

     [On-line]. Available: http://newfirstsearch.oclc.org

     Available: http://www.usask.ca/education/coursework/802papers/mergel/brenda.htm

     knowledge objects. *ITFORUM* Paper 22,

     [On-Line]. Available: http://itechl.coe.uga.edu/itforum/paper22a.htmlAs

Miles, M., & Valentine, J. W. (2001). *Numbers of middle schools and students.* NMSA Research

     Summary # 3, [On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/ressum3.htm

National Middle School Association (1997a). *Academic achievement.* NMSA Research

     Summary # 12, [On-Line]. Available: http://www/nmsa/org/research/ressum12.htm

National Middle School Association (1997b). *Evaluating the effectiveness of programs.* NMSA

     Research Summary #11,

     [On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/ressum11.htm

National Middle School Association (1997c). *Exemplary middle schools: What are the*

     components of an exemplary middle school? NMSA Research Summary # 4,

     [On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/ressum

New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) WEB Site (2005). School Reports.

     [On-Ling]. Available: http://www.ped.state.nm.us

Numbers USA (2001). *Ethical considerations for the issues of population and immigration,*

     [On-line]. Available: http://www.numbersusa.com/cgi/text.cgi?

O'Bannon, B. (2002). Planning for instruction: What are instructional methods?

     [On-Line]. Available: http://edtech.tennessee.edu/~bobannon/instructional_methods.html

Petzko, V., Clark, D. C., Valentine, J. W., Hackmann, D. G., Nori, J. R., & Lucas, S. E. (2002).

     Leaders and leadership in middle level schools. *NASSP Bulletin,* 86-631, (June 2002),

     [On-Line]. Available: http://www.nassp.org/news/bltn_ll_ml0602.html

Pentland, B. T. (1995). Grammatical models of organizational processes. *Organization Science,*

     6(5), 541-556, [On-line]. Available: http://ccs.mit.edu/papers/ccswp198

Pentland, B. T. (1992). A grammatical model of organizational routines. *Administrative Science*

Quarterly, [On-line]. Available: http://ccs.mit.edu/papers/CCSWP177.html

Quinn, D. M., & Valentine, J. W. (2001). *What impact does the use of technology have on middle level education, specifically student achievement*? NMSA Research Summary # 19, [On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/ressum19.htm

Reigeluth, C. M. (1997). *What is the new paradigm of instructional theory* (ITForum Paper #17), [Online]. Retrieved 3/27/03,

Available: http://itech1.coe.uga.edu/itforum/paper17/paper17.html

Reigeluth, C. M. (1999). Challenge: How to make good instruction? Module 1: Kinds of learning. *Instructional-Design Theories Site,*

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.indiana.edu/~idtheory/methods/m1b.html

Saskatchewan Education (1993). *Wellness 10: A curriculum guide for the secondary level.* Regina, SL: Saskatchewan Education,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.sasked.gov.sk.ca/docs/wellness/instruct.html

Schiffman, H. F. (1995). Language policy,

[On-Line]. Available: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/~haroldfs/540/polintro/polintro.html

Simon, B. S., Salinas, K. C., Epstein, J. L., & Sanders, M. G. (2000*). Using technology to develop programs of school, family, and community partnerships.* The National Network of Partnership Schools at Johns Hopkins University's Center on School, Family, and Community Partnerships, [On-Line]. Available: http://www.csos.jhu.edu/p2000

Slavin, R. E. (1995). *Research on cooperative learning and achievement: What we know, what we need to know*. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, [On-Line]. Available: http://www.successforall.net/resource/research/cooplearn.htm

Spiro, R. J., Feltovich, P. J, & Coulson (1992). *Cognitive flexibility, constructivism, and hypertext: Random access instruction for advanced knowledge acquisition in structured domains,* [Online].

Available: Retrieved 3/27/03 http://phoenix.sce.fct.ul.pt/simposio/Rand_Spiro.htm

Stronge, J. H. (1998). Leadership skills in school and business. *AASA School Administrator* (October,1998) Web Edition,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www/aasa.org/publications/sa/1998_10/Stronge.htm

Sulzen, J. (1998). *The cognitive structures model of human cognition: An examination of how the cognitive structures model applies to various educational theories*,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.psd.com/800rojcsmpaper.HTML

Surry, D. W., & Farquhar, J. D. (1996). Incorporating social factors into instructional design theory. In M. Bailey & M. Jones, (Eds.), 8, *Work, Education, and Technology,* 1-6, DeKalb, IL: LEPS Press,

[Online]. Available: http://www.gsu.edu/~wwwitr/docs/social/index.html

Tomlinson, C. A. (1995). Differentiating instruction for advanced learners in the mixed-ability middle school classroom. *ERIC Digest.* Reston, VA: ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www/ericfacility.net/ericdigests/ed389141.html

Tomlinson, C. A. (2000). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms,* Available: http://www.mcps.k12.md.us/departments/eii/eiimanagepracticespage.html

Vars, G. F., & Beane, J. A. (2001). Integrative curriculum in a standards-based world. *Middle School Journal Research Articles*,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/res_aricles_integrated.htm

Wagner, T. (2001). Leadership for learning: An action theory of school change. *Phi Delta Kappan,* 82(5), 378-383, (January, 2001),

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.pdkintl.org/kappan/k0101wag.htm

Wilde, J. (1996). Assessment strategies for professional development activities. *NCBE,*
[On-Line]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/mispubs/eacwest/profdev/part1l

Wilson, B. G. (1995a). Metaphors for instruction: Why we talk about learning environments. *Educational Technology*, 35(5), 25-30,

[Online]. Available: http://www.cudenver.edu/~bwilson

Wilson, B. G. (1997). The postmodern paradigm. In C. R. Dills & A. A. Romiszowske (Eds.), *Instructional development paradigms.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications,

[On-Line]. Available: http://carbon.cudenver.edu/~bwilson/postmodern.html

Wilson, B. G., & Myers, M. (1999). Situated cognition in theoretical and practical context. In D. Jonassen & S. Land (Eds.), *Theoretical foundations of learning environments*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum,

[On-Line]. Available: http://ceo.cudenver.edu/~brent_wilson/SitCog.html

Wilson, L. M., & Corpus, D. A. (2001). The effects of reward systems on academic

performance. *Middle School Journal Research Articles,*

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/res_articles_sept2001.htm

Wood, K. D., & Fisher, C. P. (2000). Building assets in the classroom through creative response. *Middle School Journal,* Research Articles,

[On-Line]. Available: http://www.nmsa.org/research/res_articles_march2000build.htm

Zehler, A. (1994). *Working with English language learners: Strategies for elementary and middle school teachers* (NCBE program Information Guide Series, Number 19, (Summer 1994). Washington, DC: NCBE George Washington University

[Online]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/pigs/pig19.html

Selected Cases

Carino v University of Oklahoma Board of Regents,750 F. 2d 815 (10th Cir.1984).

Gutierrez, Municipal court, 838 f. 2d 1031 (9th Cir. 1988).

Espinoza v. Farah Mfg. Co., 414U.S. 86 (1973).

Jones v United Gas Imp. Corp. 813 F.R.D. 1 (E.D. Pa. 1975).

Lau v Nichols, 414 U.S. 563, 568 (1974).

Meyer v. Nebraska, 262 U.S. 390 (1923).

United States v Texas, 506 F. Supp. 405 (E.D. Tex. 1981) rev'd 680 F. 2nd 356, 372(5th Cir. 1982)

United States ex rel Negron v New York, 434 F. 2d 386 (2d Circ.1970).

Yniquez v Mofford, 730 F. Supp. 309 (D. Ariz. 1990), aff'd sub nom Yniguez v. Arizonans for Official English 43 F3d 1217 (9th Cir. 1995, aff'd en banc, F.3d, No. 92-17087 (9th Cir. Oct. 5, 1995).

Related Readings

Leadership.

Blackbourn, J. M., Papasan, B., Vinson, T., & Blackbourn, R. (2001). Leadership for the new millennium: Lessons from Deming, Glasser, and Graves. *National Form of Educational Administration & Supervision Journal,* 1-4,
 [On Line]. Available: http://www.nationalforum.com/15blackbourn.htm

Lambert, L. (2002). A framework for shared leadership. *Educational Leadership,* 59(8), 37-40, (May 2002).

Murphy, J. (Ed.). (2002). *The educational leadership challenge: Redefining leadership for the 21st century* (One Hundred-first Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education). Chicago: NSSE Distributed by the University of Chicago Press.

Panasonic Foundation with the American Association of School Administrators (2001). The school leadership challenge. *Strategies,* 8(1), 7-12, (February, 2001).

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational culture and leadership* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Sawyer, R. D. (2001). Teachers who grow as collaborative leaders: The rocky road of support. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(38), 16, (October 2001).
 [On-Line]. Available: http://epa a.asu.edu/epaa/v9n38.html

Instruction

Fillmore, L. W., & Snow, C. E. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language.* Los Angeles, CA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

NCBE (October 1997). *High stakes assessment: A research agenda for English language learners.* Washington, DC: George Washington University.

Program

Fern, V., Anstrom, K., & Silcox, B. (1999). Active learning and the limited English proficient student. *Directions in Language and Education* NCBE, 1(2),
 [Online]. Available: http://www.ncbe.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/directions/02.htm

Molina, R. G. (1999). *Considerations for the successful implementation of two-way bilingual immersion programs* (Title VII Academic Excellence Project Two Way). San Jose, CA:

San Jose Unified School District.

Nadeau, A. (1997). Linguistic diversity and reform: Can practices be identified? *Directions in Language and Education* NCBE, 1(10), (Winter 1997). Washington, DC: NCBE George Washington University,

 [On-Line]. Available: http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/directions/10.htm

HYPERLINK "http://www.ncbe.gwu/miscpubs/jeilms/"

Language Policy

Acuna, R. F. (1987). *Anything but Mexican: Chicanos in contemporary Los Angeles* (2nd ed.). New York: Verso Publishers.

Beck, R. (1998). *Sorting through humanitarian clashes in immigration.* The Social Contract Press, [On-line]. Available: http://www.thesocialcontract.com

Piatt, B. (1990). *Only English?: Law and language policy in the United States.* Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Rubin, J., & Jernudd, B. H. (Eds). (1971). *Can language be planned*?: *Sociolinguistic theory and practice for developing nations.* Hawaii: The University of Hawaii Press.

Wodak, J., & Corson, D. (Eds.). (1997). *Language policy and political issues in education.* Boston: Kluwer.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Written Transcript of Taped Interviews

Appendix B: Multi-Item (10) Likert Scale

Appendix A: Written Transcript of Taped Interviews

Survey Questions and Interviewee Responses for the Element of Leadership (Building Principal and Assistant Principal).

Question 1: What significant changes have occurred in the city and the county over the last 5 years that may have contributed to an increase in linguistic and cultural diversity among students and faculty in the building?

(1) Participant 0107111617

Q1 - First of all, we have probably about 75 % Hispanic, 24 % Anglo, and others, as far as, the culture that is there, the linguistic that is there. It is probably not as prevalent as some of the other schools. We have our ELL kids. We have a program for our bilingual students, and that we address with one of our teachers. We have migrant students, and a program that also addresses those needs although there are not very many for a population of about 350 students. That we have. We do have a lot of lower income. We are up to about 86 %, which is the lower income side of free and reduced lunch. So, um, as far as it addresses the community itself, it is a good breakup of the community and how it is set up. I always tell people that the thing about our school is that you have students that belong to lawyers and doctors, and then you have students who live in cardboard boxes to use that figure of speech. But, yet they all seem to meld together pretty well as a society, if you will. If you got the variety that is there whether it is the cultural or the racial that is in the school. It seems to be pretty neutral. I have never had any problems with students whether it is from a language standpoint. Even with kids who come to us with no English background and with the other students it gives you a good view of, uh, the education, to me because we have kids from those levels the higher echelon, white color or blue color, and so forth. Then we also have those students that, like I said before, who come from cardboard box homes. So, a student gets a good overview of society itself in that you don't just have all the rich kids or all the poor kids. It has a good breakup. I don't know if that is answering your question? No, with the new 6th graders, part of what has happened is that the feeder schools that we are getting students from has changed form 12 to 3. Some schools we would get 5 students others 12 and so forth, but each school was different. We are getting students form School N, School P, and School M. And so those kids from those schools traditionally have had the low reduced lunches and the incidence of poverty is high there. Also, the racial breakup is about 85 %-90 %

where now we are at 65 %-70 % Hispanic and Anglo there is a real low number. I think the dynamics of the school will change because of the feeder schools, because the numbers will continue to climb. We will continue to have the poverty. Well this is just my personal perception, that the poverty level will also rise to 87% because we are a provision 2 school and all the kids will receive free or reduced lunches. All the lunches and breakfasts are free for all our kids. I think it is even going to be higher when we get the new students. That is just my take on it. They look a little bit different then the schools we have now. It makes it a little easier in that you only have to deal with three elementary schools, but because of the area that those three elementary schools are in the poverty levels are just high. I kind of want to say that the racial breakdown, it seems to me, it will be a little tougher.

(2) Participant: 0207111617

Q1 – Well, this town is so close to the border, and the only language that I am aware of is the Spanish Language. So, we get a lot of kids, or a lot of families, that come over from Mexico. The demographics have significantly changed, and there is no doubt the Spanish population is growing in the state of New Mexico. The state, the city, that is SCHOOL DISTRICT, must do something to meet those demands and the population of Hispanic people who are moving into our state. Someone has to address his or her needs, because it is growing. And we have to consider that or answer to that. We have to be able to answer those demands.

(3) Participant 0107121418

Q1 - I think in our city and our county we probably have seen more changes than some places. The last 5 years the awareness has increased. We have a new chamber of commerce, which is the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce. And that has probably boosted awareness in the city, and um, among students and faculty in the building? Our student population has remained pretty much the same. As to what it has always had in this building for the last 9 years that I have been here. Um, so I don't think there has been an increase, and the faculty has not changed dramatically, um, for the last 9 years. So, I think the city has probably shown more changes than our building, like the Hispanic chamber and some other awareness groups out there.

(4) Participant 0107111618

Q1 - First, I have only been here for 3 years, and not for 5. So I can only speak for those years. The last two years I was principal of an elementary school with significant linguistic challenges. Because of the number of students that were Hispanic and the number of students

who were bilingual Hispanic students, or who had serious English challenges to meet. And as they went through, they weren't very good. And their home life, of course, was such that they often spoke Spanish at home. So, the only English they were getting was in school. So, I can't talk about 5 years, but I can talk about the last two years, and the one we are experiencing here at the middle school. The biggest thing that we have, and I don't know if they are just changes or uniqueness, but we are getting an awful lot of students from outside the country that frankly don't have any English language experience and that linguistic. But, I would also like to suggest that it is cultural, because there are some cultural challenges that you have to follow to, so you have both. Here, for example, we had a class of 27 students who were adults. They were parents, of our students, who were learning English in the evening. Classes that we set up. So this indicates a larger number of parents, who themselves feel. Now, the change on that is that they were not having those classes before, maybe at some other place, but not at here. So that was a change. And I think that the change was indicative of the parents, or at least the parents who attended the class, that at least recognized that there was a need to, uh, to adopt different language styles or at least be familiar with the home language and with the language in which instruction in primarily given. So, I think that was a big deal. The cultural diversity among students, and I got to be honest with you, we didn't have that much cultural diversity at School P because almost 98 % of the students were Hispanic. So uh, that doesn't leave a whole lot of diversity room there. Uh, the faculty was about 1/2 Hispanic and one of them, for example, was an Anglo woman married to a Hispanic man. So, she had a Hispanic surname, but that doesn't make here Hispanic, specifically, uh, but the rest of them were Anglo. But to be fair most of them were long-term teachers at that school, and so, they were familiar with the students, the school, the culture, the community, and the families. And so, they actually did not have any real problems with that. "Sooo", the biggest change that research site has experienced in the last three years has been the closing of the schools that we have had. We moved some of the schools around. And pretty much the ones that we moved around were not what we consider the up scale schools. Uh, including school E elementary, which was much like School P in its ethnic makeup and community. And, uh, they actually moved most of school E students to school W elementary, which was not necessarily a predominantly Hispanic community or a low-income school. Certainly not that particular culture, which were low socioeconomic and that sort of thing and, uh, like at School E. And they moved a number of students from school C elementary,

which was to be closed and was similar in make up to school P. This increased the number of low income, but the new teachers that they got were primarily Anglo. So, I suspect there were some cultural diversity issues there. I can't speak for that, since I am not the principal over there, right now. But that is a possibility. And the other school that they closed was, uh, school PV. They had other things. They were a little wealthier than school C or school E, but they had a fairly large number of Hispanic students that were in there. And oddly enough all the Hispanic students all went south and the Anglo students all went north as it were. Ok, so that probably intensified a little pressure, uh, were the Hispanic students went. Other than that our challenges have not been that great. The middle schools all got 6th grade. And for here the influx of students did not change our demographics that much. Almost our entire 6th grade is Hispanic and, uh, we had enough with the language deal that we found a teacher that teaches ESL and is TESOL and bilingually certified as a regular 6th grade teacher. So, we run our entire bilingual and ELL students through her, with the exception of the newcomers that have arrived within the last three or four months who have come here from out of the country. They go to Mr. M. who is our ESL teacher. And he deals with them. And to Ms. H. who is our other ESL-TESOL teacher. So those are the changes that we have noticed. But we have had enough students that we have more than doubled the number of ELL students that we have here. Yea, we have changed from having 11 feeder schools to just three, and that makes a big difference. Uh, it makes it a little easier, because I am familiar with 1/3 of the students because of school P. And I am very familiar with the three elementary schools and is very much like school P, and it is only a block and half away from here, so.

Question 2: How will reconfiguration of the middle schools into a 6-8 grade configuration affect the building's capacity to meet the needs of linguistic and cultural diversity among students?

(1) Participant 0107121418

Q2 - Um, in our building it will have a positive impact in that we are going to be able to bring in one of the lower grades, and for three years have the students. Where before we had them for two years. So, I think the capacity is there to teach the students what they have to be taught. We have three teachers in our building that are pretty much experts in their area. They have had a lot of course work in the area. They have licenses for working with different languages, And so I think those three people working together in conjunction with our language

180

arts and English teachers, which we have five. That is a big group of eight educators to work with those three grades of students. So I think our capacity in our building is already here to work with all of them. I think it will be a positive. We have hired seven new teachers for the 6th grade level, and that is not necessarily, um, specializing in language or culture.

(2) Participant 0107111517

Q2 - I think we need to probably educate the parents more than anyone as to what is available for the students, and their child at this school. So, the education of the parents and bringing them in and making them welcome, even if it means having interpreters there. And being able to have them understand the difference that is there. In terms of, the student population that is there, and how they meld together. They do meld together real well as far as here goes. Uh you know, we still have some problems like everyone else does, but it is a pretty good view of society as a whole. But, I don't see anything except the education of parents, students coming in as well, but more so parents. I think that is a major factor that needs to be addressed for the school to succeed. Traditionally, in the middle schools you have very low numbers that are participating in the Parent Teacher Organization, other parent groups PAC, or PAC teams made up of parents. You have low numbers of parents participating. In some cases, I think it is because of the language barrier. And sometimes it is that parents don't feel comfortable being in school, because they don't speak English. And, so, if you can make them feel welcome by having the people come in, I think that will help with making the school successful with the diversity of population. Parent involvement, traditionally, the problem is parents in general. It doesn't mean that we are addressing certain parents that, uh, I find that the parents who are least involved with the school are the students that we have most problems with. Whether it be single parent households or both parent families, if the parents are not involved with the kids at school then we have problems with those kids.

(3) Participant 0207111617

Q2 - Without a doubt, it will have an effect. I feel, and this is only my opinion, we need to do more. And I don't think we do enough. We need to bring more students, as your question there says, let's see what am I trying to say? I feel there is a great need of services that need to be provided for these students. And I really feel that right now we have lacked the number of instructors, teachers, to provide for that. And now with the 6th graders coming in, you know, it is going to increase the number from 400 to 600. And I feel like you are going to have a larger

number of students whose needs have to be meet. I feel we don't have the number, as far as instructors go, to meet the needs of those students. If the population grows, then, the instructors need to grow too. We need to have more teachers. And that is what I thought we had addressed. That we are going from four to six hundred students.

(4) Participant 0107111618

Q2 - I will respond to that. The cultural and linguistic diversity here is very different from the cultural diversity at school P. School P has a long-term faculty and many of them are Hispanic and uh, six of them were bilingually certified. And so, the diversity, if you will, was not that great. Here, we have some sharper lines drawn, uh, we have some of our teachers Hispanic in origin, but the bulk of them aren't, uh, and so there is some cultural diversity. We have a number of teachers who, apparently, have a little trouble cooping with the students in culture and all that sort of thing. They don't really understand the culture. So they do some things that are kind of counter productive. Uh for example, demanding that students stand and look at them and not respond when they are talking. And uh, expecting a level of immediacy from the students that is not really a part of Hispanic culture. The other thing is, and this is an odd thing, something I've noted over the years, is that Hispanics get closer. Their personal space is closer. They tend to get closer than Anglos' personal space, for the most part. Uh, and so some of our teachers are a little intimidated when a student gets too close or touches them. Or when a parent gets too close, and uh so that and of course on the other hand the parents feel that the Anglo teachers are standoffish and feel that they are above them. And that's probably not the case either. But it does make for a shift in their viewpoint. And so they find that some teachers are not as they would define them as 'not caring enough, or not warm enough, and that may not really be what is intended by either party. But uh, some find it intimidating. And we have let's see, probably one, two, three, four, five, six, maybe, as many as eight who speak Spanish, not counting the custodians. Uh, all of them speak Spanish, and that is not very many, there may be some more, but I am not aware of them because I have not heard them speak Spanish. That is another thing, we tend to withdraw from the, uh, community language, and to be fair the community language here is Spanish because they go to church in Spanish. They go to the grocery story in Spanish. They watch TV in Spanish. And uh, their family get together is in Spanish. And that is a linguistic thing. Uh, but we are withdrawing a bit in the middle schools, and I suspect that it extends a bit in the High Schools. And the reason for that is that the test, the materials, the

instruction that we have is primarily in English, and we feel the students have to learn that. We do have some of the teachers, here, that kind of feel that bi-golly this is America, and they ought to learn English. Uh, you know, I agree. This is America that is not arguable. And yes they need to learn English, there is no question about that, but that does not invalidate their language. And so, uh, you know, that is something we need to do. The biggest problem, really though, is probably not with the students or with the parents. One of the things that I did here, that we had not had before, is that I brought in a secretary in who speaks Spanish. So, when the parents come in she responds to the parents immediately. There is for any person, regardless if your Spanish, French, German or whatever, if you come in and you can't understand what is done in the office, you feel that your access to the school is, you know, slightly restricted. And you are not comfortable. And I want the parents to feel that they can come in and talk to me, or any of us, at anytime. And so uh, the first line is someone to say "buenos dias" and that is the first thing the parent must feel. That they can communicate. And if they just want to get their kid and take them to the doctor that is perfectly a reasonable thing. All the kids need to do that from time to time. So uh, that is part of it. We can get into that doctor thing later on that is another concern. I don't know if you have a question on that or not. Language is but that question is which language? I would say …looking at our teachers down the hallway, here, who are teaching our 7th and 8th grade. You will find that most of them are Anglo and most of them speak English. And they expect to be spoken to in English. And uh, they demand a level of English competencies, which they are finding that are hard to get. Our students are running three or four grade levels behind on English acquisition, and the teachers kind of feel like the students I don't know but maybe they don't, but it seems to me that they may feel that the students are a little dumb. Uh, and that is not the case at all, they are acquiring English, and it takes a little longer for some than for others. So yea, language is a concern, linguistics if you will but which language? That is the big one, our teachers automatically go to dumb rather than, "they can't speak English". Or, they equate they can't speak English with dumb. And oddly enough, they don't get angry with that. They don't berate the students they feel sorry for them. This is perhaps not the best way to teach a student, when you think, this poor kid can't learn because he can't speak English, isn't any help. You know, that doesn't move the kid forward. You have to do something. And we have changed the structure of the school, so that we have a lot more ELLs, and a lot more influence on ELLs. For example, every student takes two English classes one is reading and one is language,

essentially. And those who are the bottom quartile also get a special English class that we are offering, which is called action reading or exploratory. So we are addressing it. And those students who need ELL go to ELL classes. They go to those classes so we can continue to work with them. So, it is possible for a student to spend more than 50 % of his day (four out of seven courses) on courses that are for language acquisition here. We have Ms. H., Mr. M., and Ms. M., uh, who handle the ESL, ELL type classes as well as the Spanish components for the bilingual, uh, grant that we have. We also have, Ms. H., who teaches English for one hour and she teaches language arts for one hour so you used Ms. L. earlier, and it is possible for Ms. L. to teach or go to Ms. L's for a language class and go to Ms. C. for an English class and go to Mr. M. or Ms. H. or somebody for a Spanish or an ELL class and then go to the action reading class. So they can go to four courses, where we have seven periods, so it is quite possible. So they can go to the after school program where we do motivation, and other things and math and on top of that, or not on top, but instead of that. They can go to the Gear Up program, which the college supports in our building.

Question 3: What are your perceptions of the rich cultural and linguistic diversity among the students at your school and in the community it serves? Please describe these perceptions at some length.

(1) Participant: 0207111617

Q3 - It is something that I feel we do not need to push aside. We need to hang on to our culture. It is important. Those are our roots. We can learn. You talk about diversity. We can learn from our culture, from all cultures. As far as language diversity goes, you always hear that if a student can pick up a second language it is going to increase his vocabulary. So without a doubt, we can't forget our culture or the linguistic diversity that we have here at the school.

(2) Participant: 0107111617

Q3 - The contributions, and, uh, you are not talking about money wise, you probably are talking about how they contribute, the private sector and parental contributions. That goes back, that one kind of overlaps with the other question, parental involvement is real important for those kids to be successful. And probably us educating those parents, uh, so that we can address those linguistically diverse students and making sure that they have the ability to learn and that there is no obstacle affecting them. Uh, as far as the diversity that we have there I think it is good. But I still think we need to educate parents and get them involved more with the education of their

kids. Um, as far as private sector contributions, we try to go out to the community. If you are talking about the community here, just our little community, we try to make sure that they are involved in the decisions that will be made. Even when we went to uniforms, which was about seven or eight years ago, I never had the cafeteria so full of people as I did there because it was an issue full of controversy. Uh, that people came in and are united to fight us to some degree, but all in all it ended up being a positive influence. We have a pie that is a partner in our education program, where we work with people in the community, businesses, and different organizations whether it is Sertoma or Pepsi. Sertoma, for example, they gave us money for the indigent fund for our uniforms. They were always ready to help us with whatever problems we had. I had a teacher that would go to them when she was doing a project and needed additional monies for support of her grant. She would go to the Sertoma Club for help. And they are always willing to help in education. There are organizations out there, uh more so that a business, Pepsi and other businesses, would be divided where each school would have their own partners.

(3) Participant: 0107111618

Q3 - I don't know that we have a critical factor. That we have that will ensure that students will experience success in our school (chuckle, chuckle). I am not quite that optimistic about it. I think we have a number of factors here, and you need to break them down into two sections. First section, are factors over which we have control; the second are factors over which we don't have control. We don't have any control over birth language, or the language that they grew up in. We don't have any control over exposure to, uh alternative languages. We are using Spanish and English here, but there are about 127 languages spoken at home here in this area. So that is certainly not the only language that goes on like that. We don't have any control over which channels they watch. We don't have any control over where they go to church, nor should we. Of course, but we don't have any control over that. We don't have any control over relatives or the extended family. So those are the factors over which we have no control of. But, the factors that we do have control over are how much acquisition can we provide? What kind of materials and supplies can we provide and encourage students to use? How much usage can we encourage students to involve themselves in. Essentially around the playground, we encourage the use of English. We don't require it by any means. But we encourage the use of English, and it works probably 60 percent of the time, you know. Although the U.S. Constitution is silent about language, we are a true bilingual state, but there is a covert effort for everyone to learn English.

It is not just Anglos who are doing that, but there are a number of Hispanics, particularly older Hispanics. I started teaching 43 years ago, so I have been around a while. I remember when I was teaching in Alamogordo, during the 60's there was a little girl whose name was M. She was a great little kid, and I took her home one afternoon from an after school event. She didn't have any one to pick her up, and she didn't have a phone. Uh, so I took her home. I took her to her house, and she invited me in. She was a very polite little girl and a lovely little girl an 8th grader or something like that. And she introduced me to her parents, and she started speaking to them in Spanish. Her mother reached over and hit her along the head, not hard, and told her. I understand enough Spanish, uh to know what she was saying. She told her to speak English. She did not want her speaking Spanish, especially, in front of a teacher. It was a whole different world; they were living in a house that had no floor. It was a dirt floor house, and there are still a lot of them around that area, believe me. I taught at Gadsden for ten years, uh, but the point is the parents felt this generation should learn English. That is what they were pushing. They weren't pushing. It has only been recently, during the last twenty years or so, that there has been a push for Spanish equity, if you will, respecting Spanish as a language. The parents did not want that. It is a huge shift, but that is a 40-year shift. It is not a, (laughter, laughter)... Yes, and I am afraid the NCLB is going to, uh, push that a little further, even to the extent making it a bit punitive. I don't think we are going back to the sending you home, spanking their hands, you know, if you speak Spanish in the classroom and things like that. I don't think we are going that far, but there will be a big push that says that. At least I feel it says this. It says to Hispanics, who have a dominant Spanish language background, that English is somehow better then Spanish and those who speak English are somehow better than those who speak Spanish. It kind of denigrates a huge portion of the population and maybe not with meaning it. But with a lot of the pressure that is put on teachers on past test, which are primarily in English and, uh, with the instructional considerations that we have, I think we are going to see, uh even more. I believe we are looking toward a very repressive period of time for non-native English speakers. I believe we are going to see that and that is a concern that we have about NCLB.

(4) Participant 0107121418

Q3 – Um, I believe that our students do have this rich cultural background and, uh, the language is definitely there. I think that we as a community can always strengthen it. There are always things that we can be doing that are more. But in the education realm, it is not something

that we work on. It is kind of on the back burner of everything we work on. It is there and we spend time on it, but it is not the cultural part of it. We don't, or we aren't allowed to, spend a lot of time on it due to the fact that we run out of time in the day. Um, we have many of our clientele, many of our students, and parents come here because of the housing. They are able to secure housing easily. Some jobs are not high paying ones. Usually, most of our clientele are lower income. And, uh, although they do a lot of cultural things at home, and a lot of them speak different languages at home, mostly Spanish, I don't think that we, as a school, involve enough of the parents in our school. And we do have a good program here, but we don't have all the support. Because the parents send their children to school and expect us, as educators, to give them everything they need. We work closer with our parents. And our parents work closer with us. Um, and we're comfortable doing that. Then, I think we would have a stronger program, for both groups of cultural and linguistic.

Question 4 – The students reflect considerable cultural and linguistic diversity among the students at your school and in the community it serves. Please describe these perceptions at some length.

(1) Participant 0107121418

Q4 – Um, I know exactly what our success is at our school. It is our teachers. They are committed and uh, driven to provide the best education possible for our students. And so, I know the teacher factor and the human factor of "these are my kids". They take responsibility for their students for any test scores and for any growth they have. Our teachers are the most critical factor in that they recognize the needs; they recognize the wants of parents. They recognize the students' background, and some of them come from similar backgrounds um, and from the community. Two of our teachers here are definitely local grown teachers, and they are contributing back to the community. So, I think that our most critical factor, here in our building, is our actual teacher- student relationship.

(2) Participant: 0107111618

Q4 - Considering the vast amount of immigrants that we have to socialize (33 million est.), yea, and there is no reason. It is stupid. It truly is stupid. You disenfranchise 33 million; you lose a huge amount of valuable work force that we need. But they don't think that way. This is a country that went for almost 120 years, maybe even longer than that, before they gave half of the population the right to vote, that was women. This country is fairly slow to change all that,

but Hispanics have the right to vote. But, you start checking how many do. I don't think it is part of the Spanish culture not to vote. I don't believe it is not in there. I don't believe that it is part of the Spanish culture to vote either. But I don't think it is, you know, "Oh, I just don't go to the polls". I don't think that is it. Uh, you don't feel comfortable. You walk into a courtroom, and you get treated special. Because if you don't speak English, they will give you a court appointed translator, but that makes you feel bad. It can't make the witness feel particularly good. So what does it do for a defendant? Uh, it has got to make a difference to them. We constantly say English is better, and those who speak English have a better chance. I think that is true, and it is becoming more and more. Not that I agree that English is better, but I do think if you speak English you have a better chance. I am not sure that it is right. English is the international language. French used to be. Well, in fact Latin then came French and now we have English. The way you can tell is that it is the one language that is required by all air controllers. Air traffic controllers are required to speak English where safety is paramount, because you have pilots from every country. You know you have multiple languages. You got to have one language so that every one can be communicating on the same wavelength. You don't have time to translate between different instructions. So that's, uh an indicator. And I don't know, not that it is something that we have to worry about here. Yea, and we do prefer that in their English classes they speak English. It is just as simple as that. And in their math classes they speak English. And I know that some of the teachers, if they know that the student doesn't understand particularly content will visit with them in Spanish. The texts are in English, and the workbooks are in English. And maybe you can get a concept over if you do it briefly. Mr. V in science can certainly do that, get a concept over, but those kids are still going to have to sit down. A really good thing has happened this year when it comes to testing, as we understand it. We are no longer going to have timed tests. Many of our kids, even if they appear to be doing this, take the test in English. And they do have to take the test in English, because if they have come from Mexico, over a year or so, they are not going to be able to take the test is Spanish, particularly, a Spanish language test. But, they have to read it in English, translate it in their head to Spanish, figure out the answer, translate in Spanish, read it back in English, and read the questions. And frankly, that takes longer. It doesn't make it so they can't do it, but it takes longer. So this year they are not timing the test. So, I think we are going to see some benefit from that. Because, I know, some of our kids just didn't get through, because there wasn't enough time to complete

188

the test. And that wasn't a good thing. When we are looking for content knowledge time should not be the criteria. Sometimes, reaction time is important. I don't know how important it is for math when you're doing algebraic things. Uh, what we want to determine or what we are measuring is their knowledge of math not their speed in math, same thing in reading. Because, we still have kids, whatever language they speak, who read at wide varying reading speeds. You can have a kid who is English dominate who reads 80 words a minute. I don't care. It will take him longer. No, I don't require a teacher to have a language policy in their classroom and there is no language policy in the district. So far as I know, I have not seen a language policy. And there used to be, but that was a number of years ago, uh for districts. We expected all students to speak English at all times. And there used to be school policies like that. They were punitive, repressive, and oppressive if you will. And I would have a problem with a teacher, except one teaching a foreign language, who required that English be the only language used in the classroom. Maybe it can be the only language the teacher can accept as a response, and maybe it is the only language the teacher understands. But, if a kid talks to someone else in Spanish, and they send them down to the office because they were speaking Spanish or a language other than English. We are going to have to have a visit with the teacher not with the students because the students would not be in trouble for that. It would be for Mr. M., for example, who is teaching Spanish, if he wanted to have a total emersion for the class that would be totally acceptable. When I taught French, particularly first, second, and third year French, I expected the class to converse completely in French. And that is a fairly normal thing. But it is the nature of that particular course rather than, uh, a requirement or a policy of the school. It is rather a curricular policy, which is a little different.

(3) Participant 0207111617

Q4 - Without a doubt it is needed. It is essential. We can't forget. I think we need more of it. We really do. Like at the high schools they have black history month at all of the schools that I have worked at. They have a black teacher who really pushes the event and activities. I think that if we do more of that for the black kids, for the Hispanic kids, there is beauty in culture. I support that we have it. It is an asset to other students. Yea, the other students can benefit or learn to appreciate other people's cultural diversity. We can all learn form this. We can't isolate ourselves, into Hispanic communities or Black communities. We have to be active participants. The more culture other students, or all students are exposed to, and kids learn to appreciate those

cultures, right, the more we can start to breakdown stereotypes. That makes this country, this community, and this world a better place. Can you imagine it, if kids in our schools could be taught more about the Islamic faith, the Jewish faith, Christianity, to really, really make a concerted effort to learn the differences, and to teach about these religions and cultures. I think it would reduce the amount of tension that we have here in this world. It just sifts down to the city and the county. Yes, I think we can all benefit.

(4) Participant 0107111517

Q4 - I think it helps in some respects. But like NCLB has kind of because the funding was not there to back up all the mandates that are there with NCLB. And I am sure it is going to change. It needs to be up graded. And it needs to be looked at a little closer. When you look at it, it is kind of putting the cart before the horse. Because there are a lot times when we don't have, or they are not thought out when they are sent out to our level. And we are trying to make them work with what ever means we have. With NCLB, I think it has some good merit to it. It is kind of making use look at our students a little closer. For successes in analyzing our data, disaggregating our data, to see how we are being successful with them. And we are constantly changing what we are doing with each of the kids so that we make them successful. So, the disaggregating of data has helped us. So, that we are able to have a more individualized education plan for each student and for our special education students. I think it is going to help us. It is the way it is going to affect the teacher where there has to be some buy in, as to, what you are doing with these kids. If its good or if it is not good. If the teachers, in general, don't feel that it is going to help then it is not going to succeed. Then if the teachers are educated on how this is working and how it is going to help kids. Then uh, many times we get information, but we don't get enough training on it. And I think that makes us a little more susceptible to not succeeding with whatever programs we bring in. Yea, accountability is there more than it used to be. Anymore, they are looking at the teacher in the classroom, versus the school or even the principal. They are going down to the teacher and asking what kids did you have in your classroom. New Mexico of course is looking at teacher licensure, uh, the three tier system, which isn't like the other states. The other states are looking at New Mexico to see how it works. It seems to have some good thought behind it. Uh, I just don't know if everything has been worked out before it has been implemented. Other times, like I said before, we do things before we play

them out. Sometimes, we need to play things out before we go ahead with the implementation to see if we are setting ourselves up for failure.

Question 5 – What are the community and parent perceptions of cultural and linguistic diversity in the building's student population? Do you feel that parents and community care about these factors?

(1) Participant 0207111617

Q5 - I really don't think we do, and I think it is awful. I think when you start talking about cultures you are dividing society into subcultures. For example, the Hispanic, in New Mexico, Texas, and California, in those states, the minority would become the majority. I don't think we do enough to educate our cultures enough, not just with the students at school but also the parents. And because of that, the parents are not concerned about culture. I don't think parents do enough to preserve culture. We are forgetting about our culture. Like I said, I don't think we need to do that. We need to hang on to our roots. There is a certain amount of pride that is related to that. So no, I really don't think the parents in our community really care about it. They don't. There might be 5 or 10 percent, but that is about it. We should do more than that.

(2) Participant 0107111517

Q5: - I hope I'm not getting in trouble when I say this, but they are not sensitive here. And they don't want to be sensitive. I would even venture to say that they really don't care. That old idea, like the melting pot, we are all going to be one. I thought that in order to be a more effective teacher you had to know that student better, wouldn't you? And what you bring into the classroom. The kids are going to appreciate you more if you try to meet their cultural diversity and try to meet their, that is, try to be more sensitive, as far as, cultures. Teachers don't care. They even punish them. I feel like a dinosaur here. We are in 2004, and I still hear teachers getting mad at kids for even speaking Spanish to other kids. You know, I even hear of Spanish speaking… And I know those families. There is a beauty of speaking another language. Some families get mad at their children for speaking Spanish. Some colleges require a language credit for admissions.

(3) Participant 0107121418

Q5 - Yes I do (think that parents care about…). But, I think that their perceptions are mainly focused on their students graduating from high school. And uh, coming into the programs we have and doing the best they can with that. Um, but they know that their bilingualism is a

191

factor and their culture is a factor. And I know that the parents care about that. And I know that our community cares about that, because of the many things we do in our community. We have the fairs, which are significant for both language groups. The two major language groups that we have are English and Spanish. Um, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce works well with all of the community members to ensure that both populations are represented. So, I know that both the parents and the community care about that. Parents or community members don't often reflect concerns. However, some of them do. There are a few that do that, really push, especially if they have had education in another country. Those parents come in and want their child to continue that education. Not only get the new education and the English part of it, but also strengthen their Spanish part of their education. So when we have had those parents come in, they really have pushed their students to become fully bilingual where they can read and write in English and Spanish. Read, write, and communicate in all the languages that they are from. So yea, the parents, quite often we have parents that ask questions, what can they do to help? How can they contribute and push their students to excel?

Question 6: Do you feel that federal and state level program requirements, that the school must meet, help or hinder, the success of linguistically diverse learners?

(1) Participant 0107121418

Q6 - I think that in our state even being new to the program, the administration program, in our state, it probably hinders the linguistically diverse learners. Because it is not the focus, we don't um spend as much time, and I know we don't spend enough money. Pushing kids to be bilingual, pushing kids to learn other languages. For example, we have a few programs in the elementary. We have very few at the middle school. And then, at the high school, they added another language, but it is not something celebrated. It is not actually given much respect. I think that the program requirement from the state and federal government, probably hinder the success in some ways, because they are not giving us much money. And we are not getting the qualified and quality teachers that we need.

(2) Participant 0107111517

Q6 - Uh, do you mean how do they fit in? If you are looking at assessment, first of all, I am not a real firm believer in standardized assessment. I know those assessments. I know that many times there is teaching going on. But, because of the accountability we talked about earlier, they want us to fall into the routine of putting the square peg in the square hole and the round peg

in the round hole. And sometimes they don't fit in that way. But you have things that you can cover. So different in what we do anyway as individuals, be it language wise, culture, or even the ways we learn like auditory, oral, visual. There are so many ways that kids learn. You try to get one standardized way of finding out how these kids are doing. I don't think we will ever. Uh well, we are not at that point now, uh, but as far as test and assessment and non- curricular activities here in the district and the school. What do you mean by that? I think it is promoted more than it used to be. Uh, as far as the activities that we are doing, we have an agreement for different arts programs that try to capture the history of different cultures and linguistic diversity that is there in all cultures and students that will come through our doors. Yea, I don't think we are doing too much because we can always improve on what we are doing. But, it is so far from the basics that we are doing that we lose sight of that. So yea, I definitely think that is what we are doing now. But, at the same time, it depends on the goals of the district. The changes in policy at the state and national level definitely change some of the dynamics at the district level.

(3) Participant 0207111617

Q6 - Without a doubt, more so the state, the state is doing what they need to do. Yes, I think they do provide the right leadership. They make an effort. I know that. I think channeling the monies into more, uh, the same programs whether it be to help us in the reading area, writing, or in the math area. Uh, many times the district has so many programs going on that it, uh, doesn't know if they are fairly well, mediocre, so to speak. Instead of going in with one or two reading programs, uh, which is the direction this district is going into now. It is trying to, uh, probably so that we learn and become masters of one or two reading programs. So we can do those well instead of having 10 or 15 different ones in our district. Yea, I would have to say just channeling our monies just to fewer reading programs and doing those well.

(4) Participant 0107111618

Q6: Well, I believe the federal government and maybe even the state government, I am not sure about that, actually believe that if we required this all of the students will combine. We have to remember that we have a rather Pollyannaish viewpoint on the whole thing. That is by 2013-2014, that school year, that every child in each district at all grade levels will be reading and speaking English at grade level, uh, and working math at grade level. I have been around for a fairly good period of time, and my feeling on that is that probably it is a pipe dream.

I am not convinced that we are going to do 100%. You know, we don't do 100% in college…kindergarteners don't do 100%. Nobody bats a 1000. So I think this policy is going to put, if they continue following it, and they don't modify it, uh it is going to put incredible pressure for students to learn English. I think we talked a little about it above. And I think this pressure may have some unintended consequences. I believe that some attitudes feel that if they put pressure everybody will learn. But they do need to remember that they are putting pressure on the teachers and the schools. But, they are not putting any pressure on the parents or on the students. And so uh, as a result, there is no consequence for the student not learning. There is a consequence for the teacher not teaching and not getting the student to learn. But, if the student doesn't learn there is no consequence to the student for not learning. I am not sure how that is going to work. But I have a gut feeling that it is going to have a negative impact on education, on the whole accountability process, and the expectations that are placed there. Can we do better? Yea, should we do better? Yea, can we do perfectly? I am a whole lot uncomfortable with that. The standard based accountability system is being implemented as we speak. At 2006 all the teachers have to be highly qualified, uh and that varies from state to state, but that is going to be a problem. Right now, I am having difficulty-hiring teachers. The other problem that is going to come up is by 2013, actually long before that, by 2010 when we are getting in the 70 and 75 percent level. I don't think we are going to make 75% in all schools, and, uh, at each grade level. I don't think that it is necessary. I think they have taken the grade level concept and confused that with uh, absolute progress. I believe there is a curve, the Bell curve if you will, of progress that students make, and I believe that there is a sliding scale of progress. And the further we go, you are working on a doctorate, do we expect every student to go get a doctorate? I don't think so. I don't think we should. Uh, there are kids who want to be carpenters. They don't want to be doctors. Uh, and there are many kids in our schools who don't choose, who don't wish, and their parents don't wish to uh, spend the time and effort necessary to get a doctorate. And I don't think it is necessary. I am uncomfortable with the whole world having doctorates. I am uncomfortable with the whole world having college degrees. I don't think that is necessary. I think advanced training is, certainly, a trade school, a vocational school, uh, two-year college. There people particularly women who are perfectly happy being dental hygienist and that is what they want to do. They don't see anything wrong with that. They don't see that in order to get to the next level they have to become a dentist. No, they don't see that. The same thing is true of teaching. Right

now, the American concept is if you start off at the bottom, and you move to the top, you are not constantly striving to the top. So any teacher who finishes his, uh, career must have been a failure, because all he did was become a teacher. That is a load. That is not right. Um, you know, I am very likely, and once I retired as a principal and went back to teaching, and there are many teachers who do that. I will do that again at some point in time, because I don't want to be a principal the rest of my life. I find principal dues paying time, not as a vocation, but there are some teachers who want to be principals because that is what they want to do. Um, but there should be a lot of teachers, and we have many of them here, whose career is teacher. That is what they want to be, and they don't see moving up to being a principal as moving up. They see it as a problem. So, I think we have to be careful when we ask students to achieve, and place, once again, our standards of achievement, overlay that on them and judge them by that. I think we ought to ask them what do you what to do in life? And offer all the options and opportunities. Every child should have the right to have a doctorate, but they should not be encouraged to do so, unless, that is what they want to do. Maybe we should encourage them to be a mechanic. I'll tell you what my son was. He is getting a degree now. But he is a master mechanic an SAE and worked for Lexis for two years. He was making 75 thousand a year, which was a lot more than I was making. Uh, you know, he was doing that after a year. But he did quit that and went back to college, and he is getting a degree…but that was after he got out of the navy. I am not going to tell a person that he can't be an auto mechanic and suggest that they do otherwise. I do think we should leave their options open. Our colleges pretty much do that.

Question 7: How do linguistically diverse students fit into the general scheme of assessment, instruction, and non-curricular activities in your school?

(1) Participant 0207111617

Q7 - I think they are left behind. They fall behind, but I don't blame the school system for it. I blame the parents. The fault lies with the parents. I don't think they push the students enough. They are too easy to give up on their children. So uh, I would like to see more participation from the subcultures that we are talking about. I just don't see it. It has to come from the parents.

I think a majority of our staff understands what is going on with language varieties. Um, I don't think they all make it a focus everyday, but I think they are aware of it They try, even core teachers try, to make lesson plans that include those students that they have those varieties

and non standard varieties. Um, so I think they are very aware and try to bring that into their planning and their presentation of the lessons. And also the people that they bring in when they bring in community members to talk to the students, and you know they try to bring in someone who will fit in with the students that we have. They are aware and they understand, but they don't focus on that as much as they focus on standards and.

 (2) Participant 0107111517

Q7 - We try to get them involved. Um, like I said before, in actual terms, there is a lot more involvement for parents then for individuals. But as they get older the kids really don't want the parents there because they have a lot of things going on. They put in all their time in the elementary. I don't think there is good participation. Everyone talks about a village raising the child. But in this case, we get so hung up on what we want for ourselves that we aren't always preparing the future for our kids. We are kind of living for today. Our society is primarily geared for today and in those 60 or 70 years that we live versus trying to pass on things to our kids, grandkids, and so forth. So yea, I don't think that we do enough, or that we don't involve enough people at the various levels of their children's education. Not that we don't try. Part of it is that even at, here, I have teachers and parents. And we all made phone calls to about 10 or 15 parents a piece. Uh, so that we could catch all of them and personally invite them to a parent meeting, and, still, not have but 10 or 15 show up. This tells you a lot about that school and the community. It tells you a lot about the parents, and uh just their busy lives, and things that they have going on in their homes. So yea, we involve them. We have the doors open and invite their participation in the planning and development of instruction and assessment. But, they don't always come in. And it is hard to force them to come in, because they have personal lives and they have their own kids. At one point, I had put down that I wanted each teacher to attend at least, uh, four or five ball games a semester. A lot of teachers approached me and told me we have our own lives and our own kids. And uh, you know, they have to pay attention to their own kids too, and we want them to be productive kids also. But it still makes it difficult. But our doors are open and so forth. But, they end up not coming.

(3) Participant 0107121418

Q7 - Um, they do pretty well in the area of assessment. It is hoped that we will be getting some directive from the central office now, which we haven't had in quite a few years. We have someone in there now. And she has a lot of information about the assessment part of it. She has

gone through and looked at the forms and the way things are organized. And so the assessment and instruction she has really helped us with it. To get the students in and get them everything they need. If the assessments have to be in one language or another, you know, we can make sure that is being taken care of. And to make sure they are doing it by state and federal requirements, but also according to the needs of our students. For non-curricular activities, same thing, our teachers push our students to get everything done. You know, no matter if they are from out of the country from out of state. If they are locals who grew up here and their parents went to school here, they still have different linguistic experiences. They still push all of our students to do non-curricular activities. They fit really well in our building. I think they do

Question 8: What role does the building administrator play in planning, developing and implementing instructional guidelines for linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant 0107111517

Q8 - It plays a very important role. He is the person that is the hub of contact…noise in the background…if I, the principal, hadn't been behind it; it wouldn't have flown. Yea, what has happened, anymore, is that we expected the parents to do a lot of the work on values with the kids, and things that the kids should already come to us with. Uh, we found ourselves, as a school, kind of imposing what is right and what is wrong in their value system. Because, they don't come from home like they used to.

(2) Participant 0207111617

Q8 - The building principal plays, I know our administrator here plays, a big part. They have staff meetings with the administration, with the higher ups, and she comes back and informs us about what is expected. What needs to be done here, as far as, testing, assessment, and evaluation? The only thing I can say is that she follows things to the letter. I honestly think she is very sincere in making sure the needs of the learners are being meet, as mandated by guidelines. She is good at that. I know when we have our meetings with her on Mondays. She always reminds us that, you know. Every other Wednesday we have general faculty meetings, and on the other Wednesdays we have team leaders meetings. She reports to them and they report to her. All the information is disseminated and shared by all. We are on the same page!

(3) Participant 0107111618

Q8: Facilitator, that is really the way to do things. Many run around and try to tell everybody how to do things, but that really doesn't work well. Uh, what the building

administrator needs to do is to spend a good deal of time with the students, with the faculty, and with the staff. We have a fairly wide diverse staff. We have special education department people, or speech therapist, or that sort of thing. Sometimes we forget about that aspect of it, but that is an important aspect. What we need to do is to provide as much information and as much opportunity for growth and let the teachers decide what they want to do. I have great faith in teachers. I believe what they are going to do is choose the right course. They got into it for all the best reasons for the most part. For the most part, they did not get into it for the money, although it is an easy job and all. But I don't get…but you start looking at how they work and it doesn't work that way. Teachers started teaching for all the best reasons, and I think they will make the right decisions. I think what the administrator has to do is to keep the group and to coalesce the group. They have to be a catalyst. So that the group figures out what they want to do, what they need to know, and where the group wants to go. This is done within the framework of the laws and district policy and all that sort of thing. You really have to present that to the teachers, and then let the teachers make the decisions on what they really think are the most important aspects on what they have to do. Let the teachers devise a play, which is what we did here. We let the teachers devise a plan and then the administrator should probably keep everybody on track. Uh, what I call it is monitor and support. Go around and monitor what is going on and give support for those, often times the teacher doesn't do something because they don't know where to find the material. They don't know what to do in that specific situation and so that the support part. But, you have to monitor it because they are not going to come to you and tell you, not all of them. Many of them will not do that. So that is monitoring and supporting. So that is the administrator's role to facilitate, monitor and support the programs. Not to do it, many believe that administrators can go around telling teachers what to do. I can't bring myself around to do that. I am not up to telling all these teachers who have BAs, MAs and maybe even a Ph.D., you know, I am not going to tell them what to do. They probably know their business probably every bit as well as I do. And so they need to be given the opportunity to work together. It has to be a group effort, some say team, but I don't like the word team. Team implies competition I think that as a group effort we are not competing. We are just struggling. The administrator's role is facilitating, monitoring, and supporting.

(4) Participant 0107121418

Q8 - In our case, the assistant does discipline. So, we don't do very much on the planning part, such as, the knowledge of what is going on. They do plan, develop, and implement with the certified teachers in those areas and with the ESL director at central office. Um, well what will be the plan for the instruction of those students fits right in with state standards and benchmarks. In that, whatever is required in an English classroom is required in a bilingual/ESL classroom. Um, same thing with communication, it comes into play there, reading, writing, communication in different forms all going into the planning and implementing of those guidelines. A lot of our teachers do state level work, and committee work at the district with the vertical alignment from one grade to the next grade and building alignment from one subject to the next. So our teachers have a lot of input in it and then our administrator works real well with getting their expertise in planning and implementing instruction. Yea, most of our departmental meeting one of our administrators will go in and observe. Often times meet with the department head to plan the meeting ahead of time, do the pre-planning and the department head follows through with the meeting. Um, you know, to disseminate the information to make sure we are on the right track and to make sure all the students are being serviced. Um, and once we have the ball rolling that the administrators are overseeing what our teachers are doing, it is not much. Once we have the plan and the work is being done it is more of an overseeing job for the administrator. Um, central staff do a little bit, concerns, implement more resources, they are there in the background to help. So they are involved but it is more whatever we can do in our building. We do that first before we ask for help.

Question 9: What would it require to get building stakeholders (ESL and core content teachers, parents, and community members) regularly involved when planning, and developing instructional practices for linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant 0207111617

Q9: Just like you have school improvement teams that meet every Monday night. You can get parents to volunteer for those meetings. You can get teachers to also be members and maybe meet once a month. Sit down as a group, parents with teachers and include administrators to plan and develop programs that are needed for these students. Yes, we have Student Assistance Teams (SAT committees), but I think you have to have our own separate, different. I don't know what you would call it. But, you know, have parents, teachers, and administrators get

together to discuss the planning and development, again, for these students. You need to have some kind of dialogue, some kind of discussion, and, again, I feel like the community and the parents have to be involved. It is their kids' education. So they need to have some kind of input. Yes, you can get committees to meet. We have more participation then we have had in the past. They become more involved in school matters. If you share that with kids you can go far.

(2) Participant 0107111517

Q9: I think the district is doing the best job that they can to address those needs. But there are so many factors, like I said, that our district has. For one, our administration or superintendent is replaced every two or so years. So, it is kind of hard. This district, traditionally, has had that problem. So if the leadership continues to be replaced like that, even though the community wants to go a certain direction, you have to have a leader who stays there and is consistent. As I see, some of our surrounding school districts who have had their administrators for eight to 10 years, and some even longer, uh, that makes a difference as well. So uh, but yes as far as the district goes, they do advocate for students. And they do the best they can for culturally and linguistically diverse students. Everything that we do for the district, even if I am at central office now, is based on what is best for the kids.

(3) Participant 0107111618

Q9: That is one thing that NCLB is going to do; that is good. It is going to take an outside influence to get them regularly involved, particularly, at the middle school level. The elementary school is a little different. They have a closer bond and the teachers work a little more closely together. The middle schools start developing a secondary school philosophy. They no longer teach students. What they do is teach a content area. And so they have a little difficulty that they are actually teaching the students. Part of that is that we give them 150 students, you know, that's a lot more difficult. So you are kind of teaching to a defense reaction. Teachers like to stay on track that means that if first period gets screwed up for one reason, if there is an assembly or something like that. They don't like that much. You know, because it upsets them being on track. They have a time line they are working under. Uh, but what you probably have to do is provide some sort of an outside pressure for them to say, "these ESL students count". We are going through the same thing with special education that we are experiencing with ESL. Special education is going to come right behind ESL, but its' going to be the same thing. We have just gone into a full inclusion program in special education, and the teachers are complaining bitterly,

and that's ok. I'll live with that. Because the one thing that they haven't done with these kids, yet, is that they don't think of them as their kids. In other words, these are the special education students, and they belong to the special education teacher. Well, they are not anymore. They are on the role for regular teachers, and they belong to the regular teacher. And they have to accept ownership of the student. Now teachers accept ownership of their regular students, but they don't always accept, uh, that all the students in the classes are theirs. The something is true of ELL students. Another story going back a number of years, at BLT. Uh, I had a little girl her name was E. She was a darling little girl. She was lovely, polite never caused any trouble. I never understood, because I wasn't thinking. I was a first year teacher, and I knew as much as an ant knows about teaching. But uh, this little girl I would give her assignments and she would sit down and write diligently. And I would say a three-page assignment, and she would turn in a three-page assignment. She had copied in a lovely handwriting, uh, three pages from the book. She had no idea what she had written. She could not speak a word of English. It took me until semester time to find out that she didn't speak English. Uh, it never occurred to me that a kid would come to school and not speak English. Uh, there she was in the ninth grade and did not speak a word of English. Yes, central-staff are always willing to help. One thing I like about this district is that you can come to them with whatever needs you have and one way or another you will get some help. I think the efforts are there regardless of the category you what to put these kids in. If they are kids, they are kids, and they are going to help. And if there are any particular linguistic needs, yea, they are going to go out of their way to see that they are met.

(4) Participant 0107111617

Q9: We would really have to make it convenient for those people to get together. Give them different times where they can meet their schedules. Um, for quite a while we had to do some pavement pounding and door knocking to get, you know, to get people out of their house and to come in. We had to have people who were real familiar with the community to make the parents and business owners feel comfortable in giving their ideas and suggestions. Um, not make it a feeling that they are going to be responsible. But make them feel that they can be a part of it, and they can help the growth of the students. So I think it would require a lot of footwork. You have to get out there, which right now we don't have a lot of time to do. We don't have a community liaison per se between the building and community except for the central office. So we don't do a lot of that. We need to have someone like a liaison person who works real well

with the community. So that they can be involved in those areas there are. We tried to. But a lot of the times we don't get what is sufficient to what we need. And for example, we set up a meeting. And we have content teachers and ESL teachers there and we have a few parents there. We would like to have 10 parents there, but we get five. We get about half of what we would like to have. Um even better than that, we would like to have 25 or even 50 parents there and that has hardly ever happened. We did at the beginning of this year, um, getting the 6th graders in we have had more involvement, probably a carryover of being involved in the elementary schools already. They have been concerned about the transition. I think what it would require is making those parents feel more comfortable and giving us their ideas and sharing what they think would work best for those students. We have it, but it is not to the amount that we would like to have it. Some of the parents come from the background that we are the experts in the area of education. So they send their kids to us to make the best decisions. I think that is a feeling of quite a few parents. So they are more standoffish. They feel you do your job over there, and we will do our job over here. And that is ok to some extent. But we need them to come in and say I know my culture. I know my child, and this is what I think would help.

Question 10: What strengths do your faculty and staff have in organizing and designing instruction for linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant 0207111617

Q10: School H has a very good system, but they are infused with a lot of money. That is where this district is lacking. I think when you compare it to school H it is very poor. School H is not. It has oil money, not only that, but you have donors who contribute for programs. A lot of school districts are being over taxed, that a lot of school systems are going to corporations and to foundations asking for money. Just like they did in school RR, you know, that was the way they built up the school. Look at school H someone is going to lose, like students here are losing if you compare them to school H. I coordinated the Advanced Placement (AP) program at school G for two years. I don't know if you know what AP programs are about. And you can take as many AP courses that you want. Some take three or four. Then you take the AP exam, and if you score five some colleges will give you credit for those classes. Ok we had a kid from school H, he was from Viet Nam that did so well he scored all fives. When he went to college he started as a second semester sophomore, because of all the credit that he had received. Now, but in school H you have an individual that gives a lot of money to finance an Advance Placement (AP) program

from pre AP 7th-12th. All the training and teachers are paid an increment for enrichment sessions. You are required to be given 15 dollars an hour…lap tops, teacher incentives. Those programs are so successful, it makes the students …but that is why I mean that this is a poor community. When I started coaching at school G I asked when they give the students their own shoes…I think your right seek more money through community and business.

(2) Participant 0107111517

Q10 - Ours was set up to where we had certain teachers that the kids were filtered through. Uh, to make sure we were meeting their needs and supporting them. Uh, the other thing, we had the different students in different classrooms and the teachers dealt with them in different ways. Teachers attended different training that the district provided for them. Uh, SADIE is one that comes to mind as far as dealing with kids with language differences, language barriers, or language problems. Uh, so yea, we are always addressing those problems. As a school I think we did a good job.

(3) Participant 0107111618

Q10: Well except for those who actually speak the language, I don't think any of them understand the nonstandard varieties. Uh, it is very difficult to pick up accents and dialects, and uh, unless you actually speak the language. I kind of doubt, that those who are not native speakers have any dialectical, uh, sensitivity at all. But uh, most teachers are becoming more sensitive to the fact that some of their students do not speak English at all, or that their English is poor. But once again, the sensitivity does not imply that they are doing anything about it. Like right now they kind of expect the ELL teachers to do something about that. They haven't taken ownership of the kids. They don't take ownership of the kids then the language problem, even though they may be sensitive that there is a problem, it is not their problem. Whereas there is a kid who has a language problem because he can't speak English well, and he is a native English speaker, they do take ownership of that. So sensitivity is not the same as accepting responsibility for it. So some of our teachers are sensitive and more so now that we give them regular lessons. They don't speak English, but they will use that, "the reason they are failing is because they don't speak English". But the reason we hired you was to for you to teach them English. So if they are not learning English then how do you respond to that. We haven't gotten to that question yet. I am a little afraid to ask it this year. But the truth is that if they don't speak English, and they come to an English class, they came to the right place, you know. That's all of it, if you

don't know something you go to school. You came to the right place, and we have to do that. But we have not accepted that as something we think of as our job. We think our job is to teach people the content in the curriculum. I think that is important, but we do have to understand that first. That we are teaching people, I think there is a lot of forgetting about that.

(4) Participant 0107121418

Q10: Strengths? I think right now they are not involved. And they should be because, you know, they are the ones that are in the trenches. They know the kids. They know the ones that need help. One of the terms that we have used is vertical articulation. When a high school teacher gets a student who is not performing he blames the middle school and on down. The middle school teacher blames the elementary teacher for not having taught that student well enough. So vertical articulation means the high school, middle school, and elementary are on the same page. Before the year begins, during, and after, they have these steering committee meetings. They discuss common concerns. For example, textbooks, study skills, it should not just come from above. I think teachers should be on an even level. Get teachers to be involved. Yes, scope and sequence comes from the state, but we are fighting the battles. Let me tell you how to win this. Just like in Vietnam, the generals did not fight that war; the executives did not fight it. But, get opinions from the generals who are fighting. We don't get teacher opinions, but we need them. In the past we have sent a lot of staff members to training to bilingual conferences so that they can strengthen their instruction. So that they can know what Texas is doing and what California is doing. So that they know what the testing companies are doing. So I think they have a lot of knowledge of just what is going on in the community, state and country as far as instruction is concerned for linguistically diverse students. I think their knowledge is probably their strength.

Survey Questions and Interviewee Responses for the Element of Instruction

Question 1 - How will reconfiguration of the middle schools into a 6 - 8 grade configuration affect the building's capacity to meet the needs of linguistic and cultural diversity among students?

(1) Participant 0104111517

Q1 - I think with the increased number of students it may have a negative effect. Because, we may not have the space needed to accommodate this new group of students. They will be coming in with limited language skills. It may have a negative effect if any. Well, that isn't

known right now. I don't think we are going to have the space. We will have the space in that the teachers' lounge will be turned into a classroom. This is a new project that the Superintendent is implementing here. I haven't seen the logistics or the planning that is going on. Only that the principal says it is going to have a negative effect in terms of the space that is available.

(2) Participant 0106111617

Q1 - As far as building capacity, we have room; we have 1000 lockers. This building was built in the late fifties and did have a 7th, 8th, and a 9th grade here. So they have had three grade levels in the building before. But meeting the needs of the students, I think the building can be adapted as it has in the past.

(3) Participant 0105121518

Q1- Well, we are going to have more teachers that are bilingual to take care of those children that are in need of bilingual instruction. But, I think that just by the fact that we are transitioning all of those people are already in place. Doing that so it will just mean a shift of personnel. And I am sure that is part of the planning. Those people are needed already to teach six graders. There are cultural differences. We can see that in the attitude of the kids. So that is obviously now, and it is not going to change. The only thing that is going to change is the number of students. As far as having to meet language needs, we have those same language needs now with 7th and 8th graders and the same cultural difference. It is just the number of students that will change. We will still have the same needs. We have a Vietnamese girl, which throws another thing in the mix for you. You know, we have mainly Hispanic and white. I guess you call us that, but we have blacks. I don't know how much Ebonics we have here, but I think Ebonics is really cultural. They don't speak it with us as much. It is something spoken among themselves at home with their families, and they do a better job of separating. Where with Hispanics, I don't think they do that as much. Where we see the Hispanic culture and language more than we do the black.

(4) Participant 0109111417

Q1 - First of all, the number of ESL students will increase. Now we are going to have 6th, 7th, and 8th grade ESL kids. I am hoping that the district will allow us to hire a full time ESL teacher for these three grades. On a positive note, I hope that Spanish will increase at levels 1 and 2 and especially Spanish Language Arts for all 6th 7th and 8th grades. Well, we don't know how many electives we will have, which will affect our classes. If they only allow them one

elective like a physical education, than that will affect my classes, which won't allow an increase in my Spanish classes. But, that depends on what they decide. I don't know yet.

(5) Participant 0106111617

Q1 - In my opinion, when you move 6th graders in with 7th and 8th graders then the need is more drastic. You are going to need more people here for sure. I am just used to having 7th and 8th graders who have limited language skills. Our migrant students, no one else, I don't have any limited language barriers for me. I don't have any more. But if you are going to move in more kids into the middle school, then we are going to need a lot more people that are capable of teaching these kids. Sure, linguistic and cultural diversity plays a role. It is for me. We do address the needs, but we have limited personal to do this. And we are going to have to bring in additional personnel to do this. So they are going to have an increase of people. We have never had a 6-8-grade configuration.

(6) Participant 0104121418

Q1 - I think that we are pretty lucky in the way we are set up for our language approach at this point. And I think that with the 6th grade coming up the building is going to be able to meet their needs. If they, indeed, keep the Spanish language arts program here, uh, were all the kids come here for their special services. But, I don't think it is going to affect us as much as it is going to affect other schools. Because, I don't think other schools are set up to meet the needs of linguistic diversity, as firmly as we are. Now, I could be wrong. Um, we are the only middle school with a principal that speaks Spanish. The others do not. You know, I think we will be ok as long as we get the teachers. You know, to cover the numbers and depending on how many of the students are ESL or ELL, um students. I think we will be ok. I don't know how it is treated in the 6th grade right now. Uh, we are going to have self-contained 6th grade. And I assume it will be treated the same, although, since we do have the Spanish language arts program here at our school. We might be able to incorporate some of those kids into the program. Because of the feeder schools we are getting, those are the linguistically diverse kids, especially in our neck of the woods, with Spanish being the top of diverse languages.

(7) Participant 0106121317

Q1 - I don't think there is going to be a difference. I don't think that it is going to affect it any because they are coming from the same area where they live. So the street talk and their home languages are the same. I don't think there is going to be a difference. For the 6th graders,

it depends on the staff that we get. It is going to depend on the kind of staff we get in here. Do you mean by…I don't think so.

(8) Participant 0105121317

Q1 - I don't think it is going to make a difference to the programs we have now. It may bring more diversity to the school. But all it is really doing is taking it from one school and putting it in another. And you know, we might get more teachers for the programs needs. But, I don't think it will change what we do here. We don't even know whom the teachers are that will be coming in. I think that some teachers are willing to go the extra mile, so to speak, when it comes to diversity and some are not. I can't speak for all teachers. But, I can speak for myself and subject area, which is math. Math is a very concrete thing. You either know the fact or you don't. For me, in explaining math, I don't speak a lot of Spanish, but I got about 8 kids that only speak Spanish. So what I do is use a lot of different colors and arrows for visual effect, as you will notice on the board. So that they see where I am getting it from, and how I am doing it. And uh, the majority of the kids if they grasp of the concepts of how to add, subtract, multiply, and divide, then this helps them. But if they don't have a concept of the four operations, then it really doesn't help them. And I also have a textbook that has a Spanish increment for them. And it gives them the word problems in Spanish. And I make sure I copy those when we do the lesson so that they can have them. Because my viewpoint is, as I said, I really don't speak a lot of Spanish. So I couldn't be expected to do a problem when it's written in Spanish. So, I am not going to expect them to do it in English.

(9) Participant 0110111518

Q1 – Obviously, we are going to have more students. We are going to move up the student population. We are going to need more, uh, abilities to deal with these kids that do not speak something that can be understood. I deal with, like I say, I have two that are difficult to understand. And we are simply going to need more programs. That is what America is built on and some people would say, "That is a strength." If you look historically, the great Dutch trading empire was strong because they allowed religious diversity and cultural diversity. Certainly the Dutch were very protestant, but they didn't care if you were catholic or some other denomination. As long as, you know, as long as you kept to your self, and basically, I think that is one of our strengths.

(10) Participant 0206121418

Q1 - Uh, apparently, in our school we have Ms. S who is from Spain and comes in to teacher Spanish Language Arts to our students. However, that is not the only language that we have identified in our building. We have a student that speaks German and is currently not getting any bilingual education services of any sort as far as in her native tongue or in any form like that. The problem that I am seeing is that we send one of our students who are a non-English speaking student to middle school M. We bus him to middle school M for 6 of the 7 hours of school. We bus him out of here, which means he doesn't start school right at 8 o'clock and returns during 7th period, which means that he misses part of 7th. I have spoken to him since the start of the school year. And I honestly don't see any changes in his abilities to speak any more English or understand any more. He understands more about his native language and his culture, but I don't see the bridge being made. I honestly don't think there is enough being done or that at this level that enough is being done at the middle school level. I think it will. We don't have enough for the students that we do have. We don't have enough. We do have some teachers in our building that do speak Spanish. And they make the modification in their own classroom. But not all teachers in our district are bilingually, uh, you know competent. And so I think that that is a problem. In my own classroom, I have made accommodations for that young man who was in my classroom. But it took them a while to get him over to the middle school M program. And I see it being more of a compounded problem in that we have 200 more 6th graders coming in. Um, we got to meet their needs some way, and, at this point, I don't think that we will meet their needs adequately enough. A lot of countries do teach their students English as part of a requirement, as one of their classes that they take. We do have a lot of students that do come in from other countries that have had English instruction. The only requirement that we have is that when students attend high school they have to take a foreign language. Whether German, Spanish, or French, but that is all. I think that better language instruction could improve their grades and achievement. I have another young man in my class. That I honestly feel, that even though you understand the basics in math you can excel. But if you don't understand the word problems, because you don't read the language, or that the language is not put into your language that you do understand. You hit a brick wall.

(11) Participant 0205111317

Q1 - Uh, it is going to make it a bit more difficult. We are getting in more staff, but the staff is not trained in bilingual methods or ESL. And a lot of them don't speak Spanish. So even less if another student comes in and speaks Vietnamese or German or whatever the case may be. Uh, we are just not trained to do it. Now we have more chaos. So it is going to be more difficult. It is going to make it more challenging. We definitely need a bilingual education teacher in the building. We have one bilingual education teacher, and she is working in the capacity as a special education teacher. She is working towards that. So, as far as improving the building any improvement would be good. But, I feel that we need a bilingual component here. Yea, it would be good to have a floating resource teacher or something like that. Or with the situation here, the student body, the demographics, it would help if some of us spoke Spanish, or were trained to service students in Spanish. That helped me a lot. I had a couple of students from Mexico, and it helped me communicate with them. The first half of the class I'd talk to the entire class. And the second half I would focus in on those students and help them out.

(12) Participant 0210121618

Q1 - I don't think the reconfiguration of all the 6th graders with the 7th and 8th is going to affect linguistic and cultural diversity among the students to a greater extent. Basically the young people that are coming to us as 6th graders are the younger brothers and sisters of students that we have already had or do have at the present time here. We are meeting their needs as far as the linguistic and cultural diversity that we have because of the linguistic and cultural diversity that we already have on staff as teachers. I think we are because we already have such a wide diversity of students at this school from the highest to the lowest. Um, from ESL to English speaking only that we are meeting their needs now. So I honestly don't believe that by adding another 200 students that the change is going to be, um, too much of a problem except for the room itself. We are a small building. Um, we are going to get 4 more portables. But 4 of us are going to lose our rooms in the building to bring the 6th graders in. So, that means the special education department is going to be doubling up, which I don't necessarily agree with or believe is good for students.

(13) Participant 0206121418

Q1 – No, we don't have a chair for the science department this year. Um, they have changed the boundary for what students come to this school, which will change our number of low social economic status students. At present, we have more middle to lower income students,

and the new boundary will increase our lower group. So, there are going to be a lot more needs linguistically. We will have an additional 200 to 250 additional students. Yes, we will definitely need to have more teachers. I am assuming about 50 percent of our students come from Spanish speaking homes. This year I do not have any students who are not English speakers, not this year. I have some that are in special education and have difficulty and come from Spanish speaking homes. But, I don't have any, you know, who are average students, or who do not speak any English.

(14) Participant 0208121318

Q1 – Actually, I am thinking that with more funding it will affect the ELL learners. Hopefully, we can get some kind of program to get the 6th graders in at the same time. Because from what I understand they are going to be segregated out in the portables, but if we can have some kind of program for the 6th, 7th, and 8th graders that would help them out. I think the building's capacity will be improved, because we are getting more funding. Because, we will have 600 students where we have 400 students at present. So, we will get more State funding. So that means we will be able to afford some kind of program for those students. Um, as far as cultural diversity because they are changing the way the districts are going to be set up. I actually think it might cut down on the diversity of the students, which I don't believe is such a good thing. Um, they are kind of making it a North side, South side kind of thing. It is going to be. I really believe it is going to cut down on the extremes of the cultures we have in here right now. But that is just my, you know, opinion.

(15) Participant 0108111418

Q1 - I don't think it would have that great of an effect. They are going to isolate the 6th graders in self-contained classrooms. At one time, I thought it would be perfect for us to get the 6th graders in here and get their typing skills and key boarding skills in the 6th grade. And now because of the reconfiguration and jobs, they may eliminate this computer position. That is not a final decision or any thing else. I think there will be a big group of kids that will be bad off if they do that. That is what I thought too, that every school needed a technology person. But, apparently it is not just because of the special education department. They are not supposed to be teaching so many classes. So when they pull some students out of those special education classes it would create a need for more classes. Like an English section, a math section, etc., and partly because the special education teachers are not supposed to be teaching so many students.

(16) Participant 0204121417

Q1: Ok, um, first of all being an English teacher, we are made up of a very diverse population of cultural and linguistic society. I think we have to incorporate using more Title 1 reading. We have to look at where the student is with reference to language. We have to establish what is acceptable academic language and what is not. And we need to make sure that the kids understand that social language, yes is awesome, is great when you are on the school grounds, when you are around your friends, and maybe sometimes in their home. However, there is a difference in our books and in our workbooks. There is a difference in the language that is spoken there. And sometimes my students, that I have noticed, are not familiar with it. And we have to make sure as teachers that we are asking them questions in their terms. And in turn asking the students to step up and speak a better, not a better, uh, but a more academic language. So, I think through Title I more workshops for parents to enable them. I think parents are not embarrassed. But they are concerned that teachers know so much, and they don't. Um, however, parents are the first teachers of these kids. And we need to empower the parents more and take some of the pressure away from teachers. As far as, ok, I am the absolute. Well, it is going to be difficult because we are treating them like 6th graders. We are putting them in a middle school situation, but we are still keeping them as 6th graders. They are going to be only. They are going to be self-contained. Sixth graders need to be transitioning. And they need to be aware that middle is 7 periods, and that we do have bells. And we do have 7 different teachers that we have to deal with. I think we are doing them a disservice by putting them up here and leaving them as self contained 6th graders. Now, as far as bringing them up here, I think they will be mature-wise. They will get the feeling that they say; "I am a middle school student now." "I have a different attitude." "I have to adapt." I think that 6 graders are in limbo. They are not babies. They don't need to be carried by the hand, but they still need a lot of guidance. We can't expect them to. Yet, we can't hold those high school or middle school expectations on them. Yet, they have not fully transitioned from elementary to middle school. So we need to be careful on how we do that. Self-contained classrooms may be seen as a transitional period. We will see this year, when we bring in all the new 6th graders. I am an 8th grade teacher, and I get the kids that are transitioning into high school. But, sometimes, I don't think that they are ready for that either.

Question 2: What limitations and problems do you observe occurring in your classes when linguistically diverse students attempt to study and learn your subject? In your opinion,

<u>what learning difficulties constitute a language problem? To whom would you refer a pupil with a language problem</u>?

    <u>(1) Participant 0208121318</u>

    Q2 - Limitations and problems? I only have three students at this time that are having some difficulties. One of them, um, I know she even has a hard time, because we are on the computers. She has a hard time all the programs are in English because that is all that we do have. Right now, we are doing a house hunt on the Internet and she is going to the Spanish WEB sites, which has helped out. But, as far as, the general just going to programs everything is written in English start menu, etc., everything is in English on it so, but when I get a chance, I try to let them go into the sites that help them out a little more. They usually do pick things up rather easily. In this class, I don't really have too many problems, but um I do allow them to have email accounts. And they write to their pen pals. And I allow them to do it in Spanish. So I really have not encountered a real big problem with the language. Um, what learning difficulties? Uh, you mean as far as, I really don't because I have not seen any students that really have a hard enough time or that big of a problem. I don't see it as a problem. I see it as an obstacle. I see it, as just getting behind that is the only difficulty I see for them as far as doing the work. Because they are trying to focus on understanding one thing and you are already on to the next thing. That is the only difficulty that I think, but the ones that I have are very bright students, but some do have that language barrier. So there are a number of Spanish web sites. I refer Spanish students to Ms. B. who is right down the hall. Last year we had some German students who had to do it on their own. It would be nice to have a list of district resources that list the various languages those students can get help on. Contact someone who does know German or does speak French you know along those lines. Around here we mainly focus on Spanish, but we do get like those two German students last year who speak another language. So, it would be nice to have resources available.

    <u>(2) Participant 0206121418</u>

    Q2 - Uh, the textbook is much harder. It is really not on their grade level as English speakers. We have some Spanish textbooks and a textbook on tape, but they have to be taught how to read it. Being a non-Spanish speaker, I can't teach them how to read these textbooks. So a lot of what I do is a lot of hands on talking together. I do have about 3 years of Spanish courses that I have taken. So I do have some understanding and some of it. So I do know which students

I can get help from. No, because we are trying to do a lot of hands on, and I think where my language fails, and actually participating in the activity helps them. So I have not seen any problems. Language problem? Just not getting a point across, you know. Uh, if they can't understand me, and I can't understand why they don't understand, you know. I have about 5 students who are really high achievers and who come from Spanish speaking homes.

(3) Participant 0108111418

Q2 - When the students first come in, I have them working on keyboarding skills and I don't think language affects them that much. Ok, all the time they are doing that. I think all the time they have spent on the alphabet helps them because of the sounds, and things they pick up on the computer. They pick up letter sounds and things like that, but when it comes to after my other projects in word processing, the big problem is that they can't read and follow the directions. So with several of the students, especially, the ones that are, uh, not fluent, not, you know, you have the limited and non-limited English students. Those students have a problem and can't read the instructions. So what I am doing is having them take it to their bilingual teacher and at least having them go over it with them and explain to them. That has proven to have an effect. Like with the Vietnamese student, no one in the building spoke Vietnamese, but she is really motivated to learn and she has picked it up real good. Uh, what I find out with a lot of these second language speakers is that a lot of times they won't ask questions. Probably because they feel that they can't communicate with me. I don't speak any Spanish. They will sit there for half a day and not ask any questions. I finally pick up on them that they are not doing anything, and we kind of have to go through things. Like I read and have them follow along as I read the problem to them. And then I demonstrate and try to get them to understand. The problem is that they don't ask questions. I think because of their language problems they isolate themselves. And that is probably the opposite of what they need to do. They probably need to get out there to learn more. The only thing we can do is refer them to the bilingual teacher. Uh, at times other students in here that speak Spanish kind of help them along. Interpret for me. But, other than that we have always have had to refer them to the bilingual teacher, but the problem with that is that they have classes too. Other people identify ELL students. I usually don't refer students to the speech department, although, I have had students who have had speech problems. They see a speech therapist once a week or twice a week or whatever. But I am not the one who refers them to that. It is usually the ESL teacher or special education teacher who refers them to that

<u>(4) Participant 0205111317</u>

Q2 - In my class specifically, the problem is the textbook. It is a Saxon based program and is really heavy into story problems, there is a lot of reading involved. And I guess the biggest challenge is to take the book apart and break it down into its key mathematical component structures that way and give the problems back to the students in ways that they can understand it. I try to throw in a little Spanish or language support for linguistically diverse students. Just basically breaking down the textbook in ways that they can understand it. This textbook it is not just the linguistically diverse students who may have difficulty, but the other students too. I had to break it down for them. The first year I broke down the textbook just for them. But this year I broke it down for everybody and that seemed to help. Most of the problem is with the written language and not as much with the spoken language. The students that I have received have been able to grasp the problems. They have been able to grasp the concepts. Mathematics is very abstract. They don't have trouble with the concepts. They do have trouble when it is presented to them outside whatever language they speak primarily at home. I have 5 limited proficient out of 94 students. My classes are 24-30 students. The student is unable to follow the instruction of a regular education teacher. Uh, a problem would be that when a student is highly qualified academically and comes from his or her native country and is seen many times as a learning disability when it is in reality a matter of comprehension. In addition to that language problem, a lot of times the students are willing but can't comprehend what is going on. Then it is because of the language. Then that is the language problem. If the student is willing and wants to learn, but just can't function in that class then he or she receives ESL instruction. Could it be like in my Spanish Class? Where I get a lot of Hispanic kids who do not speak a lot of Spanish or its informal Spanish; and we try to teach them formal Spanish. I have had parents come in and tell me that this is the way we learned it. And we say plugiar instead of shupar and parkiar instead of estacionar etc. All of it is the Spanglish. I have had parents upset. And I have had a parent pull a student out of my class for that. They say this is our Spanish, and we don't want you to teach them that Spanish. And what we have is what we want and for us it is correct. A lot of teachers have had training in previous years with hands on, visuals, and TPR (total physical response), which has been very effective. Total Physical Response where students see and perform based on directions given. A lot of it depends on the students. A lot of students pick it up by just studying. It depends on how well they are prepared. I don't know if this is related. But my program is

bilingual. And one of my major goals is to bring in more Spanish. And to truly create bilingual kids, where they speak both English and Spanish and are bi-literate is actually what I want to say. But, the pressure on me and on the district is how quickly the newcomer students learn English. That is the main focus and is what the district wants us to do. There is some controversy whether we should allow the ESL students to take the Spanish language arts class. Some people believe that they should be thrown in there all English 100%. And that is the big issue right there, whether we should service them with their native language or not. Uh, like I said, here in the building, we do not have a bilingual education component. So, I try to handle everything I can in the classroom. Uh, I do refer some to testing so they can get additional help. But it is a long process. So most of the time I just deal with it here. I have worked with those students. So they would be receiving proper instruction in an ESL setting along with a Spanish language arts class.

(5) Participant 0210121618

Q2 - There really isn't because I teach Morgan reading, and it is more of a sight word based linguistic program. Um, the young people come into us for whatever reason or disability, um, and meet the criteria for 7th and 8th grade students on the readability level. So that is why I take them back to the very beginning and teach them basic sight words or basic sight phrases that help them in words for them to use the syllabication of words and understand words anyway. Young people don't come to my program unless they do have limitations. I think that ranges from a wide set from students who are learning disabled, um, may have some difficulties from a student who may be attention deficit or have attention deficit hyper activity disorder. In the special education department, we have such a wide range of students with different disabilities or with different learning disorders that, um, we base our teaching on what is good for them in order for them to learn and succeed. So some of the problems that are occurring in regular education are not occurring in special education. Because that is what we are trained to do...Who would I refer them to? If they had a language problem they would probably be referred to me. If, um, if it is a language problem that deals with the inability to speak English or the inability to communicate in English, then we have assorted departments that deal with that. We have our ESL program, our Spanish Language arts program. We have many different programs already in place in this district that if I have a young person that comes to me who doesn't speak English or speaks English but doesn't comprehend enough in English. We have departments in our SCHOOL DISTRICT that I can make referrals to and say "come and help me". I don't feel that a

language problem is a learning problem; I feel that a language problem is a disadvantage. A young person coming in and not speaking the language is of course disadvantaged to everyone else in the class because they haven't got a clue about what is going on. They are disadvantaged in that when I am speaking and they don't know what I am talking about how do I expect them to respond? When they don't have a clue to what I am asking them to respond to. They are definitely at a disadvantage. If they come into a classroom and the teacher does not speak their language, nor does the student speak the teacher's language, then in those cases I would love to see in this district an associate. Someone who would go with that young person to give them a safety net in their own language, until they are better able to comprehend and to speak to the other students and the teacher.

(6) Participant 0205121418

Q2 – Well, as I was just saying. When they understand the concepts, the computation concepts, they can do well. But when they come to the word problems they struggle more. I have attempted to go to translation Spanish.com or one of the translation WEB sites that you can find on the Internet. I have typed in the English version of the question and ask it to translate. And it comes back with the Spanish version of it. But that takes time, and you don't have time to do that in a 40 min. class session unless you prepare ahead of time. Um, but if it is something the student doesn't understand immediately, then it is going to take some time to solve. Uh, I would think that in my classroom. It would be multiple translations for one word, or that the student might not understand some of the terminology that we do use because in their language. They may not have heard those terms before. Um, so in trying to communicate with the student in what they are learning. In short, it is a communication problem. Well if we have a formal bilingual teacher, than I would refer that student to the bilingual teacher. Um, by language problems are you referring to speech problems? Possibly language arts teachers would be helpful on that. Um, there are some programs at the lower levels, like Johnny can read, Johnny can spell, that teach a phonetic based approach, a phonetic based program. At this level, it would be the bilingual teacher, the English teacher. We have a Spanish-speaking teacher on our team, and she helps with translation. And uh, then we also have a program at middle school M, and we have placed a student over there. It is called the new comers program. I believe. In that particular instance, we had a student that came directly from Mexico and did not speak any English. They did put him in the newcomer program, which is a 6-week program. But he is still in the program because he is

not making a lot of progress, as far as, the transition between the two languages. Now another thing that is a lot of help are the students themselves. The paired peer tutoring assistance. If there is something that I can't explain well enough to the students, so that they can understand, then a peer tutor is also helpful. Um, I have asked for Spanish-speaking students to be aids so that they can help me in those particular instances. But a lot of this, the language, it comes by being around other students and being in the class so that they can learn the language better. Um, I don't quite understand what you're asking. Learning difficulties? There are so many of them. I don't understand the language problem part either. In my class, that is where my students have a learning difficulty. It's the language barrier. When I was taught my subject area, science, terminology that I used there in no way could I explain it to them. For example, to an ESL student, I don't know the interpretation of the scientific words from English to Spanish. I know what they mean, but there is no way that I could interpret it to them. There is no way that I could give them an example of that same word. I could translate it but not make it applicable. I refer students to our ESL teacher or to the Spanish teacher.

(7) Participant 0110111518

Q2 - My classroom is for emotionally disturbed children. Uh, mine is not a traditional classroom. We have different children who come in and work at different levels. Some are moving way ahead. Some are first grade and most are somewhere in the middle. So basically what we deal with are children on an individual basis. I have two associates, and they have just given me another one. Each of my children receives a contract at the beginning of the day as to what we expect them to accomplish. And we help them through it. We will work with them on an individual basis. A lot of people don't have that. They don't have the manpower to do that. But we are set up to teach you how to be in school. Skills oriented, if you happen to learn some English, then that is a positive thing. But is not necessarily what we are focusing on. We are teaching that you come to school and this is how we are taking care of what is going on the rest of the day. Well in my classroom, we have a child who is diagnosed orthopedic or something to that effect. And basically he has a medical condition and sometimes makes him or her hard to be understood. So basically, here is where the manpower thing comes into play, where we take the time and slow it down and find out what he is taking about. Most of my children have no problem communicating; in fact, excessive communication is one of the reasons they are in here. Like I said the one child we have that may have a language problem receives physical therapy

and occupational therapy. And he was receiving speech, but we have lost our speech person and that has become a problem. Uh, we also have programs like Mr. Butler who has a study skills class to help students read and that sort of thing. So we have a lot of outside things that we can touch on with these children.

(8) Participant 0105121317

Q2 – Again, in my particular subject, math, if they have grasp of the concepts (four operations), I don't think my planning isn't as difficult. I use a lot of different visual things. So that they see where I am getting everything. I don't feel that it makes a difference just so long as they have a grasp of the particular math concept. I don't really. In my subject area, I don't see much problem. I see how it could cause problems in other areas. But in math, regardless what they speak at home or here at the school, it is just that math is so concrete. You know, it doesn't matter where you go 2 + 2 will always be the same. And if they have that concept, then I don't think it really does. I don't think there is…at this particular school. I am lucky because I find a lot of students who are bilingual. And I don't know what I would do without them. Like I said there are different dialects from Mexico. My grandma is from Mexico City, and I got family in Oxaca. And when I am down there talking to them, I can't understand what they are telling me. These kids come from a different region of Mexico. And when they try to say something to me, I can't understand what they are saying. The words are different, and I don't have a grasp of the different meanings, you know. Like people say. The way they talk in Texas, and the way they talk in New York and the way they talk in California, there are three different dialects there even if English is English. But if a person doesn't have a good grasp of English, they are not going to be able to pick up those differences. And since myself, I don't have a good grasp of the Spanish language, and I hear a word that I have never heard before. I like that is something completely different. And I have no clue what these kids are saying. So, um, I have the kids interpret for me. And I tell them this and when they need help I'll tell it to another student. And he will explain exactly what I am telling him. And they interpret to the kids. And you know while he is talking I am showing them. So they are getting the visual and the verbal explanation. And I also talk a lot to Mr. M. and ask him what can I do etc. because I have never been in a situation like this. This is my third year. I try to do my best and sometimes it seems that I am not doing anything. But like I say. I can see which of the kids have that concrete. They know what it is, and the ones that have that foundation of education.

(9) Participant 0106121317

Q2 - I can tell you right now. I have a Spanish speaker who understands English. But she will only speak in Spanish. For me to tell her some of the Spanish words that are Latin, she can understand them more then the other students because it is more her language than the students that just speak English. They are having a harder time of just understanding them and even saying them. So she does ok except for the fact that when I am trying to do, um, land forms and interprets them into Spanish. It is a bit harder. She does have a hard time. Well, yah, because she does have a problem with it. I do have a lot of students in my seventh grade that have a real hard time with them. So I do a lot of hands on with them, because for us too. And they are really low. So for me to get that concept across to them, it is just easier for me to do hands on stuff then to have them write sentences or. I do special education, low quartile maximum of 15 students. I would refer them to the ESL teacher or to the counselor to change classes. I do referrals and request authorization to have it done.

(10) Participant 0104121418

Q2 - I think that probably the biggest problem, well maybe it may be a limitation, is the students ability to read the types of materials that we have to read, which are usually young teen authors. Um, of course from a variety of different ethnic backgrounds, but I think limitations the students ability to read at the 7th and 8th grade level. And I think that does create the limit. Well for any kid or child attempting to learn my subject, which is English. Um, I don't have any students that are ESL or ELL in my class this year. So when we are talking about language I don't have any problems that way. Um, I see the only limitation is the student's ability to converse or read at grade level that is the only thing I see. Follow the protocol of the school it would be the counselor who would in turn set them up for the appropriate testing whether it be speech, hearing, or limited language ability and all the different things that come with language acquisition.

(11) Participant 0106111617

Q2 - Vocabulary, in my class, a science class, you have to have a solid vocabulary in English to master concepts. Those students are going to have to have a strong background because all the textbooks are geared toward English. Some texts have Spanish based science books. But you do have to have a strong base in English before you can even succeed in understanding the concepts. They do, they only give you the terminology, I don't know how to

explain this, they give you the words they give you what they mean, but they don't show you how to learn that. They need to give you some suggestion on how …but they don't.

(12) Participant 0109111417

Q2 - Well I teach ESL and I work directly with these students. But the problems occur when they go to their regular classes. And sometimes the teachers, if they do not know of their limitations, they are unaware that the student does not comprehend the instruction. So we must make sure that these students receive the proper instruction with tutoring to go along with that. And we also need that the teachers get some training.

(13) Participant 0105121518

Q2 - Well uh yea, a language barrier does cause problems. I have a couple of students right now that are limited in their English. You would not think that with math that would be such a big problem because math is math in any language. You know, numbers don't change from one language to another. But when you get to problem solving and have story problems, you have this other where they have to read the story problem to be able to solve it. And if they are limited in English, that does cause a problem. And I am not bilingual. I know some Spanish. But, I am not bilingual enough to be able to address that for some of these kids. We have resources that we can use that get the same lesson in Spanish as it has in English. But if they have a question about how to do it, I am limited on how to explain that. How we get around that is that we use other students in the class who are, you know, proficient in it, so that they can explain what I am trying to explain in their language. So we get around it. Yea, when someone is limited in their language skills it causes problems. If they are not proficient in English and are not able to understand the word problems, then that causes a difficulty. Um, we have very good people on our staff that is part of a dual language program that are responsible for providing resources and extra help for these students. We have the family center. The family center has people in it that not only speak Spanish but also are good in math. That not only helps bridge the language gap but also can explain the math for me. You know, we have our dual language department, which is very good at that. Our kids don't stay in limited English very long. They seem to transition from being non-English and limited-English speakers to being proficient speakers quite quickly.

<u>(14) Participant 0106111617</u>

Q2 – Here, we have what I consider a young faculty. But we all have at least 12 to 16 years of service in the building. So we are young faculty, but we are a stern faculty and the strength of the school is its faculty. We communicate every day with the kids. In the district about 12 years ago we were the first school to do Teaming and all the other school fell in line after that. We are also one of the public schools in the state that had a uniform code and we replaced that in the state and which the other schools fell in line with that. Yes, I am the chair of the science department. Other sub-committees? I chair the science department. I am on the committee for MAC, which is a school improvement team. We handle all kinds of issues for students from scheduling to whatever needs are defined for the building. Those are the only two this year. Oh, also the SAT (Student Achievement Team) committee. We meet about once a week, before school or after school for about an hour.

<u>(15) Participant 0104111517</u>

Q2 - Well first of all, finding out literally, finding out the definition of the word and the many different definitions that all words have and the homophones. They have a hard time with homophones and homonyms. What ever you want to call them. The multiple definitions of words always present a problem and the different meaning that a word has in English and comprehension of new concepts. They have a hard time grasping that. Also, other students ridicule a lot of the students. I would call that a problem. And it kind of limits their enthusiasm as far as relating to the subject matter that we are covering in class. It makes them kind of embarrassed about their inability to understand exactly what is stated. Uh, what learning difficulties constitute a language problem? Well, I do have ESL, ELL students that have problem picking up the English language. I have special education students that have a variety of problems and I deal with those on an individual basis, depending on what modifications their IEP requires. What I need to provide for them. I would go to the special education department, you know. Has a language problem? Do you mean that in English or Spanish-speakers, there are different degrees of language? I guess that is where I am not real certain about what you are talking about. If you are talking about the spoken language or just that they have a problem. Even if they are English speakers they can have language problems. Spoken language? I was going for my masters in speech pathology. So when you are talking about language a lot of times I think about the speech process. Rather than, what do you speak, Spanish or English. I refer to

Mr. M., our ESL/ELL teacher, our speech pathologist, and the social worker here at our school depending on the problem. We have a lady, Ms. S. I had a student that I recommended for her class. But they are cutting that class. So I don't know what I am going to use, because they are not going to get that extra help.

(16) Participant 0204121417

Q2 – Well, it is very difficult, because being one of those ESL students or being labeled a second language learner. I can relate to how they feel frustrated by not understanding the word, by not understanding the work, but yet feeling responsible for keeping up with English speaking students. I feel that, also, even reading or not reading at the appropriate level. I know how kids can become frustrated. And they can get upset and refuse to cooperate with you. Because, what is the point of continuing something you have failed over and over? Why do it if there is no purpose, there is no meaning. That is why we have got to find ways of finding their weakness and turn it around and make it one of their strengths. As far as understanding that you are not making it right now. But, how can I help you? How can we help each other? And I think more cooperative learning. Because I think kids teach each other more then the teacher does. Um, in terms they understand. And yet you are there to help shape and guide those teens and that language. You have to develop that language. And, you know, I was brought up in a bilingual culture. I speak Spanish fluently. I didn't have that support at home. But I had to cling on to my teachers for that support. But most kids don't trust that. So we need to create an environment where kids feel safer. As far as non threatening or afraid that they are going to be laughed at, or that they are going to be labeled ESL, or they are going to be labeled special education department. Um, I think we have to do away with labels because kids already label themselves a lot. So, we need to. And it is bad when the teacher is telling you are you stupid, or "can't you do this!" Unfortunately, it does happen.

The teacher needs to understand that she or he is the adult and not to be afraid of relinquishing power. Some teachers say, "I am the total disciplinarian." But, you know, sometimes kids come with a different attitude that they teach you sometimes. And you have to learn from them. Learning difficulties? You know English is a very difficult language to learn. Just the mechanics of it, you know, the phonics if you don't have a background in phonics. I was brought up with whole language. But, I see that if the kids can't sound out, if they can't decode, or if they can't read that is a big barrier right there. You can overcome it. But it takes practice.

You have to work at it more. And especially at the middle school, if you don't have a grasp on it now, it is more difficult for them to get it in high school because they are not willing to cooperate. So I think we need to find out what the barriers are as far as them reading too low, what kind of programs. Maybe we need to start supplementing, taking away electives, and supplementing reading programs. I know we have accelerated reading. And I like that program because they have self-selecting books. However, that program to me is set up for kids who are already readers. But unfortunately most of our kids are not readers. So we have to start with that population and focus on that population and make them readers. Like how do you know if you like this book if you have not read it? Um, I think as they develop, we have to give them the opportunity to write about how they feel and how they think without them. I think, to me, I use journaling, because that gives me the opportunity to see what the child is thinking and what the child perceives my lesson as. I value his/her opinion as much as they value mine. I feel. I just think that reading is basic. You know that teachers or elementary teachers are under the gun. Of that, we have to get this or we have to get that. I understand that. But at the same token, it depends on the child. If it is a normal English speaking child, then I would say yes it would fall on the teacher. But if it is a special education student labeled learning disabled child or any other health impaired then I do blame. I don't blame the elementary, because that is their capacity that is what they are going to be able to do. Within 5 years that gap should be closing if that child is showing progress, if that child is getting that one on one tutoring. Not translation, because if you translate then you build a crutch. And I don't believe in translation; it is a crutch. All my students progress at different rates. It is on an individual basis. Um, I feel that kids or students that have come from Mexico and have that foundation of the Spanish language have an easier time of transitioning into English. But students who are born here with Spanish speaking parents are having a harder time. Because they are stuck between the language at home and the language they are being bombarded with at school, which is English. They lose both. They don't grasp English, and they don't grasp Spanish. So, it is a disservice to them.

That is when you have to come in with graphic organizers. I feel that you have to create a literature rich environment for them to understand. And you have to expose them to as many, many stories, writing, poems, and genres. And you have to expose them, and you have to explain to them in academic language. This is what it is, tell me a story. I don't know. I do debates. I do paneling. I do a lot of oral. Because, I feel that if you can say it then you are able transfer it in a

sense. But you have to build that. You can't be expecting 5 page papers. And then do expect a high page paper where they do evaluate themselves. Where they use Why, I use rubrics, and I expect them to grade themselves. And they have partners to grade themselves. That is when they become critical thinkers. Where they ask themselves, "Did I repeat myself too much?" And that is when they start asking themselves this, "What do I what out of this paper?" "What is the purpose of me?" And that is what I what to teach them, the skills. What is going to improve their language and their writing capacity? I chose language. Because, I can teach math and science, you know, I had one 4th grade teacher tell me one time, "you know R," you know, I guess I was being a smartelic and I told her my name is not R it is Rose. I had already transitioned into the American dream, in a sense of, that I am not R. I am Rose. I don't know.

I know we have to take language and culture. And I soon realized that when I went to Mexico I was characterized as the "gringa". You can't speak English, and you can't speak Spanish, what is your problem? So, I always felt that the kids understand that there are different types of language. There is social and there is academic. Even though I am not going to say that the social is wrong, because it is not, however, there is a way of saying things. You know there are acceptable forms. Because back in college, I took a lot of linguistics, and truje and traje were both acceptable forms. It just depends on that our society has been taken over by so many cultures that have added their own twist. Well, it depends if it is a bilingual issue, or if it is a speech problem. Uh, it depends if it something on how they talk. Then, of course, it would be special education with speech. But if it is a bilingual issue, then I would refer them to the bilingual office. We do have a test. I have given those tests myself, the LAS (Language Assessment Scale). I am familiar with one.

Question 3 - What additional support programs do you believe need to be linked to your classroom to further the success of linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant 0104111517

Q3 - We do have the tutoring and after school program that I think needs to be linked to the classroom to succeed. Also, a mentoring program would have a positive impact. We have a family center after school program that I think should be liked to the classroom. It is indirectly a part of our building, but there are indirect gains made through that program.

(2) Participant 0105121518

Q3 - Support programs linked to the classroom? So far our bilingual or dual language program whatever you want to call it is doing a good job. They do a good job in supporting the students in all of their subjects not just in teaching them English. The only thing I think would be, or that is needed occasionally, is that we do a good job of Spanish. We have so many Hispanic students. But, occasionally, we have other language speakers such as our Vietnamese girl. We don't have very many things to help her, and you know, we are teaching her English. But, it is difficult. And I don't know what kind of program you need, because you have only one student who needs that kind of help. How do you get the resources for one student? Yea, but you know the oriental languages are so different than so many other languages. Like in the San Francisco school district you have 45 or 49 different languages. How do you provide a program? How do they do that? There is no way to provide instruction in their language, which is what the dual language program does. We have to provide dual language instruction in their language.

(3) Participant 0106111617

Q3 – As far as non-curricular activities, since we are a school that is made up of mostly Hispanic students, we have our ESL population. You will hear them speak a lot of Spanish outside, in the lunchroom, and sometimes in the classroom. Other then that, our Hispanic kids, we have a lot of Hispanic kids that don't speak any Spanish. Yet they have Hispanic surnames. So English is probably the first language spoken at home. That they have. Then we have the kids that speak both Spanish and English where the first language is Spanish spoken at home, but they speak English here at school.

(4) Participant 0109111417

Q3 - Do you mean like tutoring? Teachers need to be made aware, not just the teachers that work directly with the students, but regular classroom teachers. In the past we have had some good training and have had a lot of success in the fact that the teachers were aware that these kids have a language problem and in a way appreciated their extra effort just to get the work done. It takes two or three times the effort as the regular student. A lot of teachers recognize that, by giving the ESL kids awards at the awards assembly. Um, the ESL teacher, myself, we have to make sure that we are on top of things and make sure the kids are grasping things or feel comfortable in the school and that they feel they have that extra support. We have had associates in the past. I have never had an associate in this district but that is an option. For

example, last year where I had all the ESL students, I had the more advanced in one part of the classroom and the new comers in the other part of the classroom. And I would work two lesson plans, and maybe an associate would be very helpful. What I want for next year is a full time teacher just to take care of the ESL and ELL students. Just to take care of the English because I am going to have to do the Spanish and then the English. In the previous years, I had to do the social studies also, and that was what we called the three-hour program. Where they come from, you know, to get that extra interest. With Spanish, I make the comparison with Spanish so they can get that comparison. So they can smile or laugh at it. If you live in Mexico, you have to take a Spanish class.

(5) Participant 0210121618

Q3 – Well, I think I answered that in the last question. It is very difficult for the young people who are linguistically diverse to come into an English-speaking classroom. And for us to expect them to perform with everyone else when they don't have a clue for what is going on. It has nothing to do with whether that child is learning disabled or has a disability. I don't believe that we should call linguistically diverse students disabled students. I would prefer that we put something in place for those students to become enabled to do the curriculum. When they have limited speaking skills, like you said non-standard forms of English, it is not just the speaking. It is the thought process. If you have to take the thought process and listen to what I say and think it in one language and translate it into another language. Then, think it in that language and translate it back in order for you to understand it and in order for you to communicate with me. That is very difficult and that for people who can do that is an exceptional skill. We are very luck here because we have a teacher, Ms. B., who is a total bilingual person. She not only speaks Spanish but reads and writes it. So if we are in a situation where we can do that, we have a resource in our building that we can go to. And she is also very gifted in the area where she is able to translate for the people who don't speak standardized Spanish or standardized Mexican. Um, she can translate in a way that she can respond to them and they can respond to us. So, I think that in this building we are absolutely fortunate that we have six teachers who speak Spanish and two of those teacher don't just speak Spanish they "Spanish speak" street Spanish. Well, and what we are taught is Castilian Spanish; and I don't know anyone here who speaks Castilian Spanish. I honestly don't. Growing up here, the young people that went to school with me and took Spanish were learning as much as I was. Because they were going " this is not what

we speak at home." So, I think part of it is the Spanish non-native speakers, like myself, speak or understand is not the Spanish that is taught. We speak it more in the dialect where it is understood here. We have people coming in from the northern-part of our state, which we had in the past. You can tell that they still speak some forms of Castilian Spanish, and they can't understand each other anymore than we can. That is the same thing in the United States. We don't speak the same English in New Mexico that they do say in Georgia, as they do in Wisconsin, as they do in Boston. I have a great aunt that lives in Boston. That I don't know what she is talking about half the time, because their colloquialisms are so much different then ours. Let me give you an example. We call the trunk of our car the trunk of our care, and my great aunt calls it the boot of her car. So unless you are around those people it is like, "what are you talking about?" And we have that even in the English speaking. So why would it be different in any other speaking community. Dialectical differences in the classroom depend on where the children move from. Um, if they move from the north, there are a lot of different inflections where they would call something totally different then what we would call it here. Um, the biggest difference is that we are the west and the south. We get both of those dialects. We use the word "ain't". Um, my cousins in Pennsylvania, North Pennsylvania, New York, Boston they don't use that. They call different things by different names that came over from England, you know earlier on. And they just kept them on. Well, we have mixed our language here with so many different cultures, like the Indian with the Hispanics with the English, with the French and with the German. So a lot of our words that we use out here we may have mixed two or three other languages just to get that word. We don't. Honestly, until you go to a different culture out of this country we don't realize it. That, well I think I am doing it this way and that this is an American thing. Um, the English side, the Irish side of my history they don't do that. They don't celebrate things the way we do. Like in my house we make tamales for New Years. My cousins in Pennsylvania don't. But that is tradition. Even in the English-speaking community, it depends on where you live who you grow up with. They take on your customs, and you take on their customs.

(6) Participant 0106111617

Q3 – Special education teachers in that subject area, some teachers come and pull out students from my classroom. That is the problem that we make is that we assume that we are all

English speakers. We are all limited speakers. I don't consider myself as being proficient in the English language. I can communicate and I can solve problems in it, but I am not proficient in it.

(7) Participant 0105121317

Q3 - First of all, I think it is important to the teacher to be able to identify who the particular students are and to talk to like the ESL teachers and what not. And to talk to them "what can I do" and to talk to them. I went to the SADIE training back in the fall and it was really interesting, what they do back in California, you know, they have all kinds of different languages there. So, I did go to the SADIE. And I thought it was really interesting. The things in Spanish, and like you said, we have that Vietnamese girl here. But I don't think we have very much written in Vietnamese to offer or to kind of help her.

(8) Participant 0104121418

Q3 – Well, we do need the support of the, I keep harping back to Spanish Language Arts, but we do have a girl that is Vietnamese and does speak Vietnamese. And when she came in she only spoke a couple of words in English. And she has progressed rapidly through the ELL program, the English language learner program. I think that the support programs we have in place are good. One of those being the Spanish Language Arts, being that Spanish is the number one language spoken in our school. So that is why I keep referring to it. We do have speech and hearing people for those who have speech and hearing problems. We have signers come in when we have students with hearing problems. So I think those continuing support programs that we already have in the district are meeting the needs of our kids. I particularly like the Spanish language arts class where the students in that class are learning the same curriculum that they are in the English language arts class. So they are getting a double dose of it. They are getting a dose of it in English, and they are getting a dose of it in Spanish. So they are coming along or are able to progress at a steady rate because they are getting it in their first language and in their second language. So I think that kind of support program if we can maintain them and keep them and have them available to us. I think that is what needs to be linked to the classroom.

(9) Participant 0106121317

Q3 - Support programs? I have the after school program. I have two that go there. Mr. M. helps me, and we have the new teacher orientation committee helps a little bit. Those are the only ones I have.

(10) Participant 0108111418

Q3 - I really need. They really need to utilize the computer more. I know there are a lot of programs that teach them English. I know that Mr. M. brings several classes in here to work on the computer. He doesn't get in here as often as he needs it. And I wind up for some reason or another scheduling with three different classes that I have a lot of bilingual kids in. It would help if I had some of my programs in Spanish, and software in Spanish. Like I use the program type-setter. And I am almost certain that there is a Spanish version available. And it might be good to run it through that. But I don't think it would be good to abandon the English version because that helps too. Language does play a role. Like my Spanish-speaking students I show them programs that they have a bookmark on them for future reference. The sites in Spanish different cites like that.

(11) Participant 0110111518

Q3 - I would like to see more speech resources and more people that would help us more.

(12) Participant 0205121418

Q3 - I feel that there should be a bilingually endorsed teacher who can help us. I know that I have had to go to other teachers in my building who I know don't have that capacity. They speak Spanish. And they have helped me in translation of documents so that I could help the students. So they see the material in both the native language and the English. But, I feel that we should have access to bilingually endorsed teachers. Yes, I think we ought to have a resource teacher that would be there or someone who would float. Uh, or someone who would follow students to assist them something like our special education department is supposed to be doing.

(13) Participant 0208121318

Q3 - For my classroom, I think just having some kind of reference or person that I can go to for the students that are having difficulty in my class because of a language problem. It would also be nice to have a program for the computers in Spanish. That I could, if I know that they are starting to get behind, I could let them work on the computer to catch up. They do catch on to computer language rather quickly. I have one student that is having the most difficulty. She has caught on wonderfully as far as how to say everything, and she has caught on. The only time she has a problems is when she is searching on the Internet. But then again, I let her go to the Spanish language sites. But, when they turn assignments in I have them translate everything into English because I don't think it is fair to let them do everything in Spanish. Because, I think that

hurts them more than anything. They need to be forced to use English. Otherwise, they seem to use that as an excuse most of the time and don't. But to be honest, if they come in here, they have to stay up with the class. Maybe having a person come in with them, but that may be above anything that we can provide.

(14) Participant 0205111317

Q3 - A bilingual component, one-on-one classes where the teacher can address the student's needs. Teachers who can help the students overcome the difficulties they are having. Like I said before any improvement would be an improvement.

(15) Participant 0206121418

Q3 -. Um, gosh, support programs? As far as science goes, I really wouldn't want to take them out of here. Because they will be doing things and seeing things that a lot of one on one situation wouldn't. But, if I had a resource person who could come in, you know, when two people are trying to explain things you get two different ideas. And it would be great to have a resource person who spoke their language. Because they could bring out ideas in their culture that I don't know and that might help them grasp the material.

(16) Participant 0204121417

Q3: Ok, I think Title I reading. I feel that we need to come up with another program. I know. I have done Morgan Reading. It is a total phonetic approach. And since I am not so familiar with phonetics; I had a difficult time teaching it. So I think we have to be better trained. Uh, but I think in programs that do exist, I think we need to develop more extended programs in a sense. I think Accelerated Reading is good, but I also did Success For ALL. And that program is good. And I really liked that program because that program builds the vocabulary that they need to build on a story and find context clues. I feel we need to focus more on context clues and reading. I don't know. I think reading to develop language. More after school programs, a Saturday program; I don't know if I would teach it.

Question 4: Does language play a part in your instruction? If so, which are the linguistic elements you pay attention to while planning and developing instruction?

(1) Participant 0109111417

Q4 - Say for ESL and the newcomers, it is very important for them to acquire vocabulary and communication skills. I work a lot with them. And then as they move on they start working on reading comprehension and then the writing skills their second and third year. In the past,

ESL students, like I said, I had a class with two groups. While I was working on vocabulary and pronunciation and communication, the other class was doing writing an essay at different levels. With beginning Spanish, the same thing pronunciation, communication, make sure they feel comfortable. And then Spanish II those kids that we call them native speakers, who are not very fluent in Spanish, but do speak Spanish in the home start working with something more difficult like the verbs and stuff like that. Then we go to Spanish Language Arts. And we do literature and writing at different levels. Here at the school we have 80-90% of the ESL students who are from the northern part. Maybe other schools may have students from the southern or central part of Mexico from Central and South America. Then it would be interesting. So there you would have dialectical differences. One time I had a little girl from Nicaragua and one boy form Columbia. And we could compare how they say things and their pronunciation. Yes, for example, in acquiring language and vocabulary, I can use something relevant to their region where they live. We can study that, as they do writing projects or research, maybe, research the area

 (2) Participant 0206121418

 Q4 – Wow, oh of course language does play a part in my instruction. Any subject where you have to verbalize, and you have to provide visuals, and no matter what kind of instruction. There is always language involved. Linguistic elements? You know what, that is probably what I am deficient in, because I am not bilingual. I do make sure that I have the lessons in Spanish for those children who need it. That is about all I do. Language always plays a part in my instruction. Anytime that I can pull out, um uh any of the Spanish words in terms of how we got this word to mean this. I try to pull out the linguistic elements. I can't remember. It was a class that they sent us to, SADIE. I try to use that, which suggests many different ways of saying it, of showing it. It doesn't just help the limited English speaker; it helps the whole student. And then even if it is words that they understand the way that they put them together, the textbook is very hard.

 (3) Participant 0205111317

 Q4 - Uh, the way the textbook is written. Yes it is a huge part. Does it play a part in the way I deliver it? No. I try to remove or break the notes down in a way the student can understand the concepts. In math, it is pretty simple because that is what I teach is concepts. And I am able to do that by removing the difficulty that they have. Are we still talking about the English language learner or linguistically diverse students? So yea, it plays a part. It can play a more

major part. But by the way I deliver my instruction, I try to simplify it for all the students. Uh, I scan through the book every lesson that I give. The first thing I do every year is I start new every year. All my notes get thrown away. All my lesson plans get thrown away. I read through the book. I look to see where the students my have difficulty. What would they have difficulty understanding? Uh, I put more importance on those concepts. I guess that is basically it. Yes, most definitely I do reflect on students' needs, including linguistic. Especially with most of the students in this school who are basically Hispanic. And with the dairies coming in we are getting more of an influx of kids with strong language ties to Mexico. They have one to two years residency in this country. Yea, you have to plan it, so that students can be successful. …

(4) Participant 0208121318

Q4 - I think language plays a part in any instruction because they have to understand what they are supposed to do and if they are going to learn. But I, really again, because I have so few that have any kind of, uh, I have three ELL students it is not causing a problem. Um, not so much in the planning but more when I am in the process that I see if they are having a problem. Like this one girl I go over to her and see if she is having problems and I let her use different methods like going to the Spanish web sites. As far as planning I try to make them do everything with the rest of the class because I don't want them to fall too far behind the rest of the class. Um, I really don't think very much on language while planning instruction. I don't make students do anything different.

(5) Participant 0205121418

Q4 - In the first part, yes, language does play a part in my instruction. Not only writing examples on the board, but I am explaining as I do it as a step-by-step process. Not only visually, that it needs to be seen, but that it needs to be heard. Also, and so that is a big part of what I do. Uh, when I am working with the students on a one-on-one that is, basically, how we are talking and working at the same time. What linguistic elements? Well when I have my Spanish-speaking students in my classroom. I am not sure that I am answering this in the manner that you want. But I would give vocabulary words in English and in Spanish. And I would read them in English to prepare them. And then, I would read them in Spanish. I took Spanish for 6 years. But I haven't spoken or read any for some 20-30 years. So, my Spanish is not as good as it should be. And it would help me to go back to school and brush up on some of it. But, uh, just to give that student the opportunity to hear it in Spanish, and then to hear it in English. And then the test,

they see it in Spanish and then they see it in English. Is that what your asking? Yes, I have included language elements in my lesson planning. I definitely have. Yes, I have done that. Now I have only one student to check to see if he understands. He says he does, but I still go back to see if he is getting it. I think sometimes they may have a learning disability, per se, or a comprehension problem and need to see materials presented in a number of different ways. You know, sometimes they may need to see a picture of it to say, "Ok, I get it." Or, they may need to have it broken down into smaller parts. You do this part. You do this part. And when you finish that; we go on to the next part. You know, that is what you have to do for all learners. Because some kids are kinesthetic, some auditory, others visual. And you have to take that into consideration when you plan for all of them. You have some part of that in every plan.

(6) Participant 0210121618

Q4 – Absolutely, when you use basic sight words language has to play a big part of my instruction. My young people have to be able to see the word, say the word, and when I say it they are going to have to be able to repeat that word. And say it enough times so that word becomes part of their vocabulary. Some of the elements that I pay attention to are the parts of speech. What parts of speech? How can I break a word down not just syllables but sounds themselves, if I have to, in order for a young person to internalize that into their vocabulary? Let me give you an example of the word that begins with "stir". We just say stir but for a young person who can't break that down can't hear that "st" and that every time they see that "ir" it is going to say "ir". They don't know that. And until that becomes internalized with them, we have to practice. They have to say it. They have to see it and say it and write it. As many times as when I point to a word on the wall they know it. If they know it, it is internalized. If they don't, then we have more work to do. I have to consider language and some of its elements in my planning. Because, that is what my work is all about.

(7) Participant 0110111518

Q4 – Yes, language plays a big part in my instruction. Here again, we are trying to get people to understand what we are talking about and understand spoken instruction. And some of these kids are not used to that. Instead of taking it so far down to their level, we are trying to rise their level. One day they will be looking for a job. I mean that is basically what we are training them for. They are going to have to understand a boss. And if you can't understand a teacher, you are going to have a hard time understanding a boss. We push that. And we are trying to, uh,

get them to raise their level. Of course, we do look at language. I have a kid that his reading level is first grade. And we do have to take that down a notch. We also have a kid that is reading second year college level. And the child can absorb large amounts of material. We also have a child that probably doesn't read at that high a level. But he is at least probably at junior year in high school. And I got some that we just take it slow and easy. We do make adjustments because we do have to find their levels. We have to find out what they can do. Frustration is a lot of the reason they are in here. And if we lower the frustration and individualize the instruction, then we can take them up to another level.

(8) Participant 0108111418

Q4 - It doesn't, because I am not a Spanish-speaker. And it plays a big role in there. I try any time that I have Hispanic or Spanish speakers to go through with them read and follow along. I help them interpret the reading. But as far as language I don't know. Linguistic elements? Uh, I have not had that problem that they switch back and forth a lot. But I do expect them to speak English. You know, and the big problem is to get them to talk at all. They are so quiet. But if I get them to talk at all, if I am really having trouble communicating with them, I will try to get another student in here to try to interpret for me. But most of the time, I have not really focused that much on different languages. I try to make them function. Right, that is more on what I spend my time on. There are four or five different words they can use. For example, they might say highlight, they might say select, they might say choose, etc. There are a lot of different words that they use. And I try to focus on the computer language more than anything.

(9) Participant 0106121317

Q4 - Oh yes! What do you mean by linguistic elements? Especially for the big words I try to give them a word that they are used to, like when we talk about nutrition and we go into these type of minerals that is food also so I try to use something that they are used to for the big words. Um, what else? Yes I use them when I am planning or developing instruction, mostly because I am new to science, so I have to do it for my self. I have to do, so that I can understand also. I really don't give language too much attention. I do for my seventh period class because I have five or seven in that class, so I have to pay attention to the words that I use, because a lot of them, if I can give them a basic word that they are familiar with and they can associate with the word they are actually using, they can understand it.

(10) Participant 0104121418

Q4 – Well, of course, it does because I teach English and English language arts. Linguistic elements? Are you meaning roots and pre-fix parts of speech or …speaking. Well in my particular instruction, I am following the scope and sequence. So in my planning and development, I have to teach what I am told to teach and when I am told to teach it during which weeks and so forth. As far as linguistic elements, I would say that my accelerated language arts program, especially the 8th grade is 80 % vocabulary. So I would say that I pay close attention to learning Greek and Latin origins and prefixes, etc. I plan a real heavy-duty unit on the western tradition of roots and prefixes and so forth for teaching vocabulary. Language plays a big part in my teaching because I speak, Italian, French, Spanish, and English. So when I plan my instruction so is there any way that I can teach students similarities in origins and roots I am always doing that. So I try to work that in, just to show kids how languages are similar more than they are different, which is just part of my curriculum. My vocabulary based curriculum. I am publishing a bilingual book with my 8th graders so, hopefully, I'll be learning a lot this summer. But I get along. I don't notice that a lot. But we do play a lot of language-oriented games like rhyming games and just fun stuff. So I play a lot with language. So I don't notice the kids doing that a lot per se. It doesn't come into play when I plan or develop my curriculum. Like I said my curriculum is pretty well set out there, as to what I have to teach. So I try to do as much as I can to get there. I do a lot of oral stuff in my classroom and that helps a lot with the kids hearing each other talk. But like I said as far as vocabulary, similarities in languages and so forth it is just too much fun to not show the kids the similarities and differences. And so you have to stress that. And you have to look at things like that because that is what brings English home. And for a lot of these kids, it is important to see how it is derived, where it comes form, and where it can go. I do that. For example, I put the numbers on the board in English, Spanish and French. And we look at them and compare them. They can understand where the similarities and differences come from. And when we do vocabulary, we do a lot of etymological work. And it helps students understand where languages come from or where the languages of the world come from. There is just too much fun to be had with learning English right down to making up our own words.

(11) Participant 0105121317

Q4 - Absolutely, I have to give them an explanation on what to do. So, I try to do a lot of visual things for the kids who don't and even for the kids who do speak English and have a grasp. And I might say something that they don't understand. So I have to think of ways to rephrase it so that it is on their level and they say "Oh yea, I get it now". And just concepts when they don't understand when it is first presented. Like with 2 divided by 2, is 2 divided by 2. Well I don't understand what your saying. Well how many times does 2 go into 2? Well what times 2 gives me two. It is the way that you phrase it that might kind of turn on a light bulb. What I am doing in instruction is always thinking of different ways of presenting the material. How else can I say this? That won't confuse this child. And what I do is whenever I am doing my lesson and going over it getting ready for the next day. I do think of certain kids or the ones who only speak in Spanish, or this kid who needs it said real simplistically. Or how am I going to explain it? So that he can understand it. And I am constantly thinking of ways and making mental notes to make sure that I do it in those particular classes. And, you know, I use a lot of color and visual things. So they will see and say this is what she is doing. Here again, our focus in on reading and not language. But language does play a big part in our instruction, uh because we have to get people to understand that they have to listen to people up front who are giving them directions. And they need to follow directions. Now, certainly we check up on them. And we are constantly working on such things. Uh, language is very important. If they can't understand directions, then they can't understand what we are trying to get them to do. Now, if I had a child who only spoke Spanish, or something like that we have three native Spanish speakers in here. If we had German, we would have a bit of a problem. But I am sure it could be taken care of. My grandfather still spoke German. In Alamogordo their ESL program is German.

(12) Participant 0106111617

Q4 - Definitely so! Yes. I look at the percentage of say migrant students in the class. I do have a Navajo and a Chinese student, but they are not proficient at all. And when I plan my instruction, I try to think how I am going to cover these concepts for them and sometimes do my lessons in two languages. I present some of my material in Spanish and some in English. Well, the non-Spanish speakers look at me kind of funny, but they take their time and they wait. And I tell them, now you know how it feels not to understand what is going on in the classroom. Linguistic elements? Like I said, I do have videos that present my lessons in Spanish and

English. Most of our staff is monolingual, so English is their first language. Very few of us speak both English-and Spanish. I am often asked to go in and translate for parents in the office or phone calls with Spanish speaking parents. Where I do translation for the secretary or for the assistant principal, and there are a few other people that I do this for. So, I wish we had more Spanish-speaking faculty members.

(13) Participant 0104111517

Q4 - Ok, yes without a doubt language does play a part in my instruction. The linguistic elements that we focus on in developing instruction are …I have a new program that I have been implementing. Its called visualization and verbalization. This particular program helps the students use both sides of the brain. And when we are looking at them, we want to give them structure to give them an outline of how to describe a picture of various things that will help them with their writing. Start them to describe in detail, for them to use descriptive adjectives, to help them "make me see" give them a mind picture of what they will write about. So that they can make me see, what they see in detail. That is what this program is all about. I have introduced it to them, and we will be going heavy on it during the last 9 weeks, now that we are done with *Light-Span* and the instructional "foci". For example, this girl is reading at grade level but has not developed the comprehension. (Shows the program). Students comment that "they make movies when I read" what an incredible statement. Students say that when they read the words turn into pictures. Doesn't that happen to everyone? Don't you see pictures when you read? So that is the basic why that program is good. Like is says here, not so much experience and research, is that the brain sees in order to process, store and visualize information. Both thinking and language comprehension are found in individuals with both language comprehensions. How are language and thought processed? Does visualization enhance comprehension? Yes, I introduce pictures and they imagine this in their heads and then we talk about them. Summary of the class explain what I did. I ask questions like what is it? What size is it? What color is it? What shape is it? Where is it? How many are there? Now these are fun. Then we get to memorize these 12. Is there any movement? Is the wind blowing the trees, etc. background, perspective, we got to explain perspective, when? Is there any sound coming into the picture? You see if they learn these 12 structure words, and when they write, they don't worry about descriptive words and adjectives. Describe it using this, and then you will get what you want. Ok, The individual looks at the picture and describes the picture orally... I ask them

questions. I keep fishing for it and continue to ask questions. I try to use this method - visualization and verbalization. I did the Academy of Reading last year I used that approach. I had that in my classroom. They discontinued it. Like I said, what has been hard on me is that out of 65 students I have all the lower quartile. I have 2/3rds of every lower quartile student. What makes it tough is that I got some that read at grade level or above, so why are they with me? No other teacher wants them, because they are behavior problems. So they give me not only the lower producing students, but the ones that are behavior disorder. So I get the low academic and bad behavior. So what do I do, the ones that are really sharp finish right away, so I got to keep them busy, while I help other students, If not they destroy the whole room. They destroy the whole atmosphere. I was wrapped up in trying to teach them.5 Oh, how many people do you know that can tell me about correlative deduction or correlative induction. I mean even the high school students, correlative meaning either or neither nor something different, I am telling the kids this do you what to know about subordinate and insubordinate clause and a dependent and independent clause. I got to tell them a sentence and a subordinate clause are the same thing, sentence fragment and a subordinate clause and a dependent clause are the same thing. They wonder, "Why don't we just use one of them?" And we are confusing them with verbs, adverbs, and antecedents, and they get so overwhelmed that they close up. I try to give them something, but I still need to follow the curriculum, I still got to expose them to words, like now, today, we are back down to unit 17, but we have finished all the units, but I skipped some because I knew they had no clue when we started. I look at some of these words like what we are doing now, metaphor, and some other words, you look at the propaganda...but anyway what I have to do is light span but any way...

(14) Participant 0204121417

Q4 - Yes it does, a very important part. That is the foundation. That is the foundation that leads into the higher thinking and to critical thinking. If you can't leave that first platform then you get nothing out of the story. If you don't understand anything you don't grow. So that is where my job is to help those kids grow, show them the words by asking: What does it mean? What was the writer trying to tell us? How do you experiences change? :Your attitude? I can remember an associate last year. We were reading the story la llorona. Pretty much everybody has heard of this myth. You know, to us in culture it is like folk tales. It was told from generation to generation. Everybody knew it, but by association didn't know or had not heard of the

tale…So that is what is where we go. What is your background? What is your culture? What is your language? All that is handed down to you? So, I think to me that is the platform and from there we can lean to lead to higher thinking and higher critical reflections. To me for Christmas we make tamales. We make menudo. We butcher a pig, you know, the typical things, "Doesn't everybody do that?" And she is going no, and I go OK. It depends on the makeup of my class. I have some very low readers. I have some very high readers and some ESL students. It just depends on how many ESL students I have and the makeup of your class. Pretty much, oral reading, and partner reading groups, it just depends. Sometimes I make them read silently, sometimes individually, or in groups. It just depends on the makeup of the class. Um, but I do try to pay attention to all the students, all of the diversity of the class. Do you mean like phonics, or whole language? I do short-step instruction. It is mostly oral. It just depends. Sure, I understand your question. I look at the context. Like last week, we had Brown v Board of Education. It was the first case that came; it was actually the second, but the first that was saying segregation of blacks and whites. And we created a debate. And I put myself in the mix by being a minority because I would not be teaching right now. So, how did that affect us? And what we did was we debated. We went a little bit higher and asked what barriers do we have now? It may not be so much about black and white, but what are the barriers that we have now? And language is a barrier. Because the kids would argue with me, "Why do I have to speak so prim and proper?" Their parents don't do that. Or, why am I settling with the Vato? How are you? Not that I would speak like that. But that was a point that was brought up. Like that, we have to be true to the language, if it is written in that context. But no, I don't think that it should be. We should learn to tolerate each other's languages and respect the language. But, also, understand that we have to follow these guidelines.

(15) Participant 0105121518

Q4 – Oh, of course, language does play a part in my instruction. Any subject you have to verbalize, and you have to provide visuals. And no matter what kind of instruction, there is always language involved. Linguistic elements, you know what, that is probably, what I am deficient in, because I am not bilingual. I do make sure that I have the lessons in Spanish for those children who need it. That is about all I do.

(16) Participant 0205111317

Mrs. Jones?

Question 5: In order to make instructional decisions, what processes do you follow in analyzing student characteristics and learning behaviors? Are the processes the same for making decisions for linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant: 0104111517

Q5-When I am making my decisions on what learning modalities these students learn the best in, I have to look up their records. The majority of my students are Spanish speaking. So, I just look at the IEP and follow the modification recommended. So, I follow the IEP and find out what learning disability they have etc. I can address those. Yes, they are the same for linguistically diverse students. If there are any particular problems they may have, because of their language, uh, they are usually addressed by the specialist that we have on campus.

(2) Participant: 0106111617

Q5 - This is a tough one. I am not quite sure what you are asking. But I think uh, the kids that we are getting are migrant worker kids that come and are here for only a limited period of time. And they have very limited English language skills in reading, writing, and speaking. They leave and some come back weeks or months later when they try to pick up the curriculum where they left off. And it's hard for them to do that because they have missed all the instruction. I am not quite sure what you are asking. No (language is not a critical factor at work) our majority minority is our ESL kids who speak Spanish. When they come into the classroom, and now that they are becoming our majority. Once again where their parents are migrant workers and very transient, they come and go. And uh, there is no fluid text.

(3) Participant 0105121518

Q5 - I think that what I look at most is, do I have visual learners? Do I have auditory learners? Learners who need to have manipulative. That is what I look at generally. Partially because my language is my language, you know, I am limited in fact that I just speak English. I worry more about them understanding what I am saying when I am explaining a new concept in math. I provide manipulative and other hands on activities for those kids who have to see it, you know, depending on what kind of learner they are. Yea, basically that is the nature of man because quite often for math to make sense to kids whether there is a language problem or not. They have the same problems as someone who doesn't understand the language still needs to see the problem. I think I would look at what kind of a learner they are more.

<u>(4) Participant 0109111417</u>

Q5 – Again as you get to know your students, once you get them in Spanish language arts these kids come with a real high educational level. Or they may not have been in school the last 2 or 3 years. And you can really tell. As they are learning English in the ESL class, those that have a high educational level can go quicker because they acquire the vocabulary and because they have the study skills where the others don't. So, I may have to do some modifications and exercises or do some extra activities or extra things to make sure that the students that aren't as academically sound as the others can also get the material. It takes a little longer to get through that. So, I guess that might be a difference. As far as behavioral difference, you throw things at one level. And you can loose two or three and sometimes that can be a problem. Spanish, it would be Spanish as a second language. But I think Spanish-speaking kids acquire English a little quicker than Spanish because English is found all around them all the time. They go to another class and hear it. Where Spanish I kids, once they leave the class may not hear it as often…newcomer program…

<u>(5) Participant 0106111617</u>

Q5 - Again, I am trying to understand what you mean by that. When I am deciding what to teach. I don't know if I do that. I think most of us do some of that. It is not reading all the time. It is not hands on all the time. It is not lab all the time. It is a mixture of all methods at any one time in any one lesson. I don't think there is any planning to it. Yes, we are given a list of linguistically diverse students' problem areas and learning difficulties. And we are given a list of processes to try. I follow those guidelines as much as I can. In their IEP, they list their deficiencies and what to follow. That is what we try to do, or that is what I try to follow.

<u>(6) Participant 0104121418</u>

Q5 – Well I can separate those two down. Because student characteristics, if there is a linguistic factor, those are pretty much given to us by special education or ELL people or the counselor. Those student characteristics are given to us so we know. So that is not a process that I follow. But I do have to look at them to see if it is going to be a problem with what they learn or if I am going to partner them up with another students. So I do have to analyze them as far as learning behavior. Ironically enough, I do learn those as I go. I look at their reading levels. I look at their writing ability. And I analyze those as they go along. And I see if they are improving and see where they are having a problem. And I address my lessons according. If more students are

having a problem in a certain direction, then I make sure that I adjust my decisions and get them all going in the right direction. The processes are the same for linguistically diverse students. I try to treat everybody the same. But I don't want to meld them into a characteristic, you know, or …what is the word I am looking for. The processes are the same. I don't want to call attention to anybody who is linguistically diverse, although I do call on him or her for help for my own language. I do rely on my students to help me. But I do use the same decisions and the processes are the same. I would go to the counselor and get my information to make my decisions and watch how they learn and how they learn to write.

(7) Participant 0105121317

Q5 - Hum, well just as I am going through, I think of my classes and what kids are in what class and may have trouble comprehending. And some of my classes are more rowdy than other. So I have got to think what am I going to do in 4th or 5th to make sure that they are going to pay attention…And even my lower classes for whatever reason I have a lot of low students in there. So I got to really think in simple ways in order to make it as simple as I can. So that they can get it to. So I got to think of my different classes continually thinking of what can I do. A lot of times I let the kids do some of the explaining. Because, you know, who can explain something to a kid better then another kid. They might have a grasp. There are times when I can explain something five or six times. And they just say "I don't get is ms." So then one of my other kids says let me try. So they explain it, so that the other student finally gets it. It's just that I am 25 and they are 13, and they got a different language going on. For the most part it is because I think of my class as a whole. And I think of my individual students. And you know I use a lot of color in my notes because I know myself I have always responded to color. And the different colors for whatever reason turn on a light in my head. And you know all the notes I took. I would start with one color and put it down and pick up a different color to help me study. And plus with math and things like that the different colors show that something was not there to begin with. And it had to be added and the different colored arrows. And I encourage my students to use the same system by using it on the board to explain the concepts. So when they go back to look at their notes, and they can see the operations at work. So that they can see that decimal wasn't there to begin with. So we had to add the decimal and we had to add those zeros. So I really try to use a lot of visual. I am a visual person.

(8) Participant 0106121317

Q5 - Student characteristics and learning behavior? I think because I was trained to do individual diagnosis that is the first thing I do. And, so when I first came in, I would sit back and watch the different classes. Because I noticed that some of them could do oral stuff. They were auditory, or hands on. They were very kinesthetic. That is just the way I was trained to do them. So, I watched them to see how they learned. I don't know of any other way to explain it just observing. That is all I do is individualized work. Because I know that some of them that can handle it, and some of those who can't. And if they can't, I have to find other means to help them understand it. To help them build on it instead of just having them to write sentences. Yes, I do similar things for linguistically diverse students.

(9) Participant 0108111418

Q5 - To be honest, I don't do that, not a lot. One of the things that I do in here is that much of the instruction I do with the students is one-on-one. I go around the room. And I let the students learn on their own 90% of the time. I respond when they have a problem. And if they encounter a problem, I try to work with that student. Then, I focus in on that student. And we try to work through the problems. And I kind of try to do, explain, and demonstrate let's work through it together kind of deal. I don't really focus on language problems for the whole class. I kind of focus individually. Yes, it is the same for linguistically diverse students. Some of the things I try to discourage are that today the kids go around calling each other fools. To my generation, I don't understand that. And one of the things I do; I make a point. And I get some strange looks from the kids, and they look at me funny. I tell them that there is nobody named fool in this classroom. You know, that just bothers me. You know that they do that. I don't like to hear that. I try to make them focus my name. The problem is they do it so often that they don't realize they say it. And we have a student that uses foul language. And they use it so much that they don't know that they are using bad language. I get on to them. We don't talk like that. What did I say? I didn't do that. They don't realize it. I try to make them understand that they don't use that street language in the classroom.

(10) Participant 0110111518

Q5 – Well, we have a lot of reports, follow-up reports, and evaluations that we can do. There are various evaluations that we can do. Here, we have a focus on reading and what reading level you are on. And therefore what language level would you be in the spoken language. If we

can find out those levels, and we are always looking then we can build around what we are doing for you. Yes, they are the same for linguistically diverse students and perhaps even more so. We are always hoping that they can do more then their testing indicates because we are always trying for more.

(11) Participant 0210121618

Q5 – The process basically is that you have to know your students first. You have to know their learning styles. If I have five out of 20 learners and two visual learners, I have to teach off of those styles. I may have another student who is kinesthetic. If I don't teach to all of their styles, one of the young people is going to be left out. So when I plan a lesson, I have to take into consideration: What is my child's reading level? How do they learn? It is not just what is that they are learning, but how do they learn it? I could have these young people do a written exercise. But, unless I have laid the groundwork, and unless they are non-tactile, they are not going to get that exercise. Unless I have said it to them, and they have said it to me, and they have seen it. You know, if we don't follow those different learning styles, and I honestly believe with my young people, and young people that I have that are mentally retarded and linguistically diverse, that that is the basis of their learning style. And if you don't know their learning style, how do you teach to them? Absolutely, they are the same for linguistically diverse students. I don't think it should make any difference in a classroom. Be it regular education or special education. The teacher knows her students. After the first two weeks of school, he or she will know. If I just give little Johnny a written assignment, and little Johnny doesn't get it because I didn't say it to him. He has to hear it in order to get the information that he needs to get the assignment done. Where as for little Susan over there, I can talk to her until I get blue in the face and, unless I write it down for her. It doesn't do her any good.

(12) Participant 0208121318

Q5 - Process? I just observe them. And uh, I do allow for quite a bit of flexibility, especially, for those in special education. As far as language, I don't so much. But I do the learning behaviors. Like when we are doing houses, we are supposed to do three. But if they only finish one, that is ok as long as they are working. So, as far as the flexibility, yes, I think it is the same for linguistically diverse students. Again, the flexibility and setting my expectations high on everybody and trying to get them to follow through on what I would like them to, in whatever way.

(13) Participant 0205111317

Q5 - When I write lesson plans, I try to include more than the multiple intelligence approach. I like to do a lot of one-on-one instruction. I give my notes, then I turn the kids loose to do their homework. And I walk around the classroom. So, I analyze each individual student. It is hard. But I think the only way to reach some of these kids is to go one-on-one with them. It is a tough question because you really can't focus on any one characteristic. Each kid is different. And each one of them has their own separate needs. So, to say that we are lacking in any area in this building is that we are lacking a bilingual education component. A lot of these kids are being left behind. The teachers are frustrated because we don't know how to read to them. We have not been trained; we have not been given the opportunity. There have not been too many in-services that address the ELL students, and their needs. Yea, it is the same process with linguistically diverse students. If you think about it, most European countries learn a second language. We are too ethnocentric. Kids are going to need a second language. I think it is part of our ethnocentric society, instead of addressing all the different cultures that we have. And everything each one brings to the table. Regardless, we are changing the students to adapt to what America sees as best. We are losing a lot of the diversity that we have here.

(14) Participant 0206121418

Q5 - I don't think of the linguistically diverse student, um, as I am planning. You know there might be times, but that would be the exception. Uh, for me it is usually in the learning experience. If they are not getting it, then, I know that I need to approach it in different ways. Uh, if they are, it is almost too late because they have to fail the first test because a lot of them won't speak up. And then after they fail the first test, then I know I have to do some different approaches. Um, yea, that always takes a part. And I guess that since I am not a Spanish speaker, um, like you say taking it for granted. I wish I were bilingual, and I knew what their problems were. To be perfectly honest, I don't put much in my general instruction to take the linguistically diverse student into consideration. I don't much think about them. When we get to the testing, the things where they have to read they have to hear. I think they can hear it better. So, I do read tests to them that kind of stuff.

(15) Participant 0204121417

Q5: Well of course the children, first I make a basic lesson plan of what I want. What do I want the child to perform at the end of my lesson? Uh, from there I start identifying my slow

readers, which are my high readers? I start modifying. Either, do they need a graphic organizer? Do they need highlights? Do they need half of the answer as highlighted material? It just depends, but I always look at reading out loud or silently, in partners or doing group work. I always have them make a project. And they have to choose the project they want. Um, it is either writing a letter or an art project, or presenting something to the group. I incorporate a lot of it. I try to use a lot of Gardner's multiple intelligences, because I feel that kids have a lot of strength. And they can contribute socially or intellectually. It just depends on the type of project that I want them to do. They can do art. They can do math. And they can do a variety of other things because with language you can take it to any end. Because what we call what pictures, what ideas came out of that era? What things were happening in America? What was the writing like? What was the mood? Who were the characters? What was the clothing like? What was the music like? We have to look at all that. Music is part of language as well. I bring some to class, and we compare classical with rap and other music. It varies. Language Arts is not like math. Math is a set you can do it. And yes there may be more than one way to work the problem. But, it is set in math. You are going to have the same answer. But, in language you don't. You miss one comma and you have totally changed the meaning of that very sentence. And that is where you have to be careful. The mechanics and what you want to say, and what you are thinking or interpreting. The question that pops into my mind is, " Why should we lower our standards?" But in actuality, how can we test them on our standards if they don't have our skills? I mean how can you get a true picture of what they are really doing, if you are testing their skills. But they don't have those skills. So, how can you penalize them for having ESL on secondary and the verbal language skills? And yet, we give them a standardized test that measures nothing. Really, because I mean honestly, ok, if we were all white same kids, well yes test them. And if they had the same experience if they were in a control group, small town, raised the same way, same home, then, yes, those test would be true. But, I sorry right now, no. I don't agree. We are testing skills that we are hoping that the kids have. However, we are missing a whole set of other skills that the students possess, unfortunately. No, it changes with every group. Because I can't expect an ESL student who reads no English to read a story and tell me what it was about. But I can sit there and discuss it with her and then have an oral exam. I can't expect a five-page paper, not at the beginning. But maybe, I can ask her to, ok, write me a journal. And yes, I will allow you to write it in Spanish because I do speak it.

(16) Participant 0205121418

Q5 - Do you have a process? Sure you have to. I have a student who has a hearing problem. And so when I speak to her, I actually have two students with hearing problems, so I have to make sure that they can see and hear what I am saying. I have to speak slowly enough so that they can hear what I am saying. And I don't slur my speech or run my words together, and that I don't rush them, and that I give them time to ask for help. I give them more one-on- one, and the same with my bilingual students, or students that speak a different language, to make sure that I give them more one-on-one. I have in my third period class two boys and one does a lot of rechecking with me. And we work a lot on one-on-one. And he is doing very well, in fact, he is an A student. And he checks and I double check so that he understands what I am doing. Uh yes, you have to take each individual student into consideration. When you do this, you have to know their learning style. And you have to be willing to commit to do whatever it takes to help them succeed. You have to almost, uh, individualize for them. It may not always be on paper. When they are in your class, you know that you have to take care of them and don't let them sit out in the cold. We do have other programs, reading programs, and phonics programs, after-school based programs that those students can also be placed in to help them learn phonics. It is done on a computer in a room, or it is done in a manner where it is fun to learn the language.

Question 6: What provisions do you make in your instructional planning to ensure that linguistically diverse students develop conceptual understanding of the content being covered in class?

(1) Participant 0206121418

Q6 – Uh, I cover most of it orally instead of out of the textbook. Because, again, the test is just too hard. Whatever I cover orally, I try to have pictures. I use the overhead an awful lot. I ask them to draw the animals and other visuals. And when they have to study their notes, um, language won't be as much of a problem. Because they can identify it. For example, this week we are studying arthropods. They need to be able to tell me what the body parts are and, hopefully, recognize the words and the body part. I use visual stimulation. They can take a picture from the book, and that is across the board, if they can actually see something. Even if they are out there, how do we use them? I have to say that our administration has really put a crunch on that kind of stuff. He is really pushing the testing thing. And the kids that don't speak the language, how are we to know what they know? And because you can't take the test, then

maybe, you're stupid. That is what we are telling those kids. I really worry about the way they have sectioned off the schools. You know. One of our higher social economic status areas is being shifted off over seven miles to a higher social economic status middle school. And this school is going to be with a lower social economic status. The way he has drawn the boundaries. And middle school M is going to be even a lot lower social economic status, maybe even 100%!

(2) Participant 0205111317

Q6 - Like I said, I break it down to the concepts or key concepts themselves. If the students are still having difficulty grasping, I just need to talk to the students in their native language, in this case, which is Spanish. It helps. It really does. Uh, are you talking about checking for understanding or about delivery? Um, I do. But I am sure that I can do more. Honestly, I wish I could do more to help these kids. But the opportunity is there for them to learn.

(3) Participant 0208121318

Q6 - Basically, I just plan time to speak with the student and make sure that they understand. And I do a lot of observing with the students. And make sure that they are able to complete the assignment and stay up with the class. And know what they are doing. As soon as they are falling behind, I try to jump in and see what I can do. Um, make changes at that time. Right, understanding again, if they are able to keep up, then they understand what they are doing. If I tell them to copy and paste something into Microsoft Word, and they do that, then I know what their understanding is. And I do some observation more then test. And we do vocabulary. We do five words per week. And uh, I've been very impressed by one of my ELL students. She makes sure that she copies down the definitions every week, types them, and prints them out. She has got them so that she can study them. Some of my other students don't do that. And I allow them extra time if they want to type up the definitions for the week. I guess that is conceptual understanding.

(4) Participant 0110111518

Q6 – Well, here again, the various levels we have 12 students and have 4 or 5 different levels. And it depends on what day it is and that may determine the levels. Uh basically, we individualize everything. I have to. I am not mass production like English or math classes or stuff like that. I am allowed to individualize. And I am able to customize what we do. You know some kids are not able to do some things. So, I am able to customize.

(5) Participant 0210121618

Q6 – I think the provisions state themselves. First of all, you have to find out is my young person linguistically diverse? Are they on the same page that I am? Are they learning the same way that I am teaching? If they aren't, then I have to find a way and plan for it the best way for that young person to learn? If it is a language barrier, then it is my job to bring in someone in here who is going to help the two of use to meet that language barrier, if they can't conceptualize content, or they can't internalize it. And until they can internalize it, they are not going to keep it forever, to make it a learned skill. They are going to keep struggling and struggling and struggling every year that goes by. Until they make it part of them. And until they internalize all the information and comprehend all the information, where they can build on it.

(6) Participant 0205121418

Q6 - I do more one-on-one. I give it to the students as a class. And then I focus on individual students that I know are having difficulty with the language or trouble with the concepts. Like, I would work with them on a one-to-one basis or assign them peer tutors if I can't get to them right away. Students that I know that are competent in that field or can speak the same language. So that they can be helped in understanding what we are doing.

(7) Participant 0108111418

Q6 - Uh, when I go over things at the first of the year about different parts of the program, like highlighting, and selecting, and stuff like that. If I look out and see that they aren't understanding, like I say that is when I focus in there and try to demonstrate to the individual student. And when we first start a semester, I have these students in here. The first thing we do is cover some things on the computer. You know, and so I try to make sure we are doing this step and that we understand this step. And I make sure that everyone that's got it waits until we make sure that everybody has got it. So when I run into problems with this one and can't get this program started, before we go on to the next step and explain things to the class, I go to that student and show or demonstrate what I am talking about. One of the things that I see that is happing. I don't know if it is a good thing or a bad thing. But because we are a smaller school and we only have certain electives and we only have certain times that we have bilingual education, those are the times when the kids are in groups and pretty much together most of the time. They are grouped pretty much. They continue early in the morning. And they start it on the bus. When they come in the building the majority go into the cafeteria. And then they sit there

and are speaking Spanish most of the time. Again, I don't know if that is much of a good thing. But, I can understand why it happens. But again, because of the inflexibility in the schedule I wind up with a class that I call an ESL class. I will have close to half of the students that are ESL kids. And at times would be better off if I had classes where those students weren't grouped together. The limited English and the non-English speakers, sometimes I can use them to interpret for me for the non-English speaker. But other times, because my approach is hands on, and I am trying to help one-on-one. And sometimes, I try to help too many of them at the same time. It causes a bottleneck. In that, I have too many in classes. And I have to help all of them one-on-one. And I don't have enough time. I can't help all of them. And sometimes it is my fault that this one student needs help. And he sits there for twenty minutes needing help because I have two or three before him. And then maybe when he first needed help he didn't raise his hand. And finally, before I realize he needs help, he has sat there for quite a while. And I think that's a function of that there are too many students in one class. I have a class of 22 and actually there are only two or three limited English students in that class. But, there is one of them that is really bad. If he has any trouble, he will just shut down, you know. And when I have that many students it is hard to get back around to check him. I would like my classes to be under twenty and I have 29 machines. And last year I had a class that had 28. Right toward the end of the semester there were a couple of them that did check out. So I had 26. Twenty-nine is impossible that is too many students.

(8) Participant 0106121317

Q6 - I try to use all three learning styles. Because even if the child is auditory, if they don't understand the words, and they can do kinesthetic stuff, then I think they can make the connection between them. And if they are visual, they are seeing the word. And they are still making the connections. So, the three approaches are: auditory, visual, and kinesthetic. Yes, this helps them develop a conceptual understanding. Assessments? At the beginning of the year to determine their learning styles, and I do assessments like projects that I request. I have them do a packet, like cloud types. At the end, they have to put that packet together. A lot of it was drawing, kinesthetic stuff. They had to show me the different kinds of clouds. Um they had to tell me orally or verbally. What are the differences between the clouds? What comes out of the clouds? So that is one type of assessment. The other is a student who doesn't read or doesn't

write. But if I go over the questions for him, he will just kick them out like that (snap, snap, snap), quick, verbally. And he is an ESL student.

(9) Participant 0105121317

Q6 – Again, I just try to think of different ways to explain things, and let the kids explain it if they want to. Kids just have ways to explain things. Where as an adult you can't get down to their level. But the kids might grasp what I am saying. And the kids say, "I wouldn't have thought of it in that way." But you guys, obviously, have thought it out. And I let them help each other and make the classroom a positive learning environment, you know for any student. I encourage them to answer questions, because many are afraid of getting the wrong answer. And I tell them, "Well, you know, you are not going to learn, if you don't get a wrong answer," "You know it is just a stepping stone." So I try to make sure I have different ways to explain things. And when we are doing measurements I try to have yardsticks and rulers. And that way it is concrete. They can see it right in front of them. They don't have to picture it. They can handle it.

(10) Participant 0104121418

Q6 - I would have to look at the big picture for that. Um, I don't do it like for bit-by-bit content, but I do a variety of activities. I do a lot of group work, small work, partner work, and individual work. I call on the kids to do presentation. They have to do writing as a group. They have to explain their writing. They explain their artwork. They do individual projects where they can express their own, um, understanding of the content. So for conceptual understanding, I approach my instruction in a variety of ways. And I feel that in the course of the school year. I am going to hit enough of those different ways where at some point that the curriculum is going to get across, the content rather. So, I just look at that as the big picture because I do not break down every activity and do it in three or four different ways. I just offer a lot of ways to address a lot of different style learners. I think. Are we going to do this visually? Are we going to do it orally, silent reading, etc."? I do that when I plan my activity.

(11) Participant 0106111617

Q6 – Like I am going to use a Spanish tape or video. I am very lucky in that most of my lessons come in both languages. So the video clips that I use. I present them both in Spanish and English. I do plan it. And I do show that I need 10 minutes in Spanish and 10 minutes in English. I do know it helps. For me, when I use my videotapes the concepts are easier to understand. The visual is more easily understood then the verbal. I am not proficient, so I can't communicate in

both languages as easily. I can communicate, but it is better for them to see it, hear it, and feel it. Use more than one way

(12) Participant 0109111418

Q6 - To make sure they understand, usually with the ESL students I ask the teachers in their regular classes if they see a difference at the end of the first semester. You see the difference with the students who have studied hard and work hard in studying English in the second semester. Even though they are not fluent in their new language. They are able to comprehend a lot more. And their self-confidence in the school and their grades, not only in my class but every class they are taking, and how they acquire vocabulary and basically how well they are doing keeps improving. I think at one time they did not have science or history. But a director came in and said they need those two classes because they need to listen. And that part where they have to struggle and do their part, and it worked out. Again, we are not just throwing them out there to sink-or-swim. We are throwing them out there, but with that support. It is tough. The first semester is really tough for them to do their homework. They have to do it in English. They may stay till five in the afternoon to make some progress. And it has worked. And that is part of it. In some cases, some of these students are considered special education or learning disabled. And they are not. I think that also has an effect on the drop out rate. They come from Mexico where you are one of the top students. And you come here. And you are labeled learning disabled special education.

(13) Participant 0105121518

Q6 –I think we do the same thing for all of them. You want to be sure that they understand the concepts. So you do a lot of things to, um, give them lots of practice. And I don't know that it makes any difference. It makes a difference in the way it is presented. But um, like I said. So much of math, in order to be sure that they understand it, you got to present it in so many different ways. I think that is all part of making provisions. Um, so that is all tied together. I think your number six and number five are all tied together.

(14) Participant 0106111617

Q6 - We really have no guidelines. Since, we don't have an ESL director anymore. We have an interim director. But I think the district's focus is not to have one in the near future. Which is kind of crazy, because we are close to Mexico. And we do have this population of kids coming through our schools. Um, there is no written directive addressing the linguistics of our

Spanish speaking kids with our curriculum. That is, we take it upon our selves, those of us who do speak both languages, to translate the best that we can in the science area. It is kind of hard sometimes because my Spanish is northern New Mexico Spanish. And so, I speak a lot of Spanglish-English, a lot of English in our dialect. And so when I speak my dialect and try to speak to the kids coming from Mexico, they look at me like if its totally two different Spanish versions, which it is. So, but we try our best to get our communications through.

(15) Participant: 0104111517

Q6- Well, I make sure that I speak to them in a language that they understand. In something that they understand, and I question them periodically to find out if they are following along with what we are trying to establish or trying to do in the class.

(16) Participant 0204121417

Q6: Yes, music, technology, of course.

Question 7: Have you collaborated with other educators in the building to modify assessment and instruction for linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant 0104111517

Q7 - Uh, from time to time I do. I try to get together with Mr. M, our ESL teacher, more often to accomplish that. No, I am not part of any instructional support groups other then the department meetings in the English department. We do get together with Spanish and other English instructors in trying to adjust the lesson plans for re-teaching and tutoring students who need attention.

(2) Participant 0106111617

Q7 - Once again, a strength we have within my department is that we have three, including myself that can try to communicate with these kids in the Spanish area with science. No, I don't think that teachers are sensitive to language varieties including non-standard varieties that students bring into the classroom. I think that some of the opinion that some of these teachers have is that content should be English taught and English spoken within the school, which is kind of half good because these ESL or monolingual kids need to pickup English. And at the same time, it is the attitude of some teachers that, you know, this is America you speak English. You write in English even though they don't know anything about the other language spoken by the kids. Oh yes, I think it is import to diversify the language of instruction and curriculum in the sciences. Because I always use the example of, "You take me and put me in a

German class of science." And of course if I never had any science before, I'd be totally lost. It is not that because I am stupid. It's just that I don't know how to read German. Another problem is that our parents have very little educational background. And so trying to help their kids do their homework in science and maybe math, they can't because they have never had that education before.

(3) Participant 0105121518

Q7 - We have to collaborate with each other. Because we need to have as much insight as we can in terms of how to reach our students and not just the linguistically diverse. But you know, there is diversity in the way they learn. It just seems like you can't come up with enough ideas on your own. You have got to be able to talk to other people to improve your ideas, which is the reason for professional development. Um, you can't do it on your own because education is not simple. We need to use each other as resources. I am a member of Delta Kappa Gamma, and we help each other. We provide a lot of information for each other. I think gone is the day when you can take out you teacher guide and teach. You have got to, um, use whatever resource is available. That includes literature and journals you can read with each other. Well, I know that we have math department meeting real often. We have meetings that just include all of the staff. And we talk about how we are going to help the at-risk student and the at-risk student includes more than just the linguistic students. So we brain storm ideas on how to meet the needs of all high-risk students. I think here we happen to have a staff that works well together. We brain storm on what we think the needs are. And we come up with goals. Not only with goals to meet these kids needs, but the strategies to accomplish the goals and objectives. So um yea I think this is not the only staff that I have worked with. This staff does a good job in pulling together all the different subject matters. We all know each other's goals, and we are working on these goals together. You know the science department is helping the English department. You know, we are all working together somewhat. I think the idea of setting goals and setting strategies together and everybody working on them together is good. I think the team approach was good. But what was wrong with the teams approach was that you had one social studies, one math, one science, etc. And I think what you need is to have the whole English department to meet together to form goals. You need to have the whole math department to meet together to form goals and strategies. Then you need to bring them together to share their plans and to examine the goals so that you can all be working on all the goals together. So like I said the science department can

help the English department. And we can all be working together. We each, individually, can set our goals. But we need to let each other know what those goals are. So that everybody can be trying to help each other with them. So the teaming idea is good. But you need to have that communication.

(4) Participant 0109111418

Q7 - I think that I have mentioned some of that already. As far as working with the students, the teachers are giving extra time and special instruction. A lot of the students at this school, I don't know if I mentioned it to you, but they have had training for this. Make them more aware of the situation. Making sure the students are not just sitting at the back of the class. There needs to be collaboration with the other educators to make sure that doesn't happen. We prefer that they struggle and learn something and not just passing. Because the teacher feels that they are *pobrecitos* and gives them a blanket B. It is the case. I have had children here from elementary. And they said we don't have to do anything. They just pass us. We have to make sure that just doesn't happen here. The assessment that we use to determine the language problem is the LAS. I don't know if you are familiar with that. And we have meet before, not with teachers in the building, but with central office about changing that. But, as far as sitting with a group of teachers and talking about different ways of assessing for language we haven't. The gear-up program form ENMU helped out with the tutoring last year. For three years, I was doing the adult ESL. I was working with the community. But, with Gear-up I had ESL kids. I also translate a lot of IEPs. We worked with the special education department to help students who have a learning disability. And we placed them in a special math or science class to get extra help. During IEP meeting, we discuss linguistic diversity, whether the students is better off in a bilingual class or special education. When we do a lot of our testing a lot of the kids who have a Spanish surname come out low in reading and writing. Not just because they are Spanish speakers or non-English speakers. It is just that they don't take the test as learning disabled. So we have done some of that. Just yesterday we worked with Ms. D. on getting information for students on the LAS. So I was doing that yesterday. I usually go to them in science, like Mr. T or Mr. V., and just check out how the students are doing. This year I have been doing that a lot less because Ms. G. has been doing it. She is the ESL teacher I don't do that as much.

<u>(5) Participant 0206121418</u>

Q7 - We talk to other faculty, and they help us. But, we don't sit down as a group and discuss it, you know, plan our lessons on it. But we do get together. Like I get together with Mr. M. and ask him, how are we going to test these kids? What would be fair? Am I going to change some of the questions? Do I give them half, what percent should be given in English and what percentage in Spanish? Or, you know, that kind of a deal. I think we have communication between us, in science and the special education department and ESL people. No, we don't cross department lines. But I have had some of the English teachers come and talk to me on how to do some of the lessons or to give them stories to read in English but that deal with science concepts. No, I don't think we have instructional support groups, as such, other than the departmental meetings. And the communication we have between us.

<u>(6) Participant 0104121418</u>

Q7 – Well, I am the department chairperson for English. So I do hear the concerns of other teachers, as well as, voice my own concerns. So, we do collaborate, uh, to modify assessment and instruction. Yes because we give each other ideas. And we try to look at problems. And see who, you know, needs what. And how we are going to deal with that. And point the teachers who are having problems with a student in the direction of either the counselor or the person who is going to handle that student in ELL or ESL, uh, area of their instruction. Yes, I do collaborate with other educators. And we modify assessment and instruction regularly. How are we going to address this or that problem? The case in point of the Vietnamese girl who came in at the beginning of the year, and she spoke no English when she came in. That was a good chance for us to collaborate on that. Because that was the first time we had been faced with that. And we had to come up with a lot of different ways to help. And it turned out that the child is making great gains in the English language. Of course, we are English teachers. So that is the concentration of her classes. But that was a good experience for us in collaboration. And, yes we have to collaborate. No, I haven't meet with other instructional support or governance groups. I do sit on the school advisory committee where we offer advise for the whole school. And we do that as problems arise. Are those the problems that we need to address? That is kind of planning for the whole school. So I wouldn't call it a political body. But, it is a group at large for the whole school.

(7) Participant 0105121317

Q7 - I have. I have talked with Mr. M.. I have talked to him several different times. He is our ESL teacher. And he has talked to the kids several different times. And he has looked at my notes and states that I am doing everything he would do in a similar situation. But, he speaks Spanish and doesn't have any problem moving back and forth. He has talked to some of the kids as to what I do for them. But, I have talked to him a lot about it. I want to do my part as a teacher. To do the best job I can to help the kids succeed… There is really a need for diverse instruction to be fair to these kids. I know there are still a lot of people who believe that we are in America and should learn English. And that would be nice, but realistically it does not happen all the time. And we need to still, even if you don't want to, go out and learn a new language regardless. You don't have to, but think of a way that these kids can grasp what you are trying to teach them so that they can be successful in life. Don't take it out on them just because you don't what to learn a new language. No just departmental, we just tell our department head this is what we are doing. And they, I think it was Mr. M., that got the Spanish increment of our lesson ordered for us. I think it was he who did that. So, the majority of my students are Hispanic. We have come a long way. In the 60's I took a lot of sign languages even in the 60's there were school that forced students to speak English it was to the point…we are incorporating different way to communicate with people.

(8) Participant 0106121317

Q7 – Yea, as a special education teacher, we do it as a department. And then we have to check on the student anyway to make sure that stuff is being modified, especially on assessments that they are being done. Like, for instance, I said that student that if he can't write it down if they are working with him to do verbal assessments instead. So we have to yes. Well, we have to get with our teachers, individual content, especially if they are not succeeding in the class. Then we have to go in and make sure that modifications are being done. Or we might have to change the modification or do other things that will help the student succeed.

(9) Participant 0108111418

Q7 – No, I have talked individually mostly with Mr. M. about what I can do with individual students. But as far as any formal collaboration or things like that, I haven't done any of that. I am the only one in my department. And at times I am expected to know more then I know about computers. I didn't have any formal training on computer instruction. I just, in fact, I

had one statistics class in college where we used a computer. And other than that I had no training. When I cam to the school to do my student teaching the teacher had a lap top computer to do his grades. So I did that. And that teacher also took care of the computers in the building there were only seven at that time. But I just started, and all my stuff is only picked up. I don't think I am that much of an expert on software. Now, we are up to 250 computers in the building. I have about 200. And I am expected all the time to keep those up. There is some technical support I can call on if we have big problems. But most of the time you know day-to-day things, I am supposed to take care of and that's one of the problems I run into especially with all the virus problems. But thankfully, we have these Macs that the viruses don't affect them too much. You know, 99 percent of the viruses that are out there in the world affect PCs and Windows operated systems. But, we have a few of them in the building. And if you go there to do virus work, it may take hours to do that kind of work. I get one extra preparation period to do that kind of stuff. I have two printers and one other computer.

(10) Participant 0110111518

Q7 - Here again, we work with Mr. B. and Ms. B. until they kicked her up stairs and made an administrator out of her. She was incredibly helpful with a lot of our lower functioning kids. Uh, anything that we can do for these lower functioning kids we will do. Like Mr. E., in computers, has been very helpful with these kids and in getting everything going for us. Anything that we can use, even coach M. in physical education you know. If we can get a child to function over there then that is good. And it will always help them with their linguistics. I am a firm believer in physical activity, which is good.

(11) Participant 0205121418

Q7 - Sure, because I have collaborated with other teachers in my building. I collaborated with Ms. B and with Ms. F. to accommodate students that are Spanish speaking and got help from them. I also have Ms. P in my second period class as an associate. And she speaks Spanish and provides that extra help. But, I have collaborated. And I have you know rechecked some of the quizzes and work. No, I don't have time to participate in any instructional groups.

(12) Participant 0208121318

Q7 - Not really, I do talk to each of the teams. I know which students are ELLs. And we also have the special education and low-income students and those sorts of things classified. But as far, unless I have a problem I don't go and talk to anyone about them too much. Teams are 2-

8th grade and 2-7th grade teams with 4 teachers in each. Um, and the kids are also teaming. This year we have teams, but next year we probably won't. No not really. There aren't any instructional groups. It would be nice to know who I could go to and what resources I could use for ideas in doing modifications. We are electives so we have to collaborate with the teams.

(13) Participant 0206121418

Q7 – Yes, I attend IEP meetings. But they have to qualify for special education first. No, I don't participate in any other instructional groups. Except for our team meeting. Language occasionally comes up like in a conversation. That so and so speaks another language or lives in an all Spanish speaking home so that helps. You know.

(14) Participant 0205111317

Q7 - Uh, yes we have a trained bilingual education teacher in the building. However, she is working in the special education department. Last year, when I did have those kids that were having a lot of difficulty understanding the material, they were having difficulty speaking English, I went ahead and sat down with her and said, "Well what can I do?" "How can I do it?" Oh, yea, she is the only one in the building that has been trained in that aspect. So she is the only one that I went to. Yes, I help in IEPs. Language does not come up often. It is behavior. It is modifying the materials. In those IEPs that I participated in, they were not linguistically diverse students or language proficient students; they were regular education students.

(15) Participant 0210121618

Q7 – Uh, yes, I have a linguistically diverse student who happens to be a special education student. So, with the regular educators and the special education teachers we have to collaborate amongst us because this young person would not be successful. She is linguistically diverse and she is also non-English speaking. So how can I meet the linguistically diverse if she can't understand what I am saying to her? And in order to do that, we have to talk to the people in our building who understand the language part of it. And the regular educators have to talk to people who understand the special education part of it. So, unless the three groups collaborate together, how is this student going to be successful? We also do it at IEPs. And we do it every week when we talk to other educators. We do it when we talk to Ms. B. or Ms. S., um, and ask them what is going on. What do you need from me? What kind of modification do we need? What are the modifications that we need to have in the classroom so that this young person can be more successful? I am really lucky because being the department head for special education I

have the opportunity. And also being the sponsor of student council that I get to see all sides of what is happening here… And with the faculty and other department heads, we get together to discuss the things that are needed for professional staff development. So, I am very fortunate in the position that I am in. In that I am in the know of a lot of things. That I think that a lot of people until the team members or team leaders bring back or until the young people talk about it that other people don't know. Special education is fortunate in that we can get together. And we discuss young people together. We discuss what we have to do. If we have a new special education teacher, and we do have one this year, the rest of us do everything we can to make her life easier and to maker her classes go smoother. I think the department heads in this building absolutely discuss in their departments. "Ok, so this is what is going on in my classroom help me make it better and make a difference." I think we are fortunate in that we are a cohesive enough staff. If I am having a problem in my classroom, I can go to my colleagues and sit down with them and say, "You know what, I am doing this wrong, help me figure out a way to do it different, because it is not working the way it is." And we feel comfortable enough with each other. I hope it is a feeling of comfort. That if we have someone in the building who feels comfortable enough to say, "you know Ms. M. this is what is happening." "Brainstorm with me and help figure out, and I will do the same with you." "Brainstorm with me, these are the things that are going on in my class; help me figure out what my role is and how I can change it."

(16) Participant 0204121417

Q7: Well, to me in special education, also, I monitor students. I help like the science and English classes. I help with students that are having problems. I know that I handle most, if not all, the ESL students because I am bilingual. So yes, I am collaborating in terms of what they can do and what they can't and how do you modify. How can you help the students? What strategies do you use to modify instruction for the students with limited language proficiency? No formal committees, although we do have the student assistance teams (SAT) committee. We are planning strategies on strategies. We do have a department head. Yes, we have monthly meetings. Uh, we discuss mostly curricular matters, but we do address adaptation of materials. I know that I was on an adoption committee for our department and that was the biggest push that I had on the ESL book and all the literature in Spanish. And I did get those books, and we did get additional resources for them.

Question 8: What do you consider to be your language policy in your classroom?

 (1) Participant 0205111317

Q8 - There really is no policy if I am understood the question right. If they want to talk in Spanish, they can talk in Spanish. If they want to talk slang, as long as they keep it clean and descent and is appropriate and nobody is offended, you know. I would hate to say, "You need to speak a certain way," because that is not the way that they talk. I am totally against that. Don't memorize! I want you to think, decipher …rote memory is probably the worst way to teach math. If you teach the child to think, you would be better off.

(2) Participant 0210121618

Q8 – What is my language policy in my classroom? Language proficiency is my policy. I would really like to see the young people coming out of my class. I would really like for them to be on a proficiency or 4th grade level in language as 7th and 8th graders. That is my goal. That if they can have basic sight words up to the 4th grade, I think that is going to set them really well to leave here as 8th graders and go onto the high school, because they have that basic vocabulary.

(3) Participant 0206121418

Q8 - I don't know if I have a language policy. Yea, I do correct poor language. I do ask for complete sentences on a test, not just the one or two word responses. Because I want their language to continue, as far as, the way they use it. Um, I had an incident the other day where the kid didn't have any idea he was using foul language. So it opened up a whole area where we had a sex education class right there. I don't mind them opening up. And kids are asking questions and we can cover some things in class. I guess if I do have a language policy, it is all unspoken. You know being respectful and taking care of not using any foul language. Yea, I think so! I have a language policy.

(4) Participant 0208121318

Q8 - Again, I just I try to be flexible. I try to let all my students know that I have high expectations for each one of them. Uh, I do allow for them on things, which are not that important for the time. Like my Spanish students, I let them surf Spanish sites for their research. But, I want them to report in English. Uh, and if they need help, that they have plenty of time to do their work in here. And I know some of them. Last year I had a couple of students who had difficulty. And I did let them work in pairs. You know where they worked with someone else who did know English and who helped them get the report ready. But basically, I would just

consider my language policy to be high expectations and flexibility. I really don't tell them that this is going to be our language policy. I really feel those students feel they are having a hard enough time and feel segregated. And don't say, "Well you have a language problem and this is what I am going to do with you." I just talk to the whole class and say these are my expectations of you. And I don't really believe in segregating them out from the rest of the class.

(5) Participant 0205121418

Q8 - Assist the student in any way that I can. If I need to have a student help me with translation, I will do whatever I need to do in that regard. If I don't have a student, I have asked for an aid. So that I can assist the student with translation by using translation.com or any other program on the World Wide Web.

(6) Participant 0110111518

Q8 - Please don't take this as racist, but it is English because that is basically all my children speak. It is very difficult for these kids because they don't practice Spanish; they speak English. Like I say if something comes up where we have a native Spanish-speaker, believe me, we can handle that here. If we had a French or German speaker, I would probably have to go back to class and brush up on some things. But beyond that we can handle it. My wife teaches at the high school, and she has interpreters in on every call. She pairs them up and says, "You two work together." They are kids that she can count on. It is my job to educate not to make them speak another language.

(7) Participant 0108111418

Q8 - Other than the fact that I always encourage speaking English, you know, and not using street language, I really don't have a real policy here. I have not given that too much thought.

(8) Participant 0106121317

Q8 - I still don't understand what you are asking. Is it how I have them understand what I am telling them? Or … well, my students have to do a lot of verbal, because that is how they are able to explain a lot of things verbal. Also, their enunciation is important because we can't understand them; so we work on enunciation. Um, it is hard to get them to say the science words correctly because if they can't speak the language, it is hard to get them to pronounce them correctly. I have some ESL students. I would say I have only one of Mr. M.' students. Some of them are ELLs and some ESL. I am probably at about 80 percent ELLs. I only have one. Yes, in

all of my classes all of my students are English as a second language. They do switch, but with each other. They know talking among peers. They do. But talking to an instructor, they don't. They talk straight English. To me, um, I have a couple of them that I tease and tell them I don't talk Spanish. Just to see what they will say. So they talk to me in Spanish. I have one that is, really his Spanish is very strong. And if he tries to talk to me, he tells me I know you will understand me! I tell him. No I don't. So I try to see if he will say it in English to where I can understand it. He knows I am just playing with him. But other then that they really don't switch. They usually speak English.

(9) Participant 0105121317

Q8 - Not really, I do the best that I can, and they do the best that they can. And, as long as I have a student that can interpret for me, I happy. Keep it clean. They know that I don't speak a lot of Spanish, but there are some words that I do know. And If I hear that word come out of your mouth again, they try to say that I don't know what it means. But I do. They get a kick out of me. There are some words that I do know. English is a language that is taught in a lot of different languages. Like in Japan a lot of the kids want to learn English. It is just an international thing. And I had a real good friend from Nigeria. They have 3 languages and some of them like to learn English.

(10) Participant 0104121418

Q8 - Well uh, I am pretty much into the theme of liberal arts and I am pretty liberal. Of course, it's English because that is what I teach. But you know, as far as, a language policy in my room, I want the kids to have as much fun with the English language as they can. So when it comes to playing games with alteration or with short poetry or whatever we can bring in. My policy is to use every source that I can to help the students to learn and use English. Of course, we are learning formal English. When it comes to writing, we use formal grammar. But then there is no reason we can't talk about street language or slang. So, I incorporate it all. But my primary focus is to teach the kids proper English grammar, as far as, written and spoken language is concerned. So that is kind of my policy. That is a tough question, you know, for an English teacher. I would hate to think that it was a covert policy, that we speak English only, judging by the nature of the subject matter that we teach. I would not want that to be subversive in any way. That is just the subject matter that we teach. That is what they are here to learn is English.

(11) Participant 0106111617

Q8 - I don't know if I have a policy. I will tell you my personal opinion. I think everyone should be proficient in English. You can speak Spanish at home, but in the classroom the primary means of communication should be English. And that would be my primary language of instruction, but I am lucky. Like I said I am almost bilingual. I can speak and teach some of it. But I tend to fall under the one language - English. That is what happened to me when I was in high school. I couldn't speak Spanish. I was forced to speak English. I would stay after school. I was penalized for speaking in Spanish.

(12) Participant 0109111417

Q8 - Learning to communicate, reading and writing, and thing like that. I guess I could add to that, that giving more a commitment to learning another language. Also, that Spanish is not a foreign language in the state of New Mexico.

(13) Participant 0105121518

Q8 - Oh gosh! My policy in my classroom is that when I have a student that doesn't understand English I have to, number 1 find some kind of a peer tutor for them in the classroom, so that as I am speaking someone else can be explaining to them what I am talking about. Um, I provide them with the lessons in Spanish, and that's about it. I don't think I teach just math language. I expect them to have a varied vocabulary. You know, I used to be a language arts teacher as well. So, I want them to understand what the math language is. And I want them to understand the math vocabulary. But I also want them to have a good vocabulary in general. So um, I guess I am not real sure what you want. We need to improve their vocabulary. I know, I don't limit my language. I want them to understand, you know, to have a broader vocabulary, so I am not going to talk only in terms of math.

(14) Participant 0106111617

Q8 - It is so hard now, because like I said, our minority majority kids are trying to be ESL. And it is so hard to find science books that have a translation. And every time we have an adoption, which we have coming up in two years, my job is to call up science book companies to see if they have a full translation book to go with the English version of the science book. A few years ago, about 12 years ago, there's a textbook company that had one page of English and the other page was in Spanish, which was perfect. With the last adoption another company just had a cassette, which I thought was very good. But when I sat down to listen to it, it was not in-depth

on what was being talked about in the chapter. So, it is hard to find a book company that has a Spanish text for our students.

(15) Participant 0104111517

Q8- Yes, well what we do, is that I try to be consistent and express them to the different words that try to increase their vocabulary base, the phonetic definition of the words. Yes, I try to help them respect differences, as long as they can grasp the concepts that are presented in class.

(16) Participant 0204121417

Q8 - I want them to understand that I am not trying to tear down their language, because language is who we are and how we communicate (think and understand the world). However, there are different forms. There are forms on how we communicate and how we come across, more civilized, or should I say more productive. Yea, I just, I don't know. I think the more you focus. I tell my students those are words, and you can use them at any time, but there are going to be consequences. So be careful. I don't put a big emphasis on profanity, because I think if you focus on the negative the kids will cling on to that. They will want to use that. And you just have to put the standard and tell the kids, "that is it, you are done." I don't know. I hardly have any problems with that. I will tell you the truth. I have never had a problem with a child using inappropriate words…

Question 9 – What would you estimate the school's language policy to be?

(1) Participant 0104111517

Q9 - I think that they are pretty liberal and empathetic, in terms of, assisting the ELL and culturally diverse kids.

(2) Participant 0106111617

Q9 - First of all, we need to bring back our ESL teachers to teach ESL and perhaps have them in a classroom setting or have them float with the kids. They go to English with the kids and to all the subject areas. If not, have a self-inclusion classroom where they can go to and have everything translated for them. But, as I understand, we really don't have those support personnel like we used to have when we had an ESL director and ESL was an inspiring program within the district. I am sure that there is language, because if you were to take a person who speaks both English and Spanish and still take English classes there is always a struggle there. Because it starts in early childhood and if you don't grasp that concept by the time you get to middle school there is a struggle.

(3) Participant 0105121518

Q9 - It is about the same as mine. I think we have a written one in that as a school, we have word walls. We work on vocabulary together every week. We have vocabulary words that everybody works on. And as a school, we have a school wide vocabulary enriching policy, which I think is our language policy.

(4) Participant 0109111417

Q9 - I guess what I said a while ago, creating bi-literate students making Spanish or French a second language. And I was told by the powers that be that there are other priorities, and we know what those priorities are. That was what I was told. I was told twice. Once I asked for more Spanish language arts and more Spanish. And that was what I was told. There are other priorities. The principal is very supportive.

(5) Participant 0106111617

Q9 - Probably that they need to open it up to everybody. All languages should be expressed equally. In our case we should have a higher percentage of bilingual teachers teaching our classes then we have monolingual teachers.

(6) Participant 0104121418

Q9 - I find that question very hard to answer, because I don't recall ever speaking about a language policy. As you said the covert policy is always English. But we have always done what we can to accommodate our parents. Our meetings are conducted in Spanish and English and so forth. So we have always done what we can to accommodate that. So I really don't think that it is covert other than we are a small part of the district. So, if our district has a policy, be it covert or overt, then of course we are following it. I think here we try our best. This year we have 84 percent Hispanics and 12 percent Anglo. We have quite a wide variety. So we try to accommodate everybody.

(7) Participant 0105121317

Q9 - I think it is basically to keep it clean. I think that is probably what it is. It is not. We have a lot of bilingual students. We have a lot of Spanish speaking students. And we have a lot of students that only speak English. We have, it is just don't be hateful. Just keep it a good environment. Of course, you have to use it correctly.

(8) Participant 0108111418

Q9 - I don't really know what the school's language policy is. I really haven't seen any language policy myself, either covert or overt. My opinion is that most teachers encourage English. I don't know how many discourage using Spanish in the classroom. I don't really know. My training in college is math. Even myself, I don't use the correct language even in math. My supervising teacher would say you have to use the proper terminology. I don't know.

(9) Participant 0110111518

Q9 - Like I said 85 to 90 percent of the students here only speak English. So I would guess as far as majority wise that it would be English. But there are a number, like Mr. M over here, has an excellent program for Spanish speakers. There are a number of teachers here who can handle themselves in both languages. It is not a big deal. I would assume that the policy is basically English. But they are willing to work with what ever gets a child through the day. I think it is. You know, we are basically. We do whatever it takes to get the kids through the day in the classroom…Well yes if you what to become an international airline pilot all the ground control people and maintenance speak English. In international navigation on the high seas, the language is English. Basically, finance is English. And if you wish to go to school at some of the best school you are going to have to learn English. The reason that India is so popular in their outsourcing jobs from the U.S. is because they have a tremendous volume of English speaking people. You know, when I get on the phone for a bill I am speaking to someone with a very heavy accent from, and I am probable talking to someone from New Delia. But here again my mother was from Czechoslovakia, and they spoke nothing but Check at home until she was 6 years old. But my grandfather said that since we are in America, and we will speak English. But she still reads it and speaks it occasionally and goes to church services that are done in Check. But, she functions in English.

(10) Participant 0208121318

Q9 - That is kind of a hard question to answer. Yea, whatever that the state mandates or district mandates, I guess that would be their policy. But, I know the building principal tries to get programs set up too. I was glad to see the program this year with Ms. S in the morning comes in to give the students Spanish instruction where they go to a separate Spanish class. And I think that is helping out for those students. Um, I know that they are pretty flexible because for a couple of students last year they did let them stay in a class. Or they pair up the students with

somebody else. They paired them up with students who would go with them to other classes. Because America is set up the way it is. We are an immigrant country

(11) Participant: 0210121618

Q9 – I believe our language policy is set by the benchmarks and standards of the state. Um, we would like for all of our young people to test language proficient at their grade level. Um, and I think honestly, the language arts teachers, and not just the language arts teachers, they are doing the best they can. The other core subjects and electives they do whatever is possible. And, also, whatever is impossible to get young people up to speed, to where they need to be educationally.

(12) Participant 0205111317

Q9 - Sink or swim it is pretty sad. We try. But we are not given the tools. The child is left out there to struggle and struggle. Either they get it eventually, or they just lose interest. Um there might be, but I am just telling you the way it is. In education, there is a lot of paper work. So maybe somewhere there is a policy. It is easy to write something down and not do it.

(13) Participant 0206121418

Q9: Yea, much more lax than my own. I hear the foul language out in the halls. Um, I think in the classroom they are expected to use appropriate language, good language. And in the halls, they use whatever goes. Um, as far as foul language, yes it is written. But whether it is enforced, I don't think so.

(14) Participant 0204121417

Q9: The same, no profanity, use appropriate language, manners, and then you have to think which standards, which manners? You know, in my husband's culture, you eat with your hands. You don't use silverware. So, it is interesting. What standards do we need to establish school language policy? We do have one, but we do need to be more culturally diverse. In my opinion, I think we do have a school language policy. We should have it written in the 5130 about profanity, because we read it to them all the time.

(15) Participant 0106121317

Q9 - I don't know if the school has a language policy. I think the district does need a policy. I think all the teachers should be at least familiar with the languages spoken in their classroom or within the district, maybe not proficient but at least familiar. And probably take

professional development classes on how to cope and meet the needs of linguistically diverse students.

(16) Participant 0205121418

Q9 – Well, they do provide. But I have never seen a written language policy for the district. I do know we have bilingual teachers. I do know that they are made available to our school. Ms. S is not necessarily the bilingual teacher. But she does help, and she does assist. But she teaches Spanish language arts, which allows students to learn in their own language and does not really help transition them from Spanish to English or any other language to English. So, I know district wide or nation wide we are supposed to have a plan in place. But I, and here is the thing, bilingual in New Mexico is usually considered Spanish and English. But Spanish speakers are not the only bilinguals that we have. We have multi-lingual in this state. Usually you learn how you are taught. But I am teaching math using the Saxon math. And I have learned things, since I became a teacher, that I did not know when I was a student. And I never had a teacher or anyone teach me. I honestly think that has made me a better math teacher the instruction that I have had in math.

Question 10 – Have you participated in staff development opportunities for meeting the learning needs of linguistically diverse students? Do you have additional professional development needs regarding linguistically diverse students?

(1) Participant 0104111517

Q1 0 – Yes, I have. I can't remember the man's name, but it was on diversity. It helped them deal with the students and helped them grasp the concepts of language. Well, I need to be kept abreast of the latest trends and theories and philosophies in helping these students. I am always ready to learn more. This is a new position. This is my second year doing this. I am usually an administrator. We don't have too many like that, but the one thing that we have done consistently throughout the district, and we are going to be doing more of it this year is the SADIE training. Uh, I don't really know what the acronym stands for but what they are both for ESL and special education students. They are strategies to help teachers to get better, uh, in the process of teaching. Students who don't fit into their preconceived ideas of what is a student should be actually involved in this curriculum. And so the SADIE is about all we have done for the mainstream teachers. And for the ELL, ESL of course, they get advanced training, which is good. But I am not sure it filters into the regular classroom. That is one of the places where it

needs to filter. So are we going to do anything in the future? Next year probably, next year we are going to have a new superintendent. The interim-superintendent is working real hard. And what he is going to try to do for us is to have an opportunity to have, say from 1:30 on every Wednesday afternoon for training. And I think it is going to make a big difference. Because then we can give them all the training they need. I need technology training. I need math training. I need manipulative training. I need SADIE. I need ELL training. I need sensitivity training. I need all sorts of training here, which I just don't have the time to get done. We only have four training days for the whole year. There is just a limit. I think they are going to get some choices in terms of time. They also get to help design for the building staff development days. They also get to help design that. Uh, but a couple of the days they don't get any choice at all the district just tells them.

(2) Participant 0106111617

Q10 - They are not going to tell you. They are just going to look at you. But you try to do the best you can with what you got. I wish we had ESL aids. As a matter of fact, we do have one. But she is too busy to be everywhere. Once again, we need to look at the individual teacher. If they are just monolingual, then that is the way they are going to teach and expect the children to understand that. If your a teacher who speaks more than two languages, they are going to do code talking, which I do my self. What is real funny is that we have a Vietnamese girl here that came straight from Asia somewhere and has been here for two years. And they put her in with the Hispanic kids and she speaks better Spanish than she does English.

(3) Participant 0105121518

Q10 - I can't remember exactly the names of them. Several years ago our district decided to have several of the schools to join in a dual language program. And the idea was to start at kindergarten and have at least 50…but the idea was to do instruction in both Spanish and English. And we were given the opportunity to go to in-service training. I think that as long as we have students who are not language proficient we are always going to have needs to learn what to do. I see this as going in the direction where teachers are going to have to be multilingual. And that's not going to happen unless we make our students multilingual already in school. I think there are a lot of countries that have students even in elementary school learning another language. And that is what we don't do in the United States. But, we go back in that we are not multilingual. I have nephews and nieces that have grown up in other countries and that

speak three or four languages. And I think they have an advantage. I don't know where we are going to fit this into our curriculum. We do need to have a language policy where we need to have everybody on the same page. But, we do need to know other languages as well. I think we need to be sensitive to non-standard varieties and be on the same page. But, I don't know how. It seems that no matter how much training we have there are still frustrations with it. Um, because well we have been talking about Hispanics and Spanish. Within the Spanish language there are so many dialects. Depending on where you come from in Mexico or Spain. I can learn Spanish. But it may not be the same Spanish the child brings into my classroom. And that is not just Spanish. I am of Dutch heritage from the Netherlands. And I can talk with my relatives then drive 50 miles, and they speak another. It has a number of dialects within the small country. Every language has that problem. We not only have different languages, but we have different dialects. I don't know. And that is why I say that somehow we need to get on the same page because we are never going to be able to provide instruction to all.

(4) Participant 0109111417

Q10- National, state, and local conferences, my endorsements are in bilingual, and Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). And I have a major in Spanish. Oh definitely, I need my Masters in Spanish. Now I can take a class from the university and use it in the class. Getting my Masters would open a lot of doors.

(5) Participant 0106111617

Q10 - I don't think I ever have. When these workshops come around, they are not offered to everybody. They usually tell us what workshops you are going to. But, I am sure that there have been plenty of our people who have gone to such training. Do I have any additional needs? Um, no I don't think I have. Since I am retiring this year, I think I wouldn't have any

(6) Participant 0104121418

Q10 - You know, I haven't. I have missed a couple of the Ron Rohac training workshops. He was very prominent in the district and a couple of the teachers went to that. And he did specifically address that at in-service in meeting the needs of linguistically diverse students. And he gave a lot of ideas and so forth. I can't recall a staff development that I have gone to other then special education where they incorporate the speech, hearing, and oral problems of our linguistically diverse students. But, I can't recall a specific in-service or staff meeting that I have gone to for that. And I have been here 13 years. There is always a need for that. And of course, I

have a need for that because of awareness. And you know, we need to be aware. And we need to know where to get our resources. And so yea I have a lot of needs. I wouldn't call them additional needs. I would call them first level professional development needs. Um, and I think they are always there. And as learning professionals, I will always need additional professional development help in that area. I am quite well traveled. And I have been exposed to a lot of languages and cultures. And I think if we don't bring it all in the kids won't appreciate the wide diversity that there is.

(7) Participant 0105121317

Q10 –Yes, I went to the SADIE training. It was really interesting, but most of the stuff they went over I was already doing. So, I really didn't get that much out of it. And a lot of the stuff that they were doing had to do with how you can do it in other classes. And since I am only teaching math, but it was really interesting. I think there is always room to learn. You can always learn something new. Since this is only my third year teaching, I have about 7 at one point I had as many as 10 non-English speaking students and now I got 7. There is always room to learn. Do I have additional needs? Absolutely. Do I know what they are? Well, I can probably learn to speak Spanish better than I do and that would help me more. I try to speak Spanish as often as I can…with American sign language people don't understand how important that is. There is such a great need for interpreters. And I know when I was learning sign language it was fun…even in our school there are students who are deaf and need that interpretation. They need an interpreter.

(8) Participant 0106121317

Q10 – Yes. We do that in staff development. We do a lot of that in our special education departmental meetings for students who have a lot of linguistically diverse difficulties. Um, it is still a big debate, is it a learning problem or a language problem? It goes hand in hand. I have participated in it, because I have a lot of students who have problems. I think there is always room. You always have to keep yourself open to learn new things about it. You know because things change so much, times change, students change so much, so there are always new things. There are always additional needs.

(9) Participant 0108111418

Q10: I went through 5 or 6 SADIE trainings. There were a couple of women from California that came in on a Saturday and did a fantastic presentation. They used another language. Everybody thought it was Spanish for a little bit, but the Spanish-speaking faculty

couldn't understand it. But they presented this one version and just presented it in one language that used hand language and voice inflection. And they used a lot of different things and made me understand a little more about what that student was feeling over there as a non English speaker as you are speaking English to them. Too many times I find myself, because I am limited on speaking Spanish, that my way of getting to them was increasing my volume. Every once and a while I still find myself doing that. Present it in English and show them what I am talking about and maybe they will start picking it up. I talk about the Vietnamese girl. She has the class twice and there is no difference in the class. The first time she did not talk at all. I had problems with her hitting other students for making fun of her speech. The second time, though, she had made remarkable progress. And she got through the majority of the lessons. She is picking up reading that fast. She is the only Vietnamese in the ESL program. And she is picking up Spanish in there. She came and they took her out of my class. She went to the counselor and said she wanted computers. When she got back she finished all her work ahead of time and asked what should she do now. I told her, "I want you to help other students." And she said, "Oh no! I can't do that." You know, I said, "Yes you can, it will help you with your English." Well, I had strictly math students. Some of those ESL students were some of the best students in my class. You know, some who are second-generation students you know, and they don't speak any languages. And you know, they didn't seem to be motivated. They seemed to be the "trouble makers." You know, and that is what I am saying, most of those ESL students are simple motivated to learn and very well behaved. Well, I think it would really help me in this area if I understood more Spanish maybe some Spanish classes. But I haven't ever been motivated enough to do it. I have worked here all my life and some of the words I do know. I know how to pronounce them pretty well. But at times, with the written Spanish like a newspaper or book I can look at it and figure out what it is saying. But understanding what they are talking about has always been my problem. You know, it has always been beyond me. They seem to go too fast for me. My granddad used to run a fencing crew all over this area and he spoke a lot of Spanish. I am sure if you have the right motivation and/or you had to do it. I could do it. Well, you see some people. You read about them all the time. And they speak 4 or 5 languages. I don't know how they keep them straight.

    (10) Participant 0110111518

    Q10: No, I haven't. I don't think that any have been available. Most of them have dealt with behavior. I think they want me to deal with behavior concerns more than with language. I

think that is a matter of time more than availability. I would say no, because that is not necessary. If we had to get, uh, someone in here who spoke French, German or even Ebonics, Ebonics we could figure out, but French and German would take a little longer. But, I am sure we can handle that. Diversity is what we deal with in here. I got first grade levels. And I have college levels. Diversity is what we are about. We are not here to be against diversity. That is simply what we work in. It is my feeling that countries that not only practice diversity but embrace it are countries that are going to be around for a long time. Like the Japanese who consider themselves to be racially pure, but they get upset when you mention that they are an offshoot of the Koreans. They consider the Koreans to be beneath mention. They consider themselves to be culturally superior. I think that is why Japan has problems, because they are unable to embrace, uh, additional ethnicity. I think that looking at one set of ethnicities you are looking at one set of abilities. But by embracing all you have, the ability to get a lot of good things that a lot of people can do…it is why you have the little Tokyo, the little Italy. Because, basically, people are comfortable around their own kind. But, basically, that is when they are at home. If you are going to function in the world, particularly in a world of computerization, Internet, info-systems and things like that, I mean just outsourcing of jobs. I was watching a program the other night where they are considering, there is one transport plane that was one of a kind to transport their space shuttle, the cargo hole can hold 7-8 737s at one time. They can take this plane and fly it to another place where people can work at a lower price and then fly it back. The world is becoming a global thing. You are going to have your countries that can't. Japanese people are Xenophobic. They think their language is the best…

(11) Participant 0210121618

Question 10 – I have been to well with me I have attended many things with Morgan reading, with academy of reading, and with the workshops on the ESL or ELL students. Um, I have been here a long time. So I have had the opportunity to work on staff development with linguistically diverse students, which is not necessarily Spanish as the 2nd language, um, but that deal with English as a second language. I think that in this district we have a long way to go. Because I believe we are meeting some of the needs of the young people who are Spanish speaking. But I believe that this district doesn't meet the needs of the other languages. Like the young people who speak Chinese, or Russian, or German, uh we don't have curriculum in place for those young people. And they are just as in need as anyone else who English is the second

language. I think we will always have needs. From people who know a whole lot more about it then we do. And, not only do we have those needs; we have the wants of our young people to be successful. And we want all of our young people to be successful. We don't want anybody to be left behind. We don't want anybody to feel, "I can't compete," because they don't know what you are talking about. And I guess, I am really lucky that I work in a building where that is a priority. We want every student in this school to be successful no matter who you are. I believe that our national culture is becoming more and more diverse all of the time. What we have found is that the young person that came to this school as a non-English speaker. Altogether, um, he had the opportunity to go to middle school M. We have him for accelerated reading. We have him the rest of the day. But he had the opportunity to go to middle school M from here because we don't have a program here. And it gave him an opportunity to be successful. That was a real step forward from years past. And we have 6 or 7 young people who could use expanded services. And we are lucky they have a peer partner that they have in class. On the other hand, are we being unfair to the peer partner who is missing out on a lot of thing because he or she is helping out? They are doing a disservice for both. We do use peer partners at this school. We use them effectively. We have 6 here. And they go with them all day. And they end up being best friends. But, those peer partners are we holding them back? If we don't put them to help out what would their grades or academics look like? If they didn't go with this student, it is a catch 22. Our Hispanic population is growing. It depends. Some years it is different. I think the redistricting is going to affect the number of students we are going to have. Hispanics are about 52 % at this school. Like that we have a wide range of students with different cultural and socioeconomic backgrounds. .

<u>(12) Participant 0208121318</u>

Q10: Yes, whenever the district has things I have gone to a few of those. And we have also had things here at the school. We have people come in and talk to us. Um, and those were pretty much talking about strategies for working with ELL students. Not really, if I had more students, than I have this year then maybe I would start looking for some more help with it. But, because I only have one per class and that is even pushing it. But I have enough time to observe them and provide the help they need. As far as professional development needs, I really don't see any. It really does not hurt to do more things and learn more about ELL students.

(13) Participant 0205111317

Q 10 - No, not in the three years I have been here. There was one where we talked a little about bilingual and how they did it in California. They did not actually say, "This is the way it is done, these are some of the tools that are needed, or these are some of the methods that are more successful." In fact, it is the only one that has been available to us. Most definitely, I do have additional needs. Being a teacher, we are life long learners. And you can never know too much about anything whether it is teaching in a diverse classroom. In my case, it is math. There is always going to be a need. I would say most definitely.

(14) Participant 0206121418

Q10 - The SADIE and uh they have done some with it like that whole notebook right there. Using guided reading that was a big push, vocabulary and comprehension strategies. That was a focus this year, which was put on by the district. They also did the four by four block scheduling. That is all we hear about this year. It was designed department wise. Yes, I definitely feel that I have additional needs for just making me aware what their needs are. Many times we just go in without content. And it is just like here. It is. I am not reaching the student. I guess what would have helped me more would have been to know what you are talking about when you say language. Are you talking about instructional language? Are you talking about Spanish language? Are you talking about English language? Are you talking about appropriate language, in terms of, subjects and predicates, verbs and nouns? If there are any tools that we can use out there, I don't think that we know what they are. And we do with what we can. And if the student suffers, well those are benchmarks that they have to get through. They know they are out there. And they know that our kids have them. I think that is part of why they work here. We are a provision 2 school where we can provide breakfast and lunch to all of our students, um, through a provision 2 federal government program. The size has not changed much. Most of our students are the same.

(15) Participant 0204121417

Q10 – This year no, but in the past, I have gone to the bilingual conference. And I have gone to some special education conferences to. They have helped in organization, note taking and how to work with diverse children. They enabled us. They have even given us a book. I have been teaching 8 years and have gone to some sort of conference every year. This is the first year that I haven't gone to any. But, I think I am pretty well trained. Well, I do have 18 credits toward

a Masters. I have 18 credits in Spanish. It is not necessarily linguistics, but I feel that if we start understanding languages and one of my classes was language. Uh, I think that is when we start breaking off into more sub caste systems of language and what the linguistic make-up is right now.

(16) Participant 0205121418

Q10 - Ran out of time to finish interview for this interviewee form Middle school Y in the math department, because interview was conducted during 45 min. prep time.

Appendix B: Multi-Item (10) Likert Scale

Likert Scale to Assess Aspects of Language Policy at Work

Observational Unit_____Date_____

Department/Subject Area_____

Observation and analysis will be based on the 10 items delineated below. Each was designed to help assess elements of language policy sensed during each interview. The levels of observation include, 1) leadership, and 2) instruction.

KEY: 5 = Excellent, 4 = Good, 3 = Satisfactory, 2 = Fair, 1 = Poor

1. _____ General feeling of tolerance or permissiveness of language difference.

2. _____ An environment that promotes linguistic diversity.

3. _____ Overt (implicit) manifestations of language use.

4. _____ Covert (explicit) manifestations of language use.

5. _____ Degree of language alternation observed.

6. _____ Orientation towards language in operation.

7. _____ Organizational responsiveness.

8. _____ Observed functions ascribed to language use.

9. _____ Community responsiveness.

10. _____ Administration resource capacities.

Comments_____

_____

_____Researcher Signature