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Abstract

Lasser, Cristin Jensen (Ph.D., Educational Equity and Cultural Diversity, School of Education)

No Teacher Left Behind: Teachers’ Perceptions of their Emerging Bilingual Students and how these Impact Opportunities to Learn

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Kathy Escamilla

The field of education, particularly at the primary level, is dominated by white, middle-class female educators. Consequently, a cultural mismatch between teachers and students in the United States can occur as the demographics of classrooms and communities continue to change. Exacerbating matters, only 3% of these teachers are fluent and able to teach in any second language. Juxtapose that with the number of emerging bilingual students in U.S. classrooms (10.5%, of which 73% are native-Spanish speakers) and the chances of these students’ social and academic success seems dismal at best.

Therefore, the purpose of this concurrent mixed-methods study was to explore the ways in which teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students are complicated by in-class and school-wide systems and structures. In this study I identified and examined these classroom and school-specific systems and structures and how they impacted emerging bilingual students’ opportunities to learn.

Consistent with a concurrent mixed-methods approach, I collected and analyzed multiple forms of data during the 2013-14 school year. Primary sources of data for this study included student perception surveys, teacher interviews, classroom observational field notes of both typical and CSR instruction, and teachers’ cultural competency ratings from the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI).
Findings from this study showed that teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students academic capabilities were challenged by varying levels of administrative support, inconsistencies in school-wide behavior systems, limited classroom space, pressure from assessments (district and state), use of students native language for punitive purposes, lack of classroom management, low expectations (which yielded low efforts on the part of students), and little assistance from paraprofessionals. Conversely, participants used CSR and each other to support their emerging bilingual students. Findings also revealed that when controlling for differences between CSR and non-CSR teachers, more CSR teachers gained in intercultural competence than non-CSR teachers over the course of an academic year according to the IDI. Unfortunately, however, although reliance on each other and the implementation of CSR facilitated positive perceptions of emerging bilingual students academic capabilities, they were not enough to disrupt deficit-driven discourses directed toward emerging bilingual students in the classrooms at participating schools.
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Chapter 1: Introduction and Conceptual Framework

Statement of the Problem

Tse (2001, p. 45) delineates the facts and fallacies surrounding the U.S. English debate and its staggering effects on parents’ and teachers’ beliefs and practices, stating:

Many believe that our brains are just like our stomachs: To have room for dessert, we can’t overeat. Just like an expanding balloon, some believe our brains can only hold so much, and if we fill it too fully with the heritage language, there will be no room for English. This misconception leads many parents and teachers to advocate arresting development of the native language to leave ample room for the new language. (quoted in Souto-Manning, 2006, p. 559)

According to Moll, Sáez and Dworin (2001), there is a long history of degradation of anything non-mainstream (non-white) in U.S. schools. Spring (1994) refers to this as the deculturalization process of schooling, whereas Valenzuela (1999) dubs it subtractive assimilation. Despite the rhetoric, Moll, Sáez and Dworin (2001) believe that these attitudes manifest themselves in the denigration of language and culture for the largest groups of emerging bilingual students in the United States, Spanish speaking Latinos. While the majority of countries around the globe view bilingualism as a value-added entity in an effort to build cultural competency, the policies and practices within the United States reflect a linguistic credence in which the influence of a student’s mother-tongue is value-laden or detrimental to their educational attainment and English language acquisition. Thus, emerging bilingual students

---

1 I adopt the term ‘emerging bilinguals’ from Reyes (2006) as opposed to the term ‘English language learners’, or ELLs. I believe the latter term is based on a subtractive view that situates children as lacking English, the dominant language and the language of prestige in this society (Baker, 2001; Landry, Allard, & Théberge, 1991). Therefore, ‘emerging bilinguals’ is used in this study to describe students who speak a native language other than English and who are in the process of developing bilingual and biliterate competencies (in this case in English and Spanish).
endure the Americanization process. Academic marginalization and separation, development of rapid English-proficiency and finding a place within the U.S. racial hierarchy characterize this process (Olsen, 1997). The extent to which schools reinforce and enable these phenomena to occur varies according to state and national policies, systemic supports and teachers’ capacities vis-à-vis beliefs, attitudes and educational training.

Moreover, the educational experiences of emerging bilingual students in the United States, Spanish speaking Latinos in particular, are marked by covert forms of tracking (Darder, Torres & Gutiérrez, 1997; Diaz-Soto, 1997; Frankenberg & Orfield, 2007; Gándara & Contreras, 2009; Noguera & Wing; 2006; Valenzuela, 1999). For example, students whose parents identify themselves as native speakers of other languages on the home language survey are often placed in ESL classes regardless of their English language competence. Similarly, emerging bilingual students who receive ESL services are often unable to comply with college pre-requisites because they are pulled from content area classes in order to receive additional language support. Although I believe that schools need a way to support students in English language acquisition, it should not be at the expense of learning academic content, especially content required for success in post-secondary educational endeavors.

Due to inadequate training and ignorance, mainstream teachers tend to implement inappropriate instructional approaches for emergent bilinguals that are really geared toward students with special needs (Souto-Manning, 2006). Similarly, minority teachers fall victim to internalized oppression (Tappan, 2006), in which they adopt the dominant [read: white middle-class] group’s ideology toward teaching and learning while in the process accepting their “subordinate status as deserved, natural and inevitable” (Griffin, 1997, p. 76). Unfortunately, this oppression is then manifested in pedagogical practices that perpetuate inequalities for
culturally and linguistically diverse learners (Freire, 1972; McLaren, 1998). Thus, inappropriate instruction has multiple negative consequences for these students including: the development of a negative self-concept, overrepresentation in special education classes, and underachievement (Baca & Cervantes, 2004). For these reasons, among many others, terms like “achievement gap,” “at-risk,” “language minority,” “English language learner” and “limited English proficiency” pervade the deficit discourse used to describe emerging bilingual students in classrooms throughout the United States.

In addition to deficit-driven discourses employed by both teachers and school administrators alike (Blommaert, Collins, & Slembrouck, 2005; Escamilla, Aragon, & Franquiz, 2009; Souto-Manning, 2006; Walker, Shafer, & Iiams, 2004), attitudes and beliefs toward diversity and students’ native language use in the classroom inhibit or enhance emerging bilingual students educational experiences and opportunities. Teachers who respect students’ language and culture produce students with increased efficacy as learners who take pride in utilizing their bilingual repertoire in social and academic settings (Huerta, 2011; Moll, Sáez, & Dworin, 2001). Alternatively, teachers who lack diverse perspectives and multicultural training, and who do not undergo additional certification or coursework in English as a Second Language (ESL) or bilingual education methods are less accepting of emerging bilinguals in their classes (Batt, 2008; García, Nevarez, Stafford, & Aria, 2005; Karabenick, Clemens, & Noda, 2004).

These attitudes and beliefs toward diversity and students’ native language use in the classroom albeit positive or negative are apparent in teachers’ academic expectations of emerging bilingual students as well. Teachers who reduce language demands and expectations for these students, or who view their role as gatekeepers of knowledge, tend to limit emerging bilingual students’ access to quality instruction (DaSilva Iddings, 2005; Reid, 1994).
Conversely, students with teachers who uphold high expectations and performance standards for all students achieve in a manner consistent with this ethos (Donovan & Cross, 2002; Huerta, 2011).

The culminating effect of teachers’ discourses, attitudes and beliefs, and their academic expectations on emerging bilingual students is evident in these students’ perceptions about learning and belonging in U.S. classrooms. Environmental factors like classroom placement and approaches to language learning impact emerging bilingual students’ academic outcomes and feelings toward school in general (Bernat & Gvozdenko, 2005; Callahan, Wilkinson, & Muller, 2010; LeClair, Doll, Osborn, & Jones, 2009). Furthermore, students’ motivation, frustration and anxiety in the classroom can be compromised by feelings of marginalization due to cultural and linguistic differences. Collectively, these findings from previous research suggest that teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward diversity and students’ native language use as manifested in their discourse, practices and expectations, impact students’ perceptions about school and learning, and subsequent academic achievement.

**Rationale and Purpose for the Study**

Data from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2011) indicate that the number of emerging bilingual school-age children (ages 5–17) rose by 51% from 3.5 million to 5.3 million between 1998 and 2009. Of those 5.3 million children ages 5-17, 73% speak Spanish, 13% speak an Asian/Pacific Islander language, 10% speak an Indo-European language other than Spanish and 4% speak another language. Furthermore, the states with the highest percentages of emerging bilinguals are Arizona and New York (6% each); Nevada and Texas (9% each); and California (11%).
Additionally, not all teachers view language and culture as assets students bring with them to the classroom. The field of education, particularly at the primary level, is dominated by white, middle-class female educators (Cushner, 2008). Consequently, a cultural mismatch between teachers and students in the United States can occur as the demographics of classrooms and communities continue to change. Exacerbating matters, only 3% of these teachers are fluent and able to teach in any second language (Cushner, 2008). Juxtapose that with the number of emerging bilingual students in U.S. classrooms (10.5%, of which 73% are native-Spanish speakers) and the chances of these students’ social and academic success seems dismal at best (Pearson, 2006).

Furthermore, because bilingual education is not federally mandated, individual states are responsible for enforcing laws regarding “best” practices for emerging bilingual students. For example, two of the five states with the largest percentage of emerging bilingual populations, California and Arizona, have passed laws restricting the use of students’ home languages at school for instructional purposes. These language policies, Propositions 227 and 203 respectively, prevent teachers, schools and school districts from implementing language programs that would benefit their predominantly bilingual student population. Consequently, teachers are censored and banned from implementing “best” instructional practices because they lack systemic support from either school administration or departments of education (Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly & Callahan, 2003; Martinez-Wenzl, Pérez, & Gándara, 2010).

Moses (2000) offers a compelling counterargument to the language debate in favor of self-deterministic policies that preserve the ability of all people to make favorable life choices while maintaining a sense of integrity and authentic cultural identity in the process. She believes that the detriments of anti-bilingual education policies are twofold. First, these policies send the
message to non-native English speakers that their culture is unworthy of mainstream recognition (Moses, 2000). Second, emerging bilingual students’ sense of self is stifled as they are forced to choose between the language and culture of school and that of their home and community.

Citing the work of Kymlicka (1995, p. 7), Moses states, “People’s self-respect is bound up with the esteem in which their national group is held. If a culture is not generally respected, then the dignity and self-respect of its members will also be threatened” (p. 339). Consequently, myopic language policies such as those passed in California, Arizona and more recently, Massachusetts, serve to constrain the educative choices for all and afford academic liberty and justice for some.

Exacerbating matters, research has shown that the achievement gap is higher in language restrictive states (Rumberger & Tran, 2010).

Although the state in which this study took place does not adhere to language restrictive policies, thanks to the successful defeat of Amendment 31 in 2002, an anti-bilingual, English immersion initiative, an achievement gap between monolingual English-speakers and emerging bilingual students still remains. Consequently, the district in which this study took place sought to mitigate this achievement gap by implementing Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) in middle school science, social studies, and language arts classrooms. As a part of this larger five year study funded by an i3 (Investing in Innovations) U.S. government grant, I investigated the in-class structures, like CSR, and in-school systems that served to challenge and support teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. Specifically, I examined both monolingual and bilingual teachers’ evolving attitudes and beliefs toward emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities while implementing CSR in middle school science and social studies classrooms.
CSR is a strategy-facilitated reading comprehension approach with a strong theoretical as well as empirical base. It is grounded in sociocultural theory (Perez, 1998) and cognitive psychology (Flavell, 1992; Palincsar & Brown, 1984), with components of constructivism as well as explicit instruction (Harris & Pressley, 1991). It includes several practices associated with improved outcomes in reading comprehension: (a) teaching students to monitor their comprehension and procedures for adjusting when difficulties understanding arise; (b) using cooperative learning practices while implementing comprehension strategies in the context of reading; (c) providing graphic and semantic organizers that assist students in writing or drawing relationships; (d) providing support for questioning strategies that assist students in answering critical questions about the passage, feedback to students regarding their answers to questions about the text, and opportunities for students to ask and answer questions about the text; (e) teaching students to write important ideas about what they’ve read and to summarize these ideas after longer passages are read; (f) combining multiple strategies for students to apply; (g) embedding comprehension instruction within subject-matter learning, such as history or science; (h) providing explicit strategy instruction, particularly for low-achieving students; and (i) building vocabulary knowledge, especially for English language learners (RAND Reading Study Group, 2002).

The purpose of CSR is to help students access content knowledge through increased comprehension of related texts, as measured by the reading comprehension assessment Gates-MacGinitie Reading Comprehension Test (MacGinitie, MacGinitie, Maria, Dreyer, & Hughes, 2000). After teachers directly model a set of reading comprehension strategies, students practice these in small, structured, collaborative peer groups (Klingner & Vaughn, 1999). Strategies include connecting to prior knowledge, deciphering unknown vocabulary, summarizing,
questioning and synthesizing. The intended goals of CSR are for students to internalize these strategies to understand texts independently, and to develop higher order thinking skills.

CSR is a research-validated instructional practice that has demonstrated success in small studies in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms from fourth grade through middle school (Klingner, Ahwee, van Garderen, & Hernandez, 2004; Klingner & Vaughn, 2000; Klingner, Vaughn, & Schumm, 1998; Vaughn, Klingner, Swanson, Boardman, Roberts, Mohammed, & Stillman-Spisak, 2011). Findings show that CSR yields positive outcomes for emerging bilingual students, students with learning disabilities (LD), struggling readers, average and high achieving students. While CSR has been researched extensively to measure its impact in the areas of sustainability, student behavior and discourse, and overall academic achievement, little is known about its benefits for teachers. Specifically, prior to this study researchers had yet to investigate teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students academic capabilities while implementing CSR.

I argue that the existing components of CSR (e.g. collaborative group work, connecting to students’ prior knowledge, students use of cognates\(^2\) to decipher unknown words, emerging bilingual students\(^3\) use of their L1\(^4\) to discuss English texts) are consistent with “best” culturally relevant pedagogical practices (Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Boykin, 1996; Bravo, Hiebert, &

\(^2\) Cognates are words in two or more languages that have a common etymology and thus are similar or identical in form and meaning.

\(^3\) I recognize, however, that some of these emerging bilingual students, though thought to just be learning English, may in fact be simultaneous bilinguals. Simultaneous bilinguals learn both the language spoken at home (in this case Spanish) in conjunction with the language of instruction (in this case English) (Escamilla & Hopewell, 2010). Therefore, they may not have native language literacy supports from which to draw upon in school.

\(^4\) The designation L1 refers to students’ native language(s). In this study, students’ L1 is primarily Spanish. Therefore, Spanish will be used throughout the remainder of this chapter when referring to participating students’ L1.
Pearson, 2007; Greenfield, 1997; Huerta, 2011; Tyler, Boykin and Walton, 2006). Thus, monolingual and bilingual teachers alike who employ CSR in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms have the potential to develop more positive beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ capabilities, therefore disrupting deficit-discourses and enhancing achievement for emerging bilingual students.

**Conceptual Framework**

The conceptual framework I applied to this study was derived from previous research conducted by Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002). I adapted the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Peter, 1993) to map the change environment for teachers involved in the CSR-CO Project regarding their beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ academic competencies. In this conceptual framework, four domains of the teacher change environment are detailed. The personal domain of change refers to what the teacher knows, believes or feels about teaching and students. The external domain represents the supports received by the teacher within the school context. The domain of practice is comprised of the teachers’ pedagogical practices with students in the classroom. Finally, the domain of consequence consists of student and teacher outcomes represented by data or other measures used to gauge the effectiveness of instruction. Each domain is connected to the other via action and reflection processes described in detail below. Thus the interconnected, non-linear structure of the model enables the identification of particular “change sequences” and “growth networks,” giving recognition to the idiosyncratic and individual nature of teacher change (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).
This conceptual framework combines elements of theories from fields such as cognitive psychology, linguistics and education related to both pedagogical practices and professional learning to further explicate the iterative process of teacher change (Boreham & Morgan, 2004; Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002; Crawford, 2004; Freire, 1972; John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996; Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Maintaining the idea that learning is situated in social interactions, I represent the change environment as a circle in which all domains are interconnected and interact simultaneously with
one another. Additionally, the interactive piece which I believe to be fundamental for change to occur is represented by the silhouettes of two people engaged in conversation. Finally, the arrows represent the cyclical nature of teacher change as they engage in continuous action and reflection processes. Action refers to what the teachers do with the knowledge and contending beliefs and attitudes they are presented with in practice. Reflection means consideration for and understanding of different ways to work both individually and collectively with students, coaches and colleagues in order to facilitate the construction of new knowledge and meaning through the transformation process.

**Domain Explanations and Supporting Theories**

The conceptual framework for this study was derived from the work of Paulo Freire (1972) regarding reflective action and praxis in the teacher-student relationship. I also applied a sociocultural perspective on teaching and learning using a Vygotskian approach to understanding the teacher’s role as situated practice within social interactions (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Additionally, I used elements of culturally relevant pedagogy to examine how CSR could be used to enhance teachers’ abilities to teach and understand culturally and linguistically diverse students. Examination of teachers’ changing beliefs and practices entailed the use of scaffolding within teachers’ zone of proximal development through the co-construction of knowledge related to CSR implementation and student learning outcomes (Boreham & Morgan, 2004).

The domain names represent the aspect of the teacher world that influences/impacts change. The components of what each entails are detailed in the corresponding overlapping box to further emphasize the interconnectedness of each component within each domain. These explicative components reflect the research questions, data collection methods and analysis employed in my study and the underlying theories from which these processes were derived.
Reflective action. In this conceptual framework, all domains interact simultaneously with one another through the processes of action and reflection on the part of the teacher. Paulo Freire suggested in his seminal work, Pedagogy of the Oppressed, that as teachers acquire new knowledge they “discover themselves as its permanent re-creators” (1972, p. 69) when the process of attaining the new knowledge has included common reflection and action. Therefore, the CSR teacher has the potential to develop “co-intentional” education where university coaches and cooperating teachers together are constructing goals for instructional improvement and shared strategies for working to meet the needs of all students. Rather than viewing teaching as transmitting information to students, the CSR teacher within a Freirian perspective is prepared to first understand a meaningful place to begin in working together with students facilitating their construction of knowledge and meaning.

In his work with Brazilian farm workers, Freire started by seeking generative words – words and concepts that held meaning for the participants (Freire, 1972). Freire believed that first engaging in a conversation to generate ideas of meaning was essential because this “investigation thus becomes a common striving towards awareness of reality and towards self-awareness, which makes this investigation a starting point for the educational process or for cultural action of a liberating character” (1972, p. 107). Next, participants reflect on the goals and act upon them in partnership in a cycle of reflection and action.

Although CSR combines elements of reciprocal teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984) and cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1989), it is also consistent with my interpretation of how the CSR teacher within a Freirian perspective works in collaboration with students, colleagues and coaches to acquire new knowledge. The critical framework of this study not only shapes the lens with which the teacher seeks to understand herself in relation to her students, but
also the way in which the teacher, her colleagues, and CSR coach work collaboratively toward professional and personal growth.

**External domain.** The external domain is comprised of the school context, student/family characteristics, competing school demands and initiatives, and CSR-related professional development activities and experiences. The external domain is supported by sociocultural and culturally relevant pedagogical theories related specifically to the funds of knowledge students bring with them from home to the classroom.

**Situated learning.** Researchers from the field of cognitive psychology and learning sciences have looked at the role professional development plays in eliciting changes in teachers’ practice and students’ achievement from a situated learning perspective. For example, researchers Vera John-Steiner and Holbrook Mahn applied a Vygotskian framework to their analysis of sociocultural approaches to learning and development. Specifically, they examined the relationship between language and culture, and collaborative teaching and learning in the classroom. Accordingly, the learning process is situated in social interactions as learners partake in activities collectively and acquire knowledge through active participation within a group, albeit teacher-teacher, teacher-student or student-student (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

In this study, I acknowledge that teachers do not work in isolation from each other, their colleagues, or the administration. Instead, they are members of a school-wide community. They are in constant interaction as they move from one class period to the next day after day. As such, they engage in conversations throughout the school day either as small groups of teachers according to content area or grade level, or as individuals in passing. Similarly, as members of a shared community, they adhere to school-wide rules and systems often with little say in how
these rules and systems operate. Because of this, what happens in the classroom has consequences for the school community.

In this study, the establishment and maintenance of a CSR community is promoted by the teacher in relation to her students and cooperating coach. Instruction and planning are situated in social interactions between teachers, coaches and students within the context of CSR. Ideally, coaches provide teachers in the CSR study with constructive feedback, support and model lessons. Through active participation, observation and reflection teachers understand how to become more linguistically and culturally conscious, effective science and social studies instructors with the ultimate goals of mastering CSR instructional techniques and enhancing student achievement throughout the process. This acquisition of knowledge occurs in a process called internalization where “sustained social and individual endeavors become[s] a constituent part of the interaction with what is known and leads to the creation of new knowledge” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p. 197). In this study, participants co-constructed new knowledge with other teachers, their students and their coach through these practices.

**Personal domain.** The personal domain represents teachers’ previous personal and professional experiences, their perceived intercultural competence, language orientations and their beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students. The personal domain is supported by the language orientations teachers possess which are reflected in their attitudes and beliefs toward students’ native language use and its application in the classroom.

**Language orientations.** Richard Ruíz, a scholar of language planning and policy development, suggests three orientations when thinking about how language development is perceived in a society (Crawford, 2004). These orientations reflect the differing opinions of a
nation’s people. The following orientations, or ideologies, are in no way linear or fixed. That is to say, there is some overlap in characteristics within and across orientations.

*Language as a problem.* Some people view the native language of ELLs as a problem or deficit for students to overcome. Here the central concern is with the complications that can arise from linguistic diversity such as poverty, illiteracy and ethnic hostility (Crawford, 2004).

Thinking of limited English proficiency as a problem, for example, a *disability of* children who are *disadvantaged* by their linguistic-minority backgrounds, implies the need for remediation to bring English learners up to standard, to compensate for their cultural deprivation. (Crawford, 2004, pg. 73)

In classrooms where teachers hold this orientation, educational instruction tends to focus on the assimilation and acculturation of emerging bilingual students. Bilingualism becomes subtractive, meaning that acquisition of the dominant language is obtained at the expense of the minority language or culture causing a weakening or loss of the mother tongue (Landry, Allard & Deveau, 2009).

People who hold this orientation promote language restrictionism, the belief that speaking exclusively in English should be a requirement for Americans in certain contexts (Crawford, 2004). Some would argue that the most practical context for such practice is the classroom. However, this sink-or-swim mentality can have detrimental effects on emerging bilinguals, both socially and academically. In fact, research has shown that “learning one’s language for identity reasons does not lead to less motivation to learn the dominant language because one still tends to be motivated to learn this high-status language for social mobility or instrumental reasons” (Landry et al., 2009).
Language as a right. Proponents of this orientation emphasize the social implications of languages. They are concerned with issues of social justice and equal access for minorities especially when it comes to rights associated with schools, courts, voting booths, and other public facilities and institutions (Crawford, 2004). Language as a right not only benefits a collective group of linguistic minorities, but individuals as well.

Advocates of this orientation believe in both ethnic entitlement and maintenance of native language and culture. Additionally, they demand native-language accommodations while preserving their right to English instruction and equal educational access (Crawford, 2004). Whether supporters of this belief deem that ESL services will suffice, others assert that exposure to both languages is best achieved through effective transitional programs, either early or late exit, (though the latter yields better long-term results) or dual language programs (Ovando & Combs, 2012).

Language as a resource. People who support the ideology of language as a resource, or asset, believe that language acquisition yields power. A central component of this viewpoint is that bilingualism is additive meaning:

[S]tudent’s proficiency [in a native language]…[is] conceived as a resource: a useful tool not only for academic achievement but also for English acquisition; a way to enhance cultural identity, familial ties, and social adjustment; a future advantage in the job market because of its growing value to employers; and a potential contribution to monolingual American students where schools are able to exploit the opportunity. (Crawford, 2004, p. 73)

Teachers who believe in language as a resource promote instructional programs whose goals align with dual language cultivation and preservation, as demonstrated with two-way
immersion pedagogy. Those who view language as a resource and support the principle of additive bilingualism, therefore, believe in integration and the transformative power and ability of linguistic or cultural capital to strengthen within group competencies and between group social interactions. According to Laudry and Allard (2010), basic indicators of cultural capital for linguistic minorities include access to schools or educational programs in a non-dominant language.

Through this orientation lens, CSR teachers encourage students to make meaning of a text by discussing the meaning of unknown English words and key concepts in Spanish among peers with similar language and cultural backgrounds. Students also discuss ideas in Spanish while coming up with gists (summary statements) and generating text-related questions even when the text is in English. Although this may not seem like a strong strategy for emerging bilingual students initially due to language suppressive experiences in schools that promote the exclusive use of English (Hopewell, 2011), students are reinvited to use Spanish through CSR. Consequently, for the first time in this particular project, CSR model lessons, texts, cue cards, posters, flipcharts and learning logs have been translated into Spanish so that schools offering transitional native language instruction can utilize this instructional strategy with native-Spanish speakers.

**Domain of consequence.** The domain of consequence is what happens to teachers and students as a result of the other three domains (the external domain, personal domain, and domain of practice). In this study, this domain was informed by two primary measures (one for teachers and one for students); namely, the intercultural development orientations of teachers according to the IDI (Intercultural Development Inventory), and the SPS (Student Perception Survey). These measures are described in detail in the methodology chapter (Ch. 3).
Domain of practice. The domain of practice refers to the presence or absence of culturally relevant pedagogical components and knowledge acquired through theories of language acquisition and coaching opportunities in the classroom related to CSR instruction. This domain is supported by the underlying theories of CSR (namely cooperative learning and reciprocal teaching), theories of bilingualism, sociocultural theories related to situated practices, and culturally relevant pedagogy. Although I recognize that all of these theories inform this domain, only the latter will be discussed in detail here.

Culturally relevant pedagogy. Programs and pedagogical practices that seek to align themselves with the goals and characteristics of culturally relevant pedagogy, defined in this study as producing students who can achieve academically, who demonstrate cultural competence in maintaining their community and heritage ways with language and other cultural practices while acquiring dominant ones, and who can understand and critique the existing social order (Ladson-Billings, 1995), capitalize on and integrate students’ funds of knowledge into instructional practices, incorporate principles of a humanizing pedagogy and recognize education for all as a multicultural endeavor. Teachers who implement and embody these principles and practices create additive educative experiences in an effort to increase equitable educational attainment and opportunity for emergent bilingual students.

Humanizing pedagogy. Humanizing pedagogy is grounded in the belief that teachers’ and students’ lives are influenced by societal power, racial and ethnic identities, and cultural values (Bartolomé, 1994; Freire, 1987; Nieto & Rolón, 1997; Salazar & Fránquiz, 2008). Thus, the quest for teachers is figuring out how students learn, not whether they are able to learn (Huerta, 2011). Ultimately, it is important that neither educational policies nor pedagogical practices (in)advertently dehumanize the students. School policies and teachers’ practices reflect
these humanizing beliefs when children’s home and community language and culture are used to support learning and students’ identity formation, when school codes and customs are explicitly taught, when mainstream knowledge is disseminated amongst emerging bilingual students, enabling them to participate in the dominant culture (Huerta, 2011). Additive educative experiences contain elements of humanizing pedagogy, facilitating students’ academic performance and disposition towards school.

In this study I sought to better understand how middle school teachers in an urban school district in the Rocky Mountain region of the United States rejected or embraced attributes of humanizing pedagogical practices toward their emerging bilingual students specifically while implementing CSR in the content areas of science and social studies. Additionally, I explored the impacts these practices had on their beliefs regarding emerging bilingual students’ capabilities as learners in mainstream classrooms. Through attitudinal surveys, individual interviews and classroom observations, I documented and analyzed their personal and professional experiences before, during and after implementation of a reading comprehension instructional model for these students. The particular reading comprehension approach, Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR), enabled participants to see that reading skills and strategies are essential elements of learning, fundamental to both content knowledge and language acquisition.

*Funds of knowledge.* The term funds of knowledge is defined as “historically accumulated and culturally developed bodies of knowledge and skills essential for household or individual functioning and well-being” (Moll, Amanti, Neff & Gonzalez, 1992). Luis Moll worked with teachers to incorporate students’ funds of knowledge into lesson plans and subsequent classroom instruction. By learning about students from a holistic perspective, teachers were able to create
home-school connections for both students and parents by drawing on their cultural and linguistic resources. For example, upon learning that a student’s mother made candy, a teacher participating in the Moll et al. study (1992) asked the parent to come into the classroom to share her knowledge and expertise with the students. This enabled students to learn how to make candy from natural (fruit) ingredients and to engage in rich discussion about general nutrition.

Additionally, students’ ability to identify cognates, words that are orthographically, syntactically and semantically similar across languages, can be a fund of knowledge used to bridge community and classroom practices (Bravo et al., 2007; Montelongo et al., 2011). Because the majority of Spanish-English cognates are high-frequency Spanish and low-frequency English words derived from both French aristocracy and Latin, native Spanish-speakers may have an advantage over monolingual English speakers when acquiring academic English (Bravo et al., 2007). Thus, teachers incorporate students’ funds of knowledge into lessons through purposeful planning and intentional instruction.

In this study, I explored the various ways in which teachers drew upon emerging bilingual students’ funds of knowledge through content-specific literacy events, namely in the areas of science and social studies. As previously mentioned, through CSR students are taught how to use cognates, words that contain similar semantic and phonological structure from their native language ($L_1$) to English ($L_2$), in order to figure out the meaning of unknown words while reading, and are also encouraged to discuss texts in their native language. Providing students access to content-area knowledge through native language supports and creating a learning space in which they are encouraged to discuss English texts in Spanish, so drawing on their full linguistic repertoire, can have empowering effects on students’ self-efficacy. In this study, CSR teachers drew on students’ funds of knowledge by connecting CSR lesson topics and readings to
students’ talents and interests in and outside of the school setting through thoughtful text selection.

*Multicultural education.* Nieto (1999) describes the perspectives of experienced teachers in creating multicultural learning communities. These two teachers allude to the importance and interconnectedness of language and culture in the classroom. Nieto includes these teachers’ anecdotes as a means to facilitate discussion about perceptions of bilingual programs and the importance of understanding language acquisition for all students. Nieto finds that for some, seeing value in multicultural and multilingual education is a process that takes time.

The first teacher, Román, discusses the unfortunate underlying reality of bilingual programs as both remedial and underappreciated entities in schools (Nieto, 1999). She challenges educators to rethink the ways in which schools stifle or build upon students’ native-language skills and encourages all schools to become places where bilingualism is promoted and valued among monolingual children as well bilingual speakers. As an educator who trains pre-service teachers, Román brings these aforementioned issues to the forefront through course required readings and subsequent class discussions centered on students’ social class and language orientation while working toward transforming teachers’ perceptions and practices *poco a poco* (little by little) throughout the academic year.

Similarly, Nieto (1999) believes that student learning and teacher transformation are underlying processes of multicultural and multilingual education. This principle is reiterated through the case study of another teacher, Bill Dunn. In his experience learning Spanish over a three month period, Bill discovers things about himself as a learner that require him to depend on his students as teachers. Nieto (1999) includes an excerpt from the teacher’s journal in which a student responds in an effort to show her support for this teacher’s transformation. She states,
“A lot of these teachers around here are [k]no[w]-it-alls. They think they know everything. When you try to learn Spanish, you are showing me that you are a learner too” (p.152).

According to Nieto (1999), “[l]earning from one’s students means that teachers predictably become more multicultural in their outlook and worldview” (p. 154). As student demographics change and classrooms become more culturally and linguistically diverse places, it is imperative that all teachers are equipped with positive perceptions of student learning, and the instructional tools, strategies and know-how to effectively engage and educate emerging bilinguals in the classroom. Collaborative Strategic Reading is one more instructional tool that has the potential to transform teachers’ practices and perceptions. Through cooperative learning structures with individual student roles and heterogeneous groupings, teachers promote opportunities for diversified student interaction by creating a student-centered learning environment in which students’ individual contributions are valued and utilized.

Cooperative learning is not just about putting students in small groups. Like any instructional strategy, it is about quality instruction coupled with a student-centered approach to learning. Heterogeneous grouping, as opposed to randomized or student selected groups, increases the potential for learning by pushing lower-level students thinking and reasoning and by providing opportunities for high achievers to elaborate explanations related to content-area learning through structured and meaningful interaction (Slavin, 1996). Moreover, students ask more questions and challenge one another’s answers more frequently amongst each other than during whole-class, teacher-led discussions, because of the non-threatening nature of small group interactions (Garcia, 1991). Participants in a study conducted by Antil, Jenkins, Wayne and Vadasy (1998) reported enhanced academic learning through “kid talk”. By having students restate concepts in familiar, modified language, teachers noticed increased production and
comprehension during subsequent content-related discussions and assessments (Antil et al, 1998). Teachers who employ collaborative group structures like CSR have the potential to develop positive beliefs and attitudes regarding students’ academic capabilities when they notice increased student engagement and academic performance, especially toward emerging bilinguals, who may be more reserved than native English speaking peers in a large group setting.

Significance

The conceptual framework for this study captures the complexity of teacher change. Additionally, by viewing change as an iterative process that occurs within and across four domains of the teacher’s world (the external, personal, practical and consequential), it is clear how change in one domain can lead or motivate change in another. Although many theories inform the various components of each domain, the underlying theory of the change environment, situated learning, posits that learning is situated in social interactions. These social interactions among teacher-teacher, teacher-student or teacher-principal, challenge teachers’ existing practices and presuppositions and encourage/inhibit teachers’ professional and personal growth.

The initial goal of the study was for teachers to use the knowledge acquired through CSR implementation, professional development and related coaching experiences to develop positive beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ capabilities. Teachers’ positive perceptions could then serve as an impetus for emerging bilingual students increased social and academic achievement. However, it became clear once in participating schools, that there were a multitude of other factors (in addition to CSR) that challenged and supported teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. By identifying these
factors, my intent was to show how extant school systems and in-class structures necessitate school-based and systemic reform regarding the effects of teachers’ perceptions on emerging bilingual students’ success.

**Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of this study was to examine the factors (both in-class and school-based) that support and/or challenge teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. Adding to the extant research base pertaining to CSR, and teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and expectations of emerging bilingual students, this study sought to answer the following questions through mixed-methods approaches:

1. What instructional practices and in-class structures (i.e., CSR instruction, classroom management, paraprofessionals, use of students’ native language) challenge or support teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? In what ways?

2. What school-specific contextual factors outside of the classroom (i.e., school climate, systems and structures) challenge or support teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? How so?

3. Do teachers who have used CSR for a year have higher IDI scores than teachers who have not when controlling for potential differences in IDI pre-test scores? If so, in what ways?

In this study, I hypothesized that teachers with more positive perceptions of their emerging bilingual students (as measured by the IDI, teacher interviews and classroom observations) implemented instructional practices and in-class structures that met the social and academic needs of these students (as measured by classroom observations and the SPS). That is,
teachers’ level of cultural competence informed their pedagogical practices and perceptions of emerging bilingual students.

Use of Terms

The following key terms I use throughout the duration of the dissertation:

*Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR)* – the reading comprehension strategy employed in this study that combines elements of reciprocal teaching (Palincsar & Brown, 1984) and cooperative learning (Johnson & Johnson, 1989)

*Colorado Measure of Academic Standards (CMAS)* – the state’s large scale assessment designed to measure student performance in the Colorado Academic Standards in Science and Social Studies (Pearson, 2015)

*Cultural and Linguistically Diverse (CLD)* – an education term used by the U.S. Department of Education to define students enrolled in education programs who come from homes and communities where English is not the primary language of communication

*Development Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS)* – a theory outlining six stages of intercultural development (denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, integration) (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003)

*Developmental Orientation (DO)* – the actual level of intercultural development calculated systematically using the combined results from the contextualizing questions (constructed response items), a qualitative measure, and the Likert-scale items (fixed-response), a quantitative measure on the IDI

*English Language Acquisition (ELA)* – the process by which one develops proficiency in the English language

*English Language Development (ELD)* – the provision of direct instruction in English language usage including: content vocabulary development, survival vocabulary development, oral language development, and the development of reading and writing skills in English

*English as a Second Language (ESL)* – a model for providing services to emerging bilingual students that includes supported English content instruction and English language development

*Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (GMRT)* - a reading comprehension assessment (MacGinitie, MacGinitie, Maria, Dreyer, & Hughes, 2000)

*Implementation Validity Checklist (IVC)* - an observational tool that was used to measure teachers’ fidelity to the CSR model

*Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI)* – a statistically reliable, theory-based and cross-culturally valid measure of intercultural competence used to determine orientations to cultural
difference at the individual, group and organizational level (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003)

*Information Technology (IT)* – the technology involving the development, maintenance, and use of computer systems, software, and networks for the processing and distribution of data (Merriam-Webster, 2015)

*Measures of Effective Teaching (MET)* – the name of a multi-year, multi-school district study which found that teachers’ students’ survey results were moderately predictive of students’ achievement gains, as measured by standardized tests

*No Child Left Behind (NCLB)* - the 2002 reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the major federal law authorizing federal spending on programs to support K-12 schooling, requiring states, school districts, and schools to ensure all students are proficient in grade-level math and reading by 2014 and show “adequate yearly progress” toward meeting this goal (New America Foundation, 2014)

*Perceived Orientation (PO)* – the perceived level of intercultural development calculated systematically using the combined results from the contextualizing questions (constructed response items), a qualitative measure, and the Likert-scale items (fixed-response), a quantitative measure on the IDI

*Professional Development (PD)* – a wide variety of specialized training, formal education, or advanced professional learning intended to help teachers improve their professional knowledge, competence, skill, and effectiveness (Great Schools Partnership, 2013)

*Professional Learning Community (PLC)* - a group of educators that meets regularly, shares expertise, and works collaboratively to improve teaching skills and the academic performance of students (Great Schools Partnership, 2014)

*Student Perception Survey (SPS)* – a measure of teacher effectiveness incorporating student voice used by the school district in this study

*Test of Silent Reading Efficiency and Comprehension (TOSREC)* - a reading test that assesses silent reading of connected text for comprehension

*Transitional Native Language Instruction (TNLI)* – a model for providing services emerging bilingual learners that includes native language instruction in Spanish, supported English content instruction and English language development (term created by the school district, 1999)

*Transitional Colorado Assessment Program (TCAP)* – an assessment of math, reading and writing skills based on the Colorado Department of Education’s content standards administered to students in grades 3-10, formally known as the Colorado Student Assessment Program (CSAP)

*Typical (TYP)* – used to refer to teachers’ instructional practices when not using the reading comprehension strategy, CSR
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Given that “cultural membership has a ‘high social profile,’ in the sense that it affects how others perceive and respond to us, which in turn shapes our self-identity” (Kymlicka, 1995, p. 7), teachers’ attitudes, beliefs, discourse and expectations toward emerging bilingual students affect their success both in and out of the classroom. Teachers’ ideologies determine the quality and the extent to which students receive restricted or enhanced access to content-area instruction. In essence, they serve as the gatekeepers of knowledge for emerging bilingual students whose parents may or may not have the dominant language, resources and/or level of education necessary to supplement for inadequate instruction.

In addition to teachers’ ideologies, there are a multitude of factors that impact emerging bilingual students’ access to equitable opportunities to learn in U.S. classroom. In order to gain a better understanding of these factors and how they influence teacher and student perceptions alike, the review of the literature for this study provides a comprehensive overview of previously conducted research in these areas. For these reasons, the literature review is organized into seven key sections.

First, I lay the foundation for my argument necessitating a change in teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward emerging bilingual students academic capabilities by exploring studies related to value-added and deficit-driven teacher discourses in culturally and linguistically (CLD) classrooms. Second, I discuss studies pertaining to teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward diversity and students’ native language use in the classroom. Third, I examine teachers’ academic expectations of emerging bilingual students. Next, I explore emerging bilingual students’ perceptions about learning and belonging in U.S. classrooms. Then, I discuss previous research regarding teachers’ cultural competence. Next, I summarize key findings from earlier
studies regarding the efficacy and impact of Collaborative Strategic Reading, the instructional strategy used in this study, on culturally and linguistically diverse student behaviors and academic outcomes. Finally, drawing primarily from cognitive psychology, I present a chronological understanding of the evolution of models for professional growth and their depiction of teacher change and student achievement.

Value-Added and Deficit-Driven Discourses in Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Classrooms

Discourses are socially constructed. Social identities are manifested in what we say, ultimately reflecting who we are and what we think and value (Paltridge, 2006). Therefore what teachers say about students and when and where it is said matters. In effect, teacher talk can impact students’ social, emotional and academic well-being (Bourne, 2001; Callahan, 2005; de Oliveira & Athananses, 2007; Huerta, 2011; Marx, 2001; Pappamihiel, 2007; Souto-Manning, 2006; Yoon, 2008). Subsequently, studies of discourse in school-related settings have been conducted for decades.

In the 1960s, Labov began studying the nonstandard forms of English used by school age children in both structured and unstructured settings. Using the sociolinguistic interview, Labov was able to elicit particular speech patterns characteristic of a group, namely six African American male adolescent and pre-adolescent peer groups from South Central Harlem, to show that these children did in fact possess the vocabulary and capacity to learn (1969). In doing so, he sought to challenge the discourse associated with linguistic theory according to Chomsky (1965) that concerned itself with an ideal speaker-listener in a homogeneous speech community, knowing that speech communities are dynamic and change according to external factors and influences. Labov worked to disprove the deficit theory or belief that culturally and
linguistically diverse (CLD) children are deficient because of the impoverished cultural, linguistic and economic environment in which they are raised. Additionally, he found that there are sociolinguistic factors that control CLD children’s speech, especially the asymmetrical power relationship between teacher and student. He claimed that in this situation, the child knows that anything she says can be used against her (1969). Labov also felt that cultural and verbal deprivation theories are used to mask the real problem: Instead of working to correct the deficits of the educational system, the myths of cultural and verbal deprivation blame the child (1969).

More recently, Blommaert, Collins and Slembrouck (2005) wrote, “Problems with multilingualism are presented as problems of individuals” (205). Oftentimes teachers blame students for what they perceptively can and cannot do without looking within themselves and the school environment to identify other influential factors that serve to impede academic and/or social achievement. Souto-Manning (2006) used critical narrative analysis to investigate a teacher’s discourse toward emerging bilingual students. In her study analyzing interview transcripts with a veteran special education teacher and her own teacher journal entries, she found that teachers’ inadequate training and ignorance led to implementation of inappropriate instructional strategies for emerging bilingual students. Similarly, Escamilla (2005) challenges the “best practices” paradigm because it allows teachers to blame students when practices that are deemed appropriate for all students fail to work for some, especially emerging bilingual students.

Additionally, the ways in which teachers talk about their students are largely influenced by their own educational, cultural and linguistic backgrounds. For example, in a quantitative study of 62 female European American elementary school teachers, Tyler (2006) found that students who displayed competitive and individualistic classroom behaviors characteristic of
Euro/mainstream society were rated by teachers as having higher levels of motivation and achievement than students who demonstrated vervistic and communal traits more typical to Afro cultural societies. Similarly, in a year-long qualitative study of three mainstream classroom teachers with ESL students using teacher interviews and classroom observations, Clair (1995) found that teachers have misconceptions about second language acquisition and desire quick instruction fixes and one-size-fits all approaches to teaching emerging bilinguals. For example, one mainstream teacher of ESL students stated, “I mean as far as teaching goes, teaching is the same no matter what kinds of kids you have” (Clair, p. 191, 1995). According to Clair (1995), this statement is problematic because it denies the utility of specialized knowledge and instruction for second language development, it takes individual student differences for granted, and it ignores the complexities of the social and academic setting in relation to student achievement.

Economic and power asymmetries between and across cultural groups may also impact how and what is said about students and teachers alike. In a qualitative study of 69 U.S. teachers in Mexico, Escamilla, Aragon, and Franquiz (2009) investigated the transformative potential of a Study in Mexico Program on teachers’ beliefs and observations about schooling in Mexico. Of the 69 participants, 11 were born and educated in Mexico, 32 were born in the U.S. and identified themselves as Mexican-American, 23 were Anglo, two were of Asian descent, and one reported that she was born in India, but schooled in the U.S. Regarding language proficiency, 47 considered themselves bilingual (English/Spanish) and 22 reported they were monolingual English speakers. Data sources included a survey, focus group discussions, participants’ daily journal entries, and field notes of school observations and class sessions. In general, researchers found that teachers used coded language when comparing teaching methods and materials from
the U.S. and Mexico as if the former were superior to the latter. For example, one participant stated, “My cooperating teacher wants to learn from me. I came to learn from her, but it seems like much of her knowledge is stale” (Escamilla et al., p. 14, 2009). Over time, however, perspectives changed as participants began to challenge their assumptions as evidence in the following statement, “My Colorado first graders could not read these stories [read by first graders in Mexico]. I am starting to think that I need to raise my expectations” (Escamilla et al., p. 14, 2009).

Furthermore, although minority teachers often experience internalized oppression when working in a school system dominated by white middle-class female educators (Griffin, 1997; Tappan, 2006), some studies have found that there is greater congruency between teachers and students who share similar language and culture experiences (Flores, 2001, Huerta, 2011). In a qualitative case study of four teachers in California, Huerta (2011) found that effective teachers held high expectations and demanded rigor from their Latino students. One teacher in particular, an immigrant herself, believed that it was her job to help these students make greater gains than their non-immigrant peers. She claimed, “Here [in the U.S.] you have to prove yourself and you have to be one step ahead…We [immigrants] have to do things differently. Yet these kids are capable and it’s my job to get them there!” (Huerta, p. 46, 2011). As an immigrant she felt that students in similar circumstances needed to achieve twice as much in order to make it in the U.S. (Huerta, 2011).

In a mixed methods study, Lee and Oxelson (2006) used survey data and semi-structured interviews to investigate teachers’ attitudes toward students’ maintenance of their heritage language in the classroom. Researchers gathered survey data from 69 teachers (14 male, 55 female) and interviewed ten of these same teachers throughout California. Of the 69 survey
participants, 38 taught elementary school students and 31 taught at the middle/high school level. Although the ethnicity of the participants was not reported, 24 of the participants also indicated that they were fluent in a language other than English. After thorough analysis of the data, researchers found that teachers who knew two or more languages and had BCLAD\textsuperscript{5}/ESL training felt that heritage language maintenance was important and that it was their responsibility to support and encourage native language use in the classroom. Alternatively, monolingual teachers or teachers without training as language educators held either indifferent or negative attitudes toward heritage language maintenance and felt it was not their responsibility in the classroom.

Teachers’ deficit-driven discourses are perpetuated by high-stakes policies like NCLB (2001) and their associated testing. High-Stakes testing leads to high-stakes performance for teachers. Lee and Oxelson (2006) found that the pressure on teachers to teach to the test inhibited them from meeting students’ individual needs. Teachers felt that because the test was in English, emphasis should be on teaching English in the classroom. If students’ needs were not covered within the content of the assessment, then they were not being met (Lee & Oxelson, 2006). These language restrictive policies can further deficit-driven discourses.

Finally, researchers have found that school climate matters. Walker, Shafer and Iiams (2004) interviewed six ELL teachers and found that principals created school environments that either tolerated student’s native language or did not. Two teachers reported that the principal at their school gathered all emerging bilingual students together to explain that native language use on the playground was unacceptable. At that same school, the janitor and lunch monitor withheld breakfast from students who spoke their native language in line. In devastating cases

\footnote{BCLAD stands for Bilingual Cross-cultural, Language, and Academic Development.}
such as those previously mentioned, would not it be better for all parties involved to be as a participant in de Oliviera and Athanases’ (2007) qualitative study states, “[more] culturally sensitive than culturally angry” (p. 212)? Unfortunately, however, positive and promising attitudes such as these are more often the exception than the norm in U.S. schools.

Collectively, these studies show that there is a multitude of internal and external factors impacting discourses regarding culturally and linguistically diverse learners in school settings. Moreover, previous researchers provide empirical evidence to support the notion that deficit-driven discourses regarding culturally and linguistically diverse learners are commonplace in U.S. schools today and have been for decades. These negative discourses are perpetuated by the educational training, cultural and linguistic backgrounds, and socioeconomic status of teachers and students, educational policies, and overall school climate. For these reasons, the aforementioned factors are considerations I took into account when collecting demographic data about teachers, and analyzing field notes from classroom observations and teacher interviews. More importantly, however, these factors informed each domain of my conceptual framework: external domain (school climate), personal domain (cultural and linguistic backgrounds of teachers, socioeconomic status), domain of practice (educational training), and domain of consequence (cultural competence).

**Teachers’ Attitudes and Beliefs toward Diversity and Students’ Native Language Use in the Classroom.**

Huerta (2011) investigated the notion that “teachers’ prior knowledge and life experiences strongly influence the way they perceive the nature of learning and their students” (p. 38) by conducting an investigational ethnographic study with four teachers of Latino children in two elementary schools on the west coast of the United States. She examined the pedagogical
perspectives and practices of these Bay Area elementary school teachers using focus groups, field notes and interviews as primary forms of data. Through her analysis, Huerta (2011) discovered that these teachers acknowledge and respect students’ culture, which was subsequently reflected in their individual educational environments. Additionally, teachers held all students to high performance standards and expectations modeling competency through their pedagogical practices, which enhanced students’ sense of efficacy as learners (Huerta, 2011).

Moreover, Huerta compared teachers’ perspectives toward their emerging bilingual learners by drawing primarily on Freire’s (1972) idea of praxis, reflection into action, measuring what teachers understood about their students against the types of practices they implemented in the classroom. Huerta (2011) discovered that these teachers shared several characteristics evidentiary of humanizing pedagogical practices and beliefs. For example, they explicitly linked curricular concepts to students’ lived experiences by activating their prior knowledge. They created sociocultural learning contexts by co-constructing knowledge through students’ culture and language, deeming the latter to be a vital tool for students’ academic success. These teachers rejected the deficit perspective held by many educators regarding bilingual Latino students’ aptitude as learners, instead viewing them as competent individuals. Furthermore, these teachers employed educational practices that exposed their students to societal inequities. Consequently, they empowered their students with the tools and strategies necessary to combat injustices regarding disproportionate power structures which pervade the educational system at various levels: locally within the school and community, nationally through policy and globally.

In another study, Moll, Sáez, and Dworin (2001) presented findings from two case studies in which teachers used students’ native language, Spanish, to engage in “reflective literacy.” In the first case study, conducted with two kindergarten students, the researchers
found that because of the safe classroom climate created by the teacher, children were able to function as “cultural agents,” speaking and writing in both English and Spanish depending on the language used by the initial speaker. In the second case study, conducted in a third grade classroom, the authors illustrated the student’s use of biliteracy as she investigated a research topic reading books in one language, Spanish, and writing a report in another, English. Because Spanish and English shared equal status as unmarked languages in this classroom, students used either language in social and academic settings with comfort and confidence (Moll, Sáez, & Dworin, 2001).

Conversely in a mixed methods study conducted by Batt (2008) which sought to discover educators’ perceptions regarding challenges and needs for improved instruction of emerging bilingual students, findings revealed that educators’ qualifications were the greatest factor affecting the quality of education received by emerging bilingual students. Lack of diversity and multicultural training, resources and funding led to understaffed and overworked ESL and bilingual teachers. Participating mainstream teachers felt that the success of emerging bilingual students was up to ESL and bilingual teachers. However, according to the ESL and bilingual teachers, providing equitable educational opportunities for these students is everyone’s obligation (Batt, 2008).

Similarly, García-Nevarez, Stafford and Aria (2005) conducted a mixed-methods study to investigate elementary school teachers’ attitudes regarding emerging bilingual students’ native languages and its use in instruction. Survey responses from 152 first through fourth grade teachers and focus-group interviews with 15 of these survey respondents in Arizona indicated that attitudes toward these students differed significantly with the type of certification or endorsement teachers held, years teaching experience, and ethnicity. Given that this study took
place in Arizona, an English-only state, findings cannot be extrapolated to other contexts. For example, bilingual certified teachers were more supportive of emerging bilingual students’ use of their L1 in the classroom than either ESL or traditionally certified elementary school teachers (García-Nevarez et al, 2005). The authors also found that the more years the teacher taught, the more likely he/she was to have a negative attitude toward students’ use of their L1 in the classroom (García-Nevarez et al, 2005). Finally, Latino teachers expressed more positive attitudes and acceptance toward the use of students’ L1 in the classroom than non-Latinos (García-Nevarez et al, 2005).

Karabenick, Clemens and Noda (2004) drew similar conclusions. In a quantitative study, the authors collaborated with a school district that had recently experienced a flux of refugee and immigrant students to better understand how to meet the needs of these students. Participants included 729 teachers, 18% of whom reported fluency in a language other than English, and 5% who indicated having had credentials or training in ESL or bilingual education. Survey results revealed that although teachers held positive attitudes toward emerging bilingual students, bilingual education and bilingualism in general, a significant proportion of these teachers held less supportive beliefs and attitudes toward their ability to meet students’ educational needs through culturally responsive pedagogical practices. Teachers with less favorable attitudes were less accepting of emerging bilingual students in their classes and believed that L1 proficiency inhibited school performance and hindered L2 learning (Karabenick, Clemens, & Noda, 2004). Subsequently, these negative perceptions led to diminished feelings of self-efficacy toward their ability to successfully teach these students.

In a quantitative study reporting teachers’ opinions about the use of native language instruction for emerging bilingual students, Ramos (2001) examined influential factors that
potentially affect teachers’ perceptions. Considering grade levels taught, years of teaching experience in current grade level and years teaching overall, Ramos used a survey to measure 218 K-8 Californian teachers’ opinions on native language theory and practice. Concurrent with previous researchers’ findings discussed thus far, the author discovered that although teachers expressed support for the underlying theory, they felt less supportive of its practical implementation in the classroom. Moreover, participants reported that the knowledge imparted upon them in credential classes and teacher preparatory programs had no influence on their currently held opinions (Ramos, 2001).

Additionally, Lee, Luykx, Buxton and Shaver (2007) conducted a two-year mixed methods study to examine the impact of professional development sessions aimed to assist elementary teachers in their ability to incorporate students’ language and culture into science instruction. Participants included 43 teachers, two of whom were male. Of these 43 participants, 25 reported speaking a native language other than English, 34 identified themselves as non-White, 36 were endorsed in ESOL education, and 25 held master’s degrees. Similar to conclusions drawn by aforementioned researchers, the authors found that teachers’ beliefs and practices did not show significant change upon completion of the professional development intervention. Although participants rated the importance of incorporating students’ home language into science instruction as high, they continued to view the influence of students’ culture on science learning as something detrimental, a deficit to overcome (Lee et al, 2007). Consequently, these negatively held beliefs prevented emerging bilingual students from receiving high-quality science instruction.

Taken as a whole, these studies highlight the important role that teachers’ beliefs and attitudes play when determining emerging bilingual students’ equitable opportunities to learn in
U.S. classrooms. Extending upon this idea, other researchers have sought to measure teachers’ expectations of emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities in the classroom by collecting and analyzing data from classroom observations, teacher interviews, survey and questionnaire responses, teacher-student feedback and overall classroom interactions. These same data sources, in addition to Student Perception Survey data, were used in this study to better understand teachers’ beliefs and attitudes toward their emerging bilingual students.

**Teachers’ Academic Expectations of Emerging Bilingual Students**

Generally speaking, students will achieve in a manner consistent with teachers’ expectations (Donovan & Cross, 2002). In a mixed-methods study, DaSilva Iddings (2005) explored the ways in which emerging bilingual elementary school students in English-dominant mainstream classrooms gained access to classroom activities, language and participatory opportunities. Participants included 16 second grade students (10 monolingual English, six native Spanish speakers), and three teachers⁶ (a classroom teacher with over 20 years of teaching experience and training in special education, a special education teacher’s aide, and a student teacher). Through classroom observations and follow-up teacher interviews, the author found that emerging bilingual students’ access to quality instruction was complicated by unequal opportunities for participation, reduced language demands and expectations and lack of clarity/articulation by teachers of instructional purposes and objectives for emerging bilingual students (DaSilva Iddings, 2005). This correlated in a negative way to student outcomes.

Other research findings suggest that teachers’ expectations toward students vary according to their race and socioeconomic status. In a quantitative research study conducted with 80 parochial grade school teachers regarding students’ academic capabilities and teachers’

---

⁶ All teachers were monolingual English speakers.
expectations, McCombs and Gay (2001) found that these elementary school teachers held the highest expectations for middle-class White students and lowest expectations for lower-class Latino students. Initially, participants were assigned to one of four conditions in which they received a student profile sheet (same for all students) and photo of a student (either White or Latino dressed in clothes reflective of their socioeconomic status), and were asked to make an academic prediction for that child. Then teachers were given verbal IQ information about the student and were asked to rank that child in a class of 30 students. Before making this determination, half of the participants were told the child’s IQ was high (128) and half were told it was low (85). Overall, participants rated students with higher SES more favorably than lower SES students and White students more favorably than Latinos with White students of higher SES rated more favorably than Latino students of higher SES. When asked to comment on the criterion used to rank the student, 45% of participants reported that physical appearance was the main criteria used to make academic judgments toward these students. This suggests that teachers use students’ physical appearance as an indicator of their academic ability.

Finally, in a year-long qualitative study, Vollmer (2000) examined the assumptions implicit in high school teachers’ discourse around emerging bilingual students and the impact this had on their performance in the classroom. Participants included seven high school teachers from a California school in which 40% of the student population came from non-English backgrounds. Primary data sources consisted of classroom observations and in-depth teacher and student interviews though only analysis from teacher interviews was considered in the report. Taking a critical discourse analytic perspective, Vollmer (2000) found that teachers had different expectations for different subpopulations of emerging bilingual students. Namely, Russian students who comprised 14% of the school’s LEP (limited English proficient)
population were perceived to be the new model minority, a term previously used to stereotype Asian American students. Vollmer found that in general, teachers believed these students were easier to communicate with, more motivated to learn and were capable of assimilation in ways that other Latino and Asian emerging bilingual students were not.

Together these studies raise concerns regarding the potential for differential success and failure rates of emerging bilingual students. According to Vollmer (2000), “Research has shown that teacher expectations of poor performance and resistance to assimilation can lead to neglect and indifference, and ultimately poor performance in school, marginalization and social distance for the stigmatized groups” (p. 64). If teachers strive for their students to achieve assimilation and acculturation, then their expectations of students from culturally and linguistically diverse families will be limited. Therefore, I sought to determine whether or not the teaching ideologies reflected in the aforementioned studies were also shared by the participants in my study before and after they were provided with an instructional tool that had been shown to meet the needs of all students, especially emerging bilinguals.

Emerging Bilingual Students’ Perceptions about Learning and Belonging in U.S. Classrooms

Academic learning can be enhanced when students feel valued and appreciated by their teachers and peers. This is especially true for emerging bilingual students who may feel marginalized due to cultural and linguistic differences. In a quantitative study conducted in Australia, Bernat, Carter, and Hall (2009) investigated the factors that shaped language learners’ beliefs about learning. Drawing from cognitive and personality psychology, the authors used data from the Beliefs About Language Learning Inventory (Horwitz, 1987) and the NEO-Five Factory Inventory (Costa & McCrae, 1985) to explore whether a relationship existed between
learners personality traits and their beliefs about language. Participants included 262 ESL learners ages 17-39 from the following countries: China, Korea, Japan, Thailand, Columbia, Vietnam, Germany, Mexico, Peru, Indonesia, Turkey, France, Hong Kong, Burma, Taiwan, Bosnia, Bangladesh, and Chile. Although the authors found only one correlation between the personality trait of neuroticism and language learning (e.g., the higher a participant scored on the Neuroticism scale, the more difficult they perceived the English language to be), self-reports from the BALLI revealed that students with positive beliefs toward language learning were able to overcome academic problems and sustain motivation to learn whereas those students who held negative beliefs experienced frustration and anxiety in the classroom (Bernat, Carter, & Hall, 2009). The authors conclude that students’ conceptions about learning are both dynamic and open to modification when teachers attend to the cognitive and affective components of emerging bilingual students’ attitudes (Bernat, Carter, & Hall, 2009).

Additionally, other researchers show that classroom placement affects both emerging bilingual students’ academic outcomes and feelings toward school in general. LeClair, Doll, Osborn and Jones (2009) compared the classroom perceptions of emerging bilingual students and general education students based on self-reported results from the ClassMaps Survey, a tool used to measure academic efficacy, self-determination, behavioral self-control, teacher-student relationships, peer friendships, peer conflict, concerns about bullying, and home-school connections. Of the 257 grade 3-5 students surveyed, 37 (14%) received ELL services. Although these emerging bilingual participants did not report their first language, demographic data from the school district’s ELL program reported that 50.2% of students spoke Spanish, 20.3% spoke Vietnamese, 12.9% spoke Arabic, and 7.0% spoke Kurdish, with 46 other languages making up the remaining 9.6% at the time of the study (LeClair, Doll, Osborn, &
The authors found significant differences between emerging bilingual students and their native English speaking counterparts on two of the eight subscales. Overall, emerging bilinguals rated themselves lower in academic efficacy and rated their general education classmates as more likely to follow class rules. Using results such as these from instruments like the ClassMaps Survey, teachers can help strengthen emerging bilingual students’ social and academic competency by investing potential classroom environmental factors that inhibit or enhance instruction and interactions.

In another study Callahan, Wilkinson and Muller (2010) used quantitative methods to estimate the effects of ESL (English as a second language) placement on language minority adolescents’ college preparation and academic achievement. Drawing from a sample of 2,352 high school sophomores in 523 schools, the authors compared data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study and course information from students’ transcripts against that of their mainstream peers. Findings revealed that emerging bilingual students placed in ESL classes (n=493) were less likely to enroll in college preparatory coursework by the end of high school. Furthermore, emerging bilingual students placed in ESL classes scored lower on the 12th grade math achievement test and had lower grade point averages than their emerging bilingual peers placed in general education classrooms. Consequently, the authors caution educators against retaining emerging bilingual students in ESL classes and urge administrators and teachers to consider the short and long-term consequences of students’ placement which may limit students’ ability to comply with college pre-requisites.

Early (1989) studied the placement of emerging bilingual students by investigating their integration patterns into general education classrooms. Specifically, the author examined the progress and achievement of a sample of emerging bilingual students, 20 primary and 20
secondary, who entered an ESL program in British Columbia, Canada. Using school reports, personal student files and anecdotal administrative reports over a four year period the author discovered a correlation between the number of years until integration in mainstream classrooms and students’ grades earned in subject-area content classes. The author found that the academic progress monitoring of emerging bilingual students who achieved full integration was non-existent. She also challenged the unrealistic assumption held by many educators that ESL students, both primary and secondary, acquire full proficiency with more rapid integration into mainstream classrooms. This study also highlights the questionable but common practice of withholding academic content from emerging bilingual students until they have acquired full proficiency in the language of instruction.

Additional studies by Rodriguez, Ringler, O’Neal and Bunn (2009) and Cummins, Bismilla, Chow, Cohen, Giampapa, Leoni, Sandhu and Sastri (2006) suggest that school climate and age matter when analyzing emerging bilinguals’ perceptions of educational experiences. Rodriguez et al. (2009) compared monolingual and emerging bilingual elementary school students’ perceptions with respect to school climate, curriculum and instruction, extracurricular activities, self-efficacy and self-esteem using Likert-scale items and interviews of 123 students, 66 of whom were emerging bilinguals from a school in rural North Carolina. Between-group comparisons revealed similar perceptions. Both groups of students felt safe and secure at school, deemed their learning environment to be both clean and welcoming, felt respected and expressed pride in the school overall. Additionally, both groups reported awareness of instructional goals, found content to be moderately challenging and felt teachers varied learning activities. However, significant differences between groups were found at the 5th grade level regarding self-efficacy and self-esteem. Emerging bilinguals reported lower levels of each affective factor.
compared to their monolingual peers. Interestingly, the same held true for emerging bilingual kindergarteners regarding a lower reported self-esteem compared to monolingual classmates.

In an investigation of affect, identity, respect and human relationships in children’s learning, Cummins et al. (2006) analyzed artifacts from first, second, fourth and fifth grade students in various multilingual schools throughout a school district in Toronto, Canada. Student work, observations and interviews revealed that the acknowledgement of their prior experiences and native language by teachers assisted in students’ ability to transfer knowledge and skills across languages. The authors concluded that instructors should communicate respect for students’ language and culture, thus allowing students to engage with literacy and invest their identities in the learning process (Cummins et al, 2006).

Collectively, these studies informed my research by bringing the intersection of language instruction and student beliefs to the forefront in order to better understand how/if these beliefs change teachers’ perceptions of emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. In this study, emerging bilinguals’ beliefs were reflected in Student Perception Survey (SPS) responses and teacher-student, student-student interactions during CSR and typical instruction.

**Building Teachers’ Cultural Competence to Work with Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners**

Cultural competence in education is characterized by the ability to respond to all children’s needs while understanding the sociocultural contexts that impact students’ educational experiences in and outside of the classroom (Barrera & Kramer, 1997). Thus, teachers who are culturally component possess the ability to think, feel, and act according to the ethnic, sociocultural, and linguistic diversity of their students (Lynch & Hanson, 1998).
Several studies investigate factors that inhibit and promote cultural competency among teachers. In an ethnographic study of 18 exemplary African-American teachers (14 female, four male), Foster (1993) sought to identify key characteristics that made these teachers effective with predominantly African-American students. The participants were selected based on community nomination in which community members, namely students, were asked to identify their best teacher. Then the author contacted nominated teachers eliciting their participation in the study. The author found that because these teachers came from different backgrounds (80% urban, 67% from segregated neighborhoods), their beliefs about the purpose and functioning of school varied accordingly. However, because they all possessed knowledge of their community norms and the position of the community within the larger societal context, they felt successful in meeting the needs of their diverse students (Foster, 1993).

In a qualitative study investigating the effectiveness of a professional development to help mainstream teachers of Latino students develop cultural competence, Colombo (2007) collected data from twenty-seven teacher participants. These teachers ranged in experience from 5-15 years and had completed at least one course in cultural diversity in their teacher training. Data sources included 16 workshop observations, 24 field observations of Parent Partnership for Achieving Literacy (PAL) family literacy nights, workshop evaluation forms, brief interviews with all teacher participants, and nine in-depth teacher interviews. Of the 27 participants, 25 reported growth in cultural knowledge and awareness as a result of these workshops, which occurred over a 4½ month period (Colombo, 2007). Additionally, through triangulation of interview, observation, and workshop evaluation data, Colombo (2007) found that teachers’ growth in cultural competence was characterized by the following experiences: a sense of disequilibrium in order to develop empathy for culturally and linguistically diverse students,
increased interaction with people of different cultural backgrounds, combining field experiences with course work through family literacy nights, and the time to make connections between workshop content and students with other teachers. Ultimately, Colombo was able to create opportunities for U.S. teachers to develop cultural competence within the local school context.

Conversely, Dantas (2007) explored the impact that a teaching abroad experience in Brazil had on U.S. teachers from California. In a qualitative study, Dantas (2007) examined six teacher education students understanding of culture and their own cultural identities and how these factors impacted teaching and knowledge of diverse students, families and communities after four preparatory classes in the U.S. and eight days in Brazil. Drawing from sociocultural, ethnographic, and interpretive perspectives, Dantas used data from field notes, videotapes of course activities in Brazil, course assignments and course materials, questionnaires, and interviews to create individual case studies of each participant. The six participants were all female, between 21-29 years old, five of whom identified themselves as European-American and one Mexican-American. All participants came from upper to middle class backgrounds, and four of the six were native Californians. Similar to Colombo (2007), Dantas (2007) found that through the international teaching experience, participants were able to use cultural clashes to reflect upon their own social positioning. These clashes challenged participants’ assumptions about students, classrooms, and learning in Brazil, and ultimately led to the undoing of prior assumptions. This is an important step in the process of learning how to reach and teach students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds (Banks et al, 2005).

In another qualitative study of preservice teachers’ development of cultural competence, Buehler, Gere, Dallavis, and Haviland (2009) analyzed one White teacher’s negotiation with cultural competence over a 12-week period beginning with a lesson she taught as a student
teacher and in the weeks and months that followed. Researchers drew from the following data sources for their analysis: 30 journal entries, 10 videotaped classroom observations with field notes, and 12 audiotaped interviews. Similar to findings previously mentioned, the authors reported that the student was confronted with both cognitive and affective challenges while developing cultural competence over the course of the semester. Specifically, her emotional responses to racialized situations, confronting her Whiteness, and the school context in which she was placed all served to mediate her development of cultural competence (Buehler et al, 2009). This supports Foster’s earlier finding (1993) that developing an understanding of the sociocultural context of schools is essential in order to promote cultural competence.

Together, these studies highlight the important role that social, emotional, and contextual factors play in inhibiting and enhancing the development of cultural competence in teachers. These factors also align with the various domains of the conceptual framework in my study; namely, the external domain (school, professional development), the personal domain (beliefs, attitudes, cultural orientation), and the domain of practice (educator training, culturally relevant pedagogy). Furthermore, findings from the aforementioned studies informed my research and ability to anticipate potential factors that influence teachers’ perceptions of emerging bilingual students while implementing CSR.

**Collaborative Strategic Reading**

Over a 15-year period, researchers have evaluated the effectiveness of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) using quasi-experimental and experimental design studies. Researchers found that CSR yields positive outcomes for emerging bilinguals, students with learning disabilities (LD), struggling readers, average and high-achieving students. In a preliminary quasi-experimental study (Klingner, Vaughn, & Schumm, 1998), researchers provided instruction in
diverse, inclusive fourth grade classrooms. Participants included 141 students, 85 assigned to the
treatment (CSR) group and 56 assigned to the control condition. Although the ethnicity of the
participants was not reported, the school’s student population at the time of the study was 68%
Latino, 24% white, 7% black, and 1% Asian or American Indian. Students in the treatment group
used CSR strategies to comprehend social studies texts while comparison students received
typical teacher-directed instruction. Researchers found that students who received CSR
instruction made greater gains when compared to their peers who did not receive the treatment
on outcome measures which included a standardized reading test, social studies unit test, and
audio-tapes of group work. The main effects when analyzing for between-group differences
were statistically significant ($F (1,138) = 10.68, p = .001$) with a reported effect size of 0.44.
Additionally, these students demonstrated equal proficiency in their knowledge of social studies
content.

Next, Klingner, Vaughn, Hughes, and Arguelles (1999) conducted a mixed-methods
study regarding the sustainability of research-based practices, CSR being one of them. They
wanted to understand the extent to which participants of a professional development offered
three years prior continued teaching the reading strategies to their students. Participants included
four general educators, two special education teachers, and one part-time enrichment teacher.
All teachers taught at one of three schools in a large urban school district serving between 60-
96% Latino students and had between 4 to 30+ years of experience in the classroom. Findings
from the analysis of checklists, individual and group interviews, and classroom observations
revealed that teachers’ frequency of strategy implementation varied depending on the strategy.
Researchers also reported that having a supportive network within the school (including
administration), seeing students benefit from and enjoy the strategy, being able to adapt the
strategy, and having materials and resources on hand were reasons teachers gave for continuing to use the strategy. Additionally, teachers mentioned that pressures to prepare for high-stakes testing and cover the curriculum, lack of time, not understanding the strategy well enough, and feeling the strategy did not fit well with a particular teacher’s style or practice inhibited them from continuing its use (Klingner et al, 1999).

A year later, in a mixed-methods study with emerging bilingual students, Klingner and Vaughn (2000) investigated the ways in which bilingual students help their peers while using CSR. Participants included 37 fifth grade students, 35 of whom were either native Spanish speakers or spoke Spanish and English in the home. In order to capture students helping behaviors, researchers audio-recorded cooperative group discussions, administered a content-based vocabulary measure, and kept a log of all classroom observations, demonstration lessons, conversations with students and teachers, and personal reflections. As previously mentioned, emerging bilingual students are explicitly taught how to draw on their native language using cognates when discerning the meaning of an unfamiliar word through CSR. In this study, authors found that emerging bilinguals looked for academic and linguistic support from bilingual peers when trying to figure out clunks, unknown words, while reading, thus improving content learning and vocabulary acquisition as measured by a unit vocabulary measure. Students’ pre and posttest gains were statistically significant (t (21) = 7.28, p = .000 for the chapter 14 vocabulary test and t (27) = 6.73, p = .000 for the chapter 15 vocabulary test). Authors concluded that participants demonstrated high levels of academic engagement and were able to help each other understand new vocabulary terms facilitating access to scientific concepts and content (Klingner & Vaughn, 2000).
Then, Klingner, Arguelles, Hughes, and Vaughn (2001) conducted a mixed-methods sustainability study to understand the extent to which participants of a year-long professional development continued teaching the reading strategies learned to their students and other teachers within their schools. Researchers were also interested in learning why other teachers who used the strategies but did not attend the initial professional development workshop continued to teach these strategies to students. Specifically, professional development participants were taught CSR, Making Words, and Partner Reading. Ninety-eight teachers responded to surveys administered by the research team and eighteen teachers participated in a more in-depth investigation, six for each strategy. Participants worked in one of two large urban elementary schools serving over 91% Latino students and over 47% emerging bilinguals. The majority of the participants were general education teachers with certification in either elementary or special education though none had obtained additional certification for teaching either Spanish or English to Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) (Klingner et al, 2001). After analyzing data from surveys, Implementation Validity Checklists (IVCs), interviews (focus group, semi-structured, and video-stimulated recall), and classroom observations, the researchers found that almost all of the teachers in both schools had tried at least one of the strategies at some point. Focal participants also reported that their motivation to teach the strategy was enhanced when they thought it would benefit students, when they were provided the training and in-class support, because they wanted to try something new, because another teacher recommended they try it or they saw a teacher use it with students, or if they thought students would need it in subsequent grades (Klingner et al, 2001). When asked why they sustained use of the practice, teachers reported that students liked it and were learning from it, it matched their
teaching style, it aligned well with other initiatives, and that administration supported its use (Klingner et al, 2001).

Subsequently, in a qualitative study Klingner, Ahwee, Pilonieta, and Menendez (2003) investigated teachers’ barriers and facilitators to strategy implementation. Twenty-nine teachers participated in the study and learned four research-based literacy practices over the course of a 10-day professional development. CSR was one of the strategies teachers learned and eleven used CSR throughout the duration of the study in classrooms with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Through analysis of teacher interviews, teacher logs and classroom observations, researchers found that the reasons for choosing a particular strategy, like CSR, were that teachers felt it was appropriate for their students, could improve reading abilities, and it was a good fit with existing practices (Klingner et al, 2003). Barriers to implementation most often cited by teachers included lack of instructional time, competing demands, and lack of materials (Klingner et al, 2003). Common facilitators to implementation included support from school administration and the research team, students’ enthusiasm for the strategy, enhanced student performance while applying the strategy, and teacher preparedness (Klingner et al, 2003).

Next, researchers conducted a quasi-experimental study comparing five CSR and five comparison teachers and their students in ten culturally and linguistically diverse inclusive fourth grade classrooms across five schools (Klingner, Vaughn, Arguelles, Hughes, & Leftwich, 2004). Classes were assigned to either treatment (CSR) or control conditions based on teachers’ classroom experience, educational training, student demographics, and familiarity with CSR. The number of students in each class ranged from 26-34 with 211 student participants overall. Although specific student participant demographic information was unavailable, the percentage
of Latino students across the schools ranged from 92% to 97%, the percentage of emerging bilingual students ranged from 25.6% to 51% and students receiving FRL ranged from 76.1% to 83.9% (Klingner et al, 2004). Teachers’ professional experience in the classroom ranged from 1-32 years with only two of the participants having received endorsements to teach emerging bilingual students. Again students applied CSR comprehension strategies while reading social studies texts. Students in CSR classrooms improved more in reading comprehension than comparison students as measured by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. However, only gains made by the high/average-achieving group were statistically significant ($F (1, 132) = 5.76$, $p = .018$) Effect sizes for the total sample (n=211) were $d = .19$, $d = .25$ for high/average-achieving students, $d = .51$ for low-achieving students, and $d = .38$ for students with LD.

Thus, low-achieving students made the most gains in reading comprehension. This suggests that as an instructional intervention and tool, CSR has the potential to close the achievement gap for struggling readers.

Finally, researchers employed an experimental study in language arts or reading classrooms with 7th and 8th grade culturally and linguistically diverse students from two states and in three school districts (Vaughn, Klingner, Swanson, Boardman, Roberts, Muhammed, & Stillman-Spisak, 2011). Teachers and students were randomly assigned to treatment (CSR) or control conditions. Teacher participants included 17 educators with 1-35 years teaching experience, 11 of whom held multiple certifications in one or more of the following: English/language arts, special education, English as a second language (Vaughn et al, 2011). Additionally, 782 students participated in the study with 400 of those students receiving CSR instruction. Throughout the 18 week study, CSR teachers received professional development and in-class support from the research team. These teachers were coached on how to implement
CSR with fidelity. Additionally, the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (GMRT), AIMSweb Reading Curriculum Based Measure, and Test of Silent Reading Efficiency and Comprehension (TOSREC) instrument were used to assess students’ academic achievement over the course of the study. Results from the GMRT indicate that students in CSR classes outperformed students in comparison classes with effect sizes at $g = .12$ for the total sample and $g = .36$ for struggling readers. Although the higher effect size for struggling readers is encouraging, especially regarding the efficacy of CSR for these students, the low overall effect size suggests that improving reading comprehension through experimental studies is not an easy task (Vaughn et al, 2011).

In conclusion, Collaborative Strategic Reading has been researched extensively to measure its impact in the areas of sustainability, student behavior, academic achievement and teacher efficacy. Therefore, in this study I contributed to the extant research base by investigating the factors (both in-class and school-based) that support and/or challenge teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities while implementing CSR in middle school science and social studies classrooms.

**Models of Professional Growth**

Researchers from the field of cognitive psychology and learning sciences have studied the impacts of professional development (PD) on teachers and students for decades. Most of the research conducted in these areas has looked at the role PD plays in eliciting changes in teachers’ practice and students’ achievement. For example, Fullan (1982) created one of the first models to illustrate this process. The model below represents the process of professional growth for teachers with the ultimate goal being changes in student learning outcomes.
However, Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) believe this model is misleading because it implies that changes in beliefs and attitudes need to occur prior to changes in practice and subsequent changes in student achievement hence the name, “An implicit model…” Therefore, Guskey (1986) expanded upon this model and suggested that in order for significant changes in beliefs and attitudes to take place, student learning outcomes must be evident first. He posited that “seeing is believing,” once teachers actually witness changes in their students as a result of their refined practices they are more likely to believe in the capabilities of their students and the efficacy of the new practices. This is illustrated in the model below.

Clarke and Hollingsworth (2002) also criticize Guskey’s model because it depicts change as a static, linear process. They believe that professional growth is a more complex, dynamic and cyclical process as explained in the models for professional growth below.

Unlike Guskey, Johnson and Owen (1986) posit that teachers move back and forth through various stages as they grow and engage in professional learning experiences. This process begins with the recognition of existing practices. Depending upon how teachers’ view these practices, this recognition may lead to instructional refinement. They believe that
refinement or modification of practices then causes teachers’ to re-examine the new practices in light of the old. Depending on whether this re-examination is favorable, teachers may decide to renovate their practice by adapting these changed practices on a permanent basis. Once a change has been made then teachers are more likely to engage in renewal processes, constantly refining, re-evaluating and renovating practices as they grow.

Other scholars followed a similar course to the cyclical nature of change adapting and expanding upon these models. For example, Lappan et al. (1988) applied Lewin’s Change Management Model (1948) in her study of middle-school math practices (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002). Applying a concept first developed in social psychology to education, Lappan et al. found that teachers cycle through three phases of change. Aligned with the recognition phase mentioned previously by Johnson and Owen, the first phase of Lewin’s model is characterized by unfreezing teachers’ practices. Lappan et al. found that unfreezing (recognizing) their existing practices served as the impetus for change. Unfreezing then led to instructional change where new practices were learned and applied. Once acquired, these new patterns of practice were then refrozen and integrated into teachers’ repertoires (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Years later Cobb, Wood, and Yackel (1990) combined aspects of both the aforementioned linear and cyclical models to create their own. They agreed with Guskey that changes in practice precipitate changes in student learning and teachers’ beliefs and attitudes. Like Johnson and Owen, they felt that cognitive dissonance needed to occur in the teacher’s mind prior to changes in practice. They felt that challenging teachers’ previous instructional approaches, their appropriateness and effectiveness, could serve as a catalyst to subsequent change, similar to the recognition stage proposed by Johnson and Owen (1986) and the unfreezing phase of Lewin’s
model (1948). Ultimately, Cobb et al. felt that the change process was iterative as each component interacted with and influenced the others simultaneously (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Clarke and Peter (1993) took this idea one step further by creating the Interconnected Model of Teacher Professional Growth. This model is similar to Freire’s idea of reflective action (1970) in which teachers discover themselves as permanent re-creators of knowledge as they reflect on goals and act upon them in partnership. Likewise, Clarke and Peter believe that change occurs through the mediating process of reflection and enactment. In this model, they represent the teacher’s world as existing in four domains analogous to the domains identified by Guskey (1986): personal, practice, consequence and external (Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Figure 4. The interconnected model of professional growth (from Clarke & Hollingsworth, 2002).

Hollingsworth extended upon the work of Clarke and Peter (1993) by applying this model in a longitudinal qualitative study with elementary school teachers. These teachers were participants in a mathematics professional development program. Taking a case study approach,
Hollingsworth (1999) conducted interviews and informal discussions with two focal teachers (one male, one female) throughout the course of the professional development. Hollingsworth found that the teachers’ experiences as participants in the professional development program, though different in many ways, were supported by the Interconnected Model. For example, one participant, Alan, felt that support he received from school staff and the EMIC (math) tutor, the availability of resources and equipment, the ethos of the school, and the professional development culture influenced his professional growth. Conversely, another participant, Cath, reported that at her school there was little collegiality, lack of coordination and leadership, and no apparent commitment to professional development in math. Nonetheless, these external obstacles did not appear to hinder her enthusiasm, participation, or professional growth over time. These findings support Clarke and Hollingsworth claim that professional development should be designed so that participants enact change in various forms and sequences according to their individual needs and preferences.

The intended goal that all of the aforementioned models of professional development share is for teachers to transfer the knowledge acquired through these experiences to actual classroom practices, pedagogical transformation and positive student outcomes. Although CSR-related professional development was not developed from one particular model of professional growth, viewing professional learning and student results as mutually inclusive processes increases the likelihood that teachers and students will embrace instructional initiatives, like CSR, in order to achieve much needed school/systemic reform.

**Summation**

These studies demonstrate how teachers’ beliefs and attitudes as manifested in their talk and interaction with students varies according to cultural, linguistic, school, and pedagogical
differences. In this study, the use of Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR) is a pedagogical change teachers were asked to make. Prior to this investigation, the efficacy of CSR had been tested with emerging bilinguals, students with learning disabilities, struggling readers, average and high-achieving students (Klingner, Vaughn, & Schumm, 1998; Klingner & Vaughn, 2000; Klingner et al, 2004; Vaughn et al, 2011). The effectiveness of CSR had also been tested with regards to sustainability, student behaviors and achievement, and teacher practices but never with regards to their beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students in particular. Therefore, in this study I examined the factors (both in-class and school-based) that support and/or challenge teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities while implementing CSR in culturally and linguistically diverse middle school classrooms.

Additional gaps in the research justified the need for further investigation regarding the interaction of the aforementioned factors and their potential for teacher transformation and enhancement of emerging bilingual students’ social and academic outcomes. For instance, the majority of studies investigating emerging bilingual students’ perceptions of belonging and achievement and teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and expectations reviewed thus far, have been conducted at either the elementary or high school level. However, Rodriguez et al. (2009) suggest that a shift occurs in students’ perceptions as they enter into the adolescent years of schooling. Therefore, this study fills these research gaps by targeting middle school teachers and students specifically throughout these formative years of both social and academic development.

We also know that teachers’ pedagogical decisions matter and impact their expectations of students, particularly emerging bilinguals. For example, Vollmer (2000) found that poor expectations can lead to poor achievement. Likewise, Klingner et al. (2004) found that teachers’ changes in practice can lead to higher student achievement. But what about their beliefs and
attitudes specifically? Using the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI), I measured teachers’ cultural competence before and after CSR implementation. Additionally, I used interview data and classroom observations to document how closely their words and actions align with their cultural orientation. In doing so, I was able to describe the relationship between what teachers say and do with their students, and what they believe about cultural diversity.

Although many of the studies used mixed-methods approaches, very few coupled student survey data with classroom observations. The mixed methods studies I reviewed mostly combined surveys with interviews. However, in a qualitative study, Reeves (2006) warns against exclusive use of surveys because of respondents’ desire to please the researcher or pressure to provide socially acceptable responses. Although no study is void of limitations, by triangulating data sources from student perception surveys, qualitative teacher interviews, field notes from classroom observations of both CSR and typical instruction, and teachers’ IDI scores in my analysis, I sought to mitigate potential biases and limitations.

Moreover, previous research has shown that it is difficult to quantify students’ academic gains or losses in relation to teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and expectations. This is due in part to the fact that there are a multitude of complex factors that impact student achievement. Therefore, in this study I accounted for these additional factors by including the voices and opinions of students regarding teacher support, teachers’ ability to facilitate learning, and their expectations of students through student responses on the SPS.

Furthermore, change takes time. Similar to Cummins’ view (1980) that students need 5-7 years to develop CALP (cognitive academic language proficiency); Learning Forward (2011) suggests that teachers need between 3-5 years to exhibit changes in beliefs and practices. However, the majority of previous studies took place within a small time frame or were a mere
snapshot of teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and expectations at one point in the school year. In contrast, by conducting a year-long study, I was able to document teachers’ attitudes, beliefs and expectations for students and to more accurately portray the complexity of potential change processes over time.

Finally, after reviewing the literature pertaining to the role of professional development in affecting teacher growth, it is apparent that research is limited regarding follow-up with teachers upon completion of professional development learning opportunities. Future studies that seek to document and articulate explicit events or encounters that elicit teachers’ transformation are needed to enhance professional development experiences for teachers of all students. For this reason, I observed both CSR and TYP instruction before, during, and after CSR PD booster sessions, and asked about the PD and other coaching experiences specifically in the final interview so that teachers had the opportunity to talk about the effectiveness of these professional development learning opportunities.

In conclusion, the intent of this study was to examine the factors (both in-class and school-based) that support and/or challenge teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. I sought to understand the similarities and differences of these factors across schools and among focal teacher participants.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Strategy of Inquiry and Rationale

Change is a complex phenomenon. A plethora of factors inhibit and/or enable change to occur. Change within the school context is further complicated by mandated policies at the federal, state and district level, pressures to perform and demonstrate adequate yearly progress (AYP), the overall school climate, parent engagement in students’ educational experiences, teachers’ dedication to the profession, and students’ social and emotional health, to name a few. Therefore, due to the complexity of the underlying issue of this research study, teacher change as manifested in their beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students, I chose to apply a concurrent mixed-methods approach to both data collection and analysis.

A concurrent mixed-methods approach combines both qualitative and quantitative data in order to conduct a comprehensive analysis of a research problem (Creswell, 2008). Unlike other mixed methods approaches, concurrent mixed methods procedures allow for both qualitative and quantitative data to be collected simultaneously throughout an investigation. Both forms of data are then used to interpret and understand subsequent findings. One of the many benefits to conducting a concurrent mixed methods study is that it allows the researcher to ask and analyze different types of questions, both fixed and open-ended in nature (Creswell, 2008). Additionally, a mixed methods approach accounts for the limitations inherent in each approach individually by combining them so that threats to biases in either method alone are mitigated or cancelled out (Creswell, 2008). Triangulation is then used to verify findings from both qualitative and quantitative data sources, hence increasing the validity and reliability of the analysis and successive results.

Traditionally, mixed methods approaches have combined qualitative data from interviews and observations with quantitative data such as surveys (Creswell, 2008). In my review of the
literature, I found that scholars conducting research employing a mixed methods approach regarding teacher discourses in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms, teachers’ attitudes and beliefs toward diversity and students’ native language use in the classroom, and teachers’ academic expectations of emerging bilingual students also used these same forms of data (interviews/observations and surveys) (Batt, 2008; DaSilva Iddings, 2005; Flores, 2001; García-Nevarez, Stafford & Aria, 2005; Lee, Luykx, Buxton & Shaver, 2005; Lee & Oxelson, 2006; Ramos, 2001; Sirota & Bailey, 2009). Therefore, I expand upon current understanding of teacher change in beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students as manifested in what they say about their students and what they do in the classroom, by using not only teacher surveys, interviews and observations, but student data (Student Perception Survey (SPS)) as well. My intent in doing so, was to increase the robustness of my findings and contribute to the existing literature by bringing to light additional contributing factors that may inhibit and/or enable teacher change to occur within the current high-stakes educational culture of schools.

Research Questions

In the following figure, I provide an overview of the research questions and how each aligns with specific data sources and forms of analyses, both of which are detailed in subsequent sections of this chapter. Consistent with a concurrent mixed methods approach and as evidenced in this figure, I answered the primary and secondary research questions through multiple forms of data sources and analyses. Primary sources of data for this study included: student perception surveys, teacher interviews, classroom observational field notes of both CSR and TYP instruction, and teachers’ scores from the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Data analysis</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What instructional practices and in-class structures (i.e., CSR instruction, classroom management, paraprofessionals, use of students’ native language) challenge or support teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? In what ways?</td>
<td>-classroom observations -student perception survey (SPS) -teacher interviews</td>
<td>-coding of observational field notes -descriptive statistics of SPS responses - transcribed and coded teacher interviews</td>
<td>To document and describe the extent to which what teachers say about emerging bilingual students aligns with or contradicts how they interact with these students during CSR and typical classroom instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What school-specific contextual factors outside of the classroom (i.e., school climate, systems and structures) challenge or support teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? How so?</td>
<td>-classroom observations -teacher interviews</td>
<td>- transcribed and coded observational field notes - transcribed and coded teacher interviews</td>
<td>To understand how teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students are influenced/impacted by people, processes and procedures within the school context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do teachers who have used CSR for a year have higher IDI scores than teachers who have not when controlling for potential differences in IDI pre-test scores? If so, in what ways?</td>
<td>-IDI measure</td>
<td>- descriptive statistics of IDI results (pre/post CSR implementation)</td>
<td>To see if teachers who used CSR for a year developed more cultural competence than teachers who did not use CSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. Research questions and their alignment with data collection methods and sources.*
In order to answer the primary research question, I interviewed teachers and observed their typical and CSR instruction. This enabled me to not only ask teachers directly about their beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities, but it allowed me to see if what teachers said about these students aligned with how they interacted with them in the classroom. I also looked at emerging bilingual student responses to the Student Perception Survey (SPS) regarding the teacher’s ability to facilitate learning, her expectations of students, and providing support for students. This allowed me to compare what teachers said about the effectiveness of their instruction for emerging bilingual students with students’ perceptions of the teacher’s effectiveness. Collectively, these data were used to identify instructional practices and in-class structures that challenged or supported teachers’ perceptions toward their emerging bilingual students over the course of an academic school year.

To answer the second primary research question, I collected and analyzed teacher interview data before, during and after CSR implementation, and documented teacher actions and discourse in and between classes throughout the course of the 2013-14 school year. I sought to understand how other school-based structures and systems impacted their perceptions of emerging bilingual students. In doing so, I was able to better understand the school climate at each participating school and the ways in which both bilingual teachers and students were positioned within the school community.

Finally, by analyzing and comparing both CSR and non-CSR teachers’ responses on the IDI pre and post CSR implementation, I documented the cultural competence of teachers participating in this study over time. This enabled me to determine whether teachers who used CSR developed their cultural competence at a greater/lesser rate than teachers who did not use CSR during the 2013-14 school year.
Participants and Setting

This research was conducted with teachers in nine middle schools throughout an urban school district in Colorado during the 2013-2014 school year. These nine schools and their teachers were selected for several reasons. First, seven of these middle schools began their first year of CSR implementation during October 2013, while two served as control schools using TYP instruction in all classes. Therefore, I expected that all participating teachers had limited familiarity with the instructional intervention and did not have preconceived notions as to how the instructional strategy under investigation may transform their teaching, perceptions, and students’ academic outcomes. Additionally, because teachers were first-time CSR study participants, it was easier to ask them to partake in additional competency measures since they had not become accustomed to the previous, less involved, requests from university researchers. Finally, because none of the schools had teacher leaders this year, each of the five focal participants received similar in-class support from their CSR coach (in both frequency & content) and the same number of CSR-related professional developments.

Schools. The first school, Mount Hope, is a traditional K-8 school with an enrollment of 296 students in grades 6-8 (1054 in total). The school is known as a newcomer center within the school district and provides both ESL services and English language acquisition (ELA) support in English for emerging bilingual students. There had been a slight decline in enrollment in recent years with subsequent decreases in the number of Hispanic and emerging bilingual students, though this past year the student population grew causing the school to exceed its

---

7 A teacher leader (TL) serves as a liaison between other CSR teachers in the school, project PIs and CU/DPS coaches. This person is also charged with additional CSR-related responsibilities like materials management and attending leadership workshops, and receives monetary compensation for their time and effort.
8 Pseudonyms are used for all names in the study (including schools and participants)
9 All descriptive school information was gathered from the school district’s website: www.dpsK12.org
facility capacity. There is no highly gifted and talented program offered to students with this designation; however, the school does provide multi intensive (MI) classrooms for students with special needs who qualify.

The second school, Duncan, is also a traditional K-8 school with an enrollment of 275 students in grades 6-8 (829 in total). The school is known for offering an arts-integrated education that includes both vocal and instrumental music, and visual and media arts. The school provides both transitional native language instruction (TNLI) for students in grades K-5 and ESL resource support for emerging bilingual students in middle school. Much like Mount Hope School, Duncan has undergone fluctuations in enrollment over the past two years; however, the number of Hispanic and emerging bilingual students continues to increase. There is no highly gifted and talented program offered to students who qualify but the school does provide MI classrooms for students with special needs at both the elementary and middle school level.

The third school, Aspen Grove, is a traditional 6-12 school with an enrollment of 421 students in grades 6-8. The school’s mission is for all students to graduate high school while preparing students to enroll in 4-year colleges and universities without remediation. Aspen Grove provides its emerging bilingual students with ELA support in English both within content area instruction and to further their overall English language development. They also provide TNLI instruction for sixth grade students in social studies, and a bilingual paraprofessional for these same students in science. There has been a slight increase in enrollment over the past year with subsequent increases in the number of Hispanic and emerging bilingual students. Aspen Grove does not provide a gifted and talented program; however, the school does provide MI classrooms for students with special needs who qualify. Since three of the five focal CSR
teachers came from this school, more will be said about the school climate/environment in subsequent chapters.

The fourth school, Woodbury School, is a K-8 charter school with an enrollment of 170 students in grades 6-8 (589 in total). The school places a strong emphasis on parent engagement and strives to educate the whole child by teaching basic and advanced levels of academic and social skills. Although the school prides itself in holding high academic standards and rigorous accountability for the success of its students, Woodbury Charter does not provide any services for its emerging bilingual students. Likewise, the school does not provide a highly gifted and talented program or additional services for students with special needs who qualify. Although there has been a gradual decline in enrollment since 2008 with subsequent decreases in the number of minority students overall, there has been a substantial increase in the number of emerging bilingual students at the school.

The fifth school, Superior, is a traditional 6-8 school with an enrollment of 386 middle school students. The school offers an International Baccalaureate (IB) program to prepare its students for global success. Superior School provides ELA support in English for emerging bilingual students as well as MI classrooms for students with special needs. The enrollment of the school and the number of Hispanic students has more than doubled since it opened in 2010. However, the number of emerging bilingual students enrolled in the school has more than tripled in that same time period. Their gifted and talented program was offered for the first time during the year of this study to students with this designation and others who were recommended by teachers. Additionally, the school specializes in MI instruction for students with autism. Two of the five focal CSR teachers came from this school, therefore, more will be said about the school climate/environment in subsequent chapters.
The sixth school, Broadway Academy, is a traditional K-12 school with an enrollment of 452 students in grades 6-8. Broadway Academy is a magnet school that offers a college-preparatory education focused on creative and artistic vocations. Students learn through theatre arts, 2- and 3-D visual arts, media arts, instrumental and vocal music, as well as dance. The school provides ELA support in English for emerging bilingual students but does not offer other programs from highly gifted and talented students or students with special needs. There has been an increase in enrollment since the school opened in 2011 with subsequent increases in both the number of Hispanic and emerging bilingual students.

The seventh school, Blackstone, is a traditional K-8 school with an enrollment of 288 students in grades 6-8 (811 in total). The school places a high emphasis on providing students with a standards-based education and strives to close the performance gap by monitoring all students’ academic progress through frequent formative and summative assessments. Additionally, Blackstone encourages high levels of parental involvement in school-related activities. The school provides ESL services for emerging bilingual students from Spanish qualified resource personnel. However, Blackstone does not offer a highly gifted and talented program or additional services for students with special needs. There has been a steady increase in enrollment over the past five years with a slight decline from the 2012-13 school year to 2013-14, though the school continues to exceed its facility capacity. The number of students receiving free and reduced lunch has increased over time, along with the number of ELA and SPED students at the school.

The eighth school, Fairview, is a traditional 6-8 school with an enrollment of 875 middle students. The school serves students in the Southwest region of the district and provides a special International Preparatory Program for students who apply and are accepted into this
magnet school. According to the school’s mission prominently displayed on its website, Fairview MS emphasizes social, emotional and academic development in its students and values cultural and linguistic diversity. While the school does not offer language support services for emerging bilinguals or a highly gifted and talented program for students, Fairview does provide MI and Affective Needs (AN) self-contained classrooms for students with cognitive and emotional needs. Enrollment has fluctuated over the past five years. However, the number of emerging bilingual students continues to steadily increase.

The last school in this study, Clear Creek, is a traditional 6-8 school with an enrollment of 594 middle school students. The school offers a highly gifted and talented program in addition to an accelerated program meant to prepare students for advanced academic placement in high school. Clear Creek MS does not offer language support services for emerging bilingual students but does provide MI classrooms for students with autism and affective needs. There has been a gradual decline in enrollment over the past five years with subsequent decreases in the number of Hispanic students. However, the number of emerging bilingual students enrolled at the school is on the rise.

Although there is currently a court order mandating that all schools I this district have services for emerging bilingual students, the number of schools that did not provide any services for these student during the time of the study (33.3%) is disconcerting; especially given the fact that at one of these schools over 50% of the student population was comprised of emerging bilingual students. Also noteworthy is the fact that of the nine participating schools, only one offered transitional native language instruction. In reality, however, this service was not provided because of the limited number of teachers qualified to teach content area classes in students’ native language(s) and students’ limited proficiency to read and write in their native language(s).
Therefore, if/when services were provided, the emphasis was on learning English, and sometimes at the expense of learning the content.

Table 1

*School Demographics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Total enrollment</th>
<th>Students receiving free &amp; reduced lunch (FRL)</th>
<th>Hispanic students</th>
<th>Total minority students</th>
<th>Emerging bilingual students</th>
<th>Language support/Program type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Hope</td>
<td>1054</td>
<td>1014 (96.2%)</td>
<td>339 (32.2%)</td>
<td>971 (92.1%)</td>
<td>778 (73.8%)</td>
<td>ESL &amp; ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>829</td>
<td>777 (93.7%)</td>
<td>678 (81.8%)</td>
<td>819 (98.8%)</td>
<td>550 (66.3%)</td>
<td>TNLI &amp; ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>410 (97.4%)</td>
<td>337 (80.0%)</td>
<td>409 (97.1%)</td>
<td>257 (61.0%)</td>
<td>TNLI &amp; ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>565 (95.9%)</td>
<td>447 (75.9%)</td>
<td>580 (98.5%)</td>
<td>320 (54.3%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>374 (96.9%)</td>
<td>324 (83.9%)</td>
<td>366 (94.8%)</td>
<td>180 (46.6%)</td>
<td>ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>389 (86.1%)</td>
<td>367 (81.2%)</td>
<td>400 (88.5%)</td>
<td>205 (45.4%)</td>
<td>ELA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>485 (59.8%)</td>
<td>398 (49.1%)</td>
<td>503 (62.0%)</td>
<td>175 (21.6%)</td>
<td>ESL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>483 (55.2%)</td>
<td>291 (33.3%)</td>
<td>543 (62.1%)</td>
<td>210 (24.0%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>268 (45.1%)</td>
<td>147 (24.7%)</td>
<td>328 (55.2%)</td>
<td>58 (9.8%)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teachers and students.** The 21 teachers and their students who completed the IDI and SPS measures used in this study were part of a random sample of middle school teachers participating in the larger CSR-CO Project\(^{11}\) within the district. Initially, select middle school science, social studies and language arts teachers (both CSR and non-CSR) from eleven schools in the district were asked to complete the twenty minute Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) (see Appendix A, IDI Recruitment Flyer (Pre)). These eleven schools were the only

---

\(^{10}\) FRL generally serves as a proxy for socioeconomic status.

\(^{11}\) The CSR-CO Project is funded by an i3 (Investing in Innovations) five-year grant from the U.S. Department of Education and is a district-wide initiative to improve the reading comprehension of all middle school students.
remaining middle schools left in the district that had not previously partaken in the larger CSR-CO Project.

The names and contact information of these 74 teachers were given to me by the CSR-CO Project Principal Investigator (PI) based on selection criteria from the experimental design team (i.e. some schools were randomly selected to be “CSR” schools while others were designated as “Control” schools; some schools were asked to use CSR in only science and social studies classrooms; and some were only asked to use CSR at certain grade levels). Of the 74 teachers solicited to complete the survey at the beginning of the school year (October 2013), 34 teachers did so, for a completion rate of 46%. These 34 teachers came from all eleven schools, representing grades 6-8 and the content areas of social studies, science and language arts. Of these 34 teachers, 19 were designated as CSR teachers, while 15 were asked to use typical (TYP) instruction. That accounted for a 49% response rate on the part of CSR teachers (19 out of 39 teachers) and a 43% response rate for TYP teachers (15 out of 35 teachers).

At the end of the school year, only the 34 teachers who completed the IDI initially were solicited to complete it again in May, 2014 (see Appendix B, IDI Recruitment Flyer (Post)). Of these 34 teachers, 21 teachers completed the survey for a response rate of 62%. Thirteen of these teachers used CSR during the school year while eight did not. That accounted for a 68% response rate on the part of CSR teachers (13 out of 19) and a 53% response rate for TYP, or non-CSR, teachers (8 out of 15). Unlike the teachers who initially completed the survey, these teachers came from nine of the eleven schools. That is why only nine of the eleven schools are described at length in the previous section. Similarly, for this reason, only the data from these 21 teachers are included for analysis since the first part of the research question it was used to answer asks: Do teachers who have used CSR for a year have higher IDI scores than teachers
who have not when controlling for potential differences in IDI pre-test scores? Likewise, only data from the Student Perception Survey completed by the students of these 21 teachers was used since these were the only teachers who completed the survey at both points (pre and post CSR implementation).

In addition to the IDI survey items used to calculate respondents intercultural development orientation, teachers were asked 20 demographic questions regarding: their gender, age, number of years lived in another country (besides the U.S.), educational level, primary region of the world lived until the age of 18, ethnic identification, country of citizenship, employment position title, grade level of place of employment (i.e. elementary, secondary), type of educational institution they work in (i.e. public/private, religious/non-secular), percentage of international students enrolled at the school, number of employees at the school, percentage of minorities employed at the school, percentage of employees from other countries (outside of the U.S.), years teaching experience, language(s) spoken aside from English, percentage of emerging bilingual students, percentage of special needs students, type of community in which they reside (i.e. rural, urban, suburban), and whether or not they plan to return to the school the following academic year.

The majority of teacher participants were White (86%) and female (60%). Most respondents were between the ages of 22 and 40 (48%) and had never lived outside of the U.S. (52%).
Figure 6. Gender and minority status of the respondents (reported in percentages).

Figure 7. Age of the respondents (reported in percentages).
Figure 8. Time lived in another country (reported in percentages).

Teaching experience among participants was more diverse with approximately 29% of the respondents reporting 3-5 years and 29% reporting between 6 and 15 years of experience, while 43% had been in the profession for over 16 years. Additionally, most of the participants reported living in the same type of community in which they taught (urban) while of those who reported speaking another language besides English, 43% spoke Spanish.

Figure 9. Number of years teaching (reported in percentages).
Regarding education level (completed), 71% of the teachers earned an M.A. or equivalent graduate degree, while 19% reported a B.A. as the highest degree earned to date. Ninety percent of teachers reported that North America was their primary region of residency until the age of 18, while 90% identified the U.S. as their country of citizenship (the remaining 10% did not respond). Of the 21 respondents, all reported that they were either faculty or staff at their school and that they worked in secondary education. Similarly, all teachers identified as working in public schools. Most of the teachers (76%) reported working at schools with a staff size of 21-100 people, while the remaining 24% said they could not make a general estimate of the staff size. Other demographic information pertaining to the composition of the school staff is recorded in the figures below.

Figure 10. Place of residence and language(s) spoken besides English (reported in percentages).
Figure 11. Minority status of the staff (reported in percentages).

Figure 12. Percentage of staff from other countries (besides the U.S.).

Regarding the student demographics of each school, teachers reported the following information:
Figure 13. Percentage of international and minority students.

Figure 14. Percentage of emerging bilingual students.
Figure 15. Percentage of students with special needs.

When compared with the district student demographic reports at the school level, these data show discrepancies between teachers’ perceptions of their students’ status (i.e. ethnicity, language, learning disability) and what is self-reported by students/parents. For example, six of the nine schools (67%) had a minority student population between 75%-100% whereas teachers from only three of the nine schools (33%) reported a minority student population of that same size. Similarly, five out of the nine schools (56%) had an emerging bilingual student population of 50% or less, while teachers from three out of the nine schools (33%) reported the same number. Conversely, six of the 21 respondents (29%) reported an emerging bilingual student population of 71% or higher while only one of those respondents actually worked at a school with that high of a percentage of emerging bilingual students (Mount Hope, 73.8%).

Regarding the SPED status of students, teachers from six of the nine schools reported the percentage of students with special needs to be between 11-20% while only four of the nine schools actually had that same percentage of students with special needs. Likewise, teachers from two of the schools reported a SPED population of 21% or higher while only one school actually had a special needs student population that high (Aspen Grove, 22.8%). This suggests
that these teachers tended to underrepresent the minority status of their students while over-representing the language and learning needs of these same students.

Lastly, teachers were asked whether or not they would be returning to their same school the following year. Thirteen teachers (62%) said yes, seven (33%) said no, while one teacher (5%) was unsure. Although the majority of teachers reported staying at their same place of employment, the fact that one third of participants were not, suggests that teacher turnover rate within the district is a prevalent phenomenon.

**Focal teachers.** Unlike the survey respondents (both teachers and students), the five focal CSR teachers were part of a nonprobability, or convenience, sample based on their availability/accessibility to the researcher (Babbie, 1990). They were selected for the following reasons: I was their CSR coach during the 2013-14 school year, they taught the same grade level within their school which meant that they worked with the same students, they completed the IDI, and as a group, they were relatively balanced with regards to gender, grade, subject taught, and bilingualism. Three of the teachers taught 6th grade students, while two taught seventh graders. Similarly, three teachers taught social studies, while two taught science. Two focal teachers were White females, two were White males, and one was Latino. Finally, of the five, two spoke other languages besides English (Spanish and Russian).

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Schoola</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Language(s) Spoken</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>English &amp; Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>English &amp; Russian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a All names used are pseudonyms.
Thus, both monolingual and bilingual CSR teachers with varying years of teaching experience in the content areas of science and social studies who taught emerging bilingual students at these schools were asked to participate in the qualitative aspects of the study (interviews and observations).

ACCESS data was used to identify emerging bilingual students in these classrooms and cut scores on this measure were used to group students according to English language proficiency in the language domains of reading, writing, speaking, listening, comprehension, and a combination of language domains that included oral language, literacy and comprehension. Students’ proficiency levels are described in the table below according to their overall, or composite score, which was calculated as the average score of all four language domains.

Table 3

Emerging Bilingual Student Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Total Students</th>
<th>Emerging Bilinguals</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>3-4</th>
<th>4-5</th>
<th>5-6</th>
<th>Data na</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a All names used are pseudonyms.

*b These numbers describe student performance in terms of the six WIDA language proficiency levels (1-Entering, 2-Emerging, 3-Developing, 4-Expanding, 5-Bridging, and 6-Reaching)

*c In some cases, an overall score was not available.
More will be said about these focal teachers, their students, and their perceptions of these students in subsequent chapters.

**Measures**

Multiple measures were used throughout the course of this study to answer each research question using both quantitative and qualitative analyses. Each data source is described in detail below.

**Student perception survey.** The Student Perception Survey (SPS) was designed as a measure of teacher effectiveness incorporating student voice. It provides teachers and school leaders with a perspective on teachers’ educational practice as experienced by students. It is administered in late fall each year to students in grades 3-12 in the school district where this study took place. During the duration of this study, it was administered in November, 2013.

The SPS is based off the student survey used by the Measures of Effective Teaching (MET) project. This survey was normed with a sample of students who identified as the following: 31% Hispanic, 33% Black/American Indian, 34% White/Asian, 11% Gifted, 8% SPED, 13% ELL, and 56% who received subsidized lunch. The sample was equally split regarding gender (male/female) (Kane, Kerr & Pianta, 2014). Research findings from the MET project—a multi-year, multi-school district study in which this school district participated—found that teachers’ students’ survey results were moderately predictive of students’ achievement gains, as measured by standardized tests. In other words, when controlling for the accuracy of students’ responses to SPS questions, students were able to not only recognize effective teaching and respectful, learning-focused, classroom environments, but also benefit from that teaching. In addition, when measuring teacher effectiveness, the MET project found that inclusion of student surveys with classroom observations and achievement gains produced
more reliable results than when classroom observations and achievement gain measures were used alone.

The SPS is comprised of thirty-three items, each assessing one key characteristic of students’ perceptions of classroom teachers. Specifically, students’ perceptions of the three subscales regarding teachers’ ability to facilitate learning, expectations of students, and support for students were measured in this study using the SPS (See Appendix C). To ensure that the SPS results were reliable and valid sources of teachers’ performance, the school district applied additional requirements prior to calculating an SPS score for a teacher. First, teachers were required to have at least 10 “complete” surveys in order to receive a score; a complete survey was defined as a survey where the majority of survey items were complete (information retrieved from school district website on August 1, 2013). Surveys found to be inauthentic were removed from analysis. Survey authenticity was identified by examining the pattern of student responses. The school district’s assessment and evaluation team built in checks to ensure student responses were genuine (i.e., a student answers the survey items with thoughtfulness and integrity).

Second, all surveys were required to have a teacher ID, student ID and school number on it so that survey authenticity could be verified, and so that responses for different student demographic groups could be reported.

SPS reports are available for viewing by teachers and school leaders in the Teacher and Principal Portals. According to the website (information retrieved from school district website on August 1, 2013), “the SPS reports were designed to include information to help teachers identify areas of strength and growth, and include the following:

- Overall SPS Score—The overall SPS score provides information that indicates how well the teacher performed across all SPS items and categories.
• Category SPS Scores—The category-level results provide information to help teachers identify areas of strength and growth.

• Item-level SPS Scores—The item-level results provide teachers with a more detailed picture of how students perceive them in the classroom.

• Demographic Breakdown—The report includes breakdowns of students’ responses by characteristics such as gender, ethnicity, English Language Acquisition (ELA) status, disability status and grade. These demographic breakdowns allow teachers and school leaders to identify specific sub-groups of students on which the teacher may want to focus instructional efforts.

Regarding the content of the instrument, 13 items assess teachers’ ability to facilitate learning from the perspective of students. According to the district website, “facilitates learning” is defined as “the teacher supports students’ understanding of academic content and encourages students to think critically and explain their ideas” (information retrieved from school district website on August 1, 2013). Sample items include: “My teacher is good at explaining things that are hard to understand;” and “My teacher helps me understand my mistakes so that I can do better next time.” Eight items assess high expectations of students. According to the school district’s website, high expectations are defined as the teacher’s ability to communicate high expectations for students’ behavior and academic effort (information retrieved from school district website on August 1, 2013). Sample items include: “My teacher makes sure that students in this class behave well;” and “My teacher makes sure I do my best in school.” Additionally, seven items assess teachers’ support for students. “Supports students” means that “[t]he teacher supports students emotionally and creates an engaging classroom-learning environment” (information retrieved from school district website on August 1, 2013). Sample items for this
dimension of the construct include: “I like the way my teacher treats me;” and “My teacher listens to me.” Five additional items are included in the measure but do not map onto any of the three aforementioned subscales of the construct.

Items pertinent to this study regarding culturally relevant pedagogy include: “My teacher explains what we are learning and why”, “My teacher uses examples in class that I understand”, and “My teacher explains things in different ways.”

Students selected their response from a 4-point Likert scale (Never, Some of the time, Most if the time, and Always). For analysis and teacher anonymity purposes, the district would not permit the disaggregation of data at the individual or school level. Therefore, I was only permitted to report patterns and trends in the data at the group level. They also required that I use a sample of teachers greater than or equal to 21. Consequently, in the subsequent findings chapters I compare CSR and TYP teachers SPS scores as a whole since 21 teachers participated in the IDI portion of the study discussed below but do not report individual SPS scores for the five focal teachers in this study.

**Intercultural development inventory.** The Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) is a statistically reliable, cross-culturally valid measure of intercultural competence adapted from the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (DMIS) (Hammer, Bennett & Wiseman, 2003). The IDI is a 50-item, theory-based instrument used to measure orientations to cultural difference at the individual, group and organizational level. It takes 15-20 minutes to complete and subsequent results are represented as a graphic profile indicating where an individual or group is in terms of intercultural development.

In conjunction with the 50 IDI Likert-scale items, participants are asked to complete an IDI questionnaire comprised of contextualizing questions. Through open-ended response items,
participants describe intercultural experiences related to (1) cross-cultural goals, (2) previous challenges with cultural difference, (3) critical incidences of cultural difference, and (4) ways they have dealt with cultural difference in the past (Hammer, 2012). These responses are used to relate IDI profile scores to actual lived experiences of the participant.

The IDI was developed over a six-year-period by researchers Milton Bennett and Mitch Hammer. They started development in 1993 by conducting interviews with 40 international participants. These interviewees were asked about their experiences with cultural diversity. Upon completion of the interviews, four raters categorized participant responses according to the six stages of the DMIS (denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, integration). These responses translated into 60 items which constituted the first version of the instrument. Items were reviewed by culturally diverse testing groups for clarity before being submitted to an expert review panel comprised of seven cross-cultural experts (Hammer, 2011). This team of seven experts removed items that were not similarly classified by at least five of the seven experts. Consequently, researchers created an inventory of 145 items (statements related to cultural diversity) that corresponded to stages on the DMIS. Next, items were tested on a sample of 226 international participants, 70% from the U.S. and 30% from 28 other countries (Hammer, 2011).

After further review, 122 items were identified and tested on a new sample of 591 culturally diverse respondents (Hammer, 2009). However, there was no disaggregation of responses according to respondents’ demographic information. The final 50 items were generated from this pilot test and administered to 4763 individuals from 12 cross-cultural samples (i.e. managers from NGOs worldwide, U.S. church members, U.S. university students,
and high school students from Austria, Brazil, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Germany, Hong Kong, Italy, Japan and the U.S.) in a validation study (Hammer, 2011).

The IDI has met criteria making it a valid and reliable psychometric instrument. Hammer (2011) has conducted various in-depth analyzes of the instrument. He established construct validity by comparing and correlating the 50 items on the instrument to the six orientations on the DMIS (Hammer, 2011). Regarding concurrent validity, Hammer found that the three ethnorelative stages (acceptance, adaptation, and integration) positively correlate with the Worldmindedness Scale (Hammer, 2011). Additionally, the three ethnocentric stages (denial, defense, and minimization) positively correlate with the Intercultural Anxiety Scale (Hammer, 2011). Finally, because the instrument is available in 17 different language (Arabic, Bahasa Indonesian, Chinese, Czech, English, Finnish, French, German, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian, Spanish, and Turkish), content validity was established through back-translation procedures to ensure both linguistic and conceptual equivalence of the items (Brislin, 1970, 1976, 1980).

Accordingly, intercultural competence is defined as the capacity to shift cultural perspective and adapt behavior to cultural commonality and difference through deep cultural self-awareness and understanding of the experiences of people from diverse cultural communities (Hammer, 1998-2012). Intercultural competence development is characterized by the ability to mitigate interpretations and behavior based on stereotypes and to increase interpretations and behavior based on cultural generalizations and frameworks.

Ethnocentrism is regarded as a belief that one’s culture is central to reality (Bennett, 2004). People who embody this belief allow experiences, interactions, stereotypes and inequities to go unquestioned. Accordingly, they avoid or deny cultural differences claiming to be color-
blind within an ethnically and linguistically diverse society (Bennett, 2004). Alternatively, people with ethnorelative orientations recognize that their own beliefs and behaviors are just one of many possible realities. They seek out cultural difference and accept its importance and relevance in their lives. Subsequently, people with ethnorelative worldviews adapt their perspective by integrating these ideals and attitudes into their identity (trans)formation (Bennett, 2004). The Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC) used to explicate teachers’ intercultural development orientations in this study is a modification of the original DMIS, the theoretical basis of items on the IDI. Moving from left to right along the continuum, Figure 16 shows the various stages through which one passes as they gain both cultural competency and sensitivity according to Bennett’s intercultural development framework.

![Inter-cultural Development Continuum](image.png)


Items were created by the test developers according to the five aforementioned subscales and were used in this study to assess both teachers’ perceived orientations (PO) and developmental orientations (DO) of cultural competence. These orientations were calculated systematically using the combined results from the contextualizing questions (constructed response items), a qualitative measure, and the Likert-scale items (fixed-response), a quantitative measure. Thus, teachers who had more intercultural mindsets reflecting higher levels of cultural
competence had both perceived and developmental cultural orientations characteristic of someone in “Adaptation,” whereas less culturally competent participants were oriented toward the left-hand side of the continuum, “Denial.”

Previous applications of this instrument include: individual coaching, team building, performance management and innovation purposes, and as a baseline assessment for training needs, organizational development, program evaluation and research (Hammer, 1998-2012). In this study, I used the IDI as a baseline measure to better understand teachers’ cultural competence (CSR and non-CSR) before CSR implementation. Upon conclusion of the 2013-14 academic school year, I then re-administered the IDI to see if teachers changed (gained or regressed) in their cultural competence and compared CSR teachers’ scores to non-CSR teachers’ scores to see if differences between groups of teachers could be attributed to the use of CSR in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms.

Semi-structured teacher interviews. Five focal teachers in the content areas of science and social studies were interviewed three times over the course of their first year using CSR with emerging bilingual students. The interviewer was the primary researcher in this study in order to eliminate potential disparities and biases in the data due to varying interviewer style/skill.

Following a qualitative semi-structured interview protocol (Seidman, 2006; Weiss, 1994), the content of these interviews focused on the benefits and barriers to CSR implementation with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Questions were divided into the following categories: CSR for teachers, CSR for students, and supports for students and teachers using CSR. Teachers were asked to discuss the diverse learning needs of emerging bilingual students while using CSR, CSR instruction and strategy application for emerging bilingual students, and
teachers’ opinions regarding coaching and professional development opportunities related to the use of CSR with emerging bilingual students (see Appendix D).

Specifically, in order to answer the primary research question, during the final interview the researcher asked monolingual and bilingual CSR teachers to discuss if the use of CSR affected their beliefs and attitudes about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. In this same interview session, in order to address the second research question, the researcher also asked other school-specific supports and structures that impacted participants’ thinking about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. Findings from these interviews are reported at length in subsequent chapters.

The interviewer followed a similar interview protocol with each teacher, asking the same initial questions. However, she deviated from the protocol when necessary in order to elicit more detailed information from the interviewee. Additionally, these interviews varied in duration based on teachers’ engagement in the task and willingness to disclose personal and professional information.

**Video-simulated recall interviews.** I used the video-stimulated recall method (Lyle, 2002) for the second and third round of CSR teacher interviews. Accordingly, teachers watched a video of their CSR instruction and were asked to comment on particular points through the viewing and select a segment to view alongside the researcher. Prior to the viewing, teachers were asked two sets of questions: 1) Watch for student interactions: who’s participating, how often and in what ways? Who's not participating in the lesson and what are they doing? 2) What are you doing? What kind of feedback are you providing regarding student work and/or behavior? How are you engaging the students in the lesson? During the joint viewing, I asked the following additional questions: What do you notice about your students here? (level of
engagement, participation, comprehension, etc.) What were you thinking at this point? Why did you do ___? Did you notice anything in the video (this section/ a particular student-students or teacher-student interaction) that surprised you? What will you do differently next time?

Then I asked teachers to watch their grade-level colleagues using CSR with the same group of students. Like with their own videos, teachers were asked to comment on particular points/instructional or student moves through the viewing and select a segment to view alongside the researcher. During the collective viewing I asked similar follow-up questions: What do you notice about the students here? (level of engagement, participation, comprehension, etc.) How are they the same/different from what you see in your class? How is this teacher’s instruction the same/different from yours? Did you notice anything in the video (this section/ a particular student-students or teacher-student interaction) that surprised you? What is going well or could be improved upon in this classroom?

By reflecting upon observed CSR lessons of themselves and their colleagues, I sought to better understand how teachers’ beliefs and attitudes toward their students (emerging bilinguals in particular) were manifested in what they said to their students and how they interacted with them. By viewing the video together and asking questions of teachers directly, participants were given an opportunity to articulate their rationale for saying and responding to students in the ways they do, especially their emerging bilinguals.

**Classroom observations of typical (TYP) instruction.** Classroom observations of typical instruction served as the primary source of data collection to answer research questions one and two (see Table 1) and as a means to compare teacher’s instruction in CSR and non-CSR settings. I began conducting these observations in January, 2014, after teachers got through the initial CSR strategy introduction lessons and were using the full CSR cycle with students. During
these observations of teachers’ typical instruction (i.e. when not using CSR), I focused my attention on capturing focal teacher and emerging bilingual students’ interactions. Unlike my active participant role as a coach, as an observer I took a more passive approach when collecting data. That is, I sat in either the corner of the classroom or with a small group of students and recorded what I saw and heard in writing. I documented these observations in the same manner for each teacher beginning each set of field notes with a seating chart and record of learning objectives for the lesson. I also documented teacher and student discourse verbatim when comprehensible using time stamps to organize my notes. The duration of these observations varied depending on the length of the class period at each school. Through these detailed field notes, I was able to document and describe what teachers said to students, what students said to each other, and what students said about their teacher during TYP instruction. This allowed me to better understand the quantitative data related to students’ perceptions of teachers and teachers’ cultural competence.

**Implementation validity checklist.** The Implementation Validity Checklist (IVC) is an observational tool that was used to measure teachers fidelity to the CSR model (i.e. how closely aligned instruction is to the complete CSR process). These observations were conducted three times during the 2013-14 school year by researchers from the University of Colorado Boulder. Data from these observations (i.e. field notes and scores) were used in this study to compare CSR instruction with instruction that teachers provided to students when they were not using CSR. I chose to use the fieldnotes and scores from teacher’s IVCs instead of my coaching fieldnotes from CSR lessons in order to maintain objectivity and mitigate biases in my analysis. I thought that outside observer notes and scores pertaining to CSR instruction would be more objective since these observers were unfamiliar with the teachers and students. Their fieldnotes focused
specifically on what was seen and heard unlike my coaching fieldnotes which sometimes included interpretations of what was observed both on the part of teachers and their students.

**Data Collection and Recording Procedures**

The following table depicts the timeline during which various data sources were collected over the course of the study.

Table 4

*Timeline of Data Collection*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Time of Collection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Perception Survey</td>
<td>November (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural Development Inventory</td>
<td>October (2013) and May (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
<td>Nov. (2013); Feb./Mar. (2014); Apr./May (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TYP classroom observations</td>
<td>Once a month from January 2014-May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Validity Checklist (IVC)</td>
<td>January, February &amp; April/May (2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers were given a letter at the beginning of the school year explaining the study and asking for their voluntary participation according to the University of Colorado at Boulder IRB guidelines. Additionally, focal teachers were asked to participate in interviews throughout the school year and gave the researcher permission to observe instruction when CSR was not being used. All teachers were promised anonymity and given the option to opt out of the study at any time. Regarding students, only their grade level, native language designation, and level of
language proficiency as measured by the CELA (Colorado English Language Assessment Placement Exam) and ACCESS\textsuperscript{12} were used for identification purposes.

The SPS was administered to all the students in November of the 2013-2014 school year (see Table 3). Students completed the survey anonymously using their student ID as a way to report responses for different student demographic groups only. Students were instructed to complete the SPS for each teacher, though only the results for CSR and non-CSR teachers participating in this study were used for analysis purposes.

As an instructional CSR coach, I visited the classrooms of focal teachers 2-4 times a month to plan, coach and debrief CSR lessons. I also took extensive field notes during focal teachers’ typical instruction to document teacher-student interactions over time. I coded field notes from my classroom observations of typical instruction, and from teachers’ IVCs for emergent themes related to the research questions. Additionally, I videotaped one CSR lesson in each focal teacher’s classroom in order to conduct video-stimulated recall interviews with participants.

I followed the protocol for conducting semi-structured, open-ended qualitative interviews set forth by Seidman (2006) and Weiss (1994). These interviews were conducted two times throughout the school year, once at the beginning of the school year and again at the end of the school year. I also conducted two video-stimulated recall interviews with each focal CSR teacher. Teachers were asked to watch and select segments from a video of their instruction and one of their colleague’s CSR lesson to review and discuss with me afterward. The duration of

\textsuperscript{12} ACCESS Exam for English Learners is an English language proficiency assessment given to Kindergarten through 12th graders who have been identified as English language learners (ELLs). ACCESS aims at measuring students’ academic English proficiency in Speaking, Listening, Reading and Writing. For more information about the ACCESS Exam visit the WIDA webpage at: http://www.wida.us/
each interview varied from 20-50 minutes. All interviews were audio recorded with permission from each participant and transcribed verbatim. The interview transcriptions were coded for emergent themes related to the research questions for analysis purposes.

Lastly, teachers completed the Intercultural Development Inventory in October, 2013 and again in May, 2014. Teachers were given the option of taking the survey anonymously or providing their name, and were also asked to report their gender, ethnicity, number of years teaching, and bilingual status, in order to report responses for different demographic groups. Teachers completed this instrument twice during the 2013-14 academic year in order to assess potential changes in cultural competence (if any) while implementing CSR with middle school students in culturally and linguistically diverse urban classrooms.

Data Analysis and Interpretation

A concurrent triangulation approach (Creswell, 2008) was applied throughout the data analysis phase of the study. That is, both quantitative and qualitative data sources were used to (dis)confirm findings related to the aforementioned research questions (see Table 1). Regarding the qualitative data sources, analyses of field notes from classroom observations (TYP and CSR), and focal teachers’ interviews were conducted in order to identify instructional strategies and in-structures that challenged or supported teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. Quantitative data sources (IDI and SPS) were used to measure teachers’ cultural competence, and students’ perceptions of teacher instruction, support and expectations.

Qualitative data. Analysis of the qualitative data (i.e. field notes from classroom observations, and transcriptions of teacher interviews) were iterative in that, analyses of data collected on each teacher and her students were ongoing throughout the study. Auto-recorded CSR teacher interviews were transcribed by the researcher using Express Scribe NCH
transcription software. This software allowed me to control the speed of the audio and to add time counts so that I could go back to particular segments for repeated listening if need be. Each teacher had four interviews varying in length from 20-50 minutes. Through repeated listening of the data, I was able to capture features of speech including all of the words, partial words, vocal sounds, and instances of speaker overlap. Finally, punctuation was added for readability purposes only. Some attention was given to capturing intonation, stress, vocal pacing, prosody, and pause length so that readers could better understand how interactions and question/answer sequences developed over the course of the interview.

Upon completion of the fieldwork, analyzed data sources were reviewed chronologically for recurrent themes or patterns relevant to understand the impact of CSR and reflective practices on teacher’s perceptions about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. A list of themes evident from each data source was generated using a coding manual (Saldaña, 2013) and a cross-case comparison by teacher was facilitated through the use of a grid (see Appendix E). Themes were listed and cross-referenced for each focal CSR teacher according to all qualitative data sources indicating the extent to which a theme was present or absent in the data for particular teachers. Displaying data in this manner helped to highlight themes that emerged across all teachers and those that occurred in isolation.

Initial analysis. I begin my analysis of the interview and observation data by reading through the transcripts and fieldnotes from both CSR and typical instruction for each focal teacher. I selected focus segments deductively by highlighting excerpts from the data that were pertinent to answering my research questions and/or mapped to one of the domains explicated in my conceptual framework regarding teacher change (i.e. external or personal domains, domains or practice or consequence).
With my initial research question, I sought to identify and understand the ways in which participant teachers’ instructional practices and in-class structures challenged or supported teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners. The initial deductive codes I developed drew from discourse analysis (Gee, 2011; Rapley, 2007; Willig, 2008) by examining the speech of teachers while in conversation with their emerging bilingual students. I looked for embedded meanings regarding what teachers said to and about their emerging bilingual students across classes and what these students said to the teacher and to each other in these same settings. I used versus coding (Saldaña, 2013) to identify instances of conflict or contradiction between what participants said about students’ academic capabilities and how they interacted with these students during instruction. I also coded for instructional strategies and in-class supports that teachers referenced when talking about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities or that I observed in their classroom practice (i.e., CSR instruction, classroom management, paraprofessionals, use of students’ native language) (see Appendix E).

My initial deductive codes for examining data pertaining to my second research question regarding school-specific contextual factors outside of the classroom that challenged or supported teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners were also derived from discourse analysis. I looked for embedded meanings in what teachers (and administrators) said to and about participant teachers and their emerging bilingual students. I used values coding (Saldaña, 2013) to apply codes that reflected participants’ values, attitudes, and beliefs toward their emerging bilingual students as manifested in school-specific systems and structures, and the social/emotional/academic climate in which they worked. I also used in vivo coding (Saldaña, 2013) to honor the participant’s voice when his/her words more
accurately/authentically identified a school-specific contextual factor than applying a more general code.

**Detailed analysis and coding.** The next phase in analysis was inductive coding (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). In addition to the deductive codes I developed initially to reflect the conceptual underpinnings and research questions, once I had identified focus segments in my audio recording transcriptions and classroom observational field notes, I engaged in "open coding" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). Open codes were developed inductively as basic concepts or themes (e.g., negativity in teacher talk, venting about/advocating for students) and emerged from the data as commonalities across groups. Using Glaser and Strauss' (1967) "constant comparative method," I searched for similarities in conversational and instructional excerpts across participants and their students over time to develop categories.

Once all of the data had been coded inductively, I grouped codes according to categories relating to my conceptual framework and research questions (e.g., in-class structures and instructional practices (domain of practice), role of students’ native language (personal domain—language orientations), collegial and administrative support (external domain)), but also according to commonalities across codes (i.e. talking back, counting down & taking time from passing period became part of the “classroom management” code). These "axial codes" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) represented axes or intersecting ideas forming in clusters. Finally, I developed "selective codes" (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) to describe the story told by the data. The themes that emerged through selective coding informed my research questions and guided the layout for my findings chapters (see Appendix E). Finally, I sought moments of disconfirmation in my codes (Corbin & Strauss, 1990) when I could expand my thinking about the in-class and school-
specific factors that impacted CSR teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities.

**Coding of supplemental data.** The third phase of analysis consisted of three steps: 1) coding supplemental data, (2) linking codes from supplemental data to audio recorded and observational coded data to view the larger picture and (3) revisiting the data to identify gaps. Once coding began to reveal a picture of the in-class and school-specific factors that influenced teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students, I began to connect codes and themes from audio transcription and observational data, and supplemental data (i.e. teachers’ responses to the open-ended contextualizing questions on the IDI) to piece together a larger theoretical understanding of the factors that challenged and supported teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. From this level of understanding, I searched for gaps in my coding where I needed substantively more evidence. When gaps in my understanding emerged, I used results from quantitative data sources (i.e. IDI & SPS) to confirm or revise my themes as needed.

**Writing analytical memos.** Throughout the data collection and analysis phases of my study, I wrote analytical memos to guide my thinking. As Maxwell (2012) states, "Memos do for ideas what fieldnotes and transcripts do for perception: they convert thoughts into a form that allows examination and further manipulation” (p. 12). After classroom visits, interviews with individual participants, and rereading transcriptions and field notes from these events, I wrote analytical memos that described the content of these events, reflected on possible connections across individual participants and groups of students, posed new questions, and highlighted the emergence of potential codes. Writing the memos helped me identify factors that supported and challenged teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. It
also allowed me to understand how these factors were conceptualized and actualized by my participants.

**Quantitative data.** I analyzed my primary quantitative data source, the IDI, using SPSS software. Since this study included a relatively small number of participants and the quantitative data were meant to be used for heuristic purposes only, I first examined the data using numerous types of descriptive statistics. In addition, I ran paired t-tests. Because the numbers were small and the data were not normally distributed in all cases, I used the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test (Field, 2005). These $t$ tests were conducted to evaluate whether significant differences existed between the two populations of teachers (CSR and non-CSR). A significance level of 0.05 was used for the $t$ test. Similarly, group statistics, including means, percentages, sample sizes, and p-values, for both monolingual and bilingual CSR/non-CSR teachers on the IDI were calculated based on individual and group profile reports.

Since the school district restricted my use of the SPS data, I was only able to calculate and compare mean scores between and among CSR and non-CSR teachers at participating middle schools. The school district only permitted use of the data on sample sizes greater than twenty, so I used the scores of CSR and non-CSR teachers who took the IDI pre and post CSR implementation. Combined with data from the IDI, I was able to see if there was a relationship between teachers’ intercultural development and students’ perceptions of these teachers.

In total, there were twenty-one teachers who took the IDI at the beginning (Time 1) and end (Time 2) of the study. These included thirteen CSR teachers and eight non-CSR teachers representing nine of the eleven schools that participated in the larger CSR-CO Project for the first time during the 2013-14 school year. However, due to the small number of total participants and mixed-methods nature of this study, the quantitative analysis was used for heuristic purposes.
and to generate insights and understanding. It does not imply statistical generalization (Hirschi & Selvin, 1973).

**Role of the Researcher**

Ultimately, my interest in this particular topic stemmed from its relevance toward my research goals and instructional coaching practice as a CSR graduate assistant. I had worked collaboratively with teachers as an instructional coach for the past four years. During that time, I noticed varying levels of teacher buy-in regarding CSR implementation and its relevance to content-area instruction. I also noticed the ways in which teachers talked about particular groups of students and their perceived academic competency. For example, at one school, students were tracked into either “high honors,” “honors” or “pathways” courses. Students in the “pathways” courses were often described as slow, lazy, irresponsible and disinterested. Interestingly, these were also the classes with the highest percentage of emerging bilinguals, students with special needs and minority students of predominantly Latino and African descent.

Because of my dual role as both a researcher and an instructional coach, I had the privilege of working intimately with my focal participants and their students over the course of the study to plan, execute and reflect upon the quality of their instruction as it related to CSR. Due to this relationship, I helped teachers critically reflect upon their practices and perceptions of both self and student while utilizing an instructional strategy that incorporated students’ languages and cultures in order to better understand the content.

**Validity and Reliability**

I addressed issues of reliability and validity, including generalizability, throughout the data collection and analysis phases of my study. My approach to each of these issues is discussed in this section. First, broadly speaking, external validity is concerned with the extent to which a study’s findings can be applied to other situations; also known as generalizability. As stated
previously with regards to the quantitative data analysis, because the data came from a small sample, it is not generalizable to the population and is therefore used for heuristic purposes only.

Secondly, internal validity deals with the question of how one’s findings match reality. Merriam (1988) explains the incongruence of this term with regards to qualitative research:

One of the assumptions underlying qualitative research is that reality is holistic, multidimensional, and ever-changing; it is not a single, fixed, objective phenomenon waiting to be discovered, observed, and measured. Assessing the isomorphism between data collected and the ‘reality’ from which they were derived is thus an inappropriate determinant of validity.” (p. 167)

Furthermore, judging the validity or truth of a study rests upon the investigator’s showing “that he or she has represented those multiple constructions adequately; that is, that the reconstructions (for the findings and interpretations are also constructions, it should never be forgotten) that have been arrived at via the inquiry are credible to the constructors of the original multiple realities” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 296). The qualitative researcher is interested in perspectives rather than truth per se, and it is the researcher’s obligation to present “a more or less honest rendering of how informants actually view themselves and their experiences” (Taylor & Bogdan, 1984, p. 98).

In light of this, Merriam (1988) suggests six basic strategies for ensuring internal validity: “using triangulation, checking interpretations with individuals interviewed or observed, staying on-site over a period of time, asking peers to comment on emerging findings, involving participants in all phases of the research, and clarifying researcher biases and assumptions” (p. 183). In this study, I sought to ensure internal validity by (1) using multiple methods and data sources to address the research questions as a form of triangulation; (2) spending almost a year
engaged with students and teachers at each site; (3) reviewing the findings as they emerged with outside educational researchers; and (4) being self-reflexive and honest about my own biases and assumptions as a researcher (see the previous section in this chapter). As a researcher and instructional coach, I inherently brought a biased perspective to my study. Cognizant of these personal biases, I invited two other researchers to help me with the interpretation and analysis of the data. These two researchers were selected based on their willingness to voluntarily assist me with this research, their previous (and current) experience as educational researchers, and years working with culturally and linguistically diverse students and their teachers.

Lastly, reliability refers to the extent to which one’s findings can be replicated. However, as Merriam (1988) explains, “reliability is problematic in the social sciences as a whole simply because human behavior is never static” (p. 170). Lincoln and Guba (1985) suggest thinking about the “dependability” or “consistency” of the results obtained from the data. “That is, rather than demanding that outsiders get the same results, one wishes outsiders to concur that, given the data collected, the results make sense—they are consistent and dependable” (Merriam, 1988, p. 172). Techniques for ensuring dependable or consistent results include: (1) explaining the assumptions and theory underlying the study, (2) triangulating the data, and (3) describing in detail how the data were collected and how findings were derived from the data (Merriam, 1988). As discussed previously, in this study I triangulated the findings by using multiple methods and data sources from both teachers and students to address the research questions. In addition, I was forthright in describing the theory on which the study is based (see chapter 2), and in outlining my personal biases and assumptions as a researcher. In this chapter and in the findings chapters to follow, I provide details about how the data were collected and how the
themes emerged from that data. In some instances, this included using quotes from the interviewees to illuminate the meaning of those themes.

In conclusion, because it was my intention to accurately document the words and actions of CSR teachers across multiple settings, namely, before, during and after CSR and typical instruction, I use detailed descriptions of teacher-student and teacher-teacher interactions captured through field notes. Gathering data on teachers whom I was also coaching mitigated potential threats to validity due to varying coaching styles and strategies. Working with these teachers on a weekly basis as their CSR coach afforded me the time needed to establish a trusting, professional and personal relationship with them as a researcher in order to gain invaluable insight and perspective from my study participants.
Chapter 4: IDI Findings

This chapter includes the findings from the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) used to answer research question number three: *Do teachers who have used CSR for a year have higher IDI scores than teachers who have not when controlling for potential differences in IDI pre-test scores? If so, in what ways?* In order to answer the first part of this question, I begin the chapter by reporting findings from the CSR teachers’ IDI scores. I then present the findings for the TYP teachers’ IDI scores. Next, I compare IDI scores of CSR and TYP teachers to account for differences, if any, within and between groups. Disaggregating results in this manner allows for a more nuanced understanding of differences in IDI scores and serves to answer the second part of the research question: *In what ways?* As in the previous chapters, all names used are pseudonyms.

CSR Teachers’ IDI Scores

As mentioned in the methods chapter, there were 13 CSR teachers who took the IDI at the beginning (Time 1) and end (Time 2) of this nine month study, including the five focal teachers whose pedagogical practices and perceptions are analyzed in more detail in subsequent chapters. Figure 17 depicts the Intercultural Development Continuum (IDC) first referenced in the chapter three. Table 4 lists CSR participants’ IDI scores at Time 1 and Time 2, along with the corresponding IDI orientations and change score. Figure 18 represents the score distributions for all CSR participants at Time 1 and Time 2, while Figure 19 shows the distribution according to intercultural worldview.
IDI Scores at Time 1

The average IDI score for CSR teachers at Time 1 was 95.06, which is in the middle of the Minimization range. Scores ranged from 68.73 (Denial, on the Cusp of Polarization) to 119.72 (Acceptance), a spread of 50.99 points. One teacher was in Denial (on the Cusp of Polarization), four teachers were in Polarization (3 on the Cusp of Minimization), eight teachers were in Minimization (2 on the Cusp of Acceptance), and one was in Acceptance. There were no teachers in Adaptation, the highest possible intercultural mindset.

Table 5

**CSR Teachers’ IDI Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR Teacher⁹</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1 Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>IDI T2 Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>IDI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>108.61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-12.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>101.93</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>87.60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-6.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>Cusp of P</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>101.21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>119.72</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>112.72</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average ALL CSR Teachers | 95.06 | M | 92.33 | M | -2.73

*Note.* P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.

⁹All names used are pseudonyms.
IDI Scores at Time 2

At the end of the school year, the average IDI score for all CSR teachers was 92.33 (M), which represents an average decrease of 2.73 points from Time 1. In total, 6 out of the 13 CSR teachers showed positive gains on the IDI; two moved up an orientation and four moved up within an orientation. Table 5 illustrates CSR teacher movement within and between IDI orientations. One teacher moved from Denial to Polarization, and one moved from Polarization to Minimization. Two teachers moved up within Polarization, and two moved up within Minimization. Four of the six who gained did so by more than two points, with two of the six gaining more than four points over the nine month period.

In total, seven teachers regressed numerically on the IDI. One of these teachers moved from Minimization to Polarization, whereas the other moved from Acceptance to Minimization. The remaining five teachers all regressed within their initial IDI orientation. Of those who regressed within their IDI orientation, four teachers moved within Minimization and one moved within Polarization (on the Cusp of Minimization). CSR teachers who showed positive development gained between 0.68 and 7.14 points; whereas those who regressed lost between -0.81 and -13.55 points. Of those who gained, the average gain score was 3.45. Among those who regressed, the average decrease was -8.09 points.

![IDI Scores at Time 1](IDI_Scores_Time1.png) ![IDI Scores at Time 2](IDI_Scores_Time2.png)

*Figure 18. Distribution of IDI scores at time 1 and time 2 for CSR teachers.*
Figure 19. Distribution of intercultural worldviews at time 1 and time 2 for CSR teachers.

Table 6

CSR Teachers’ IDI Score Change Between and Within Worldviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDI Score Change</th>
<th>Pre- → Post- Test</th>
<th>CSR Teachers (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ to next worldview</td>
<td>D (Cusp of P) → P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) → M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ within the same worldview</td>
<td>P → P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) → P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M → M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) → M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to next worldview</td>
<td>M → P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ac → M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-within the same worldview</td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) → P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M → M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) → M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* D = Denial; P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.
Interestingly, although the average IDI scores between groups do not differ significantly, the change scores do vary considerably between the two groups. The average IDI score at Time 2 for CSR teachers who gained was 92.64, and the average score change was 3.45. This represents a minimal change within Minimization. Within this group, the teacher who scored the lowest overall (68.73) gained the most—just over 7 points—and moved from Denial (on the Cusp of Polarization) into Polarization. The other five either stayed within Polarization (n=2) or Minimization (n=2), or moved from Polarization into Minimization (n=1). Conversely, the average IDI score at Time 2 for CSR teachers who regressed was 92.01, and the average score change was -8.09. This represents a change from Minimization into Polarization (Cusp of Minimization). Within this group, the three teachers whose scores decreased the most—over 12 points—either moved within Minimization or from Acceptance into Minimization. Of the four remaining CSR teachers whose scores regressed, one stayed within Polarization on the Cusp of Minimization, another moved from Minimization into Polarization, one moved within Minimization, and the other moved from the Cusp of Acceptance to Minimization. Taken as a whole, the group range in scores decreased from 50.99 at Time 1 to 37.53 at Time 2. The difference in the score spread between Time 1 and Time 2 for all CSR teacher respondents can be seen in Figure 20. Although the group’s average stayed within Minimization both at the beginning and end of the nine month study, the decrease in score spread indicates that these CSR teachers ended their school year in a relatively similar place. Unlike Time 1, where CSR teachers’ scores were more diverse ranging from Denial (Cusp of Polarization) to Acceptance, by Time 2 all CSR teachers scored within either Polarization or Minimization.
To better understand the relationship between Time 1 and Time 2 IDI scores for CSR teachers, I ran paired t-tests. Because the numbers were small and the data were not normally distributed in all cases (see Figure 21), I used the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test (Field, 2005). On average, when analyzed as a whole, CSR teachers’ IDI scores at Time 2 ($Mdn = 92.30$) were not significantly less than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 95.06$), $z = -0.943, p = 0.345$. When separated by those who gained and those who regressed on the instrument, however, for CSR participants who gained, the Time 2 score ($Mdn = 92.64$) was significantly greater than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 89.19$), $z = -2.201, p = .028$. Similarly, for CSR teachers who regressed, the Time 2 score ($Mdn = 92.01$) was significantly less than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 100.10$), $z = -2.366, p = .018$. 

*Figure 20:* Spread of time 1 and time 2 IDI scores for CSR teachers.
IDI Change Scores Broken Down by Initial Development Orientation

Breaking down the IDI change scores by initial Developmental Orientation (DO) reveals some interesting findings (see Tables 6 and 7). Not only did the CSR teacher who began the school year in Denial (Cusp of Polarization) increase his IDI score, his score increase was the greatest (+7.14) among those teachers who experienced score gains from Time 1 to Time 2. Additionally, of the four CSR teachers who began the year in Polarization, three gained at least 1.5 points with one moving from Polarization to Minimization. These numbers did not reach statistical significance (p = .144) most likely due to the very small sample (n = 4), but they indicate intercultural development on the part of these teachers.

In contrast, the teachers who began the semester in Minimization had much more varied change scores. The change scores of the seven teachers who started in Minimization range from -14.33 points to 4.90 points, with an average change of -5.09 points. It is noteworthy that of the seven teachers who regressed on the IDI over the course of the nine month study, five began in Minimization. Only one regressed a full orientation to Polarization, while the other four remained within Minimization. On the other hand, two teachers who began in Minimization gained within Minimization with one moving into and the other staying on the Cusp of Acceptance. Again, there was no statistical significance (p = .091), likely due to the very small sample.

Figure 21. IDI change scores for CSR teachers.
sample (n = 7). Only one teacher began the school year in Acceptance and she, like 8 other CSR teachers, ended the school year in Minimization regressing by -13.55 points.

Table 7

*Analysis of CSR Teachers’ IDI Change Scores by Initial Development Orientation (DO)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial IDI DO</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Min./Max.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-1.81/2.16</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-5.09</td>
<td>-14.33/4.90</td>
<td>0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>-13.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Only one CSR teacher had an initial orientation of Denial, therefore the mean change score represents only that one person’s score and other statistics are not included.

b Only one CSR teacher had an initial orientation of Acceptance, therefore the mean change score represents only that one person’s score and other statistics are not included.
Table 8

*CSR Teachers’ Movement Within and Between Intercultural Worldviews According to Initial Developmental Orientation (DO)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial IDI DO</th>
<th>Pre ↓ Post</th>
<th>CSR Teachers (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial (n=1)</td>
<td>D (Cusp of P) ↑ P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total D ↑</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization (n=4)</td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) ↓ P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total P ↓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P ↑ P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) ↑ P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) ↑ M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total P ↑</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization (n=7)</td>
<td>M ↓ P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M ↓ M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) ↓ M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total M ↓</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M ↑ M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) ↑ M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total M ↑</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (n=1)</td>
<td>Ac ↓ M</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ac ↓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* D = Denial; P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.

**Percent Achievable Progress**

I also calculated each CSR teacher’s percent achievable progress—or, in the case of those who regressed, percent negative progress—on the IDI. The concept of percent achievable
progress was first introduced by Lilli Engle (Engle & Engle, 2004) and is defined as the extent to which each respondent bridges the gap between his or her entry-level IDI score and the highest achievable score (145). This is calculated by subtracting the T1 score from 145 and the T2 score from 145, then taking the T2 difference from 145 and dividing it by the T1 difference from 145. Finally, subtract that quotient from 1.0 to arrive at the percent achievable progress. This approach “is particularly appropriate since the IDI concerns personal development as opposed to absolute knowledge” (Engle & Engle, 2004, p. 230). In the case of CSR teachers who regressed, I calculated the extent to which each teacher bridged the gap between his or her entry-level IDI score and the lowest achievable score (55). This is calculated by subtracting the T1 score from 55 and the T2 score from 55, then taking the T2 difference from 55 and dividing it by the T1 difference from 55. Finally, subtract that quotient from 1.0 to arrive at the percent negative progress. The percent achievable or negative progress is reported for each CSR teacher in Tables 8 and 9 respectively.

Of the thirteen CSR teachers who took the IDI, six of them gained. Three of those teachers gained more than 5% of their achievable progress with only one teacher gaining more than 10% of her achievable progress. For these teachers, the average percent achievable progress was 6.22%. Conversely, seven CSR teachers regressed between Time 1 and Time 2. Their average percent negative progress was -17.78%. The lower percent negative progress is due in part to the larger IDI score changes from T1 to T2 for CSR teachers who regressed in their worldview.
Table 9

**IDI Percent Achievable Progress (AP) of CSR Teachers who Gained**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th>IDI Change</th>
<th>% Achievable Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>Clear Creek</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>112.72</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % AP for CSR Teachers: +6.22%

Table 10

**IDI Percent Negative Progress (NP) of CSR Teachers who Regressed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CSR Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th>IDI Change</th>
<th>% Negative Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td>108.61</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>-12.58</td>
<td>-29.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>-6.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>101.93</td>
<td>87.60</td>
<td>-14.33</td>
<td>-30.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>-6.36</td>
<td>-20.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>101.21</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
<td>-15.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>119.72</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>-13.55</td>
<td>-20.94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % NP for CSR Teachers: -17.78%
TYP Teachers’ IDI Scores

In addition to the 13 CSR teachers who took the IDI at the beginning (T1) and end (T2) of this study, there were eight TYP teachers using their “business as usual” instruction throughout the school year who also took the IDI. They were asked to participate in order to measure whether CSR is an instructional tool apt to increase a teacher’s cultural worldview. Table 10 lists TYP participants’ IDI scores at Time 1 and Time 2, along with the corresponding IDI orientations and change score. Figure 22 represents the score distributions for all TYP participants at Time 1 and Time 2, while Figure 23 shows the distribution according to intercultural worldview.

IDI Scores at Time 1

The average IDI score for TYP teachers at Time 1 was 101.10, which is in the middle of the Minimization range. Scores ranged from 75.77 (Polarization) to 118.57 (Acceptance), a spread of 42.80 points. Two teachers scored within Polarization, five teachers were in Minimization (2 on the Cusp of Acceptance), and one was in Acceptance. There were no teachers in either Denial or Adaptation, the lowest and highest possible intercultural mindset respectively.
Table 11

_TYP Teachers’ IDI Scores_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYP Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1 Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>IDI T2 Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>IDI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
<td>111.56</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
<td>111.08</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>105.89</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bree</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
<td>118.57</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>118.37</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>76.76</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>72.53</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>107.88</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>104.96</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>108.63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>96.14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>75.77</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78.06</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average ALL TYP Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>101.10</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>95.87</strong></td>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td><strong>-5.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IDI Scores at Time 2

At the end of the school year, the average IDI score for all TYP teachers was 95.87 (M), which represents an average decrease of 5.23 points from Time 1 to Time 2. In total, one out of the eight TYP teachers showed positive gains on the IDI; she moved up within the Polarization orientation. This teacher gained more than two points over the nine month period. Table 11 illustrates TYP teacher movement within and between IDI orientations.

In total, seven TYP teachers regressed numerically on the IDI. They all regressed within their initial IDI orientation. One teacher moved within Polarization, five teachers moved within Minimization (two starting on the Cusp of Acceptance) and one moved within Acceptance. TYP
teachers who regressed lost between -0.20 and -12.52 points. Among these teachers, the average decrease was -6.30 points.

**Figure 22.** Distribution of IDI scores at time 1 and time 2 for TYP teachers.

**Figure 23.** Distribution of intercultural worldviews at time 1 and time 2 for TYP teachers.
Table 12

*TYP Teachers’ IDI Score Change Between and Within Worldviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDI Score Change</th>
<th>Pre- → Post- Test</th>
<th>TYP Teachers (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+within the same worldview</td>
<td>P → P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P → P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M → M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-within the same worldview</td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) → M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ac → Ac</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.

Interestingly, although the average IDI scores between TYP teachers who gained and regressed in worldview do not differ significantly for the two teachers who are within Polarization (76.92 and 74.65, respectively), change scores do vary considerably for the seven TYP teachers who regressed in worldview. The average IDI score at Time 1 for TYP teachers who regressed was 104.72 compared to an average score of 98.42 after Time 2. This represents a decrease in score of 6.30 points, 1.07 points above the whole group average. Like the group average, this signifies a minimal change within Minimization. For this group, the four teachers who regressed the most—over 5 points—moved within Minimization, whereas the teacher with the highest worldview (Acceptance) regressed the least (-0.20 points) within the same orientation. The other two moved within Polarization and Minimization. As a whole, the group range in scores increased from 42.80 at Time 1 to 45.84 at Time 2. The difference in the score spread between Time 1 and Time 2 for all TYP teacher respondents can be seen in Figure 24.
Although the group’s average stayed within Minimization both at the beginning and end of the nine month study, the increase in score spread indicates that these TYP teachers ended their school year with more disparate worldviews. However, because no TYP teacher moved to the next worldview, this indicates that these teachers ended their school year in a relatively similar place, either within Polarization, Minimization or Acceptance.

![Figure 24. Spread of time 1 and time 2 IDI scores for TYP teachers.](image)

**T-Tests**

To better understand the relationship between Time 1 and Time 2 IDI scores, I ran paired t-tests. As with CSR teachers, because the numbers were small and the data were not normally distributed in all cases for TYP teachers (see Figure 25), I used the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test (Field, 2005). On average, when analyzed as a whole, TYP teachers’ IDI scores at Time 2 ($Mdn = 95.87$) were significantly less than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 101.10$), $z = -2.240$, $p = .025$. Likewise, when separated by those who gained and those who regressed on the instrument, for TYP participants who regressed, the Time 2 score ($Mdn = 98.42$) was significantly less than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 104.72$), $z = -2.366$, $p = .018$. However, because only one TYP teacher gained, the Wilcoxon nonparametric t-test could not be performed.
Figure 25. IDI change scores for TYP teachers.

IDI Change Scores Broken Down by Initial Development Orientation

Breaking down the IDI change scores by initial Developmental Orientation (DO) reveals some interesting findings (see Tables 12 and 13). First, only one TYP teacher experienced score gains from Time 1 to Time 2. The remaining seven regressed in worldview. This regression indicates a decrease in intercultural development for the majority of TYP teachers in the sample.

Secondly, of the two teachers who scored within Polarization, one gained and one regressed in IDI scores. Although the teacher whose score increased did so at a lesser rate than the teacher whose score decreased, these numbers did not reach statistical significance (p = .655) which was likely due to the very small sample (n = 2). Thirdly, it is noteworthy that of the seven teachers who regressed on the IDI over the course of the nine month study, five began in Minimization. Furthermore, of the TYP teachers who regressed, the five teachers in Minimization (two on the Cusp of Acceptance) had more variable change scores. The change scores of the five teachers who started in Minimization ranged from -2.92 points to -12.52 points, with an average change of -7.94 points. In the case of these teachers’ scores, there was a statistically significant (p = .043) difference between pre and post-test scores, likely due to the large range in score change. Lastly, only one teacher began the school year in Acceptance and
she, like the majority of TYP teachers in the sample, regressed—though minimally—within her initial development orientation.

Table 13

*Analysis of TYP Teachers’ IDI Change Scores by Initial Development Orientation (DO)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial IDI DO</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Min./Max.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-4.23/2.29</td>
<td>0.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-7.94</td>
<td>-12.52/-2.92</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>1^a</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Only one TYP teacher had an initial orientation of Acceptance, therefore the mean change score represents only that one person’s score and other statistics are not included.

Table 14

*TYP Teachers’ Movement Within and Between Intercultural Worldviews According to Initial Developmental Orientation (DO)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial IDI DO</th>
<th>Pre ↓ Post</th>
<th>TYP Teachers (n=8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>P ↓ P</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total P ↓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>M ↓ M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) ↓ M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total M ↓</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Ac ↓ Ac</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ac ↓</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.
Percent Achievable Progress

As with each CSR teacher, I calculated TYP teachers’ percent achievable progress—or, in the case of those who regressed, percent negative progress—on the IDI. The percent achievable progress is defined as the extent to which each respondent bridges the gap between his or her entry-level IDI score and the highest achievable score (145). Refer to the section on Percent Achievable Progress for CSR Teachers in the first part of this chapter. In the case of TYP teachers who regressed, I calculated the extent to which each teacher bridged the gap between his or her entry-level IDI score and the lowest achievable score (55). The process for how this is calculated is described in the aforementioned section on AP/NP for CSR teachers. The percent achievable or negative progress is reported for each TYP teacher in Tables 14 and 15 respectively.

Of the eight TYP teachers who took the IDI, one of them gained. This teacher gained more than 3% of her achievable progress from T1 to T2 of the IDI administration. Conversely, seven TYP teachers regressed between Time 1 and Time 2 of the study. Their average percent negative progress was -14.02%. The lower percent negative progress is due in part to the larger IDI score changes from T1 to T2 for TYP teachers, four of whom negatively progressed by over 10% (>20%).

Table 15
IDI Percent Achievable Progress (AP) of TYP Teacher who Gained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYP Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th>IDI Change Score</th>
<th>% Achievable Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>Blackstone</td>
<td>75.77</td>
<td>78.06</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>3.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average % AP for TYP Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+3.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16

IDI Percent Negative Progress (NP) of TYP Teachers who Regressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYP Teacher</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th>IDI Change Score</th>
<th>% Negative Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
<td>111.56</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>-11.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
<td>111.08</td>
<td>105.89</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
<td>-9.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bree</td>
<td>Mount Hope</td>
<td>118.57</td>
<td>118.37</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Woodbury</td>
<td>76.76</td>
<td>72.53</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td>-19.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>107.88</td>
<td>104.96</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>-5.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>Duncan</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td>-12.52</td>
<td>-28.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>108.63</td>
<td>96.14</td>
<td>-12.49</td>
<td>-23.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % NP for TYP Teachers -14.02%

A Comparison of CSR and TYP Teachers’ IDI Scores

In this section I explore differences in IDI scores and intercultural worldviews between CSR and TYP teachers during the 2013-14 school year. As mentioned previously, 21 teachers took the IDI at the beginning (Time 1) and end (Time 2) of this nine-month study. Of these 21 teachers, 13 used CSR in either their science or social studies classes and eight teachers used their typical instruction (TYP) with scant knowledge of CSR and the strategies employed therein. Table 16 lists all teacher participants’ IDI scores at Time 1 and Time 2, along with the corresponding IDI orientations and change score. Figure 26 represents the score distributions for all of the participants at Time 1 and Time 2, while Figure 27 shows the distribution according to intercultural worldview.
IDI Scores at Time 1

The average IDI score for all teachers at Time 1 was 97.36, which is in the middle of the Minimization range. This is slightly higher than the average score for CSR teachers (95.06) and below the average score of TYP teachers (101.10). Scores ranged from 68.73 (D, on the Cusp of P) to 119.72 (Acceptance). Interestingly both of these scores came from CSR teachers, meaning this group had a wider range in IDI scores at T1 than TYP teachers. Of all teacher participants, one teacher was in Denial (on the Cusp of Polarization), six teachers were in Polarization (3 on the Cusp of Minimization), twelve were in Minimization (4 on the Cusp of Acceptance), and two were in Acceptance. There were no teachers in Adaptation from either group.

According to the data, there were teachers in both groups that began the 2013-14 school year in either Polarization (n=6), Minimization (n=12) or Acceptance (n=2); however, while there were no TYP teachers in Denial, there was one CSR teacher with this intercultural mindset (on the Cusp of Polarization). While the average Time 1 score for both CSR and TYP teachers fell within Minimization, it was at the low end of the Minimization scale for CSR teachers and toward the higher end for TYP teachers. This suggests that on average, TYP teachers began the school year with more developed intercultural mindsets than CSR teachers.
Table 17

*All Teachers’ IDI Scores*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>IDI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>108.61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-12.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>101.93</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>87.60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-14.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-6.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>Cusp of P</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>101.21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>119.72</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-13.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>112.72</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average CSR Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>95.06</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>92.33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-2.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>111.56</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>111.08</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>105.89</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bree</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>118.57</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>118.37</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>76.76</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>72.53</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>107.88</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>104.96</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-12.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>108.63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>96.14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-12.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>75.77</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>78.06</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average TYP Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>101.10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>95.87</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-5.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average ALL Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>97.36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>93.66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-3.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance. <sup>a</sup>Names are pseudonyms.
IDI Scores at Time 2

At the end of the school year, the average IDI score for all teachers was 93.66 (M), which represents an average decrease of 3.70 points from Time 1. This average decrease is greater than the average decrease score for CSR teachers and less than the average decrease score for TYP teachers meaning that TYP teachers decreased more in IDI scores from T1 to T2 than CSR teachers. This is supported by the fact that only one of the eight TYP teachers showed positive gains on the IDI while six of the 13 CSR teachers showed positive gains. However, in total, only one third (seven out of 21) teachers showed positive gains on the IDI. Of these seven teachers, two moved up an orientation and five moved up within an orientation. Table 17 illustrates teacher movement within and between IDI orientations. Collectively, gains were relatively minimal with only one CSR teacher gaining more than five points between IDI scores. One teacher moved from Denial (on the Cusp of P) to Polarization while another moved from Polarization (on the Cusp of M) to Minimization. Three teachers moved up within Polarization, and two CSR teachers each moved up within Minimization to the Cusp of Acceptance.

Conversely, two thirds of the teachers (14) regressed numerically on the IDI (seven teachers from each condition). Two teachers (one CSR, one TYP) moved within Polarization, one CSR teacher moved from Minimization to Polarization, nine teachers regressed within Minimization, one CSR teacher moved from Acceptance to Minimization, whereas one TYP teacher regressed within Acceptance.

Teachers who showed positive development gained between 0.68 and 7.14 points. Of those who gained, the average gain score was 3.29. This is slightly below the average gain score for CSR teachers of 3.45 points. Teachers who regressed lost between -14.33 and -0.20 points. Among those who regressed, the average was -7.19 points. This is below the average regression
for CSR teachers (-8.09 points) and above the average regression score for TYP teachers (-6.30 points).

Figure 26. Distribution of IDI scores at time 1 and time 2.

Figure 27. Distribution of intercultural worldviews at time 1 and time 2.
Table 18

*CSR and TYP Teachers’ IDI Score Change Between and Within Worldviews*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDI Score Change</th>
<th>Pre-→ Post- Test</th>
<th>CSR Teachers (n=13)</th>
<th>TYP Teachers (n=8)</th>
<th>Total Teachers (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ to next worldview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Cusp of P) → P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Cusp of M) → M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P → P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Cusp of M) → P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M → M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) → M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total +</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- to next worldview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M → P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac → M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P → P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P (Cusp of M) → P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M → M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) → M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac → Ac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total -</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. D = Denial; P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.*
The change scores differ considerably between CSR and TYP teachers. The average IDI score at Time 2 for CSR teachers was 92.33 (M), and the average change score was -2.73. This represents a minimal change within Minimization. Among all CSR teachers, the teacher who was originally in Denial (Cusp of Polarization) gained the most—just over seven points—and moved between worldviews from Denial into Polarization. Three teachers stayed within Polarization; one of these teachers regressed numerically (-1.81 points) and the other two gained (1.92 and 2.16 points). Additionally, six teachers stayed within Minimization; four of those teachers regressed numerically (-0.81, -12.58, -14.33 and -7.16 points) and two gained (4.90 and 0.68 points). Of the three remaining CSR teachers all moved between worldviews; one moved up from Polarization to Minimization and the other two moved down in worldview from Minimization to Polarization, and from Acceptance to Minimization respectively. Therefore, all CSR ended the school year in either Polarization or Minimization. Their range in scores decreased from 50.99 at Time 1 to 37.53 at Time 2. The difference in the score spread between Time 1 and Time 2 among CSR teachers can be seen in Figure 28. This indicates that despite being in more disparate stages of intercultural development at the beginning of the school year (D-Ac), CSR teachers all ended up in a relatively similar place (P or M).

For TYP teachers, scores at Time 2 ranged from 72.53 (P) to 118.37 (Ac), a range of 45.84 points. This translates to change scores ranging from -0.20 to -12.52. Of particular note is the fact that seven of the eight TYP teachers regressed on the IDI. Although one TYP teachers moved up within Polarization, the remaining seven all moved down within their original IDI worldview. One TYP teacher moved within Polarization, five moved within Minimization, and one moved within Acceptance. As a group, their range in IDI scores increased from 35.79 at Time 1 to 45.84 at Time 2. The difference in the score spread between Time 1 and Time 2
among TYP teachers can be seen in Figure 18. However, because all TYP teachers scores shifted within their original IDI orientation, unlike among CSR teachers, where teachers ended the school year in either Polarization or Minimization, TYP teachers’ scores remained just as diverse at T2 as T1 (P-Ac) (see Figure 28).

For TYP teachers, the average IDI score at Time 2 was 95.87 (M), which represents an average negative change score of 5.23. Again, this is a change within the Minimization scale. However, although the decrease in scores is larger for TYP teachers as a whole from T1 to T2, when compared to CSR teachers, they still scored higher on the Minimization scale than the CSR teachers (92.33) at the end of the school year. This suggests that on average, TYP teachers ended the school year with more developed intercultural mindsets than CSR teachers even though all but one TYP teacher regressed in IDI score.

![Figure 28. Spread of time 1 and time 2 IDI scores by condition.](image)

**T-Tests**

To better understand the relationship between Time 1 and Time 2 IDI scores for CSR and TYP teachers, I ran paired t-tests. Like the t-tests ran for CSR and TYP teachers previously, I used the non-parametric Wilcoxon signed-rank test (Field, 2005) because the numbers were small and the data were not normally distributed in all cases (see Figures 29 and 30). On average,
when analyzed as a whole, scores at Time 2 ($Mdn = 93.66$) were significantly less than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 97.36$), $z = -2.135, p = .018$. When separated by condition (CSR vs. TYP), TYP teachers scores at Time 2 ($Mdn = 95.87$) were significantly less than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 101.10$), $z = -2.240, p = .025$. Whereas, for CSR teachers, scores were not significantly less at Time 2 ($Mdn = 92.30$) than at Time 1 ($Mdn = 95.06$), $z = -0.943, p = .345$. This suggests that CSR teachers’ worldviews did not shift as much over time as TYP teachers though more CSR teachers gained on the IDI ($n=6$) than TYP teachers ($n=1$) as evidenced by more positive change scores (see Figure 30).

![IDI Change Scores](image)

**Figure 29.** IDI change scores for all teachers.

![IDI Change Scores](image)

**Figure 30.** IDI change scores for teachers by condition.
IDI Change Scores Broken Down by Initial Development Orientation

Breaking down the IDI change scores by initial Developmental Orientation (DO) among all teacher participants reveals a more nuanced understanding for how teachers’ scores differ as a whole (see Tables 18 and 19). Within each worldview of which more than two teachers were a part of, CSR and TYP teachers both gained and regressed in worldview. For example, the CSR teacher who began the school year in Denial increased his IDI score gaining 7.14 points and moving from Denial (Cusp of Polarization) into Polarization. Conversely, the two teachers (one TYP and one CSR) who began the year in Acceptance decreased their IDI scores. They lost 13.55 and 0.20 points respectively for an average decrease of 6.88 points. Although, there was no statistical significance (p = .180), likely due to the very small sample (n = 2), this was a substantial loss for the CSR teacher who moved between worldviews from Acceptance into Minimization.

For the six teachers who started the year in Polarization, the change scores ranged from -4.23 to 3.92 points, with an average change of 0.71. Four of these teachers (3 CSR and 1 TYP) increased in IDI score with an average increase of 2.57 points. Three of these teachers (2 CSR and 1 TYP) moved up within Polarization, whereas one CSR teacher moved from Polarization to Minimization. For the two teachers (one CSR and one TYP) whose scores decreased, the average was -3.02 points. Both of these teachers moved down within Polarization. However, as a whole, these numbers may not reach statistical significance (p = .463) due to the very small sample (n = 6), and do not indicate significant intercultural development on the part of these teachers since only one of the six moved between worldviews.

In contrast, the teachers who began the semester in Minimization had much more varied change scores. The change scores of the twelve teachers (7 CSR and 5 TYP) who started in
Minimization range from -14.33 points to 4.90 points, with an average change of -6.28 points. It is noteworthy that of the fourteen teachers who regressed on the IDI over the course of the nine month study, ten began in Minimization. Nine of these teachers (4 CSR and 5 TYP) regressed within Minimization, while the other CSR teacher regressed into Polarization. The average score decrease for these teachers was -8.09. On the other hand, the two CSR teachers who began in Minimization and increased their IDI scores, gained within Minimization. Their average score increase was 2.79 points. Unlike those teachers who began the school year in Polarization, these numbers reached statistical significance (p = .008), most likely due to the larger variance in scores despite the small sample size (n = 12). This indicates significant intercultural development/regression on the part of these teachers.

Table 19

Analysis of ALL Teachers’ IDI Change Scores by Initial Development Orientation (DO)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial IDI DO</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Min./Max.</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-4.23/3.92</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-6.28</td>
<td>-14.33/4.90</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-6.88</td>
<td>-13.55/-0.20</td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aOnly one CSR teacher had an initial orientation of Denial, therefore the mean change score represents only that one person’s score and other statistics are not included.
Table 20
**CSR and TYP Teachers’ Movement Within and Between Intercultural Worldviews According to Initial Developmental Orientation (DO)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial IDI DO</th>
<th>Pre ↓ Post</th>
<th>CSR Teachers (n=13)</th>
<th>TYP Teachers (n=8)</th>
<th>Total Teachers (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denial (n=1)</td>
<td>D (Cusp of P) ↑ P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total D ↑</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polarization (n=4)</td>
<td>P ↓ P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) ↓ P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total P ↓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P ↑ P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P ↑ P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) ↑ P (Cusp of M)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P (Cusp of M) ↑ M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total P ↑</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimization (n=7)</td>
<td>M ↓ P</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M ↓ M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) ↓ M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total M ↓</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M ↑ M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (Cusp of Ac) ↑ M (Cusp of Ac)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total M ↑</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance (n=1)</td>
<td>Ac ↓ M</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ac ↓ Ac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Ac ↓</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* D = Denial; P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.
Percent Achievable Progress

In this section, I compare the percent achievable progress and percent negative progress between CSR and TYP teacher participants. Since I already discussed trends for individuals and subgroups within either the CSR or TYP condition, here I will report only at the group level. The percent achievable or negative progress is reported for all teachers in Tables 20 and 21 respectively. As previously mentioned, of the 21 teachers who took the IDI, seven of them gained from T1 to T2. One of those teachers gained more than 10% of her achievable progress, and the average gain across both groups of teachers was 5.81%. The average percent achievable progress was almost double that of TYP teachers (3.31%) in favor of CSR teachers (6.22%). However, since only one TYP teacher gained, this finding is not significant. Conversely, 14—seven teachers from each group—regressed between Time 1 and Time 2. Their average percent negative progress was -22.07%. The average for all teacher who regressed was -15.90% with CSR teachers averaging -17.78% and -14.02% for TYP teachers.

Table 21
IDI Percent Achievable Progress (AP) of Teachers who Gained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th>IDI Change Score</th>
<th>% AP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>3.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>82.04</td>
<td>85.93</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>6.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andy</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>68.73</td>
<td>75.87</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>112.72</td>
<td>113.40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % AP for CSR Teachers +6.22%

| Pam     | TYP       | 75.77  | 78.06  | 2.29             | 3.31% |

Average % AP for TYP Teacher +3.31%

Average % AP for ALL Teachers +5.81%
Table 22

IDI Percent Negative Progress (NP) of Teachers who Regressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th>IDI Change Score</th>
<th>% NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td>108.61</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-1.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>97.84</td>
<td>85.26</td>
<td>-12.58</td>
<td>-29.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becky</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>84.63</td>
<td>82.82</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>-6.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>101.93</td>
<td>87.60</td>
<td>-14.33</td>
<td>-30.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>85.94</td>
<td>79.58</td>
<td>-6.36</td>
<td>-20.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>101.21</td>
<td>94.05</td>
<td>-7.16</td>
<td>-15.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>119.72</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>-13.55</td>
<td>-20.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>111.56</td>
<td>105.00</td>
<td>-6.56</td>
<td>-11.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>111.08</td>
<td>105.89</td>
<td>-5.19</td>
<td>-9.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bree</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>118.57</td>
<td>118.37</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>76.76</td>
<td>72.53</td>
<td>-4.23</td>
<td>-19.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>107.88</td>
<td>104.96</td>
<td>-2.92</td>
<td>-5.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sally</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>98.56</td>
<td>86.04</td>
<td>-12.52</td>
<td>-28.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steph</td>
<td>TYP</td>
<td>108.63</td>
<td>96.14</td>
<td>-12.49</td>
<td>-23.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average % NP for CSR Teachers: -17.78%

Average % NP for TYP Teachers: -14.02%

Average % NP for ALL Teachers: -15.90%
Conclusion

In this chapter I discuss findings from the Intercultural Development Inventory (IDI) for both CSR and TYP teachers during the 2013-14 academic year. I begin the findings chapters in this way because the quantitative data presented here can be used to better understand and explain focal teachers’ perceptions and actions toward their bilingual students as reported in the interview and observational data.

At the beginning of the study I posited that CSR teachers would show greater growth on the IDI measure overtime than TYP teachers because there are components of CSR (e.g. collaborative group work, connecting to students’ prior knowledge, students use of cognates to decipher unknown words, emerging bilingual students use of their L1 to discuss English texts) that are consistent with “best” culturally relevant pedagogical practices (Aronson & Bridgeman, 1979; Boykin, 1996; Bravo, Hiebert, & Pearson, 2007; Greenfield, 1997; Huerta, 2011; Tyler, Boykin and Walton, 2006). Instead, I found that as a group, CSR teachers scored lower on the IDI at both times 1 & 2 than TYP teachers, though the change score was less for CSR teachers from T1 to T2 than for TYP teachers. Although CSR teachers scored lower on average on the IDI when compared to TYP teachers, it is important to note that a higher percentage of CSR teachers (46.2%) gained on the measure than TYP teachers (12.5%). Even though this difference cannot be attributed to CSR directly, it supports the notion that teachers who employ CSR in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms have the potential to develop intercultural competence over time.
Chapter 5: Instructional Practices and In-Class Supports for Emerging Bilingual Students

I think some [emerging bilingual students] just took [CSR] more seriously because they're just more serious into school than some of the other [emerging bilingual] students. So, there are students, just happen to be just school's just not for them. (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014)

Perceptions of students’ capabilities exist in teacher thinking and become evident through teacher talk and classroom instruction. In the quote above, taken from an excerpt during Paul’s exit interview one week before the conclusion of the school year, Paul revealed his beliefs about his emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities when he stated that some are “just more serious into school than some of the other [emerging bilingual] students” and already for some of his sixth grade emerging bilingual students he knows that “school’s just not for them” (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014). Although in this same interview Paul stated that his students are “very intelligent”, in the same utterance he claimed that “it’s just the effort’s not there” (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014). This feeling that emerging bilingual students lacked effort was not unique to Paul, however. Other participants also felt that students’ lack of effort was an obstacle that got in the way of teachers’ ability to effectively instruct these students (Tom, field notes, April 21, 2014; Lisa, field notes, January 29, 2014; Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014). However, the data show that effort put forth by teachers toward meeting the academic needs of their emerging bilingual students and effort expended by these same students toward meeting instructional goals went hand-in-hand.

My initial goal in this dissertation was to understand how CSR in particular informed teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. It became evident through extensive data analysis, however, that CSR was only one of many other factors (i.e. instructional practices, in-class and school wide structures and systems) that challenged
and/or supported teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Therefore, in this chapter I present findings pertaining to my first research question: What instructional practices and in-class structures (i.e., CSR instruction, classroom management, paraprofessionals, and use of students’ native language) challenge or support teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? In what ways?

In order to answer this question, the chapter is divided into sections, each mapping onto an instructional practice or in-class support that helped explain teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. Within the five sections, two include subsections based on significant themes that emerged from the data. These sections and subsections are: (1) supporting the language needs of emerging bilingual students (for some participants this included the use of students’ native language in the classroom); (2) student effort and teacher expectations; (3) classroom management; (4) Collaborative Strategic Reading (and the importance of thoughtful text selection therein); and (5) the presence or absence of a paraprofessional. Although other instructional practices and in-class supports were discussed or observed throughout the duration of the study, only instructional practices and in-class supports that were mentioned or observed repeatedly among participants in CSR and non-CSR instructional settings are described in detail in this chapter. That is not to say that the other instructional practices and in-class supports were not important, they were just not as significant in explaining the ways in which teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners were challenged or supported in the classroom.

**Supporting the Language Needs of Emerging Bilingual Students**

In a recent synthesis of research regarding effective and commonly used pedagogical practices for teachers of emerging bilingual students, Goldenberg (2013) listed several
instructional supports proposed by researchers and practitioners when teaching emerging bilinguals. These supports included: 1) building on student experiences and familiar content; 2) providing students with necessary background knowledge; 3) using graphic organizers; 4) making instruction and learning tasks extremely clear; 5) using pictures, demonstrations, and real-life objects; 6) providing hands-on, interactive learning activities; 7) providing redundant information (gestures, visual cues); 8) giving additional practice and time for discussion of key concepts; 9) designating language and content objectives for each lesson; 10) using sentence frames and models to help students talk about academic content; 11) providing instruction differentiated by students’ English language proficiency; and 12) strategic use of students’ home language (Goldenberg, 2013). So when asked how the teachers in this study supported the language needs of their emerging bilingual students, it was not surprising to hear them mention one or more of the strategies from the aforementioned list.

Paul was the only participant who said that the way he supported the language needs of his bilingual students both during CSR and non-CSR instruction was through the use of their home language, Spanish. When time permitted, he did this by translating texts and working with students one-on-one to discuss the meaning of these texts in Spanish. This was probably the easiest strategy for Paul because he spoke the language but one that he rarely put into practice because the majority of instructional time was spent managing students’ behavior instead of teaching the content. For example, the data show that in the nine months Paul spent using CSR with his students, he never made it through more than one paragraph of text with his students in a 50 minute class period (Paul, field notes, January 22, 2014; Paul, filed notes, February 5, 2014; Paul, field notes, April 16, 2014).
The instructional supports Tom provided for his emerging bilingual students differed from those of Paul. When asked how Tom supported the language needs of his emerging bilingual students Tom said,

Ah, visuals and like simplifying the task (2.0) making sure that, like (3.0) this is kind of a school wide focus but I did it before (1.0) Key (3.0) making sure that there's key vocabulary that's, you know, three to five words for each unit. That if they understand this word and this concept, then the other stuff is helpful but this is what I want them to take away. So (3.0) so keeping the takeaway simple, and- (3.0) or not simple but keeping the takeaways few. (Tom, interview, May 14, 2014)

Later he reiterated the fact that his supports included providing emerging bilingual students with lots of visuals and added that he also used sentence starters “because I see how it helps them formulate a statement [and] practice (3.0) practice using, ah, English construction when they're speaking” (Tom, interview, May 14, 2014).

Like Tom, Lisa said that she provided her emerging bilingual students with words that she wanted them to use in their oral and written language, and gave her students “choice differentiation” which she defined as “hav[ing] sentences and if they want to use then, they can use them. If they don’t want to use them, they don’t have to” (Lisa, interview 4, May 21, 2014).

Unlike Tom, however, the support Lisa provided her emerging bilingual students served a dual purpose: to help meet their language needs and to help with their behavior. When asked how, she stated

Putting them with people that they can um (2.0) they [can] behaviorally be with. I think it's the big one for um (2.0) especially 6th period (the class comprised entirely of emerging bilingual students) cuz I think part of their behavior is stemming from lack of
language, understanding of what's going on. So I think that's part of [the reason] why our class is like (1.0) kinda crazy. Um (1.0) but (1.0) putting them with people that need Spanish support. Then they can get it within the group. Or (1.0) um (1.0) having a higher person in each group. While the high might not be super high, [they’re] not on grade level, but [they’re] higher than, than the rest (2.0) to kind of challenge the group together. So I think just thinking about how they're, how they're grouped and the needs of certain kids. (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014)

Tony also mentioned intentional grouping as a means to support the language needs of his emerging bilingual students. Tony used students’ scores on the ACCESS English language proficiency measure to make heterogeneous groups. But he alluded to some difficulty in doing so stating,

   Mmm, well it's kinda tough. Um, you know, most of it's trying to form groups with (1.0) based on what their access scores are and if they're really low then all right we're gonna put 'em in stronger groups. Um, but that has a downside. You have a strong group and a really weak person, you know. I know the ho-, the research always says, you know, hopefully that weak person will get pulled up, but what I found is a lot of times that weak person just shuts down. (Tony, interview, May 21, 2014)

That is why on non-CSR days Tony showed a lot of videos. Unlike with heterogeneous grouping, Tony found that in practice, the use of video for his emerging bilingual students was just as successful as the research claimed. Regarding the use of video specifically, Tony said,

   Yeah, I was, um, I was actually hesitant to use videos, you know. I didn't wanna be that teacher. But then read some articles um (1.0) and one that struck me was, you know, especially again with the ELLs was, you know, not to be afraid to use videos and that
kind of attack to help get points across. And it kinda struck me as well wow (1.0) that makes a lot more sense. (Tony, interview, May 21, 2014)

Tony did not just turn on a video and use it as a substitute for teaching. He frequently stopped the video to check for understanding, to make curricular and cross-curricular connections, to elaborate on key concepts or to recap important points (Tony, field notes, January 27, 2014; Tony, field notes, February 5, 2014; Tony, field notes, February 27, 2014; Tony, field notes, March 3, 2014). Students also had responsibilities while viewing. They were expected to take notes, record what they saw on the video, write interesting facts and/or answer questions related to the content of the video.

Similarly, Jane took into account the language needs of her emerging bilingual students by using video and differentiating tasks. In fact, she mentioned utilizing a variety of supports, some that were mentioned by Goldenberg but several others that were not. In our final interview together, she stated that she supported her emerging bilingual students when using CSR by giving them readings with the most important information highlighted. She also provided them with sentence frames on their learning logs because she thought these were helpful ways for them to “see where specifically I was pulling [information] from instead of them not being about to keep up” (Jane, interview 4, May 19, 2014). Additionally, she said that saying instructions aloud and rereading the text aloud were ways she supported the language needs of her emerging bilingual students when using CSR (Jane, interview, May 19, 2014).

On non-CSR days, Jane provided language supports for her emerging bilingual students that included

a lot of organizers, um, partners, uh, I have to be really clear, careful with the partners because my ELD kids will be paired with the ELD kids and I really want them to pair
Jane learned some of these strategies from attending professional development sessions throughout the year that taught teachers ways to increase the use of academic language among emerging bilingual students. According to Jane, “[T]he sentence stems really helped” (Jane, interview, May 19, 2014). However, after reading the research, Goldenberg cautioned otherwise. Specifically, Goldenberg was forthright in saying

There is virtually no data to suggest that…any of these modifications and supports help ELs keep up with non-ELs or help close the achievement gap between them. For some of the items on the list, such as the use of content and language objectives, sentence frames, and differentiating instruction by English proficiency levels, there are no published data at all about their effects on ELs’ learning. (Goldenberg, p. 4, 2013)

This suggests that there is little empirical testing to support the effectiveness of strategies that teachers in this study used to meet the language needs of their emerging bilingual students. Furthermore, when teachers did implement “best practices” for their emerging bilingual students, it was not always for instructional purposes.

Use of students’ native language. One of the best practices for emerging bilingual students previously mentioned was the use of students’ native language in the classroom (Goldenberg, 2008; Goldenberg, 2013). Whether it is peers talking to one another in their L1 to make meaning of curricular content or among teacher and students, the use of students’ native language can be an affective pedagogical tool (Goldenberg, 2013).
In this study, since four of the five teachers did not know Spanish, their ability to use the majority of students’ native language for instructional purposes was limited. Even in the case of Paul, who was supposed to teach social studies in Spanish, because he found that most of his students were not literate in their native language, he chose to use English the majority of the time (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013). However, among the three focal teachers and their students at Aspen Grove, when Spanish was used, it was mostly used for disciplinary purposes. This finding is consistent with the literature that shows teachers prefer to use students’ L1 for discipline and classroom management (Grim, 2010; Macaro, 2001).

In the nine months I spent observing Tom’s instruction only once did I document his use of Spanish. When he did use it, it was to tell a student to stop using the pencil sharpener. He stated, “No, stop! ¡No mas!” (Tom, field notes, April 21, 2014). However, when his students used their native language in class, it was mostly to engage in off task conversations. For example, knowing the teacher was not a Spanish speaker, a student once stated to his peers in English, “It’s okay to say bad words in Spanish because no one else will understand them” (Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014). In his eighth period class, three girls spent the whole class period talking in Spanish about getting braces at an upcoming dentist visit (Tom, field notes, February 24, 2014). During a quiz, Tom reprimanded students for talking in Spanish during a quiz saying, “When I go like this during a quiz (T puts fingers up to lips and says, “shhh”) it means stop talking, not continue in Spanish!” (Tom, field notes, May 12, 2014). Unlike Tom’s students, Lisa’s emerging bilingual students used Spanish among themselves to get each other to pay attention. For example, after Lisa called for “polite attention” during her sixth period class, a student told two other students to shut up, “¡Callaté!” so he could hear the instructions (Lisa, field notes, February 24, 2014). This finding is consistent with the literature that shows the L1 is
used more often for discipline and classroom management (Macaro, 2001) and suggests that students may also use it among each other in the classroom for the same purposes.

In the case of the other focal teacher from Aspen Grove, however, Spanish was only used to manage behavior after giving directives in English failed. This supports the extant research that says teachers use the L1 for discipline purposes because they feel it ensures effective and rapid management (Chambers, 1991; Duff & Polio, 1990; Franklin, 1990; Macaro, 2001; Polio & Duff, 1994). For example, at the beginning of class one day Paul called for students’ attention by saying, “All right, five, four, three, two, one, surf’s up!” When no students responded by mimicking the sound of waves hitting the shore saying “shhh,” Paul raised his voice saying, “¡Silencio por favor!” (Paul, field notes, February 24, 2014). When this failed still to get students’ attention he went back to the countdown shouting, “All right, five, four, three, two, one, surf’s up! ¡Silencio! ¡Con respeto, dejen de hablar!” He used this combination of English and Spanish often to manage the noise level of his students following almost all countdowns in English with a directive in Spanish like “¡Silencio!” or “¡Silencio, pongan atención!” However, because his excessive use of Spanish in this way yielded minimal success, although he may have felt it would ensure effective and rapid classroom management, instead it pointed to a general lack of control over students’ behavior.

**Effort and Expectations**

Extant literature states that students achieve in a manner consistent with their teachers’ expectations (Donovan & Cross, 2002). For the five focal teachers I worked with during the 2013-14 school year, although teachers claimed to have high expectations for all students when interviewed, their practices in the classroom showed otherwise. Consistently, for these five teachers, helping their emerging bilingual students often meant giving them the answers.
Whether it was telling them what to write through copying or dictation, or showing them where to find information in the text, more often than not, emerging bilingual students in these classrooms did not have to grapple with complex information or do much thinking for themselves.

In the class periods I observed of Paul’s, both in typical and CSR instructional settings, his instructional decisions reflected low expectations which in turn yielded low effort on the part of his students. When students were not talking with friends, they were waiting to copy information from the board dictated by the teacher. Although most of these instances were prefaced by Paul saying, “Let me help you,” or “I’m gonna help you,” for Paul, help looked like giving students the answers. For example, prior to an observation of typical instruction, Paul took me aside and explained that students would be finishing a quiz during the class period. It consisted of a two page, single-spaced, reading with six questions. As he handed me a copy of the quiz, he stated, “And I told them where to find most of the answers [yesterday] but I’ll tell them again today” (Paul, field notes, April 11, 2014). This suggests that Paul felt his students needed him to do the work/thinking for them in order to successfully complete the task. Or perhaps Paul felt that if students did not do well on the quiz, this would reflect poorly on his instruction. Either way, it did not prevent Paul from instructing his students to copy information he provided for them on the board during both typical and CSR instruction. Even when students had written something on their own, they often erased it to copy the teacher’s work instead (Paul, field notes, April 16, 2014).

This practice of telling students what to write was no substitute for learning. For example, after a fifty minute “lesson” of students copying information dictated to them by the teacher,
Paul asked students to share what they learned that day before being dismissed to the next class period. One student had the following to say (Paul, field notes, February 3, 2014):

P: What did you learn today?

S: Nothing. What were we learning about? Nothing.

After enduring fifty minutes of instruction that consisted of copying information, these same students went to science where they were often instructed to do the same. Even though Lisa balanced teacher and student talk by frequently asking students to talk to each other about the content before sharing either in small or whole group settings, or being asked to write it in their science notebooks, students were still asked to mimic teacher’s actions. For example, in one class Lisa read through some notes students were to have written in their notebooks and highlighted the most important information on the Promethean Board for all to see. She stated, “I suggest you do the same. Again, I’m highlighting up here the most important parts” (Lisa, field notes, January 29, 2014). Instead of asking students to identify the most important information on their own or with a partner, Lisa did it for them.

At times, Tony also took an indirect approach to giving students answers by offering suggestions for what to write. While watching a video on the reproductive system, students were instructed to record important facts pertaining to the content of the movie. After viewing a segment, Tony stopped the video saying, “So 374,000 people are born every day. That’s an interesting fact. I’d write it down” (Tony, field notes, March 3, 2014). Before the video resumed, students recorded this fact on their video note catcher.

On other occasions in Lisa’s class, emerging bilingual students were instructed to copy a definition into their science vocabulary packets. In addition to defining these words, students
were also given the part of speech and instructed to draw a picture to go along with the term. Instead of having students come up with their own illustration to remember the word and its meaning, however, she told them to copy one of the three illustrations she provided for them (Lisa, field notes, January 29, 2014). When preparing for a test a few months later, Lisa prefaced it by saying, “The questions from the study guide are the same questions on the test” (Lisa, field notes, March 24, 2014). Then as students were completing the study guide, she stated, “Make sure you’re not just copying answers [from the textbook] without thinking about it” (Lisa, field notes March 24, 2014). But how were students expected to think for themselves when their teachers frequently did the thinking for them?

This practice of reading information aloud to students or having them copy information given to them by the teacher was not unique to the classes comprised entirely of emerging bilingual students. Tom also used this technique with his students (30% of whom were emerging bilinguals) when they were preparing for an upcoming assessment or presentation and asked to complete a corresponding worksheet or study guide. For example, while preparing for a presentation on different Amazonian groups, Tom said, “Guys, I thought I was clear! All of the answers are found on the page that’s dedicated to your group!” (Tom, field notes, April 21, 2014). During a different lesson, Tom asked his students, “How many people are having a problem finding [the answer to] number three?” After half of the class raised their hands, he showed them where to find the answer in the text. Then he went over to one of his emerging bilingual students and repeated where to find the answer to the question pointing to its exact location in the textbook (Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014).

Because giving students answers was as a common practice among participating teachers, when they asked their emerging bilingual students to work independently and were met with
resistance, teachers made comments that alluded to their frustration. Jane once admitted that, “It’s tricky because I know they’d do better if I read directions to them but with TCAP coming up, I can’t read directions to them all the time” (Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014). On another occasion in Tom’s class, after drawing students’ attention to important pages in the textbook that contained information needed to answer questions on a graphic organizer, the following interaction ensued:

T: So I see one guy with a book open. You guys either sink or swim together-

S: Yay, an underwater adventure! (Tom, field notes, February 24, 2014)

Later that same class period, Tom went up to a student who still had not written down any information and stated, “I’m not going to put the pencil in my hand. Come on man, you can do this!” (Tom, field notes, February 24, 2014). It seemed students had become so accustomed to being given answers that they started to take their work and teachers’ threats less seriously knowing if they held out long enough, eventually, aside from doing the work for them, the teacher would tell them what to write or where to find information needed to complete an assignment. However, I interpreted this seeming lack of effort that Paul referred to at the beginning of this chapter, as more likely a product of teachers’ low expectations.

**Classroom Management**

The key to successful classroom management is high quality teacher-student relationships (Marzano & Marzano, 2003). Additionally, in a synthesis of research looking at data from over 100 studies, Marzano and Marzano (2003) found that classroom management has the largest effect on student achievement. Therefore, when the teacher-student relationship is of high-quality, there are fewer discipline problems and rule violations that often disrupt learning.
According to Marzano and Marzano (2003), an effective teacher-student relationship is cultivated by three characteristics: 1) appropriate levels of dominance on the part of the teacher (i.e. clear behavior expectations & learning goals, exhibiting assertive behavior); 2) appropriate levels of cooperation among teacher and students (i.e. providing flexible learning goals, taking a personal interest in students, using equitable & positive behavior systems); and 3) demonstrating an awareness of high-needs students (i.e. students with social, emotional, linguistic, behavioral and mental needs).

According to these criteria, the data from this study show that few participating teachers had successful classroom management because they lacked high-quality teacher-student relationships. They lacked high-quality teacher-student relationships because one or more of the key characteristics to effective teacher-student relationships were absent from the onset.

Although all focal teachers were challenged by issues pertaining to classroom management at some point throughout the course of the school year and duration of the study, Paul’s students appeared most affected by poor quality classroom management. Initially, this was surprising given the fact that of the five focal teachers, he was the only ELD (English Language Development) teacher and native Spanish speaker. As such, he was well- aware of students’ linguistic needs (key characteristic #3). However, respect toward bilingual staff by emerging bilingual students was not just a given because they shared the same native language. It was something that had to be earned.

The data show that Paul often struggled to establish effective teacher-student relationships making classroom management more difficult for him. Times when he focused his attention on students’ negative behaviors and what they were not doing as opposed to what they were doing well demonstrate this tension. Instances such as these go against the second key
characteristic of successful classroom management, using equitable & positive behavior systems. Students often took his diatribes to mean disdain for them. For example, at the end of one lesson in April, Paul explained the behavior students needed to show in order for them to pass his class.

T: [I]n order to pass this class you have to show lots of effort, get the work done and it has to be completely done. When it’s not completely done, I always give you more than enough time to finish. The reason you guys don’t finish everything is talking. Don’t take time away from yourself by talking and not working. As I told you before, you earn your grades. The way you earn your grades is by…(lists actions they can take). But if you’re not working hard, you’re not playing attention.

S: You don’t like us.

T: I like everyone. I’ve seen the best of you in ___’s class.

Ss: That’s ____’s class.

T: So some of you, I’m telling you this because I’d like to help you out- (Paul, field notes, April 11, 2014)

Even though Paul initially responded to the student’s comment that he likes everyone, in the last line he seems to be helping out only “some” in stating what is expected of them. This seems contradictory to liking everyone by only helping some. However, this feeling that he can only help some may be due to the fact that Paul was promised a class size at the beginning of the school year much smaller than what he actually got.

In our initial interview together when asked about the composition of his class Paul stated, “[O]riginally, this class was supposed to be a smaller class…with about 12 to 15 students” (Paul, interview 1, November 14, 2013). Instead he stated that a year with 34 students\textsuperscript{13}.

\textsuperscript{13} This number fluctuated throughout the year due to student mobility both in and out of the school district.
whose language, learning, and behavioral needs were all different made teaching “impossible”
(Paul, interview 1, November 14, 2013). Later in the same interview when discussing the
relationship between class size and behavior, Paul said:

Class size makes a whole lot of difference and, you know, behavior wasn't as atrocious
[in the past] as this 6th grade class that I have now. And I don't know why because
normally my 6th graders come in and they're pretty well-behaved ↑ (2.0) just, this once
they’re just a different (1.0) different task.

However, Paul was not alone when it came to managing student behavior issues. Another focal
teacher, Tom, also had to deal with challenging behaviors. In order to address this issue with his
students, Tom once made a joke in class when introducing the key vocabulary term, exploitation,
during a CSR lesson. He stated, “Like you guys exploit the fact that people don’t really get in
trouble around here so you push-” (Tom, field notes, April 21, 2014). As a result of feeling like
there were no consequences in place for student misconduct, teachers, like Tom, often decided to
take disciplinary manners into their own hands.

For example, after having a substitute teacher the previous day, Tom began his fourth
period class by discussing how the substitute teacher left him a note listing the names of students
who lost behavior points and detailing an incident in which two students gave him made-up
names (“José” and “Alfredo”) so that they could use going to the restroom as an excuse to ditch
class. Instead of bringing this to the attention of the administration, Tom asked five students to
stay after class and bribed them with the choice of either chips or candy to tell him who “José”
and “Alfredo” really were so that he could follow up with their parents regarding their behavior.
Enticed by hot Cheetos, the five students were quick to disclose the real identity of “José” and
“Alfredo” (Tom, field notes, March 19, 2014).
At other times, Tom took a more direct approach to dealing with discipline in the classroom. For example, at the end of the school year students in his 4th period class were taking a quiz in which they were instructed to incorporate terms from a recent unit on financial literacy into a short story or cartoon. Students were told at the beginning both orally and in writing that the task was to be completed independently and silently (Tom, field notes, May 12, 2014). Halfway through the class, however, one of Tom’s emerging bilingual students was called out for talking with someone at his table. The following interaction took place after Paul had just finished reminding students a second time the manner in which this activity was to be completed.

T: Marcelo?

M: Yeah mister?\(^{14}\)

T: Shut up. I can’t think of a better way to say it. (Tom, field notes, May 12, 2014)

Although this was not the most respectful way to approach a student, it must have had the effect Tom was looking for because four minutes later he commented to the whole class, “This is awesome guys. This is what it should sound like when you take a quiz” (Tom, field notes, May 12, 2014).

Tom also openly shared with his students when he felt that their negative behaviors from other classes were impacting their ability to learn in his class. One day he began his eighth period class by stating

I don’t know what happened last period but we all have a job to do…What happened over there [in the classroom next door] is totally self-contained. What happened here is totally

\(^{14}\) In all of my fieldnotes from observations of typical and CSR instruction, although I refer to students by pseudonym, I recorded students’ actual names so that I could later track whether or not they were designated emerging bilingual students. In the case of Marcelo, an emerging bilingual student, this was the only recorded instance I have of him talking aloud in class.
self-contained but it’s [the behavior] trickling over here…Obviously I have to talk to [the English teacher] about this but we’re talking about it here too. My point is that every class has a set time in which to get our job done. (Tom, field notes, February 24, 2014)

Following directions and staying focused by being on task was the students’ job but when this did not happen it made the teacher’s ability to do her job more difficult. Lisa brought this to her emerging bilingual students’ attention saying, “I see two conversations happening. It’s hard for me to be a teacher when I’m distracted by your voices” (Lisa field notes, January 29, 2014). On another occasion, Tony scrapped his lesson plan entirely to address student misconduct. He started the discussion by asking students why their misbehavior was such an issue and lamenting the use of threats to get students back on track. To this, a student responded, “Take away privileges. The only time we want to learn is when we’re doing something fun” (Tony, field notes, January 27, 2014). This comment became the impetus for a discussion on how to make the class better. Students talked about what class looked like when it is going well and possible incentives the teacher could put in place to motivate students to stay on task. They also discussed consequences for classroom misconduct that students felt would be more effective than the current school-wide system. Tony concluded the whole-class discussion by addressing the “domino effect of behavior” explaining how he has noticed that one person’s off task behavior or outburst throws everyone else off (Tony, field notes, January 27, 2014).

According to the data of all focal teachers typical and CSR instruction, students off task behavior also limited their productivity in class. Comments made by teachers directed toward their emerging bilingual students in particular, like, “Ladies and gentlemen, the class began at 12:12 [clock shows 12:42] and we have not accomplished anything in 30 minutes!,” (Lisa, field notes, January 29, 2014) and “You’ve been in this class for 42 minutes and look at what you’ve
done. I can’t help but notice that your pages are empty” (Tom, field notes, February 24, 2014) were commonplace in focal teachers’ classrooms. So too were discussions of how students’ misbehavior prevented them from achieving academic success. To this point, Tom stated, “So about 80-85% of you are working hard and are on track. Unfortunately, the 15-20% who are off track are SO off track that they are going to have a really hard time” (Tom, field notes, February 24, 2014).

Collectively, these instances of classroom mismanagement demonstrated a lack of culturally responsive awareness on the part of the teachers in this study although no one ever directly admitted to this claim. Instead, whether emerging bilingual students had an easy or hard time in the classroom was their own responsibility according to study participants. For example, Tony told his emerging bilingual students that (mis)behavior was their choice (Tony, field notes, January 27, 2014). Conversely, for participant teachers, the use of CSR was not a choice, rather an expectation by the school district and administrators who oversaw teachers’ implementation.

**Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR)**

Collaborative Strategic Reading was originally designed to support emerging bilingual students and students with learning disabilities in the Miami-Dade school district. Since its inception in the mid-late 1990’s, it has been used in content area and language arts classrooms to fulfill that purpose all the way from Florida to California and states in between. However, for the participants in this study, the first hurdle was getting these content area teachers to see themselves as literacy teachers too. In order to access textbook information, which was a common source of knowledge in these content-area classes, teachers knew that their students, especially emerging bilinguals, needed strategies. Therefore, as an instructional tool, CSR
provided students with explicit reading comprehension strategies that were used before, during and after reading to monitor their understanding.

In this study, teachers discussed how they learned more about their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities through the use of these strategies than had they relied exclusively on their typical instruction. Equally as significant, participant teachers also commented that they learned more about themselves as teachers. For example, when asked how he felt CSR went for him and his students, emerging bilinguals in particular, Tom stated

It went from being something that I was unsure about. Something that I was, um, hesitant, reluctant (1.0) all those words (2.0) and then even some negative words thrown in there. It went from being that to being something that I could count on in the middle of the week that could kind of refocus everybody (1.0) because once the students got the process down it was pretty easy to grade their papers and it was pretty easy for them to produce a quantifiable result (2.0) so that it felt like::even when it was the toughest day it felt like a day that showed more success for a lot of people. (Tom, interview 4, May 14, 2014)

When asked why he felt so reluctant to use CSR initially, Tom added, “Ah, because I don't like to be told what to do because I'm the expert in my classroom” (Tom, interview 4, May 14, 2014). But once he started using CSR and making changes to his instructional approach he stated,

The modification of the learning logs and the modifications of the readings and stuff I thought was super helpful to my SPED and my ELLs. And if it hadn’t been for CSR I
probably wouldn’t have gone to those efforts to do that. (Tom, interview 4, May 14, 2014)

For Lisa, the benefits of using CSR with students, emerging bilinguals in particular, included making reading an integral part of her content area instruction. Specifically, she commented,

I didn’t avoid reading which I think I did in the past. [I] would avoid things 'coz I didn't have a reading strategy for them to do. And when I would give them reading before it was questions that they had to answer (2.0) you know about the text (1.0) and they would be in order so it wouldn’t be reading. It would be, let me search the text for the answer. And that's how [it] was always before. You know (1.0) I would give them a reading guide, worksheet, but they would just be reading the questions and looking for the answer and not reading the passage and then answering the questions. (Lisa, interview 4, May 21, 2014)

For Jane, CSR held her accountable for checking in more frequently with her emerging bilingual students to monitor their comprehension. To this she stated,

I'll go check in on the (1.0) the louder children before I go check on the quieter children. Um (1.0) I did that with one of my um ELD boys [who’s] quiet in class. He's very attentive. He works. But he was working incorrectly. He was doing it wrong. I wouldn't get to him fast enough before he would get about half way through the assignment and I'd be like, "Whoa, whoa, whoa."” (Jane, interview, May 19, 2014)

But using CSR was not just a way for teachers to monitor students’ comprehension. According to Paul, it was a way for emerging bilingual students to monitor their own comprehension. When asked what he learned about his emerging bilingual students through the use of CSR, he stated,
What I've learned about my students through the use of CSR is they do need that help from those reading strategies to help them get along (1.0) not just for CSR but for non CSR lessons too. And I see some transfer in the non CSR lessons...Uh, I see, their thinking strategies transferring. I see they're trying to define words...and then even collaboration has transferred quite a bit. Now I think they've seen how important it is to work together and be on task. (Paul, interview, May 19, 2014)

Providing emerging bilingual students with strategies to use while reading that could transfer to other contexts was just one of the benefits teachers saw for using CSR with emerging bilingual students. For example, regarding his perception of emerging bilingual students academic capabilities, Tom said,

    The ELLs actually do more work on the CSR lesson because there are so many different chances for them to succeed...so it pushes them. It pushes them to show some mastery somewhere. There's some chance where they can succeed. (Tom, interview 4, May 14, 2014)

In addition to providing them ample opportunity to demonstrate mastery and success in a lesson, Jane felt CSR allowed her emerging bilingual students an opportunity to show off their reading fluency. She commented,

    I've learned more of them have stronger reading ability than I would hear in the classroom. Like if I did standard popcorn reading I would never hear Mario. Um, and [with CSR] I can just like cruise on by and I can hear Mario reading. Um (1.0) same thing [with] Jorge. [Students] know he's quiet. I wouldn't hear him reading. So that's (1.0) that's one of the things that I really notice the most. (Jane, interview 4, May 19, 2014)
For Tony and Lisa, using CSR increased emerging bilingual students’ participation and engagement with the content. Both teachers commented that the conversations among their emerging bilingual students around texts were “better” and at a “higher level” than their monolingual students (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014; Tony, interview, May 21, 2014). These high quality conversations were often facilitated by making thoughtful text selections on the part of teachers.

**Text selection.** CSR teachers received professional development (PD) and coaching on selecting appropriate texts for their CSR teaching. During this PD, teachers learned to identify and select challenging, quality texts for CSR activities. This included where to find and differentiate texts. Teachers were reminded to consider the purpose for using a text, its relevancy, difficulty, length, and connection to the class content. Collectively, CSR teachers were provided with concrete considerations when selecting texts for CSR lessons. The extent to which teachers were able to find high-quality and challenging texts, however, was complicated by other school-specific factors.

For example, when it came to translating materials into Spanish for his emerging bilingual students, Paul claimed that he was only able to make this happen “25% or less” of the time (Paul, interview, May 19, 2014). Unless students were using the textbook, which was translated into Spanish, it was up to Paul to translate materials. Sometimes he received help from the Spanish teacher when translating texts. However, due to the lack of time Paul felt he received for planning purposes during the school day, he did not translate more of the materials for his native Spanish-speaking students. In his initial interview he admitted,

>[I]f I have time I will try and translate what we’re doing in English to Spanish on paper for those Spanish speakers that don’t know how to read or write in English. [But] it’s
difficult for me (1.0) since I’m doing two content areas (1.0) to really hone down on my planning and really do an effective job. That’s the downfall of being in two different content areas. (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013)

Additionally, when asked about whether or not he felt translating texts was helpful Paul stated, “For some of them it [is]. For some it [is]n’t because they’re at low levels either way in English and Spanish” (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013). This comment was based off of results from a quiz Paul created at the beginning of the school year to assess his students’ proficiency in Spanish. Results showed that only eight of his thirty-four original students could read and write in Spanish. However, since Aspen Grove was a TNLI (transitional native language instruction) school, by law, content area classes were supposed to be available to students in the majority native language (Spanish). When asked how students who he felt were not proficient in their native language got placed into his social studies class that was intended to be taught in Spanish, Paul stated,

Well they looked at the ACCESS scores and thought, “Well they all (3.0) are Spanish speakers and learned Spanish.” When I went to give my pre-test, and I had it done in Spanish, out of 34 kids that I had at the time, only eight could read or write in Spanish and not very well. (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013)

From that point on Paul decided to conduct the social studies class in English since he found that the majority of the students were not proficient in their native language. For the eight students who were proficient according to Paul’s self-made assessment, he provided native language support that research has shown to be ineffective (Goldenberg, 2013) (i.e. translating instructions to them after they were given the first time from English into Spanish, and reading English text in Spanish for them when Spanish texts was unavailable). It was no wonder that
students who were not literate in English had difficulty engaging with text they could not comprehend. For example, when asked to read and summarize English text on their own, students often stated “No lo entiendo,” “That’s too long,” or “That’s too much” (Paul, field notes, February 24, 2014).

Lisa also said she struggled to find texts that met the “text quality checklist.” Lisa attributed part of this struggle to that fact that she felt her emerging bilingual students were more engaged and struggled less to comprehend texts that did not come from the science textbook. In an interview conducted after watching herself and a colleague use CSR with the same group of students but in different content area with texts from different sources, she shared,

[Textbook readings] are the ones that they struggle with more than the like (1.0) the article based reading…I (1.0) maybe- maybe like if I would honestly take what’s in the textbook and reprint it on a piece of paper (2.0) and the fact that it’s on a piece of paper would change their mind (1.0) I don’t know but I do (3.0) I notice seeing it in here with them when it’s a textbook versus not. (Lisa, interview, March 5, 2014)

By the end of the school year, Lisa was able to find more articles of high interest to her students that also covered the content students needed to master by the end of sixth grade. In our final interview together, she felt she was getting a handle on how to select texts that were appropriate for her sixth grade emerging bilingual students. When asked what she has learned about her emerging bilingual students through CSR, Lisa said,

I think I understand much more of like (1.0) what a sixth grade reading level looks like and what it doesn’t. (2.0) Cuz I know before even in the textbook (3.0) it’s not (1.0) it’s too high (1.0) for a grade level. Um and just (1.0) I- and what I and the kids (1.0) when you’re (1.0) when you’re told in their IEP or whatever they read at a first grade level or
second grade level (2.0) I don’t really know what that actually looks like. Um (1.0) I would say until now. You know? And so that gives me some perspective. (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014)

This also points to the lack of training that many middle and high school teachers receive around how to teach basic reading skills like phonics and lexile levels (Snow, Griffin & Burns, 2007). However, Lisa did not attribute her gained perspective regarding reading levels directly to CSR supports like coaching and PDs. Instead she learned this information through the internet. Specifically, she commented,

So, like for me I found that news ELA site and you can change [readings] by lexile level…And so I didn’t really know even before (1.0) like (1.0) what lexile levels are. Like, oh yeah↑ I know they’re numbered (1.0) but as far as what grade level that actually was (1.0) I had no idea…But [now] I know generally when I look at it. (2.0) Um, and then the articles tell you it will translate it to like grade 6 or grade 7. (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014)

Although a computer-based numerical evaluation of a text’s complexity may not be 100% accurate, finding this site provided Lisa with a resource, in addition to the textbook, that she felt enabled her to make thoughtful and meaningful text selections for her emerging bilingual students. When asked about other readings she found on the internet to use with these students during CSR, Lisa stated, “I found that- that’s where I got that polar (clears throat) vortex [reading], and so they (1.0) they understood a lot about air masses based on that situation (1.0) you know (2.0) in that article. So that one was good” (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014).
For these teachers, finding articles to use during CSR that were both interesting and available to students in their native language were vital to the success of their emerging bilingual students. To this Lisa said,

They're able to participate. They're in a group (1.0) that while the rest of the kids are reading English they know enough Spanish that they could read the Spanish article and can conduct a conversation in both Spanish and English to help out those other kids.

(Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014)

But when a teacher needed additional support in the classroom, where did this come from?

**A Paraprofessional in the Classroom Might have made Things Easier**

Many teachers in this study would have been so lucky to receive the instructional support that Tom did from the special education paraprofessional. Wendy worked with his students in two of the three class periods, many of whom were both emerging bilinguals with special needs. Some of the time she spent sitting with specific groups of students who had IEPs (Individualized Educational Plans). Tom chose to group these students homogeneously so that Wendy did not have to move from group to group during instruction. Most of the time, however, her time was used taking attendance, making copies, passing out papers, and managing the class while the teacher dealt with student behavior in the hall (Tom, field notes, March 24, 2014). On one occasion, Tom had to escort a student to the bathroom “by law” (Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014) leaving me and Wendy in charge of the class. When Wendy managed the class, her focus was mainly on behavior and productivity. Instead of focusing her time and energy on the students who needed her assistance with the content, she often had to refocus students who were off task or disrupting the learning of others (Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014; Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014; Tom, field notes, March 24, 2014).
Conversely, Paul had asked the assistant principal at the beginning of the year for the assistance of a paraprofessional for his bilingual special needs students in his social studies class and never heard back from him until the last month of the school year. Of his class of 34 emerging bilingual sixth graders, he recounted,

I have a mixture of special ed students, and I have a mixture of students that barely know any English so that’s another component in there [in addition to lower reading levels] (2.0) you know (1.0) the special ed students and the other students that are English language learners that know very little or no English at all. And I don’t have the time to spend with them one-on-one. So that’s a big problem for me. I have talked with Mr. Anderson about that (1.0) and e-mailed him to see what kind of support he can give me because I tell him I cannot get to all my students on a one-to-one basis because I’ve got the sped students (1.0) I’ve got the English language learners (1.0) I’ve got the other ones with the behaviors. (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013)

After pursuing the issue further and continuing to advocate for his students, Paul finally got the assistance he had asked for initially. But when asked in our final interview together how he supported the language needs of his emerging bilingual students during CSR, he stated,

[F]inally later on I got a para to help me out (1.0) which has been very beneficial [but] I would have liked the help of a para a lot earlier (2.0) It might have made things a lot easier but I didn’t get one until towards the end. (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014)

Unlike Paul who was a native Spanish speaker, Lisa was monolingual in English. Because of this, by law she received assistance in the classroom from a bilingual paraprofessional who also spent time out of class translating texts for Lisa’s students. This bilingual paraprofessional came
in to help the same group of students Paul had on both CSR and non-CSR days in science. The fact that Tom and Lisa received classroom support from a paraprofessional for their emerging bilingual students from the onset and Paul did not is cause for concern. This points to an unequal distribution of in-class resources at the school both for teachers and emerging bilingual students.

The two teachers at Superior, on the other hand, received no in-class support from certified staff for their emerging bilingual students. They did, however, share a City Year member between their four class periods. On CSR days, he sat with small groups of students and helped them work through the CSR process while reading in either science or social studies class. On non-CSR days, sometimes he took emerging bilingual students out in the hall to work with them on an activity or project in a small group or one-on-one. Other times he sat next to them in the classroom and worked with them in a similar manner. For Jane, it was the first time in fourteen years that she had assistance in the classroom (Jane, interview, November 7, 2013). Although sometimes he could be distracting because he engaged in off-task conversations with students during instruction and/or independent work time, the majority of the time he tried to help students complete their work.

Finally, the only paraprofessional I saw work in the classrooms at Superior was a special education para who accompanied a multi-intensive (MI) needs student, Kevin, to Tony’s second period science class. Tony explained that Kevin came to science each day because he had expressed an interest in the subject to his MI teachers. Since they did not focus on this subject in their classroom, Tony permitted Kevin to attend his class for the hands-on science experiences and on CSR days. While Kevin mingled with his peers by sitting with a small group of students during class, the para sat watch at a table near the teacher’s desk removed from the rest of the group. This distancing from Kevin allowed the para to become disengaged and on one occasion,
to fall asleep (Tony, field notes, March 17, 2014). So even though Tony technically received assistance with Kevin in the class, once the lesson began, Kevin learned from Tony and his students. Tony’s students, especially his emerging bilinguals, read aloud to him, showed him what and where to write, and listened to his stories (Tony, field notes, March 17, 2014). However, like other study participants, Tony never publically complained about the lack of in-class support, only that his emerging bilingual students could have benefited more from targeted language support in the classroom (Tony, interview, May 21, 2014).

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I described five instructional practices and/or in-class supports that informed teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. I posited that teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities were perpetuated through these instructional practices and in-class supports primarily in the ways in which these teachers talked to and about their emerging bilingual students in the classroom. I presented findings related to how teachers supported the language needs of emerging bilingual students (through the use of students’ native language for some), student effort and teacher expectations, classroom management, Collaborative Strategic Reading, and how the presence or absence of a paraprofessional in the classroom facilitated teachers ability to meet the academic needs of their emerging bilingual students. Finally, I examined how these instructional practices and in-class supports (or lack thereof) influenced teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students.

From these data presented, it may seem that deficit views toward emerging bilingual students are pervasive and static, when in reality perceptions are dynamic. According to the literature, they are created and perpetuated through social processes, act as worldviews to guide us, and through social processes can be changed (Leonardo, 2003; Scribner, 1997). Therefore,
changing teachers' perceptions must involve developing new knowledge (Cochran-Smith & Lytle, 1999). In the next chapter, I explore how teachers’ knowledge about emerging bilingual students was enhanced or inhibited through school-wide supports, systems and the overall social climate in which participant teachers worked.
Chapter 6: School Context Matters

Our [minority] students are often treated differently when they "act out" and family differences or claimed cultural disconnects are usually the excuse. Reporting of ALL discipline instances at our school face greater scrutiny because of the perceived "school to prison pipeline" focus that is sweeping education right now, but when the vast majority of our students (over 95%) comes from minority populations, OF COURSE WE WILL BE SUSPENDING MORE BROWN STUDENTS. Several students have been involved with threatening physical harm to others or danger to the school and those students are still a part of the general population. Students routinely get sent out of one class, only to return to the next after the bell and get sent out again, this can go on until a student has four referrals in one day, but is seen as a better choice than removal of the student to an in school suspension room for fear of losing seat time. (Tom, personal communication, May 21, 2014)

This quote was taken from one participant’s response to an open-ended question on the IDI in which he was asked to provide an example of a situation in which cultural differences needed to be addressed at his organization [school] but the situation ended negatively. His response suggested that there were inconsistencies among faculty and staff at the school when it came to dealing with student discipline, specifically when he stated that “[s]tudents routinely get sent out of one class, only to return to the next after the bell and get sent out again.” Tom was not alone, however, in attempting to understand and navigate the inconsistencies in school-wide systems and support. In addition to dealing with inconsistencies, participants in this study reported other school-specific contextual factors that challenged their perception of their students, emerging bilinguals in particular.

Therefore, in this chapter, I address my second research question: What school-specific contextual factors outside of the classroom (i.e., school-wide supports & systems, school initiatives) challenge or support teachers perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? How so? Like the previous chapter, this chapter is divided into sections, each mapping onto a school-specific contextual factor that helped explain teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. These sections are based on significant themes that emerged from
the data. They include: (1) school fit (in the form of collegial and administrative support); (2) school-wide behavior systems; (3) availability of resources (physical space, in particular); and (4) the use and impact of assessments. Although other school-specific contextual factors were discussed, experienced or observed throughout the duration of the study, only factors that were mentioned, experienced or observed repeatedly among participants at each school are described in detail in this chapter.

“Is this school for me?”

Part of employee satisfaction has to do with liking not only where you work but who you work with. At each of the two participating schools, collegial relationships were intact and well. Teachers were often seen talking to each other in the halls or coming into each other’s classrooms when they were not teaching. For example, due to her long-standing experience as a teacher at Superior, almost every time I came to lesson plan with Jane, there was another teacher in the room asking for advice. Most of the time this person was Tony, the other CSR teacher, but on other occasions they were joined by the 7th grade math teacher, the 6th grade S.S. teacher, the computer teacher, and the gifted and talented specialist. Instances of congregating in this manner were not unique to Superior, however. The three focal teachers at Aspen Grove were in frequent communication since they were part of the same grade-level team. Among these three focal participants, they had one of two things in common: they either taught the same group of students (Paul & Lisa, Lisa & Tom) or they taught the same content (Paul & Tom). What they did not have in common, was administrative support.

Administrative support. By the end of the 2013-14 only two of the five focal participants returned to their same teaching position. Two of the male teachers, Tom and Tony, went on to teach high school students within the same content area (social studies and science,
respectively). One stayed at the same school while the other obtained employment in a different school district. The third, Paul, found out in early October of 2013 that he would not be asked to come back to Aspen Grove. According to Paul, this was because he complained to Mario, the principal, about not having a classroom and other things he did not like about his teaching assignment(s). However, according to the principal, it was because he felt that Paul was an ineffective teacher (Mario, memo, January 13, 2014). The principal also reported to me that his students from the previous year had given him the lowest ratings among teachers at the school on the Student Perception Survey (SPS). The combination of an ineffective rating and low perceptions from students was enough to have Paul laid-off at the onset with the expectation that he would carry out the remainder of the school year at Aspen Grove.

The lack of administrative support for this particular teacher made coaching him even more challenging. For example, on one occasion I scheduled joint principal-coach observations of CSR instruction in both Paul and Lisa’s CSR classes with the same emerging bilingual students. After feeling frustrated by the lack of progress I was making with Paul, as a coach I needed another set of eyes to help identify next steps for coaching. The principal and I met after the lesson to talk about what we saw. I asked him what he thought about Paul’s use of CSR and his only response was, “I told you he was an ineffective teacher” (Mario, memo, January 13, 2014). Then he went on to discuss Lisa’s CSR instruction talking very specifically about instructional moves that were present/absent from her lesson. When we started to discuss next steps for these teachers, the only next step he could offer for Paul was to put me in touch with the behavioral specialist at the school. It was clear from our conversation that the principal did not think that helping Paul was worthwhile. And it was even clearer after meeting with the behavioral specialist, that she did not have time to help Paul either.
Initially I was told that the behavioral specialist at Aspen Grove was in charge of providing support for all teachers. However, in our meeting she informed me that she was only available one period in three out of the five school days to support first year teachers and teachers new to Aspen Grove. As a veteran teacher both at Aspen Grove and within the school district, this meant that Paul was outside of her purview. It also meant that Paul had minimal incentive to want to improve given the lack of availability of support staff and administrative support. By the end of the school year, Paul seemed so discouraged by the lack of support that he was absent once a week for the months of April and May due to migraine headaches (analytic memos, weeks 4/14-5/19). When asked in mid-May how things were going, Paul said that he was burnt out and ready to be done with this year so he had transitioned into survival mode in order to get through the last two weeks of school (Paul, memo, May 19, 2014). During our final interview together, when asked what he planned to do for employment in the upcoming year, Paul stated that he planned to “take a break” from teaching (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014). It seemed that the stress of a chaotic classroom and pending unemployment had started to affect Paul’s physical and mental wellbeing.

But Paul was not the only teacher at the school who felt an overwhelming sense of helplessness when it came to dealing with the administration at the school. In mid-April Tom was engaged in a conversation with a teacher at the school. They were discussing some feedback that the teacher had received regarding his instruction and classroom management. The teacher commented, “They say if I’m a better teacher my students will behave better” to which Tom replied, “And that’s just not true” (Tom, memo, April 18, 2014). Much like the principal’s reaction to Paul’s ineffective instruction, these teachers dialogue with each other suggest that they felt the quality of their instruction was compromised by the behavior of their students.
In order to assist with this, as a lead coach for CSR at both participating schools, I sought to keep the administration abreast of CSR successes and challenges in the classroom, including those related to student behavior. For example, I asked the principals at each school to join me when observing CSR instruction. This never happened at Superior because every time the principal and I had scheduled a joint observation, something came up in her schedule taking her away from the classroom. Whether it was dealing with student behavior, an administration meeting, district event, or parent conference, she seemed to always have a last-minute scheduling conflict. Conversely, at Aspen Grove we were able to schedule joint observations of grade level science/social studies teams using CSR with the same group of students. Unfortunately this only happened for the 6th and 8th grade teams, but fortunately the 6th grade classes that the principal did observe were comprised entirely of emerging bilingual students.

In both 6th grade classrooms, the principal showed up late and only caught snippets of instruction. Afterward, I asked to schedule a meeting so that we could discuss what we both had observed and possible feedback I could provide these teachers as their CSR coach. When it came time to discuss Paul’s instruction, all the principal said was, “I told you he was ineffective”. When asked about next steps, he said that “Paul was a waste of my time” since he would not be coming back to the school next year anyway). Insistent upon giving Paul support, however, I asked about possible in-school assistance he could receive regarding student behavior in particular. The principal gave me the contact information for one of the language arts teachers in the school who was also in charge of providing middle school teachers support around managing students’ behavior. However, when I met with this teacher, she informed me that she only had one class period free in the school day to assist teachers who were either new to Aspen Grove or
new to the teaching profession. Since Paul was neither of these, she was unable to give him the addition support he needed to manage his classroom more effectively.

Conversely, when it came time to discuss Lisa’s CSR instruction, the principal supported the idea of videotaping her instruction and having her watch it so that she could attend to the quality of her “teacher talk” (i.e. the volume of her voice and frequency with which she interrupted students’ discussions). The principal felt that Lisa only needed to make “minor changes” to her instruction in order to be more effective. Despite being an ELA-S science class, however, the principal made no mention of the fact that no instruction was provided to students in their native language. This suggests that the language of instruction was less important to the principal than the quality of instruction which should go hand-in-hand. So to whom did teachers turn to for support regarding their emerging bilingual students?

**Collegial support.** When asked in an interview about support teachers receive within their school related to instruction for emerging bilingual students, the five focal teachers in my study said they felt supported by each other and other teachers within either their grade-level department or content area specialization. Paul in particular depended on Tom throughout the school year for lesson plans, learning objectives, textbooks and tests. Due to his hectic schedule, Paul felt that he lacked the time and resources needed to plan for all of his classes. Following Tom’s lead alleviated some of the stress associated with planning for multiple content areas across different grades. In his initial interview, Paul stated,

…I basically follow what Tom does because I’m doing two content areas and it’s just difficult for me to be switching back and forth and planning back and forth for both content areas. I’m just all over the place. It’s just (1.0) for me (2.0) it’s exhausting so I just try and follow what he’s doing. (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013)
Throughout the school year, Tom shared all of his resources and lesson plans with Paul regarding both typical and CSR instruction in English. However, Tom was not the only teacher who supported Paul with his instruction.

Due to Paul’s ongoing struggle with classroom management, Howard, an 8th grade CSR teacher whose room Paul occupied for social studies, often had to intervene in the classroom to help manage students’ behavior and deescalate student conflict. Although this teacher did not provide the students with content instruction, on occasion he could be heard giving directives regarding students’ behavior among each other and with their teacher.

Howard was like an extra set of eyes and ears for Paul. He often consulted with the teacher first so as not to override his authority with his students and sometimes took over if Paul had to escort a student out of the classroom. For example, at the beginning of a lesson in March, Howard informed Paul that a student was sitting at his desk with his paper upside down not doing anything. After Paul took the student into the hall to discuss this, a student asked Howard to intercede in a conflict between two other students in the classroom in Paul’s absence (Paul, field notes, March 19, 2014). During a lesson the previous month, Howard also interrupted Paul to correct the behavior of two female students while he was giving instructions (Paul, field notes, February 3, 2014).

Later in the school year during student presentations, students started to boo another during his presentation. Howard interrupted to say, “Someone who boos another kid I’ll take out of this class. That’s an automatic suspension. Why would you do that? That’s so uncool” (Paul, field notes, May 12, 2014). After another student in class tried to explain that it was because that student had previously booed other presenters, Howard went on to articulate why that behavior was rude and disrespectful. This led Paul to interject and say, “So I don’t expect any talking. I
expect you to show your best respect ever. I know that you haven’t got the information from other groups because you’ve been talking” (Paul, field notes, May 12, 2014). Four minutes later, he interrupted another student presentation to say, “Okay, if I catch you with a balloon I’ll have Howard take you right down to the office with a referral. We are not playing games” (Paul, field notes, May 12, 2014). Paul’s use of the pro-term “we” (Sacks, 1995), suggests that Paul believed students should take his class more seriously, and that the adults in the classroom and building at large were in charge of making that happen. However, not all teachers at the school agreed.

During an interview with Tom in February, another teacher interrupted to discuss an incident among some sixth grade female students. She was not happy with the way other faculty were handling the situation. She stated

I don’t want people that don’t know the system (1.0) don’t know what the kids are like (1.0) and don’t (2.0) haven’t been in the trenches as long as we are, have been, trying to cater to the kids ‘cause we know the kids…I think the thing is we have to work as a team with our kids. Don’t cater to that and make us look like the big bad wolves (Tom, interview, February 12, 2014)

This interaction demonstrates that number of years teaching experience also mattered when deciding who to trust and provide collegial support to at Aspen Grove. However, this was not the case among focal teachers at Superior.

When it came to discussing students’ behavior and lesson planning, younger teachers looked to the more experienced teachers for guidance. Because she was a veteran teacher, ten years his senior, and he was both a new teacher and new to the school, Jane helped Tony navigate the school systems and to better understand his students. Every week when I came in to plan for their CSR instruction and to discuss the previous week’s lesson, Tony could be found in
Jane’s room eating lunch talking about their students. Jane even referred to Tony as her “brother from another mother” (Jane, field notes, October 4, 2013). But Tony was not the only one who sought Jane’s advice. Other, more novice teachers, both on the seventh grade team and who taught social studies went to Jane for answers and guidance.

Seeing how respected Jane was among her colleagues and her enthusiasm for CSR, the principal asked Jane to become a CSR teacher leader for the 2014-15 school year. However, Jane declined the offer because she did not want to give up teaching children to teach adults (Jane, memo, February 24, 2014). In this same conversation she mentioned that she was worried if she took the position she would just become the in-house substitute teacher as she had seen happen to other teachers who took on leadership roles within their content areas. She was not opposed to opening her classroom for other teachers to come and observe her instruction, however, as long as it meant she was provided opportunities to observe other teachers so she could improve her practice too (Jane, memo, February 24, 2014). Jane found value in learning from others as much as they appreciated all of the insight and expertise she provided them.

Collegial support did not only come in the form of support among CSR teachers, however. CSR teachers at Aspen Grove also received classroom support from the school psychologist and academic counselors. In early February, the school psychologist and his assistant came to talk to Tom’s class about suicide prevention. He began his presentation in the same manner for all three classes asking students if they knew where his office was located in the building. It was interesting that of these classes, the only group of students who knew where his office was located was the class comprised almost entirely of emerging bilingual and special needs students (Tom, field notes, February 3, 2014). In the other classes, either no one or only a few students knew where to go in the building to find him.
In Paul’s class, instead of the school psychologist delivering the presentation, he had two bilingual specialists from the district office assist with the content delivery. The fact that the school psychologist could get assistance from not just one but two bilingual aids and Paul only got help during the last month of the school year from one, may speak to the priorities the school places on the discussion/delivery of some content versus others. Maybe the school thought it was more important for these students to know about suicide prevention than social studies. Or maybe it goes back to the claim made in chapter five, that monolingual English teachers receive the support from bilingual staff first when working with emerging bilingual students because the school assumed bilingual staff were linguistically competent to handle their emerging bilingual students’ needs without assistance.

This latter point is most likely untrue given the fact that a month later the school’s bilingual academic counselors (ACs) came to talk to only the sixth grade classes of emerging bilingual students about bullying. This meant that the same group of students had the same conversation about bullying with the academic counselors and their teachers in all classes that day. In the two classes I observed that day (English language development with a non-CSR teacher & S.S. with Paul) the presenters began in a similar manner.

AC1: What we’re noticing is that a lot of teachers are coming to talk to us about bullying.

(Paul, field notes, March 19, 2014)

Minutes later, Paul interceded in his fifth period class to say:

P: And when you’re disrespecting (1.0) that’s a form of bullying. Some of you under your breath are calling your teachers names…What’s the easiest way to avoid bullying?

Ss: Walk away.
P: And be respectful (1.0) right? Of yourselves, of each other, of your teachers.

(Paul, field notes, March 19, 2014)

Conversely, in the English language development class, when the academic advisors brought up the topic of teachers reporting bullying by this particular group of students, Frank, the ELD teacher, engaged students in the following dialogue (Frank, memo, March 17, 2014):

T: The sad thing for me is that you’re not just doing this to students, you’re doing it to teachers. I have never seen this in my classroom. Are you respectful toward me? Are we equal in a way that everyone is treated fairly?

Ss: Yes!

T: Why is that?

S: Because I think it’s that you want the best for us.

T: You don’t do that to me. I brag you up all of the time! My 2/3 class. And yet I know from comments from other students that this is not how you are all the time.

Even though this teacher was not bilingual in English and Spanish, in the ninety minutes I spent observing his instruction and interactions, it seemed he had successfully cultivated relationships based on respect with this group of students. Conversely, in Paul’s class, the academic counselors focused their discussion more on disrespect toward teachers as a form of bullying. In fact, before they began their presentation, one of the academic counselors had the following interaction with a student in Paul’s class because she continued to talk with another student after the teacher called for everyone’s attention to listen to the guest speakers (Paul, field notes, March 17, 2014):

AC1: Do you treat your parents with the same disrespectful behavior?

S: No.

AC1: So have I done anything to disrespect you?
S: No.

AC1: So I’m asking for the same respect.

Although his colleagues supported Paul in the classroom by delivering content related to topics that impact student behaviors like suicide and bullying, because he taught across content and grade level, his schedule made it so that more collaboration was difficult (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014).

Conversely, the focal teachers at Superior had the exact same teaching schedule and worked with all of the same students. That left a period a day for common planning, a period to cover Time for Time together (see below for a description of this), and a period a day to meet with specialists together regarding the academic and social progress of their students. Because of the way their days were scheduled, that left ample time for collaboration.

School-Wide Behavior Systems

When things run awry in the classroom, schools usually have a protocol in place for teachers to follow so that the learning environment is not completely disrupted. Most of the time this consists of a series of steps teachers are to follow. In each of the participating schools, teachers were provided with in-class actions to take to manage behavior and then given in-school support staff to contact if student behavior went unchanged after being redirected by the teacher.

The most common response by teachers to out-of-hand student behavior in the two focal schools where this study took place, was to call down to “the office.” When someone in “the office” could be reached, the phone call was followed by a member of the school security team coming to the classroom to remove the student from the learning environment. Sometimes
students returned to class before the period ended, and sometimes, depending on the gravity of
the incident, students were removed from all classes for the remainder of the school day.

In addition to making phone calls, another action taken by teachers at one of the
participating schools was to follow a disciplinary reflection and intervention ladder. This ladder
was comprised of various levels of action to be taken by both the teacher and student. It was a
brand new system to the school during the 2013-14 academic year with varying levels of success
and interpretation due to the vagueness of each level’s description and time commitment it
required from the teacher.

**Who you gonna call?** Informing “the office” of student misconduct was just one of
many steps each participating school took toward managing student behavior. Lisa, in particular,
relied heavily on this system in order to maintain order in her classroom. After reviewing
detailed field notes of both typical and CSR instruction, I found that students were asked to leave
the classroom in two out of her three sixth grade science classes. Interestingly, no students were
ever called to the office for disciplinary action in her class comprised of the highest achieving
sixth grade students (mostly talented and gifted) (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014). However, of
the two classes in which students were frequently called to the office, one was comprised almost
entirely of emerging bilinguals and the other, special needs students and low achievers.

In these classes, students were usually sent to the office for one of two reasons: being
disruptive or for not doing work. For example, right before Spring Break, an emerging bilingual
student was sent to the student advisor’s office for talking off task. On her way out of the
classroom, Lisa stated, “I’m sorry you used up all of your warnings. Try again tomorrow” (Lisa,
field notes, March 24, 2014). In this same class a month later, another student was sent down to
the office for not writing any of the information in his notebook presented by the teacher (Lisa,
field notes, April 18, 2014). Unlike the girl who was removed from the classroom previously, however, this student was not told to “try again tomorrow.” Consistently, across these two classes, the data show that female students who were removed from the classroom were always told to “try again tomorrow” whereas the male students left the classroom silently with no interaction with the teacher.

On occasion, if Lisa felt the classroom incident warranted a call home, she was not afraid to make sure that happened immediately. For example, one of her male students had been verbally accosting a handful of students who kept complaining to the teacher. After a fifth complaint, Lisa announced to the whole class that this student was to “get on the phone and call [his] mom please” (Lisa, field notes, March 24, 2014). He complied. However, when she did not answer the phone, this student went back to his seat and got back into the lesson. Although the phone call home was enough to keep him on task for the rest of the class period, it did not deter him or other students in the class from disrupting their learning and that of others over the course of the study.

Calling down to the office for Paul’s students was a joke given the infrequency in which someone actually picked up his call to assist with disciplinary actions in the classroom. Instead, the time Paul spent waiting for someone to answer his call was time away from student learning. Once student learning was sidetracked, then it was even more difficult for Paul to regain their attention. After a call to the office was made, it often took Paul several minutes to get students side conversations to a minimum. In fact, in all of my field notes from Paul’s classroom observations, I noted how often he counted down from five before calling out “surf’s up” to quiet students down. In each monthly observation of typical instruction this happened anywhere from every one to twenty minutes in a fifty minute class period (Paul, field notes, February 3; Paul,
field notes, February 24; Paul, field notes, March 19; Paul, field notes, April 11; Paul, field notes, May 12, 2014). The accumulation of minutes spent waiting on the phone and calling for students’ attention left little time for the learning of social studies. When Paul did reach someone in the office, some of his students used the dismissal of one or two students from the classroom as an excuse to move seats mid-instruction. For example, during a classroom visit in early February, I noted that after a student was sent to the office, a male student stood up and took his seat at another table in the classroom with a different group of students while another male student got up and took the seat of the student who had just moved so he could be closer to friends (Paul, field notes, February 3, 2014). When asked about this after class, Paul responded that he “was aware of this but didn’t want to waste time arguing with the students” (Paul, memo, February 3, 2014). It is this type of inconsistency in his behavior management that allows the students to not take his disciplinary action (or lack thereof) seriously.

Unlike Paul and Lisa, however, Tom infrequently used his phone to make calls to the office. Instead, the office called him when they needed students for issues related to their behavior in other classes (Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014; Tom, field notes, May 12, 2014). Only once in nine months I spent with Tom and his students observing both typical and CSR instruction, did Tom use the phone to call for outside assistance. On this occasion, during his 8th period class the week before spring break, two students got into a physical fight in the middle of class. Tom was already seated at his desk because he was calling students up to inform them of missing assignments and needed the electronic grade book in order to access/identify missing work. No sooner had these two male students started pushing each other, when Tom phoned the office and escorted one of them into the hall. Minutes later a uniformed district security guard showed up at the door to accompany these students to the office (Tom, field notes, March 24,
2014). Surprisingly, Tom did not let this incident derail instruction. Once the boys left class, he went back to his desk and continued student check-ins/ progress monitoring.

Conversely, the only time in the nine months I spent observing and coaching to Jane’s instruction that I saw her sit at her desk during class AND use the telephone was when she was “baby-sitting phone calls” home to students’ parents regarding the status of their mid-term progress reports (Jane, field notes, March 17, 2014). Instead of her making the calls, however, she had students do this during class because she wanted to hear them take responsibility for the fact that they had forgotten to ask their parents to sign the report and return it to school. She stated, “If you are hiding it [the progress report] from your parents that is not a good choice. You need help now, not six weeks from now when grades are due” (Jane, field notes, March 17, 2014). Having students relay the message to their parents was her way of teaching them a lesson on the importance of grades and communicating this information to their parents.

However, for some students, the communication between them and their parents was complicated by language. For example, when a male student was instructed to call his mom to tell her to sign his progress report he said, “But my mom speaks Spanish and I don’t” (Jane, field notes, March 17, 2014). That was when a female emerging bilingual student in the class offered to make the call for him in Spanish. Or messages from the teacher to parents got lost in translation when relayed through the student. For example, minutes after the bilingual student made the phone call for the monolingual student, a different bilingual student made the same call home to his mom. However, when Jane asked that he also use the time to tell his mom about his misbehavior in class, the boy translated this to, “The teacher wants me to let you know that I’m behaving well” (Jane, field notes, March 17, 2014). All of the Spanish speakers in class laughed when they overheard this and explained to Jane what he had really said to his mom. That was
enough to cause the boy to tell his mom the truth and quickly hang up. But he made the point to
tell another student under his breath on his way back to this seat that, “It doesn’t matter anyway
because my mom does nothing” (Jane, field notes, March 17, 2014). Despite Jane’s efforts to use
the telephone to communicate to greater forces outside of the school, the students’ parents, what
parents did with the information was ultimately out of her control.

**On the rungs of the disciplinary ladder.** The administration at Aspen Grove
implemented a new school-wide discipline and incentive system for the 2013-14 school year.
Each level of the system was comprised of a written and verbal action to be taken by teachers
and students alike. This was a six-step process complicated by the fact that teachers were often
unaware of a student’s standing within the ladder since the school advisors were in charge of
keeping track of where students were along the process. There was also a lot of paper work to be
completed and turned in to administration by both teachers and students, especially when it
involved the whole class. For example, after students continued to talk while Lisa was trying to
explain an upcoming activity, she stopped the class and gave everyone a warning which entailed
the completion of a written reflection form and informal conference with the teacher. After
collecting the forms from students, Lisa engaged her students in the following whole-class
conference:

L: Now why did I just stop there and ask for reflection forms?

Ss: Because we were talking.

L: Some of you on Cs, Ds, or Es (referring to different levels), you don’t get a referral,
you just go straight to ISS. (In-school suspension) (Lisa, field notes, April 18, 2014)

But later that day, Lisa discovered why ISS was not a threat to students after all. I was in her
room when a teacher came to discuss a particular student who had been in ISS (in school
suspension) that week. Lisa mentioned that when this student came into her class he informed
her that he had to be woken up by the ISS teacher after falling asleep during a movie. The other
teacher asked Lisa what she did about this. Lisa mentioned that she wrote an e-mail to the person
in charge of ISS but had not heard anything back regarding her expressed concern that this
student had used his time in ISS to watch movies instead of getting caught up on missing work
and creating an action plan on how to avoid suspensions in the future. To this the teacher replied,
“It’s not worth complaining about because anytime we show concern for the academic progress
of our students, we get criticized” (Lisa, memo, April 18, 2014).

Complaining about the behavior system was not worth the teachers’ time, but neither was
their enough time outside of class to deal with disciplinary issues in the first place. For example,
one of the steps required that another staff member be present for the teacher-student conference.
In some cases this meant that a student was removed from instruction to attend this conference
based on the availability of support staff. For example, during a science lesson in Lisa’s
classroom, a student was called down to the office because he was being referred to a “Level C”
conference by one of the student advisors (Lisa, field notes, January 29, 2014). In other instances
it meant that someone less qualified oversaw these discussions between teacher and student. For
example, due to the unavailability of staff within the school, I took on this role for one of my
participant teachers, Tom (Tom, field notes, February 10, 2014). Even though the disciplinary
policy stated in the student handbook that the conference was to take place among teacher(s) and
student, Tom used class time to engage in these conferences since I was in the room. For these
students, instructional time was taken away because the use of class time to conduct these
leveled conferences ensured that the school protocol for discipline was followed in a timely
manner. Later Tom lamented to his students,
The levels aren’t working. School consequences aren’t working. The calls home aren’t working. So the group work isn’t working either because only a few groups only got passing grades on their reports. A lot of people’s grades have crashed to the bottom.

(Tom, field notes, March 19, 2014)

A month later Tom connected one of the key vocabulary words from his CSR lesson to the disciplinary system when he said, “Exploitation, like you guys exploit the fact that people really don’t get in trouble around here so you push-“ (Tom, field notes, April 21, 2014).

For Tom, the only consequences he felt held meaning for his students were grades and taking time from their passing period to complete work. Since Tom had prep periods after each of his classes, he had the time to do this unlike other teachers in the study who held classes back to back. This afforded Tom the opportunity to hold students accountable for completing their work. For many students, staying after the bell rang was unpopular because it made them tardy to the next class and caused them to miss out on the opportunity to socialize with friends during passing period. Because of this, many students in Tom’s class only needed to be held back to complete assignments one or two times before they starting getting their work done in class (Tom, field notes, April 21, 2014). In general, however, the ineffectiveness of this school-wide discipline system was probably due in part to the fact that it was not culturally responsive, a point that will be discussed in more detail in the final chapter.

Conversely, at Superior, there were systems in place both within the school day and on the weekend designed for students who did not complete their work in class or who disrupted the teaching and learning environment. The former was called “Time for Time” and the latter, “Saturday School.” Teachers and City Year staff15 were in charge of overseeing Time for Time.

---

15 City Year is a national program for high school graduates who mentor and provide in-class support for students in high-risk schools/school districts.
each day during students’ lunch period whereas the administration ran Saturday School on the weekend. Jane used both systems as consequences for her students. Students in her classes were expected to work and when they did not, she made comments like, “I can’t just have you sitting here doing nothing” or “If you don’t do your work now you can do it in Saturday School” (Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014; Jane, field notes, March 17, 2014).

For students who needed additional support and progress monitoring, a point system was put into place where teachers would rate their effort, respect, focus, participation, etc. at the end of each class (Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014). Three of Jane’s emerging bilingual students were on such a system. At the end of her first period class one day, I stayed after to observe how this system worked and documented the following teacher-student interaction. Jane had just awarded the student 1’s (out of 4) in everything but respect (he earned a 2).

Jane: Come on kid.

Student: I have a name.

Jane: I know you do but you also have a brain. I want you to use it!

(Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014)

As Jane walked away, the boy smiled at this last comment and completed the exit ticket in order to leave class which was to answer the question, “What was the most significant cause of the Crusades? Explain” (Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014). This was the only work he had completed in class all period. Maybe having confirmation from the teacher that he was capable of doing the work because he had a brain that she thought he should use was enough for him to put in effort at the last minute toward completing his work. Regardless, the emerging bilingual students that used this point system made positive choices in the classroom. For example, on another occasion I documented that after class she recommended to another male emerging bilingual student that
he be put on a point system as well. She claimed, “I know your behavior will improve when you start to see success [on the system]. Look at [a female emerging bilingual student]. Her behavior has improved drastically in the past few weeks!” (Jane, field notes, February 5, 2014). Overall, Jane expressed that this point system was an effective way to improve students’ in-class behaviors.

Not Enough Resources

Whether it was more textbooks, time, teachers, trainings, or transportation, participants in this study often lamented that there were not enough resources available within their schools to create an optimal learning environment for their students, especially when planning for and teaching their emerging bilingual students.

The life of living in a hobo cart. There is a scene in the film “Office Space” (1999), written and directed by Mike Judge, in which one of the character’s, Milton, is forced to move his office into the basement of the IT building where he works. His new space is occupied with water heaters, electric boxes and signs warning of the dangers therein. This scene immediately came to mind when I first entered Paul’s office at Aspen Grove. Paul spent his year as a sixth grade social studies teacher and English language development (ELD) instructor without a classroom to call his own. His “office” was located in the back of a high school Spanish classroom in a small room with two refrigerators and a large loud freezer that often disrupted our conversations. Due to its location, far removed from the rest of the middle school team, Paul often chose to work in the library instead which was in a more central location within the school. Of the five study participants, Paul was the only one without his own classroom. However, within Aspen Grove, he was not alone. There were a handful of other teachers, both within the middle and high schools that did not have classrooms due to the lack of physical learning space.
within the school. Consequently, these teachers could be found pushing around carts equipped with their instructional materials, computers, and coffee (or in Paul’s case, diet Coke). In our initial interview together, Paul referred to this as “the life of living in a (1.0) in my hobo cart” (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013).

To an extent, the cart afforded these teachers the mobility necessary to teach across content area and, in Paul’s case, across grade level. By working from a cart, teachers could move from room to room with materials in hand more easily. However, sometimes the classrooms in which they were guests were not of teachers who taught the same content or were of the same grade level. When asked about this, Paul stated,

P: I taught 6th and 8th [grades] and then I had a study hall (2.0), high school study hall.

Me: So you ran the whole gamut?

P: Yeah (1.0) I was all (1.0) all over the place and no classroom of my own (2.0) which makes it real difficult. (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014)

In addition to feeling “all over the place” literally, working in classrooms of teachers who did not teach the same grade level/content made planning and instruction more difficult when teachers depended on each other to share resources, like textbooks. Paul was one of these teachers.

Since Paul was slotted to teach sixth grade social studies in Spanish, he had plenty of Spanish textbooks available for use with his students. Most of the time he kept these on a shelf in his office. However, because he ended up conducting the class in English, he often had to borrow textbooks from Tom. Instead of housing Paul in Tom’s classroom (since they taught the same content within the same grade), however, Paul was housed in the eighth grade social studies teacher’s classroom. Tom’s classroom and the classroom Paul taught social studies in, were on
opposite ends of the same floor within the school. This meant that when he needed textbooks in English for his students, he had to make an additional stop to Tom’s room on his way to class. Regarding this, Paul stated, “I wished I could have been in Tom’s room because then I wouldn’t have had to carry things back and forth. (1.0) That’s a waste of time” (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014).

This was challenged further by the fact that Tom taught social studies during fourth period and Paul taught during fifth period. That left passing period for Paul to get the materials he needed for instruction. Consequently, Paul’s students often ended up sharing textbooks with each other instead of having their own to read and work from. When asked about this, Paul said, I don’t have the English (1.0) this English textbook so we have to (1.0) we have to share…I don’t have 33 (2.0) textbooks so they have to share in their groups so that’s why it’s made [teaching] a very difficult process this year (2.0) because we did not have enough textbooks to have at least a class set (3.0) Yeah (1.) so I’ve had a lot of obstacles [and] not even enough resources. (Paul, interview, May 21, 2014)

The lack of resources available to Paul both in the form of physical space and textbooks reflect a lack of respect for Paul as a professional and his students as learners. Exacerbating matters, Paul’s ELA-S social studies class became a dumping ground for all students who entered the school in the middle of the year. For example, one student in his class of emerging bilingual Spanish speakers spoke Farsi. Another student who came midway through the school year was a monolingual English speaker. When asked about how these students were placed in this bilingual environment and how Paul ended up teaching in a classroom of a teacher who taught eighth grade social studies instead of sixth Paul stated, “[T]here was no other space for them (2.0) no other space for me to teach anywhere else (1.0). So there’s a shortage of:: of classrooms” (Paul,
interview, May 21, 2014). This lack of space for him and his students also demonstrated a blatant disregard for the bilingual program on the part of the school.

Had Paul been able to share a room with another teacher, then maybe he would have been spared the humiliation of having students watch as he cleaned up his diet Coke from the floor after it flew off his cart from taking a turn too sharp, or from picking up papers strewn across the hallway after hitting an unanticipated bump from a raised threshold. Had Paul had a classroom of his own, then maybe his students would have had a place to store their projects instead of crumpling them in their lockers or forgetting them at home. Had Paul had a classroom of his own, then maybe he could have put best practices in place for teaching emerging bilingual students like hanging visuals in the classroom or building a word wall for his students to reference as they acquired new academic vocabulary in both English and Spanish (Goldenberg, 2013). Because this was not possible for Paul, however, teaching and learning were affected when instructional time was spent simultaneously translating information for students, retrieving forgotten materials on both the part of the teacher and students, and managing the linguistic, learning, and behavioral needs of his students.

**An Assessment Culture**

In addition to the four assessments students had to take for CSR alone, there was interim testing for every subject, TCAP (Transitional Colorado Assessment Program) for reading, writing and math, CMAS (Colorado Measures of Academic Success) for science and social studies, and W-Apt (WIDA ACCESS Placement Test) for emerging bilingual students. Teachers in this study often mentioned one or more of these tests as a source of anxiety and frustration both for themselves regarding the time these tests took away from their instruction, and for their students. During one of Jane’s seventh grade social studies classes, at the mention of the
upcoming TCAP testing, a student responded, “I don’t want to take it. I’m too stupid” (Jane, field notes, March 3, 2014). She then stood up and asked to go to the counselor’s office for the rest of the period to which Jane declined but took her out into the hall instead in an attempt to restore her confidence.

A month later, Jane had her students take a practice test to prepare for the upcoming CMAS testing. The information technology (IT) specialist helped in the classroom that day since the test was computer-based. Before they were instructed to begin, he stated, “Good luck, we’re all counting on you” (Jane, field notes, April 9, 2014). Two minutes later, Jane added, “Take this seriously guys. You will be testing in a room for two hours in silence. I want you to deal with the stress now. Treat it real, though. I want you to go through that panic, frustration, I can do this. I know it’s frustrating but you can do it!” (Jane, field notes, April 9, 2014). Easier said than done. In our final interview Jane commented that during the CSR Strategy Use Measure (SUM) Assessment monolingual students were frustrated by the fact that they were not bilingual when it came time to answer the cognate items (Jane, interview, May 19, 2014). According to Jane, students said things like, “I don’t speak Spanish. This is in Spanish!” even though the directions were in English (Jane, interview, May 19, 2014).Feeling frustrated by the language of the assessment was only part of the problem.

In Tom’s class he noticed a change in behavior around periods of standardized testing. During one class mid-March he commented to his students, “I’m really frustrated because I noticed this behavior during TCAP but I chalked that up to being TCAP” (Tom, field notes, March 19, 2014). Even though schools like Aspen Grove tried to balance the stress associated with testing with parties to celebrate when they were over, it did not seem to change the fact that testing was a prevalent part of their educational experience.
Regarding how this assessment culture in participating schools impacted teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students in particular, teachers at Aspen Grove and Superior used the ACCESS assessment of English proficiency as a source of information for making instructional decisions for these students (Jane and Tony, interview, November 7, 2013; Lisa, interview, November 13, 2013; Paul, interview, November 14, 2013). At Aspen Grove, in particular, the ACCESS was used to place students in certain instructional environments. For example, students who scored a three or lower (out of six) on the ACCESS were placed in ELA-S (Spanish) classes. In effect, the ACCESS was used as a proxy for determining whether or not students should receive instruction in their native language with no regard for their proficiency in the native language.

On the other hand, focal teachers at Superior never personally looked up students’ ACCESS scores. Instead, the information they received about their emerging bilingual students came from the ELD (English language development) and language arts teachers. During our initial interview, Jane recounted,

She [ELD specialist] came around and gave us a folder with a list of students who were ELLs so that we’d have to like, um, photocopy their work to use for two years. We still have to watch them for two years afterwards. Um, so I have a list of their names in a folder. So that’s how I know who are my ELL students. I have had the ELD teachers, and the language arts teachers pass the [ACCESS] information on to me. It’s not something that I have looked up. I have always just been given the list of their names, scores, and things like that….Identifying the students is the biggest part for me so for me with my instruction, it’s just easier to have them identified. (Jane, interview, November 7, 2014)
But just because they are identified as needing native language support does not guarantee that native language supports will be beneficial. For example, even though all of Lisa’s students scored low on the ACCESS, only two to three students actually receive native language support in the form of texts translated into Spanish and in-class assistance from a bilingual paraprofessional (Lisa, interview, May 21, 2014).

Conclusion

In this chapter, I detailed four school-specific contextual factors that impacted teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. I posited that teachers’ deficit oriented perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities were perpetuated through these school-based factors. I presented findings related to school fit in the form of collegial and administrative support (or lack thereof), inconsistencies in school-wide behavior systems, lack of physical space, and through the creation of an assessment culture that put added pressure on students and inappropriately placed students in classes based on standardized test scores. Finally, I described how these school-specific factors outside of the classroom influenced teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students.

Collectively these findings suggest that school climate matters, especially when it comes to the impact it has on teachers’ perceptions of their students, emerging bilinguals in particular, albeit positive or negative. For example, for some participants, their perceptions of their emerging bilingual students were influenced by the way in which they were (mis)treated by their administrators. For others, inconsistencies in discipline compromised the effectiveness of their instruction. But schools do not operate in isolation. They work in collaboration with districts and are influenced by larger, macro processes in society such as No Child Left Behind legislation and anti-bilingual education and immigration reform. Within the context of this study, I found that
teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students were mostly challenged by school-specific contextual factors outside of the classroom. Although they all demonstrated knowledge of instructional best practices for emerging bilingual students, the effectiveness of these practices was compromised when teachers felt they lacked support from within the larger school context.
Chapter 7: Discussion and Implications

The initial purpose of my study was to investigate the potential of CSR as a transformative tool regarding teachers’ beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ capabilities in mainstream classrooms. I began this study with CSR instruction as the primary vehicle with which to challenge and support teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. This original hypothesis was based on anecdotal comments made by teachers about their emerging bilingual students upon the conclusion of their first year of CSR implementation during previous years of the larger CSR-Colorado Project. However, early into the study it became evident that there were other factors both within the classroom and school context that influenced participating teachers’ perceptions of their students, emerging bilinguals in particular, to an equal or greater degree.

Therefore, over the course of the study, the two primary research questions evolved from: 1) Does the use of CSR in culturally and linguistically diverse middle school classrooms affect teachers’ beliefs and attitudes about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities? If so, which CSR components/strategies and in what ways?; and 2) Do teachers say that engaging in guided reflective practices (i.e., CSR monthly booster sessions and coaching debriefs) about personal beliefs toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners transforms their thinking about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities? If so, in what ways?; to 1) What instructional practices and in-class supports (i.e., CSR instruction, classroom management, paraprofessionals, use of students’ native language) challenge or support teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners? In what ways?; and 2) What external factors within the school context but outside of the classroom (i.e., school-wide structures and systems, school climate/environment, school initiatives) challenge or support teachers perceptions toward
culturally and linguistically diverse learners? How so? The third question, do teachers who have used CSR for a year have higher IDI scores than teachers who have not when controlling for potential differences in IDI pre-test scores? If so, in what ways? Stayed the same as it allowed me to explore differences between CSR and non-CSR teachers, and to explain findings used to answer research questions one and two.

My first research question explored the instructional practices and in-class assistance that challenged or supported CSR teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and linguistically diverse learners. Findings in my study indicated that teachers’ perceptions of their students were mostly challenged by their (in)ability to support the language needs of their emerging bilingual students, their varying levels of expectations and students’ subsequent effort, and the presence/absence of effective classroom management skills and strategies. These instructional practices challenged teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students because they mostly led to negative outcomes for these students, an indication that these teachers were ill-prepared to meet the diverse learning needs of these students. For example, when/if teachers used students’ native language in the classroom, it was for disciplinary purposes not to help them access the content needed to be successful in school. Additionally, for these teachers, helping students often meant giving them the answers which led to students expending less mental energy in class knowing that if they held out long enough, the teacher would do the work/thinking for them. Similarly, in most of these classrooms, classroom management tactics were punitive. Teachers threatened to take away privileges like field trips, lunch time, or time needed to get to the next class. With the exception of one teacher, little discussion was spent in conversation with students around changing the instructional environment so it was more conducive to learning. In effect, it seemed
that students were often blamed for misconduct without self-reflection on the part of the
teachers.

Conversely, teachers’ use of CSR supported more positive perceptions of culturally and
linguistically diverse learners. For participating teachers, the use of Collaborative Strategic
Reading afforded them the opportunity to differentiate instruction without having to create
multiple lesson plans tailored to each student’s individual learning needs. CSR allowed these
content area teachers to make reading an integral part of their instruction, especially for the
science teachers who often resorted to lectures, videos, or lab formats when not using CSR. For
these teachers, CSR was a way for both teachers and students to monitor students’ reading
comprehension and better understand students’ oral reading fluency. It provided students with a
set of strategies that they could use outside of designated CSR days. Finally, CSR was a tool that
teachers and emerging bilingual students in particular used to engage in rich text discussions.
The ability to find appropriate and engaging texts for students was a skill that some teachers
acquired over the course of the study. These teachers also felt that students with literacy skills in
their native language benefited from texts offered to them in their native language when this
resource was available.

This same sentiment regarding (lack of) availability of resources was shared concerning
the assistance of a (bilingual) paraprofessional. Even though the only teacher who had a
paraprofessional in this study mostly used her assistance for managerial tasks like attendance,
making copies, and passing out papers, those who did not consistently have a paraprofessional
felt like teachers and students alike would have benefited from the extra assistance. For example,
when Lisa received help in the classroom from the bilingual paraprofessional she noticed that
these students were more engaged in the content because they were able to converse in their
native language with an adult who had knowledge about the subject in that language. Similarly, although Paul spoke the native language of the majority of his students, he felt that having a paraprofessional in the classroom would have facilitated his ability to manage the large class size because it would have afforded him the time to meet with students one-on-one in order to address their individual learning needs. Overall, these findings regarding (in)effective in-class instructional practices and assistance are important considerations when thinking about how to best support teachers in upholding positive perceptions of their culturally and linguistically diverse students.

My second research question examined external factors within the school context but outside of the classroom that challenged or supported teachers’ perceptions of their culturally and linguistically diverse students. Findings from this study indicate that administrative support was lacking for teachers who served the largest percentage of emerging bilingual students thus adversely impacting their perceptions of these students. Because of this, I found that teachers often looked to each other for support when generating ideas for lessons, dealing with student misconduct, or in order to receive validation of their efforts and effectiveness. Similarly, teachers and students alike were often conflicted and confused by complex and inconsistent school-wide behavior systems, leading some to take disciplinary matters into their own hands in ways that seemed more authentic and meaningful to the students. Additionally, the lack of classroom space for teachers and their students challenged teachers’ ability to create an optimal learning environment for their emerging bilingual students. Finally, the time taken away from instruction in order to prepare for district, state, and nation-wide assessments put pressure on the teachers and students alike. Collectively these school-specific factors outside of the classroom impacted teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ capabilities when in the classroom.
Ultimately, in this study, the external school factors affirmed teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students as manifested in the behaviors and instructional practices that were observed in the classroom. This supports my claim that school context matters, especially when the school context impacts the ways in which emerging bilingual students are perceived both socially and academically in and out of the classroom. Teachers’ perception that “school’s just not for them” may lead to lowered expectations and subsequently, low levels of effort on the part of their students. In the short and long term, these perspectives held by some teachers in this study may serve to increase rather than mitigate the achievement gap between emerging bilingual students and their peers. Therefore, the importance of strong and supportive administrative leadership, positive and encouraging collegial relationships, transparent and consistent school-wide behavior systems, more physical learning spaces for teachers and students, and the use of assessments for instructional purposes but not at the expense of instructional time or students’ feelings of self-worth, are school-wide characteristics that cannot be dismissed when making considerations for how to support teachers in upholding positive perceptions of their culturally and linguistically diverse students.

My third research question investigated potential differences between CSR and TYP teachers on the Intercultural Development Inventory, a measure of intercultural competence. This instrument was used to assess whether CSR teachers made gains in their intercultural competencies at a greater rate than TYP teachers. Originally, the second part of this research question read: Why and in what ways? I had initially thought that if I disaggregated findings by school, subject, grade, sex, and ethnicity, this would help explain why there were differences between and within groups. However, it was clear after running the analyses on these data that I could not explain why. As the following figures demonstrate, there was too much variability
within these subcategories to explain why CSR teachers as a group scored differently on the IDI than TYP teachers.

Figure 31. IDI score comparisons within and across schools.

Figure 31 shows differences between TYP and CSR teachers in the same schools. Not all schools are presented here because not all participating schools had both CSR and TYP teachers. In the first school, Fairview, TYP teachers scored higher than CSR teachers on both the pre- and post-IDI measures. Although both groups regressed on the measure, CSR teachers did so at a greater rate. At the second school, Duncan, although TYP teachers scored higher than CSR teachers at both times, CSR teachers in this school made gains on the measure whereas TYP teachers did not. Unlike the previous two schools, at Blackstone, the CSR teachers scored much higher than TYP teachers on the IDI at both times with both groups making gains on the measure. Finally, at Superior, like at Duncan, the TYP teacher scored higher than CSR teachers on average at both times, though the TYP teacher regressed at a greater rate than the CSR teachers from T1 to T2. The discrepancies within schools suggests that differences in school
scores may not be positively attributed to CSR but that school climate could account for
differences in intercultural competencies among participants since teachers in both groups at a
single school either gained or regressed on the measure over time, except at Duncan.
Discrepancies in scores could also be attributed to individual differences. But which ones?

![Graph showing IDI score comparisons by grade]

*Figure 32. IDI score comparisons by grade.*

In Figure 32, differences in IDI scores are reported by grade level. Seventh grade teachers
are missing from these data because there were no 7th grade TYP teachers in the sample. The
data show that all teachers, when grouped by grade level, regressed on the IDI instrument from
T1 to T2 with TYP teachers outperforming CSR teachers in all instances except one. On the
post-test, 6th grade CSR teachers outperformed 6th grade TYP teachers as a group. This suggests
that 6th grade CSR teachers ended the year with more developed intercultural mindsets than TYP
teachers. However, because this particular subgroup regressed on the measure overall, the score
differential may not be positively attributed to the use of CSR.
Figure 33. IDI score comparisons by subject.

Figure 33 shows differences in IDI scores are reported by subject taught. The label “Mult.” means that some teachers in this study taught both science and social studies. When disaggregated by content area, the data show that TYP science teachers outperformed CSR science teachers, though CSR teachers gained on the measure while TYP teachers regressed. Conversely, CSR S.S. teachers outscored S.S. TYP teachers on both the pre and post-tests. However, both groups regressed from T1 to T2. Finally, like CSR S.S. teachers, teachers who used CSR in both science and social studies outperformed TYP teachers at T1 and T2. Similar to CSR science teachers, this subgroup also gained on the IDI instrument while TYP teachers did not. Because scores varied widely between groups across content, even when positive gains were made on the instrument, it is still unknown whether differences in IDI scores were attributed to the use of CSR in specific content areas.
Figure 34. IDI score comparisons by gender and ethnicity.

Figure 34 reports differences in IDI scores by participants’ self-reported gender and ethnicity. The first graph shows that female teachers scored higher than male teachers on the instrument from T1 to T2. Although TYP female teachers scored the highest at both time points overall, all groups regressed on the measure except male CSR teachers. However, because male TYP teachers regressed, score differentials cannot be attributed to the gender of study participants.

In the graph on the right in Figure 34, the data show that all subgroups regressed on the measure with TYP teachers on average scoring higher than CSR teachers on both the pre- and post-tests. Interestingly, white CSR teachers scored higher than Latino CSR teachers while the opposite was true for TYP teachers. If differences in IDI scores could be attributed to ethnicity, then a particular ethnic group would perform similarly on the measure across conditions. However, that was not the case with this particular sample of teachers. Therefore, differences in scores on the IDI from T1 to T2 may not be attributed to ethnic differences.

Although disaggregating the data in this manner does not help to explain why differences in IDI scores exist between CSR and TYP teachers, other findings from the measure as reported in chapter four are worth reiterating here. First, the most notable finding from the quantitative data is that more CSR teachers gained on the IDI than TYP teachers. Seven out of 21 teachers...
posted gains, and six of those teachers used CSR during the 2013-14 school year. Of the teachers who showed gains on the instrument, the two who moved up in worldview were both CSR teachers. The others moved up within their initial IDI orientation. Thus, this study demonstrates that an instructional tool such as Collaborative Strategic Reading may have a positive impact on participants’ intercultural development.

A second main finding from the quantitative data is that there were substantial differences between the groups of teachers. For example, the average IDI change score for CSR teachers (-2.73) was less than the average IDI change score for TYP teachers (-5.23) suggesting that CSR teachers scores converged over time while TYP teachers scores became more disparate. Also, CSR teachers IDI scores shifted within and across worldviews, while TYP teachers’ scores only shifted within their initial worldview. Although CSR teachers as a group started and ended the school year with lower IDI scores on average, this points to more profound levels of intercultural development among CSR teachers over time.

The last major finding with regards to the IDI is that the majority of teachers who regressed began the school year in Minimization, which has been identified as a “transitional” stage (Hammer, 2009, 2012). While the number of teachers participating in the present study is limited, the majority of teachers who began in the more monocultural orientations (in this case, Denial or Polarization) gained on the IDI. This suggests that it may be more challenging to help individuals in Minimization develop their intercultural sensitivity compared to those who hold other intercultural worldviews.

These findings are supported theoretically in the following section through the application of the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (Clarke & Peter, 1993). In particular, I map the change environment of five focal teachers involved in the CSR-CO Project
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regarding their beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ academic competencies during the 2013-14 academic year.

**Theoretical Significance of Findings**

In this study, I drew upon a conceptual framework adapted from Clarke and Peter’s (1993) Interconnected Model of Professional Growth in order to capture the complexity of the teacher change environment. In chapter one, the conceptual framework was described at length and the four domains of the teacher change environment were detailed. Each domain was then supported by theories from fields such as cognitive psychology, linguistics and education related to both pedagogical practices and professional learning.

![Conceptual framework](image)

*Figure 35. Conceptual framework (adapted from Clarke and Peter’s (1993) Interconnected Model of Professional Growth).*
Maintaining the idea that learning is situated in social interactions, I represented the change environment as a circle in which all domains were interconnected and interacted simultaneously with one another. The interactive piece that I believe to be fundamental for change to occur, was represented by the silhouettes of two people engaged in conversation. The arrows represented the cyclical nature of teacher change as they engaged in continuous action and reflection processes. Each domain was connected to the other via action and reflection processes and allowed for an interconnected, non-linear structure giving recognition to the idiosyncratic and individual nature of teacher change throughout the course of the study. However, since I was focused primarily on the domains of the change environment (i.e. extant school structures and systems, and in-class practices) and the factors that supported and/or challenged teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students therein, I did not specifically analyze the data for examples or findings related to reflective action. If I were to focus on the coaching aspect of my relationship with the study participants, or teacher-teacher interactions during CSR professional development (PD) sessions and professional learning community (PLC) planning time, I could speak more to reflective action processes. Therefore, this does not mean that teachers did not engage in reflective action, it just means that it was not the focus of this study.

Regarding the domains of the change environment, the personal domain referred to what the teacher knew, believed or felt about teaching and students, specifically regarding cultural and linguistic diversity. The external domain represented the supports received by the teacher within the school context. The domain of practice was comprised of the teachers’ pedagogical practices with students in the classroom. Finally, the domain of consequence consisted of teacher
outcomes regarding intercultural competence and development, and student perceptions of
teacher effectiveness.

In the sections below, I discuss the findings specific to each domain of my conceptual
framework pertaining to the factors that support and/or challenge teachers’ perceptions of their
emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. In each of these sections, I make connections
to my review of the literature and my data analysis as a way to link my findings with my
conceptual framework. I end with a discussion of the findings and how the findings within each
domain relate to one another as a way to better understand the complexity of the teacher change
environment and the factors that inhibit and enable teacher change to occur. I make the activities,
actions and thought processes of teachers transparent in order to determine what needs to change
in schools and classrooms in order to provide equitable opportunities to learn for culturally and
linguistically diverse students.

**Personal Domain**

Generally speaking, the personal domain of change refers to what the teacher knows,
believes or feels about him or herself and others. In this study, since the focus was on teachers’
perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities, I was most interested in
their knowledge, beliefs, and feelings toward language use. I applied Ruiz’s concept of language
orientations to better understand this aspect of my participants as manifested in their words and
actions.

Several findings used to answer research question one regarding instructional practices and
in-class assistance that challenged or supported CSR teachers’ perceptions toward culturally and
linguistically diverse learners addressed this domain and alluded to participants’ particular
language orientation(s). For example, all participants at some point in our time together either in
the classroom or during interviews were observed using or stated that they used language supports like sentence stems to meet the language needs of their emerging bilingual students. Intentionally adapting instruction in this way is a practice used by teachers who support the notion that language is a right (Crawford, 2004).

Conversely, there were also several findings supporting the more deficit-driven orientation, language as a problem, that emerging from the data. Students’ use of their native language was a problem when the teacher(s) did not speak the language and would make comments that suggested teachers thought students were using the language to talk off task. For example, “When I go like this during a quiz (T puts fingers up to lips and says, “shhh”) it means stop talking, not continue in Spanish!” (Tom, field notes, May 12, 2014).

Lack of literacy skills in students’ native language was also a problem. Descriptors such as “language barrier” and “deficiency” were used when discussing emerging bilingual students’ academic ability and the school’s attempt at “fixing” it (Tony, interview, May 21, 2014). The Spanish language was described by one teacher as something students “fell back on” instead of something they drew from while speaking English (Tony, interview, May 21, 2014). Similarly, because lack of native language literacy was perceived as a problem, a teacher was excused from complying with the school’s TNLI designation requiring content-area classes to be taught in students’ native language. What was supposed to be a social studies class taught in Spanish ended up being a social studies class taught in English and disciplined in Spanish. It also became the class where any student whose native language was not English or any student who arrived at the school later in the year was placed due to the lack of space in other classes. The fact that the teacher of this class was their only bilingual instructor and that he also had no classroom to call his own, instead relying on a cart to move from place to place within the school, could have sent
a message to him and his students that the creation of bilingual spaces was not a priority at the school. Similarly, the lack of highly-qualified bilingual staff at a school designated to provide native language instruction reflects a larger problem of school districts’ (in)ability to recruit and retain bilingual teachers.

The one occasion in which Spanish was observed to be a resource in the classroom was when Jane had students call home to their parents about progress reports. During this particular class, a student used Spanish to communicate to another student’s parent about the form. Similarly, teachers talked about the benefits of knowing Spanish when using CSR. This finding supports my initial hypothesis that teachers’ positive perceptions of their emerging bilingual students are supported when they witness students drawing on their native language to derive meaning from a text and acquire new knowledge.

In conclusion, no participant displayed one particular language orientation consistently throughout the study. Instead, participants exhibited characteristics of all language orientations depending on the task, time of day, and context. Teachers’ language orientations were as dynamic as the students they taught. However, there was a relationship between teachers’ favored language orientation (as measured by how often they used students’ native language as a resource, problem or right) and their IDI scores. That is, teachers with a more developed level of cultural competence used students’ native language in resourceful ways. This suggests developing teachers’ cultural competence is an important step toward utilizing students’ language as a resource in the classroom.

**Domain of Consequence**

The domain of consequence consisted of student and teacher outcomes represented by data from the SPS and IDI measures. The consequence of these data were their use to (dis)confirm
findings to the research questions posited in this study. The primary measure, the IDI, evolved from the Developmental Model of Intercultural Sensitivity (Bennett, 1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denial</th>
<th>Polarization</th>
<th>Minimization</th>
<th>Acceptance</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Defense /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reversal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Monocultural Mindset → Intercultural Mindset


In this study, focal teachers’ initial intercultural development orientations ranged from Polarization to Acceptance. At the end of the study, teachers’ intercultural development orientations ranged from the Cusp of Minimization to the Cusp of Acceptance. Three teachers gained on the measure, while two teachers regressed on the measure. Four of the five teachers remained within the same worldview (Polarization and Minimization) over the course of the study, while one focal teacher moved between worldviews, from Acceptance to Minimization.
Table 23

Focal Teachers’ IDI Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Teachera</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>IDI T1 Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>IDI T2 Score</th>
<th>Worldview</th>
<th>IDI Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>84.01</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>108.61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>Aspen Grove</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>Cusp of Ac</td>
<td>4.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>119.72</td>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-13.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>Superior</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>Cusp of M</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Focal Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>99.08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.
aAll names used are pseudonyms.

Overall, for these teachers, their words and actions toward emerging bilingual students matched the characteristics of their intercultural development orientation. This supports the legitimacy of the theory underlying the IDI. For example, participants who were in the Polarization stage tended to have an “us versus them” mentality. They often perpetuated negative stereotypes of people from different cultural backgrounds, and had a hierarchical view of culture and the value/use of other languages other than English in the classroom (Bennett, 1986). Conversely, those in Minimization emphasized the commonalities across students and teachers regardless of culture. There was an assumption of similarity, albeit human (i.e. physiologically) or values-based (i.e. subordination to a particular supernatural being, religion, or social philosophy) (Bennett, 1986) that emerged in their words and actions. Finally, those in Acceptance understood that behaviors and values existed in distinct cultural contexts (Bennett, 1986). They showed a genuine curiosity for other cultures by bringing in readings and using curricular materials that were representative of the languages and customs of their students.
Connecting the theory of this measure to teachers’ perceptions of their students as manifested in certain discourses and practices of focal teachers, allowed for the identification of trends and patterns within and across data sources employed in this study. For example, generally speaking, for teachers who regressed on the measure, perceptions toward their emerging bilingual students tended to become more negative. Conversely, for those who gained on the IDI, perceptions tended to become more positive as evidenced by their documented discourse about these students during interviews and with these students in classroom observations. Additionally, as previously mentioned, there was a relationship between teachers’ most observed language orientation and their IDI development orientation. That is, teachers who most often used students’ native language(s) as a right and resource in the classroom had more developed levels of cultural competence. A similar finding was seen regarding SPS and IDI data. Teachers with a more developed level of cultural competence received higher scores on the SPS from students than teachers with less developed intercultural worldviews. This suggests that a relationship exists between teachers’ feelings about cultural diversity and students’ perceptions of these teachers efficacy. Therefore, the theoretical base on which the IDI was created was supported time and again through interview and observational data that aligned with key characteristics of teachers’ intercultural development orientations.

**External Domain**

In this study the external domain represented school-specific factors and forces like administrators, colleagues, or school structures (i.e. behavior systems) that impacted teachers’ instruction and student learning in the classroom. This domain was theoretically based on situated learning that posits the learning process is situated in social interactions as learners
partake in activities collectively and acquire knowledge through active participation within a group (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

As a researcher and coach, the participants were in communication with me on a weekly basis. I observed their instruction in CSR and non-CSR settings and documented conversations they had among each other and with their students. I asked them to reflect upon their instruction using a video-simulated recall protocol and then had them engage in the same process while watching their colleagues teach the same students within a different content area. These observations and reflections were used to inform subsequent instruction. Additionally, I noted that when administrative support was present, teachers were supported in efforts to improve their instruction. Conversely, when administrative support was lacking, teachers’ professional growth was at a standstill. Most significant, however, were the ways in which my bilingual participant and his students were positioned within the school that impacted the types of interactions they were afforded to learn and acquire knowledge.

In this study, I consider the lack of physical space made available to this teacher and his students a racial microagression, a subtle and often unconscious form of racism used to support a racial and cultural hierarchy of minority inferiority (Kohli & Solórzano, 2012). Although emerging bilinguals comprised 61% of the middle school student population, it was said among teachers and administrators alike that they fought the district to get their TNLI designation dropped so that they would no longer have to provide native language support for their emerging bilingual students. So although it may have been a mere coincidence that the only bilingual teacher using transitional native language instruction also happened to work from a cart, I suggest that it was a reflection of the school’s view toward bilingualism. For these students and their teacher, learning was situated in other people’s spaces.
**Domain of Practice**

The final domain, the domain of practice, was comprised of the teachers’ pedagogical practices with students in the classroom. This domain was supported by the presence or absence of culturally relevant pedagogy defined as producing students who can achieve academically, who demonstrate cultural competence in maintaining their community and heritage ways with language and other cultural practices while acquiring dominant ones, and who can understand and critique the existing social order (Ladson-Billings, 1995). In general, teachers’ implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy, especially with their emerging bilingual students, was challenged by ineffective classroom management, the use of students’ native language for mostly punitive purposes, low expectations, and large class sizes with little or no help from paraprofessionals. However, the use of CSR for most teachers led to more culturally relevant pedagogical moves because, through thoughtful text selection, students were explicitly taught strategies with which to debate controversial topics and acquire knowledge in conversation with peers.

At the beginning of the 2013-2014 school year, teachers were asked to define culturally relevant pedagogy and to comment as to whether or not they felt their instruction was culturally relevant. Participants’ responses ranged from a focus on heroes and holidays to knowledge of students’ backgrounds. For example, Paul defined culturally relevant pedagogy as “teaching some of the culture into what we’re doing” (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013). He said that he could do this through geography by teaching his students about the similarities and differences across cultural celebrations. However, when asked whether or not he practiced culturally relevant teaching, he said, “Not as much as I want to just because of the way curriculum’s set up” (Paul, interview, November 14, 2013). Tom, who teaches the same content
and grade level, had something different to say. For him, culturally relevant teaching meant “knowing a student’s background or knowing where a student’s coming from” (Tom, interview, November 14, 2013). When asked how he does this, he said, “[B]ecause we teach social studies, everything that we’re teaching thankfully in the curriculum is all about how humans get along with each other” (Tom, interview, November 14, 2013). It is interesting to note here, that for Paul, the curriculum was an inhibitor to culturally relevant teaching, whereas for Tom, the curriculum was a vehicle through which to make his teaching more culturally relevant for his students.

Jane, also a social studies teacher, had similar things to say. She defined culturally relevant teaching as an awareness of small cultural differences, like eye contact, and understanding where students are coming from (Jane, interview, November 7, 2013). When asked if her teaching was culturally relevant, Jane commented that it depended on the students. She felt she was less responsive to her Vietnamese, Chinese, Cambodian and Muslim students because she knew less about their language, cognates and culture than her Hispanic and African American students. She attributed this to the fact that she was raised around Hispanics and African Americans and had more experience teaching these populations of students (Jane, interview, November 7, 2013). For her colleague, Tony, growing up in a large and culturally diverse coastal city informed his pedagogy and relationships with his culturally and linguistically diverse students. He felt that his content area of instruction, science, also lent itself to culturally relevant conversations. For example, he stated, “I can ask questions…like, that somebody might remember somebody from like a trip to Africa that came over and talk about when they’re a little kid” (Tony, interview, November 7, 2013).
Similarly, for Lisa, who also taught science, culturally relevant teaching meant “allowing students to demonstrate what they come into the classroom with already and utilizing that in the classroom” (Lisa, interview, November 13, 2013). For Lisa, the emphasis was less on culture and language and more on “a general life experience that could have absolutely nothing to do with your culture” (Lisa, interview, November 13, 2013). However, like Paul, she said that it was hard to do because of the content. Specifically, she said, “But it’s hard sometimes with something that is very content heavy and specific like science that- it’s hard for them to know how it relates” (Lisa, interview, November 13, 2013).

Through CSR, however, the majority of these teachers were able to find ways to relate the content to their students’ lived experiences. For example, Lisa said that through CSR, “you’re not telling them directly like, ‘This is what you should think and this is how you should think it,’ but they arrive at [understanding] in their own different way” (Lisa, interview, November 13, 2013). She went on to state,

[J]ust allowing them to use different types of language support brings that in too for language learners. But then also students who aren’t language learners, they can be in a group with someone who is a language learner and knows those cognates and a native English speaker could learn more from that bilingual student as well. (Lisa, interview, November 13, 2013).

This statement supports my initial argument that the existing components of CSR (e.g. collaborative group work, connecting to students’ prior knowledge, students use of cognates to decipher unknown words, emerging bilingual students use of their L1 to discuss English texts) are consistent with “best” culturally relevant pedagogical practices and as such, have the potential to help CSR teachers develop more positive beliefs and attitudes toward emerging bilingual students’ capabilities. Unfortunately, however, in this study (as noted in previous
sections) the use of CSR alone was not enough to eradicate deficit-driven discourses directed toward emerging bilingual students in classrooms at these schools.

**Summation**

The conceptual framework for this study was derived from Clarke and Hollingsworth’s Interconnected Model of Professional Growth (1999). Findings supported the notion put forth originally by Clarke and Hollingsworth, that teachers enact change in various forms and sequences within the domains of consequence and practice, and the external and personal domains according to their individual needs and preferences. However, in this study I found that even when all domains of the teacher world were present, this did not always lead to positive professional growth and change regarding their perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities. In fact, in some cases the interaction of these domains had an adverse effect on participants.

For Paul, reflecting on his practice and that of his teaching partners only served to perpetuate already negative perceptions of his emerging bilingual students. For example, while using the video stimulated recall protocol to compare and contrast his teaching with that of his grade-level partner, Paul mostly focused on what was going wrong in his colleague’s classroom as opposed to noticing strategies that worked with these students that he could then incorporate into his own practice. If students were off-task, he focused on that and made comments like, “See, it takes her a long time to get their attention too.” Even when he was asked to notice differences in her practice like longer wait time and grouping strategies that seemed to be effective in engaging students and keeping them on-task, his comments still focused on student misbehaviors that he frequently saw in his classroom which led him to say things like, “They’re talking when she’s talking too.” If he noticed similar student behaviors with different teachers
then the lack of student learning had less to do with the quality and expectations of the teacher, and more to do with students’ attitudes toward learning. In this way, by focusing on the students, the pressure was off of Paul to change.

Similarly, Paul relied on the other sixth grade teacher for lessons and readings because he felt that the diversity of the classes which he taught left little time for planning. This meant that he used the same readings, study guides and lesson plans with his class of emerging bilingual students that were used in classes comprised mostly of native English speakers. Even after attending a PD on the importance of text selection and listening to his colleague talk about the positive changes in student engagement based on the quality of text, Paul continued to implement the other teacher’s lessons without scrutiny.

Contrary to Hollingsworth’s case study applying the Interconnected Model of Professional Growth in which he found that differences in domains of influence still yielded positive professional growth in teachers, I found that certain domains impacted/inhibited teacher change to a greater/lesser degree than others. Unlike Hollingsworth’s participant whose commitment to professional growth was unhindered by little collegiality and a lack of coordination and leadership within her school, Paul’s professional growth was stifled by a lack of administrative support regarding provision of resources like planning time. Even with coaching supports in place and knowledge of effective, research-based strategies for emerging bilingual students like CSR, Paul maintained a deficit-oriented perception of his emerging bilingual students once claiming that “school’s just not for them.” Therefore, I believe that in addition to the interaction of factors within and across domains of the teacher change environment, there needs to be a willingness on the part of the teacher to change. As was
demonstrated through this example of one participant’s experiences, without a will there is no way to grow.

Implications and Future Research

In this section, I discuss the implications of this study in terms of pedagogy and future research according to each domain of the conceptual framework employed in this study and the findings therein.

Implications for Pedagogy and Future Research within the Personal Domain

According to most teachers in this study, their perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities went unchanged. For example, when asked specifically about whether or not teachers’ use of CSR changed their perceptions of these students, all teachers responded “No”, that they had always upheld high expectations for ALL students, and that emerging bilinguals were no exception. However, because other forms of data, like classroom observations of teacher-student interactions and CSR teachers’ IDI scores over time showed otherwise (i.e. teachers idea of “helping” students meant giving them answers, more CSR teachers gained in intercultural competence than those who did not use the strategy), making explicit connections between teachers’ perceptions and pedagogical practices can be a useful tool toward facilitating their professional growth.

In this study, I intentionally withheld information regarding participants’ intercultural development from them because I sought to make between group comparisons among CSR and non-CSR teachers. I felt that had I coached CSR participants on ways to develop intercultural competence outside of the use of the strategy itself then it would have skewed the data and been more difficult to identify a relationship between the use of CSR and levels of intercultural competence. In the future, however, I believe this measure could be effectively used in school
districts that serve a large population of culturally and linguistically diverse students to mitigate the cultural mismatch that currently exists between predominantly white female middle-class educators and their students.

The IDI has been used extensively as a coaching tool in the business world and with students and pre/in-service teachers who study or teach abroad into order to help people navigate cultural differences. The way it was applied in this domestic study of teachers’ perceptions to measure their intercultural competence while working with culturally and linguistically diverse students is one of the first of its kind. The vast discrepancy between teachers’ perceived intercultural orientation and actually intercultural orientation suggest that teachers think they are more culturally competent than they actually are. (See table 24 below) This was confirmed in the data when what teachers said about their students in interviews did not align with what they did with their students or how they talked to them in the classroom. One way in which I tried to get teachers to attend to the ways in which they talked to their emerging bilingual students in the classroom was through the use of the video stimulated recall interview protocol. However, because this was the first time many teachers had ever videotaped their instruction, most observations made by focal teacher participants focused on what students were/were not doing and how the teacher sounded or looked. Therefore, using a more objective measure like the IDI as a way to generate dialogue with teachers around their cultural competence could have a profound impact on their relationships with their culturally and linguistically diverse students as they learn ways to bridge the gap between their perceived and actual developmental intercultural orientation.
### Table 24

**A Comparison of Focal Teachers’ Perceived and Actual Developmental IDI Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focal Teacher&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>IDI T1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>IDI T2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>118.79</td>
<td>82.09</td>
<td>-36.70</td>
<td>117.41</td>
<td>84.41</td>
<td>-33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>127.52</td>
<td>109.42</td>
<td>-18.10</td>
<td>126.16</td>
<td>108.61</td>
<td>-17.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa</td>
<td>120.82</td>
<td>107.96</td>
<td>-12.86</td>
<td>125.71</td>
<td>112.86</td>
<td>-12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>131.04</td>
<td>119.72</td>
<td>-11.32</td>
<td>127.16</td>
<td>106.17</td>
<td>-20.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tony</td>
<td>116.48</td>
<td>81.60</td>
<td>-34.88</td>
<td>120.39</td>
<td>83.76</td>
<td>-36.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average for Focal Teachers</td>
<td>100.16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>99.08</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>All names used are pseudonyms.

Note. P = Polarization; M = Minimization; Ac = Acceptance.

Secondly, I asked teachers to reflect upon students’ use of their native language in the classroom and the instructional language supports teachers provided as a way to better understand their own language orientation. I then used these language orientations as a way to better understand teachers’ personal beliefs and attitudes toward their emerging bilingual students. What I found was that although many focal teachers mentioned that the identification and understanding of cognates by emerging bilingual students was an asset they could share with monolingual English speaking students, few teachers were observed actually acknowledging emerging bilingual students use of cognates in practice. Similarly, a tension existed between when teachers should allow students to “fall back on” their native language to generate meaning of concepts and when they should be required to speak, write, and read in English since that was the language of instruction and the language of standardized testing. Furthermore, the minimal language support that was provided to emerging bilingual students in these schools in the form of curricular materials and highly qualified teachers and support staff, could have sent a message to
teachers and students alike that languages other than English were a problem or deficit for students to overcome. For example, at Aspen Grove parents and students alike were told that transitional native language instruction (TNLI) would be provided when it was not. Mostly this was due to the fact that highly qualified bilingual teachers of content area instruction like science, were lacking within the district. This points to a larger issue of difficulties with recruiting and maintaining culturally and linguistically diverse educators in institutions of higher education and teacher preparation programs. Given the changing demographics of today’s students and the cultural and linguistic diversity they contribute to the classroom, it is imperative that school districts and teacher preparation programs seek out and support candidates equipped to meet the diverse needs and interests of their students.

**Implications for Pedagogy and Future Research within the Domain of Practice**

In this study, while most focal teachers defined culturally relevant pedagogy as understanding students and incorporating their interests into subsequent instruction and said that their practice was culturally relevant, according to the data from classroom observations of typical instruction and CSR observations using the IVC observation protocol, few teachers were observed implementing culturally relevant practices (i.e. connecting to students’ prior knowledge and experiences). Similarly, while some teachers felt that their practice was culturally relevant, they often only relied on the expertise and experiences of culturally and linguistically diverse students when studying specific aspects of their culture like religion and holidays. This discrepancy between what teachers think they are doing and what they are actually doing in the classroom point to a need for more professional development and in-class support around culturally relevant teaching strategies for teachers of emerging bilingual students.
In general, teachers in this study appreciated the in-class support they received from CSR coaching and the instructional ideas they could put immediately into practice from CSR booster sessions. With regards to this, Tom said,

As a [university] team strength is the professional development part of it. Like if teachers got professional development like those booster sessions and like the coaching, and don't get me wrong my [Aspen Grove social studies] coach is awesome but she doesn't coach me so much because she knows I'm a veteran teacher, so she doesn't push me…but you guys do push. I knew that you being here was going to be helpful to me, and it was going to accomplish something. And the same with those booster sessions. I dreaded going to those because I don't want to stay at a school building until 6:30 at night. But every time I walked away with something that I could go use in my classroom the next day, whereas most of the BS PDs that I've been a part of in my whole teaching career, are us jumping through hoops and trying to pretend like we're not bored so we don't seem rude. Or, in some of the really bad ones, you make it perfectly known you're bored by writing notes to each other and doing stupid stuff. So the whole (2.0) as a (2.0) the CSR coaching and PD as a whole, like, is the most effective use of that tool that I've ever been a part of. (Interview, May 14, 2014)

Now that the larger CSR-CO Project is in its final year of study and we have a large data set comprised of teacher surveys, documentation of coaching contacts and the content of coaching feedback, we can use this information to identify specific components of these practices that teachers found to be most beneficial. In doing so, we can then use similar strategies and structures to support teachers in developing more culturally relevant pedagogy so that ALL coaching and PD booster sessions push and challenge teachers, not just those related to CSR.

**Implications for Pedagogy and Future Research within the Domain of Consequence**

Recently, the superintendent of the large urban school district in which this study took place sent an e-mail to teachers and administrators entitled “Why we need fewer and shorter tests”. In this e-mail, he advocated for state assessments that “should be limited to three to four hours of combined time for language arts and math per year – or less than half of 1% of students’ total annual classroom time” (personal communication, February 4, 2015). However, data from
this study show that more than 1% of typical instruction time was often spent, especially in the spring, preparing for district and state tests that put stress on teachers and students alike. Similarly, teachers’ performance was assessed in the form of effectiveness evaluations and student perception surveys. Results from these measures were then often used to make hiring and firing decisions.

Instead, I suggest that outcomes from measures used in this particular study, like the IDI and SPS, be used to facilitate professional and intercultural growth. Getting teachers to understand their own level of cultural competence could lead to discussions of how one’s cultural competence is related to her worldview and enacted in curricular and instructional decisions. Similarly, knowledge of specific students’ perceptions of teachers could help teachers make more concerted efforts to meet individual students’ needs. Instead of requiring the use of SPS scores in the aggregate, as is the current practice, the school district could ask individual teachers how to present the data in meaningful and useful ways. The optimal consequence of these collective measures in the future could be enhanced student-teacher relationships.

**Implications for Pedagogy and Future Research within the External Domain**

When comparing the data collected in this study to support each domain of the conceptual framework, I found that school-wide systems, structures and personnel were most influential in challenging or supporting teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. Therefore, the importance of a positive and nurturing social climate cannot be understated. Unfortunately, however, in this study I mostly observed and identified structural and systemic challenges for teachers of emerging bilingual students. Consequently, more research is needed to identify supports that facilitate professional growth for teachers of emerging bilingual students.
In the final week of this study, I was made aware of a survey that both parents and students complete regarding the school climate. However, little is known about how information from this survey is used to make improvements within the schools. Therefore, I propose that results from this survey be used to identify schools that are meeting the needs of their emerging bilingual students and families. Future research can then entail conducting case studies within these schools to identify structures and systems that support teachers of emerging bilingual students. In doing so, schools that are struggling to meet the needs of their emerging bilingual population, can then use this information to create a learning environment conducive to the professional, personal and academic growth of teachers, parents, and students alike.

**Study Limitations**

There were four primary limitations to this mixed methods study. The first limitation relates to sample size used to collect both qualitative and quantitative data. The overall number of study participants was small. Even through multiple attempts at soliciting participants and using incentives made available through scholarship monies, I was only able to get twenty-one teachers (13 CSR and 8 non-CSR) to complete the IDI survey at both the beginning and end of the 2013-2014 school year. Similarly, of the six teachers I coached during the 2013-14 school year, only five participated in the qualitative aspects of this study because these were the five who completed the initial IDI measure. Therefore, neither the sites nor the participants were randomly selected. Since the purpose of the study was to examine the factors that support and/or challenge teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students in a more nuanced and in-depth manner than previous studies have done, however, using teachers who taught the same students in different content areas and who served similar percentages of emerging bilingual students was more important to me than sample size. Therefore, the results are not meant to be
generalizable to a larger population, but can be used to inform other researchers doing similar types of work with teachers of emerging bilingual students in culturally and linguistically diverse schools.

A second limitation regarding the quantitative data, is that this study was not designed to prove causality between the use of CSR and participants’ changes in intercultural development. It was clear in the data collection and analysis phases of this study that factors other than the use of CSR could have impacted participating teachers’ intercultural development. However, findings from the quantitative data support the notion that teachers who employ CSR in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms have the potential to develop intercultural competence.

Third, the practicalities involved in undertaking a mixed methods study of this nature were complex. For example, I often went to participating schools to conduct classroom observations and found that the teacher was absent due to illness or that they were going on a field trip without advanced warning. This meant that the number of typical classroom observations varied from teacher to teacher. Similarly, because I had to submit requests for all district data sets through the research and evaluation department and not through school administrators and teachers, I was limited in my use and access of these data. For example, I was specifically instructed not to disaggregate students’ SPS data by teacher. Additionally, lots of student data from the SPS were absent from the data set I received by the district. This meant that not all students’ perceptions were reflected in these data. Therefore, it was used only to make general statements and comparisons between CSR and non-CSR teachers. Ideally, teachers and district personnel alike would have been more transparent about their schedules and willing
to share all measures used with teachers and students. I realize, however, for privacy and practical purposes, that was not a realistic expectation.

Lastly, and arguably most importantly, there were time constraints to this study that impacted my findings. According to the literature regarding teacher change, teachers need between 3-5 years to exhibit changes in beliefs and practices (Learning Forward, 2011). However, considering this study took place in the fourth year of a five year study, along with my desire to graduate and teachers’ mobility within and between schools, it was not logistically feasible to conduct a dissertation study of this desired duration. Similarly, Medina-López-Portillo (2004) suggests that the IDI should be administered a third time to allow for further processing of intercultural experiences. However, given the competing demands for teachers’ time, like personal obligations, after school meetings and professional developments, I was only permitted by the school district’s CSR director to ask the teachers to take the IDI twice, at the beginning and end of the 2013-14 school year. Likewise, I requested to administer the SPS a second time to students at the end of the 2013-14 to see if there were changes in students’ perceptions of these teachers over time. I was denied permission to do so by the research and evaluation department in the district, however, because of potential validity threats this may have caused due to testing fatigue.

Collectively, the limitations of this study highlight considerations other researchers should take into account when conducting research of this nature. Although no study is void of limitations, I hope that in making them visible, these limitations can be seen as potential gaps that future researchers can address when working on similar studies with teachers and emerging bilingual students in large urban school districts.
Conclusion

This study examined the classroom and school-specific systems and structures that challenged and/or supported teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students. It is the first study of its kind to use the IDI as a way to understand teachers’ intercultural competence and how it relates to teachers’ perceptions of his or her students and students’ perceptions of their teachers. Although the findings mostly focused on challenges which impacted teachers’ perceptions, they suggest that changing perceptions is a complex process complicated by a multitude of factors both intrinsic and extrinsic from the teacher. Specifically, findings from this study showed that teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities were challenged by varying levels of administrative support, inconsistencies in school-wide behavior systems, limited classroom space, pressure from assessments (district and state), use of students’ native language for punitive purposes, lack of classroom management, low expectations (which yielded low efforts on the part of students), and little assistance from paraprofessionals. Conversely, participants used CSR and each other to support their emerging bilingual students. Unfortunately, however, although reliance on each other and the implementation of CSR facilitated positive perceptions of emerging bilingual students academic capabilities, they were not enough to disrupt deficit-driven discourses directed toward emerging bilingual students in the classrooms at participating schools.

Given the dearth of extant literature and research related to teachers’ perceptions of their emerging bilingual students (August and Shanahan, 2008), I suggest that educators and researchers interested in issues of social justice and equity within the fields of bilingual education and English language development turn their attention to understanding the classroom and school-specific supports that are necessary for diminishing deficit-driven discourses in order
to create the optimal learning environment for teachers and their emerging bilingual students. That means not only identifying and implementing empirically sound instructional practices for emerging bilingual students, but also providing teachers with a platform from which to share and debrief classroom experiences in order to maximize what they learn from them. Additionally, it means training and placing administrators in schools where they are capable of supporting teachers in this endeavor.

We know all too well from this study what does not work when it comes to supporting teachers’ development of positive perceptions toward their emerging bilingual students, so now is the time to investigate and replicate what does work in schools and classrooms for teachers of these students. In doing so, we will be one step closer to meeting the goal of many school districts state- and nationwide, to close the opportunity gap for emerging bilingual students. It is my hope that this study will inform theory, practice and future research, thus contributing to the study of teachers’ professional growth and intercultural development.
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*Attention Teachers*

We are interested in learning more about the cultural and linguistic diversity of your school. Please help us by taking an online survey. The survey should take 15–20 minutes of your time and will be sent to you via e-mail to complete at your earliest convenience.

In order to compensate you for your time, all names of those who complete the survey by Friday, October 18th will be entered into a raffle to win one of eight $25–$50 gift certificates to Target. Those who complete the survey within a week after receiving the survey link will have their names entered in twice. Teachers who complete the survey the same day the survey link is sent will have their names entered in three times to increase the likelihood of winning!

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Cristin Jensen Lasser at:

cabzj@yahoo.com OR cristin.jensen@colorado.edu

cell: 651–283–1130

Thanks in advance for your time and participation. We look forward to working with you and your students!
Appendix B: IDI Recruitment Flyer (Post)

Dear Teachers,

Last fall you completed a survey for the CSR-CO Project regarding cultural and linguistic diversity called the IDI (Intercultural Development Inventory). Now I am requesting that you take the survey again as a way for us to measure whether there are differences in perceptions between CSR and non-CSR teachers. As you may remember, the survey should take **15-20 minutes** of your time and will be sent to you via e-mail to complete at your earliest convenience.

In order to compensate you for your time, **ALL teachers who complete the survey by Friday, May 30th** will receive a **$10-$15 gift card**. Teachers who complete only the Likert-scale items receive $10, whereas those who complete the 3-4 constructed response questions in addition to the Likert-scale items will receive $15 for their time.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact **Cristin Jensen Lasser** at:

cristin.jensen@colorado.edu

cell: 651-283-1130

Thanks in advance for your **time** and **participation**. It’s been a pleasure working with you and your students this year!
Appendix C: Student Perception Survey (English)

**Student Perception Survey Items**

Final Items in Constructs for 2013-2014 Survey

Please do not duplicate without permission from [Assessment, Research, and Evaluation Department](#).

If you would like more information about this survey, please contact the Assessment, Research, and Evaluation Department of [Department Name].

Response Options for All Items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Some of the Time</th>
<th>Most of the Time</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Facilitates Learning (13 total items)

- Q2: My teacher helps me understand my mistakes so that I can do better next time.
- Q5: My teacher makes learning interesting.
- Q7: My teacher explains what we are learning and why.
- Q9: My teacher wants me to think about things I learn and not just memorize them.
- Q10: My teacher encourages me to share my ideas.
- Q12: My teacher helps me learn new things.
- Q14: My teacher uses examples in class that I understand.
- Q16: In my teacher's class, we learn to correct our mistakes.
- Q18: My teacher checks to make sure I understand.
- Q24: My teacher is good at explaining things that are hard to understand.
- Q26: My teacher explains things in different ways.
- Q28: In my teacher's class, I have to explain my answers.
- Q32: My teacher knows when the class does not understand.

High Expectations of Students (8 total items)

- Q4: My teacher makes sure that the class rules are clear.
- Q6: In my teacher's class, I have to work hard.
- Q11: My teacher makes sure that we all treat each other with respect.
- Q19: In my teacher's class, I have to think hard about the work I do.
- Q21: My teacher makes sure that students do what they're supposed to be doing.
- Q22: My teacher only accepts my best effort.
- Q27: My teacher makes sure that students in this class behave well.
- Q30: My teacher makes sure I do my best in school.

Supports Students (7 total items; 1 opposite)

- Q1: My teacher listens to me.
- Q6a: My teacher ignores me (reverse-coded).
- Q15: I like the way my teacher treats me.
- Q20: My teacher believes in me.
- Q29: My teacher is nice to me when I need help.
- Q31: The rules in my teacher's class are fair.
- Q33: My teacher cares about me
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Appendix D: Teacher Interview Protocol and Questions

CSR Teacher Interview Protocol

Preface:
As you know, I am studying CSR and how it helps teachers of emerging bilingual students in social studies and science classes. I am also interested in learning more about your perceptions of how CSR supports emerging bilingual students in particular.

In this interview, I would like to know your insight on how CSR is used and how it supports your emerging bilingual students. I value your experience and want to learn from your insight.

The purpose of this interview is to hear from both monolingual and bilingual teachers who are using CSR in science and social studies classes so we can improve our understanding of how CSR supports emerging bilingual students across content area classes. This interview will allow us to note if there are any differences between monolingual and bilingual teachers’ perceptions of the benefits of CSR for emerging bilingual students.

Your responses will be confidential—your name will NOT be attached to any information I share. I am simply looking for your insight on how CSR is used as an instructional support for emerging bilingual students.

Questions:

CSR for Teachers:

1. Tell me about CSR…
   a) How did CSR go this year?
   b) What were some challenges?
   c) What were some benefits?

CSR for Students:

1. How does CSR look similar or different within your student groups? Do students do things the same way?

2. Are there groups of students or individuals who you think benefit more/less from CSR? If so, who are they and why?

3. What have you learned about your students through CSR?
   a) What have you learned about your emerging bilingual students in particular?

4. Have there been any challenges to learning or using CSR for your emerging bilingual students? Which components are the most difficult?
5. Do any of the strategies in CSR seem particularly useful for students, during and/or outside of class? (e.g., other classes, during tests, class on non-CSR day, comprehending, engaging, transferring skills)
   a) What about for emerging bilingual students?

6. Do you think CSR helps emerging bilingual students learn English? If so, in what ways? If not, why?

7. Did the use of CSR affect your beliefs and attitudes about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities? If so, which CSR components/strategies and in what ways?

Supporting Students and Self:

8. What do you do to support the language needs of emerging bilingual students through CSR? How does support happen during CSR?

9. What do you do to support the language needs of emerging bilingual students on non-CSR? How does support happen?

10. Did engaging in guided reflective practices (i.e., CSR monthly booster sessions and coaching debriefs) transform your thinking about emerging bilingual students’ academic capabilities? If so, in what ways?
### Appendix E: Emergent Themes from Qualitative Data Sources

#### RQ1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Where it emerged</th>
<th>Paul’s data</th>
<th>Tom’s data</th>
<th>Lisa’s data</th>
<th>Jane’s data</th>
<th>Tony’s data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting the language needs of EB students</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of students’ L1</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort and expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Strategic Reading (CSR)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➔ Thoughtful text selection</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A paraprofessional in the classroom might have made things easier.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RQ2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Where it emerged</th>
<th>Paul’s data</th>
<th>Tom’s data</th>
<th>Lisa’s data</th>
<th>Jane’s data</th>
<th>Tony’s data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this school for me?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collegial support</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-wide behavior systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who you gonna call?</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On the rungs of the disciplinary ladder</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The life of living in a hobo cart</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An assessment culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>