Theses and Dissertations

5-2014

Language Learners, Inequality Regimes, and Secondary Schooling: Dilemmas of the New South

Karen Gober
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd

Part of the Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons, First and Second Language Acquisition Commons, and the Secondary Education Commons

Language Learners, Inequality Regimes, And
Secondary Schooling: Dilemmas Of The New South

Language Learners, Inequality Regimes And
Secondary Schooling: Dilemmas Of The New South

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Sociology

by

Karen Gober
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in Sociology, 2011

May 2014
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

_____
Dr. Shauna A. Morimoto
Thesis Director

_____   _____
Dr. Anna Zajicek   Dr. Juan J. Bustamante
Committee Member   Committee Member

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the structure of the secondary education system in Northwest Arkansas and how it shapes the culture of education for newly arrived Latino immigrants. Significant achievement gaps remain between non-Hispanic white students and Latinos within secondary education. Uncovering possible causes for this gap is necessary in order to allow equal educational opportunity for all students. While prior researchers debate the method of language instruction as a barrier to education, there has been little attention to the relationship between organizational structure and levels of achievement. In-depth interviews with teachers and administrators reveal a consistent theme: large amounts of time and energy spent focused on accountability measures seem to privilege the middle-class, native-English speaking student. I find that attempts at English education for a large influx of non-English speakers constructs secondary education as a type of inequality regime by creating and maintaining a class- and race-based concept of the 'ideal student.' Latino students, in particular, struggle to attain the ideal student status.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the help and support of many wonderful people.

To my graduate school cohort: Thank you for the laughter, the tears, even the anger, and for making the long days in the computer lab much more bearable. I wouldn't have made it through grad school without you. We were a team. We still are.

To Kristin: You get me. Thank you.

To my committee: I have referred to the three of you as the Dream Team. Dr. Zajicek, you have been an inspiration since our first day in the program. With every course we took, you made us think harder and deeper about issues of inequality. Dr. Bustamante, taking your course made me rethink how inequality operates. Listening to you speak about issues of immigration made me believe in my research, rather than just working on a project. Dr. Morimoto, you have been a pillar of patience and encouragement though this entire process. I know I have thanked you many times over the course of this project but I cannot thank you enough for the time and energy you spent working on this project with me. I once told you I didn't want to do any project unless it meant something. I think we did it.

To my children, Jeffrey and Ross: In a weird kind of way, this project is for you. I wanted you to know your mom could do this really cool thing. I've loved you even before you were born and I will never stop. Thank you for putting up with me during these last few years.

And to Kyle, who believed in me from the beginning: Thank you for your infinite love and support. You are my everything and I am yours. I love you MORE than words can express.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated those students who don't fit the mold.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This research explores the structure of the secondary education system in Northwest Arkansas and how it shapes the culture of education for newly arrived Latino immigrants. Since there is a persistent achievement gap in the United States between non-Hispanic white students and Latino immigrants, it is important to understand how the education system affects the educational trajectory of these immigrant students. Current research focuses on what the exponential growth of Latino immigrants means for receiving communities by exploring how communities receive these new immigrants and what effects these receptions have on the immigrants. More specifically, current research on English language learners (ELL) focuses on particular methods of language instruction, as well as teachers' perceptions of what barriers remain to Latinos' educational achievement. Other studies focus on policy implementation in traditional receiving areas after a major change in language policy. Little research has been found on policy implementation in new receiving areas such as the Northwest Arkansas area. My study utilizes in-depth interviews, guided by Dorothy Smith's method of institutional ethnography to explore the implementation of the English-only legislation within the Northwest Arkansas education system. Focusing on institutional barriers for new immigrants, this study goes beyond the classroom-level language instruction by exploring the structural constraints brought about by the implementation of English-only policy in Northwest Arkansas high schools.

BACKGROUND AND SETTING

Between 2000 and 2010, the Hispanic population increased by 15.2 million, representing over half of the total population increase in the United States (Ennis Rios-Vargas Albert 2013). Among Northwest Arkansas cities, this particular city has experienced some of the most significant growth in Hispanic population. Currently, this city is comprised of 35.4 percent

persons of Hispanic or Latino origin (U.S. Census Bureau 2010). Within this school district

("Brookside"), the Hispanic student population has grown from 5.35% in 1995 to 43.73% in

2012, while the White student population has decreased from 90.58% in 1995 to 40.63% in 2012

(District materials 2013a). The State of Arkansas has created accountability standards under the

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) framework which all districts are required to follow under threat

of school sanctions. Certain percentages of student populations must score proficient or above on

all standardized testing or schools will be designated as Needs Focus Improvement. Moreover,

Arkansas' English-only legislation dictates that the process of English language acquisition be

conducted strictly in the English language. Within Brookside district, the creation of a language

center is the district's solution to the large numbers of English language learners. The language

center is a new arrival center for immigrant students who have been in the United States for less

than one year, focusing primarily on English language acquisition first, with content learning as

secondary. As efforts are made at language instruction, district personnel must negotiate

accountability standards, the NCLB framework, and English-only instruction, all of which are

impermeable policies. The goal of this study is to examine how Brookside attempts to meet the

needs of its most vulnerable student population, while working within the confines of state

policies. The conflicting demands of student needs and state and federal policy leads to the

emergence of an inequality regime for English language learners.

By viewing the implementation of Arkansas' English-only policy through the lens of

Acker's theory of inequality regimes, I explore how teachers' interpretations of the policy

structure school policy and procedure and shape student outcomes. Findings are that, although

attempting to meet the needs of the students, the demands on the school emerge as an inequality

regime through the implementation of the English-only policy by creating structural constraints

for newly arrived immigrant students. English language learners enter the school district with insufficient credits for their grade, are kept physically and academically separate from the rest of the student body, yet held accountable to the same educational standards as their peers for achievement. Stringent focus on district accountability measures lead to the concept of a class- and race-based 'ideal student' against which all students are measured. Latino students in particular struggle within this 'ideal student' framework, helping us understand why – in the context of programs to aid immigrant education - barriers still exist to Latino educational trajectories in comparison to non-Hispanic white students.

SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY

Schools are responsible for the socialization of students into productive members of society, the transmission of culture, and "the selection, training, and placement of individuals on different rungs in the society" (Ballantine 2001, as found in Kendall 2011:119). During their formative years, children spend more awake time at school than they do at home. Schools teach children more than just knowledge; they also shape their self-image, beliefs, and value systems. In this way, the education system can serve to either constrain or enable students as they embark on their academic paths. Conventional wisdom tells us that education is the pathway to success. Education, as the saying goes, is the "great equalizer" (Mann 1957). Yet overwhelmingly minority students, Latinos in particular, are overrepresented among high school dropouts, underrepresented among graduates, and consistently remain in low-income brackets (Noguera 2006). These low success rates in high school lead to persistent inequality. "…[W]hether [Latinos] achieve social integration and economic mobility depends on the degree of access they have to quality education from preschool through college" (Tienda and Haskins 2011). Without social and economic mobility, Latinos face a future trapped in a vicious cycle of poverty, social

isolation, discrimination, and marginalization. With such dire consequences for a large proportion of our nation's population, we must examine how institutional structures constrain or enable the mobility of immigrant students. By examining how Northwest Arkansas schools accommodate the language needs of immigrant students, this study provides insight into how the implementation of Arkansas' English-only policy affects their educational opportunities.

INEQUALITY REGIMES

Inequality regimes are "loosely interrelated practices, processes, actions, and meanings that result in and maintain class, gender, and racial inequalities within particular organizations" (Acker 2006:443). While many research studies have focused on inequality based on mainly one or the other of race, class or gender, the focus on one category to the exclusion of all others "…almost inevitably obscures and oversimplifies other interpenetrating realities" (Acker 2006:442). An intersectional approach to research on inequality involves the inclusion of the influence of race, class, and gender, as well as the application of other categories as they apply to the specific research being conducted.

One dimension of inequality is the degree to which segregation by categories of inequality is evident. The degree and pattern of segregation can vary among organizations. In Brookside, newly arrived English language learners are kept separate from the mainstream student population in order to concentrate efforts on the process of English language acquisition. This physical separation creates barriers for ELL students by constraining their ability to integrate culturally, socially, and linguistically into the mainstream student population. Further, by focusing students' efforts on the acquisition of English first, with instruction in core content areas second, Brookside district constrains their ability to gain sufficient knowledge in those core content areas. As such, English as a second language status – which is closely associated with

race - interacts with class to create inequality in educational achievement as compared to native-English speakers.

In this paper, I argue that the school district is organized around the 'ideal student,' as white, middle to upper class, hard working, possessing a mastery of English language skills, and having the support of a family at home. Those students who do not fit this model are problematic for the school district. Acker develops the concept of the "ideal worker" as one way that race and gender inequalities operate in the workplace. The 'ideal worker' has no responsibilities at home, which allows him freedom to concentrate on his work without distraction. "[W]ork is organized on the image of a white man who is totally dedicated to the work and who has no responsibilities for children or family demands other than earning a living." (Acker 2006:448). Inability to fit this 'unencumbered worker' model creates workplace inequality. In schools, race, class, and gender also become primary ways to signify the "ideal" student. Specifically, school is organized around the ideal of the middle class student with English communication skills who is unencumbered by responsibilities to home life (including child care, housework, language and cultural navigation and income generation).

I also draw from Acker's (2006) concepts of "organizing race hierarchies" and "control and compliance." Organizing race hierarchies involves the creation of "[b]ureaucratic, textual techniques for ordering positions and people… to reproduce existing class, gender, and racial inequalities" (Acker 1989). Acker's research on job classification systems reflects how their descriptions of different tasks and responsibilities of jobs create a hierarchical ranking of jobs. I argue that the education system participates in the organization of racial hierarchies by their bureaucratic procedures for the physical segregation of ELL students, and in the selection of students for ESL services and admission into the language center. Control and compliance occurs

5

when those in power are able to get others involved to accept the system of inequality. Brookside district is maintaining control and compliance by the use of state-mandated accountability standards. Standardized testing scores drive the daily activities of district personnel who maintain a consistent focus on meeting accountability standards in order to avoid state sanctions. This threat of sanctions serves as a form of direct control over district personnel.

Language Instruction And Policy

The United States education system is set up to streamline the process of English language acquisition for non-native English speakers, to varying degrees of success. Presumably ELLs are given the tools for English language acquisition and equal opportunity for educational achievement, yet overwhelmingly, Latino immigrant students are "…'overrepresented in most categories of crisis and failure (i.e. suspensions and expulsions, special education placements), while underrepresented in those of success (i.e., honors and gifted and talented classes.)" (Noguera, 2006:316). Nearly all Latinos say it is very important to get a college education in the United States. However, less than half expect to earn a degree. Behind having to work to support their family, the next biggest reason given for this is limited English skills. (Pew Hispanic Center, 2012). The acquisition of English is crucial for immigrant students in achieving educational success in the United States; however the best way to achieve this goal is still a topic under debate.

Language policies. The debate over the best course of language learning program (e.g. bilingual or English-only) is ongoing. Supporters of the English-only movement claim that by maintaining their native language, Latino students are inhibiting the acquisition of English. English-only legislation is promoted as the best way to encourage English language acquisition (Lutz 2007). Overall, research in support of bilingual education is plentiful (Rolstad, Mahoney

and Glass 2008). Proponents of bilingual education tout its merits in enabling native-Spanish speaking students to acquire the English language while simultaneously maintaining their own native language (Lutz 2007). Overwhelmingly, studies show that the retention of Latino students' native language is essential in successfully learning and utilizing English (Rodriguez 1996). Academically, those Latino students who are allowed to retain their native language have higher achievement scores than those students who are forced to drop their native language and are restricted to English language only. As a result, bilingual Hispanics who are allowed to retain their native language are more likely to graduate than their non-Hispanic white counterparts, even controlling for socioeconomic status. "…English/Spanish biliteracy is actually an asset for Latino youth in terms of educational attainment" (Lutz 2007:333). District personnel operate under an English-only policy which dictates that all language instruction be provided to ELL students in English only. This presents a problem for Brookside since approximately 50% of the student population in this area speaks a language other than English at home (District materials 2013a).

Tracking and Segregation. Research on segregation focuses on both segregation by school and segregation by classroom. Segregation by school occurs when students attend schools that disproportionately serve racial, ethnic, and linguistic minorities. This type of segregation also occurs at the economic level; the typical Latino student attends schools where 50.4% of the children are eligible for free or reduced lunches, twice as high as the level of white children at 25.6% (Gandara and Orfield 2010). Segregation by classroom occurs when ELL students are separated from the mainstream student population for purposes of instruction (Gandara and Orfield 2010). Tracking with respect to ELL programs in the education system divides students according to ability, but also divides students along racial lines. White students are more likely to

be in the top tracks, while, due to multiple disadvantages, Mexicans are more likely to be in the lower tracks, as well as English as a Second Language (ESL) courses. Moreover, the higher track teachers tend to be more qualified and have access to more resources than teachers in the lower tracks, creating further diversity among the sets of students (Stromquist 2012). These systems of ability grouping effectively reproduce race-based inequalities (Stromquist 2012). Upon arrival to the U.S., limited English proficient (LEP) students are placed in ESL courses and remain there until they are able to pass standardized tests, at which point they can transition to standard curriculum courses. Oftentimes these LEP students are pulled out of standard curriculum courses in order to attend ESL courses. As such, they miss core content for large portions of the school day and end high school unprepared for college-level coursework. Moreover, these pullouts and alternative placements effectively segregate ELL students from the mainstream student population, creating racial boundaries. "Linguistic segregation at the classroom level for much of the day intensifies all the negative effects of school segregation" (Gandara and Orfield 2010:4). As such, the structure of ESL programs leads to racial segregation and lower levels of academic preparation.

Accountability. In the area of bilingual education research, there tends to be a greater focus on program evaluation rather than issues of instruction. "...[K]ey features of a program are identified and then tied to a particular product – student outcomes. The outcomes are then measured by standardized achievement tests…." (Stritikus and Wiese 2006:1110). The results of these achievement tests gauge policy effectiveness by identifying the best program for ELL students, leaving out the role that teachers, administrators, and school structure play in the implementation of policy. Moreover, achievement tests seem to privilege the native English speaker, calling into question the effectiveness of using standardized achievement tests for

English language learners. "[L]ittle confidence can be placed in tests that assume a mastery of English skills and that were never designed with ELLs in mind" (Crawford 2004:2). Current standardized testing proves ineffective in separating language errors from academic errors (Hakuta 2001, as found in Crawford 2004:2). Moreover, holding ELL students accountable for achieving proficient or above on standardized testing is essentially trying to hit a moving target. Those ELL students who become more proficient in English language skills test out of the ESL system and can no longer count toward the expected percentages of ELL students to be proficient under accountability standards. This means that by its very nature, the category of LEP students is necessarily below proficient standards. These ELL students will never be able to achieve proficient or above on standardized testing because by the time they have the ability to do so, they have progressed out of the ESL system. As such, accountability measures fail to measure adequate progress for ELL students. According to Crawford (2004):

> By setting arbitrary and unrealistic targets for student achievement, this accountability system cannot distinguish between schools that are neglecting ELLs and those that are making improvements. As achievement targets become increasingly stringent, virtually all schools serving ELLs are destined to be branded failures. The inevitable result will be to derail efforts toward genuine reform. Ultimately, a misguided accountability system means no accountability at all (p. 2).

DATA AND METHODS

Methodological Approach

Society is organized by ruling relations or "forms of consciousness and organization that are objectified in the sense that they are constituted externally to particular people and places" (Smith 2006:13). In order to understand the power of institutions, or the organization of institutions by ruling relations, you must begin your investigation from the standpoint of the person being ruled. "The institutional ethnographer works from the social in people's experience to discover its presence and organization in their lives and to explicate or map that organization

9

beyond the local of the everyday" (Smith 2005:11). By exploring the everyday actions and activities of workers, researchers can begin to understand how organizational practices dictate behavior. "Ruling takes place when the interests of those who rule dominate the actions of those in local settings" (Campbell and Gregory 2004:36). Using an institutional ethnographic approach, I explore how bureaucratic, organizational processes drive district personnel to focus on accountability measures in pursuit of school success, rather than the successful integration and education of all students. By studying the education system's organizational procedures, through the daily activities of district personnel, we can uncover how attempts to facilitate immigrant ESL student learning in an English-only context lead to a structure of segregation.

Epistemological Stance

Stritikus and Wiese (2006) call into question the critics of qualitative research in education who insist on a more rigorous method of research using experimental design. The authors examine how ethnographic research methods may or may not effectively contribute to the policy debate over bilingual education. Fetterman (1981, as found in Stritikus and Wiese 2006) finds that "experimental design and controlled studies obscured important realities about how different contexts shape various implementations of policy" and that "… an important role of research is to examine how a program is adapted rather than how it is duplicated" (p. 1109). Experimental design and controlled studies cannot adequately measure individual adaptation methods.

The authors find that an ethnographic approach is the best technique for exploring how policy meets practice, and "[i]f educational research is to be meaningful to all stakeholders, then a deep understanding of the conditions faced by teachers and administrators must be part of the process" (Stritikus and Wiese 2006:1127). Since the purpose of this study is to gain a better

understanding of how Arkansas' English-only law is being interpreted and implemented by district personnel in high schools within the Northwest Arkansas education system, a qualitative research approach was necessary.

Selection Of Participants

Purposive sampling was utilized in recruitment of participants for this study. This sampling approach is utilized when a researcher targets specific participants because they have specialized knowledge regarding the topic to be researched (Neuman 2007). Administrators and/or teachers who have specific knowledge regarding the language instruction of Latino students were the ideal informants. Two public high schools were selected from a Northwest Arkansas School district and a list of administrators and teachers was generated from those schools. Initial contact was made with the principals of both high schools to discuss the project objectives and possible interviews, as well as to obtain permission to contact other teachers and/or administrators within the school. The principal from one of the schools responded quickly so an interview was scheduled. During that interview, permission was obtained from the principal to contact other teachers and administrators for interviews. In-depth, semi-structured interviews were conducted with these administrators and teachers using open-ended questions. During these interviews, I used snowball sampling to find other potential participants based on their specialized knowledge of ELL students. A total of eight administrators and teachers participated including a principal, three language center teachers, two Spanish language teachers, one instructional facilitator, and two district-level ESL personnel. Using an institutional ethnographic approach, the goal was to ask participants to describe their duties and responsibilities at work. This approach provides information about individuals' jobs, and therefore the knowledge they hold, from their perspective. "Researchers honor the knowledge of

11

the insider as an avenue to discovering the power of institutions" (McNeil 2008). Most interviews were conducted off-site to allow the participant to speak freely about their duties and responsibilities at work, while others were conducted within the high school itself due to participants' time constraints. Initial interview questions were asked regarding the individual's duties and responsibilities at work. Questions were then asked as to each participant's understanding of the state's English-only law and how the policy applies to their classroom instruction. As the participants responded to these questions, other questions were asked to further explore the issues district personnel experience with respect to English language learners. The interviews took between one hour and an hour and a half to complete. Interview questions are attached as an Appendix.

During the course of my study, documentation regarding the language center was made available to me such as the grant proposal for the language center and informational brochures promoting the language center. I obtained additional information from Brookside's website where I was able to gather statistics on district demographics including home language use percentages as well as ESL procedures and guidelines. I reviewed these documents and websites for information pertinent to my research and integrated the analysis of this information into my study.

Analysis Of Data

Upon completion of interviews, data was transcribed then coded using initial coding processes. Once initial coding was completed, focused coding was utilized. By grouping and organizing the initial coding data into larger, more salient categories, relevant themes and theories began to emerge from the data. As explained by Charmaz (2006), "Coding is the pivotal link between collecting data and developing an emergent theory to explain these data. Through

coding, you define what is happening in the data and begin to grapple with what it means" (p. 46). This allowed the data to speak to me and let the theory emerge, rather than apply preconceived theories as I moved through the data. Once my focused codes were established, I was able to piece together a story of how district policies and procedures guide the everyday routine activities of participants. Below I discuss secondary education as a form of inequality regime based on procedures used to designate students as English language learners and in the segregation of these students from the mainstream student population. Next I examine issues of control and compliance by Brookside's adherence to state accountability standards. This adherence to accountability standards reinforces and exacerbates the inequalities among students with the most disadvantages in the education system.

PUBLIC SCHOOLS AS INEQUALITY REGIMES: ORGANIZING RACE/CLASS HIERARCHIES

One of the ways in which inequality regimes are produced is through the use of bureaucratic, textual processes and procedures for ordering people and positions within an organization (Acker 2006). These processes are necessary to maintain order within organizations; however, when these processes create a hierarchy of people and positions within the organization, the outcome can result in inequality between those people and positions. Within the education system, bureaucratic and textual processes are used to separate students according to disparate learning needs. In an attempt to meet the needs of newly arrived ELL students Brookside has created a learning center where all new language learners are placed for the purpose of English language instruction. As such, Brookside unwittingly creates hierarchies among students which are evidenced by the relocation of the new arrival language center, as well as individual selection and placement of ELL students within the language center. In the

13

following sections, I will describe the bureaucratic processes which led to the physical relocation of the language center, as well as the selection and placement of ELL students into the language center and the ESL program, which leads to the segregation and isolation of ELL students.

Selection of Students for ESL Program

 Home Language Survey. The catalyst for designation as an ELL student is a single piece of paper called the Home Language Survey. District procedures dictate that all students, regardless of native language, are required to fill out a Home Language Survey upon district enrollment. This assessment asks questions regarding the student's home language use. There are seven questions on the survey; if the answer to any of these questions is a language other than English, the student is immediately referred to the district ESL office for language proficiency testing. This testing includes Spanish native literacy (for native-Spanish speaking students), English language literacy, as well as math ability. Depending on the results of the English language literacy, the student will be "coded as an English learner," more commonly referred to in the district as an ESL student (Interview 9). Once a student has been "coded," a committee is formed for each ESL student to first determine, then oversee their specific academic needs while under the ESL umbrella. Individual students have their own Language Proficiency Assessment Committee (LPAC), consisting of a school administrator, a counselor, an ESL teacher, and a regular classroom teacher. The LPAC meets initially to review the student's testing scores and to decide what services will best fit the student's academic needs. After their initial recommendations, this committee then reconvenes on a yearly basis to review individual students' academic progress and determines which services the students still require. The LPAC then issues a report to the schools; letting the teachers and administrators know what their recommendations are, and how best to serve that student during their next year. Once a student

has been "coded" as ESL they remain in ESL services until formally exited from the system, as discussed further below.

Selection of Students for the Language Center

All immigrant students who are fifteen years of age or older, who have been in the United States for less than twelve months are eligible for placement within the language center. Eligible students are given the English Language Development Assessment (ELDA) to determine their level of English language proficiency. Scoring for the ELDA is from Level 1 up to Level 5. Level 1 is for students who have little to no English skills and Level 5 is Fully English Proficient (District materials 2013b). Only those students who score a Level 1 on the language proficiency assessment will be considered for placement, though some Level 2's are admitted on a case-by-case basis. Once admitted to the language center, newly arrived ELL's are then grouped by ability.

Once a student has been deemed an eligible candidate for the language center, the language center then performs its own assessments of the student's ability. They want to see if they "agree" with the ESL office's recommendation. According to one teacher, "…sometimes someone's on the cusp and we don't want to say okay, you are going to (name of school), and then all of a sudden, no this kid really needs to go here, we don't like to bounce them around so we try to be diligent on the front end" (Interview 6). Understandably, time is a crucial element in the language learning process. Having to switch schools means losing valuable language instruction time. This reassessment also allows the language center to do more in-depth testing to enable placement of students in the program based on ability. When new arrival ELL's enter the education system at the high school level, time becomes a constraining factor since there is less time for students to gain the necessary credits for graduation. Therefore, instruction of the

English language must be combined with content instruction and accelerated so that graduation rates are not compromised for these new language learners.

Location of the language center

Brookside is largely segregated by race, which means that the two main high schools, located on opposite ends of town, are segregated by race as well. From Brookside's perspective, the high school on the east side of town ("East high") was "heavy" with language learners due to the large proportion of Latino residents. Brookside wanted to balance out the numbers of language learning students by redistributing the ELL population between the two high schools. As evidenced by a copy of the grant proposal for the language center, the rationale offered by the district as a reason for the relocation was to "provide for a better ethnic balance between the high schools" as well as "ease the perception that [East high] is the language minority high school" (District materials 2013c). This notion of having to 'ease the perception of being a language minority high school' suggests that being a language minority school is a problem for the district. According to one teacher, "… we had this influx of all these high school age students who had zero language, and they just said okay what are we going to do and they started doing research, so they just got together and they said, how are we going to solve this problem?" (Interview 6) As such, the decision was made to relocate the newly arrived ELL students to the high school on the West side of town. By relocating the newly arrived ELL students to the high school on the west side of town ("West high"), Brookside would theoretically create a more even distribution of ELL students. "…they said we're going to put [the language center] at [West high] even though most of our students live on that side of town which is in [East high] school zone, because it's… a burden on [East high] to have soooo many language learners…." (Interview 6).

But why would these populations need to be evenly distributed? How does this benefit

Brookside district? Conventional wisdom tells us that education in contemporary society should seek diversity in its student populations but if this were the case, the grant proposal would most likely have been worded as such (i.e. a need or desire to increase diversity, etc.) Importantly, the proposal is framed as a need to ease the perception of a language minority school, indicating a need to solve a problem for the district. Indeed, the grant proposal would have discussed diversity, if this were the intended goal. As discussed below, the problem emerges from a focus on accountability and how schools look based on achievement scores. I argue that Brookside district redistributed the ELL population in order to more evenly distribute the achievement scores between the two main high schools.

Segregation/Isolation. Another issue for Brookside district in making the decision on the placement of the language center dealt with space requirements: West high school had empty classrooms available for such a program. In fact, an entire wing was available as a site for the language center where newly arrived immigrant students are placed. While located within the high school, the language center remains completely independent from West high school. As such, these student's classes are contained within one wing of the high school, with little access outside the wing. This organization of students ensures isolation for English language learners and effectively creates segregation of students according to language ability.

Brookside bases their ESL instructional model after a Structured English Immersion (SEI) model. SEI programs consist of pulling ELL students out of key content classes to receive English instruction daily in four-hour blocks. These programs provide intense exposure to the English language for a minimum of one year; however, research shows that immersion programs are ineffective (Cammarota and Aguilera 2012). Since the primary focus in these programs is English language acquisition, the placement of these students within these programs hinders their

17

progress in other courses such as science, math, and history, causing them to fall behind native students. Callahan, et. al (2009) found that "students with lower levels of language proficiency who are offered access to more rigorous courses actually perform better in school than those with the same or better language proficiency, but who are not given this opportunity" (as found in Gandara and Orfield 2010:11). Moreover, since the population of SEI programs consists of mainly minority students, this effectively separates minority students from native students, creating segregation within the school (Cammarota and Aguilera 2012). Brookside combines language acquisition with core content learning; however, the main focus for students in the language center remains primarily English language skills.

This instructional model isolates English language learners from the mainstream student body for the majority of the school day, leading to social and cultural isolation. According to literature from the language center, "While attending the [language center], students will attend four 85 min block 'core' classes (English, Math, Reading, History or Science). Students will also attend one elective class and lunch with mainstream English speaking students" (District material 2013d). Only one elective course per day and lunch are taken outside the confines of the language center. These are the only times that ELL students have the opportunity to interact with the mainstream student population. Further, those students who are native Spanish speaking students are required to take Spanish for Native Speakers as their elective which means that lunch is the only time they have to interact with students outside the language center. Therefore, native Spanish speaking students are the most isolated of all language learners (Interview 6).

Social/Cultural isolation. The stated purpose of the language center is to "address the diverse and educational needs of non-English speaking high school students (9th-12th) who are new to the United States, and to provide a successful transition into the community" (District

materials 2013d). In addition, program goals include acclimating students and their families into the district and the community. The way in which Brookside attempts to meet these goals is to relocate these students from one side of the district to the other and place these students in a school within a school; however this also inhibits English language learners' access to mainstream students. As one administrator explains, "…we put them in an intensive environment where they focus on English, math, and social studies, and language development, and that's their whole day, they have one period that they're out and the rest of the time is spent in the [language center]" (Interview 11). Having access to their peers would allow ELL students the ability to attain the cultural, social, and linguistic tools to enable quicker integration into the mainstream student population. However, by segregating ELL students, Brookside is constraining students' successful transition into the school community.

Due to the isolated nature of the language center, school personnel recognize the need for integration and make efforts to engage students with the mainstream population. One teacher responded to the issue of isolation by stating that attempts to get students' socialization outside the language center is "not ideal" but explained that the current program was a better approach by having core content areas integrated with language acquisition (Interview 6). Attempting to alleviate the issues of isolation, language center teachers occasionally invite guest speakers into the classroom to teach new arrivals the skills necessary to navigate the social landscape. She explains, "to make up for it, we try to invite, um, leaders from (West high) into our area, … the cheerleaders come in and they teach the kids cheers at the start of the year before the first pep rally, we've had the choir teacher come in and teach the alma mater" (Interview 6). Moreover, in an effort to have their students reach outside the confines of the language center, the program mandates that their ELL students join the International Club. However, the International Club is

an organization which attracts mainly minority students (Interview 6). Essentially, an effort to meet the language needs of the students reinforces other barriers to English learners, including creating a student hierarchy by having school "leaders," for example, teach language learners appropriate culture. As a result, the English learning program policies and practices may further exacerbate segregation issues within the school district. This limited exposure to mainstream students constrains the ELL students' ability to acquire not only the necessary cultural and social skills, but more important for Brookside, the language skills they require of these students.

While the grouping of students for a common educational purpose seems to make sense academically, the separation of a group of students from the rest of the student population can have more serious ramifications. By sectioning off the ELL students into their own wing of the school and only allowing the possibility of one elective class outside their language center, Brookside is segregating students by language ability. Once this occurs, students are perceived differently based on their physical and social location. This leads to de facto stratification of students based on race. Put differently, since the majority of students placed in mainstream classes are either native English speaking students or English language proficient students, non-native English speakers, particularly newly arrived immigrants, may be perceived as academically inferior. In his research on the educational trajectory of Mexican-origin people, Alejandro Covarrubias states that these perceptions of ability translate into lifelong trajectories. "Often, we learn to assign value to these differences that serve to elevate the status of some people while diminishing the worth of others. These differences and their value, in turn, become 'natural' to us because they become so widespread and consistently used" (2011:88). Moreover, these beliefs that academic differences are 'natural' can "significantly shape educational outcomes…" (Covarrubias 2011:88). As such, these perceived differences in academic ability

become an immobile barrier for ELL students. While the school district has no direct intention of creating inequality between the population groups, the result is a structure that separates immigrant ESL students from the mainstream student population. This has long-term consequences for who has voice and authority within the school. According to Smith, "… some students learn that their own voices have authority, that they count and should be heard; others learn their lack. Some learn that they belong to groups that have agency in society and that they can count on being recognized as such. This forming of groups is more than the 'socialization' of individuals; these are ways of relating that are projected and perpetuated beyond school" (2000:1149). As such, the education system produces and embeds cultural, social, and racial inequalities which are then reflected in students' educational achievement.

Exiting

Once a student has been coded as an ESL student and placed in ESL services, it is difficult to exit the system. District procedures dictate that students must score a Level 5 on the ELDA, have C's or higher in all core classes, and have to score proficient or above on either the Benchmark assessment or End of Course exam, depending on the age of the student (Interview 6, 11). Again, scoring a Level 5 on the ELDA means fully English language proficient. Only when those criteria have been met will a student be released from ESL services. However, scoring a Level 5 on the ELDA, as well as maintaining C's in all core classes is a difficult task for ELL students. In fact, according to one teacher those tasks would be hard to accomplish even for a native-English speaker. "I think that a lot of native English speakers wouldn't score all fives and be able to exit ESL" (Interview 6). When mainstream students are allowed D's and above in order to maintain a passing grade, expected achievement scores for ELL students are above and beyond what mainstream students are expected to score. This results in ELL students getting

trapped in the ESL program and becoming increasingly frustrated with the process. Teachers and administrators both refer to students' frustration over ELDA testing:

- "[They say,] 'I had to go and take this ELDA test, and how come, that I know English and how come they ask me what's your name, what color is your shirt?' They get so frustrated!!! And I say well, I guess it's, you know, because you answered, you know when you took that survey, oh they speak Spanish at home, well they go there, they classify them as ESL" (Interview 7).

- "Yeah we have to give incentives to take the ELDA, and that's interesting… if you guys show, if you come on time and you're not just filling in a pattern and you're working really hard on all these sections, we're gonna give you a pass for one of your finals…" (Interview 6).

- "I mean, kids don't wanna take tests, and um, some of the kids feel like that they're um, I don't know, why do I have to take this test, do I have to take this test 'cause I don't speak the language? …[they've] had it up to here with assessments" (Interview 9).

ELL students are effectively being held to a higher standard than native-English speaking students. Moreover, they become frustrated with the system and have little incentive to become a part of the mainstream population – from which they have been separated. This frustration with the exiting process coupled with the embedded cultural, social, and academic inequalities of being an ESL student can reinforce the likelihood of underachieving educational outcomes for ELL students.

CONTROL AND COMPLIANCE

Meeting state mandated accountability standards such as graduation rates and achievement scores exerts control and compliance over Brookside by focusing on school success,

over and above the successful integration and education of all students. While the school indicates a desire to help all students achieve academic excellence, this intense focus on accountability standards privileges native English speaking students over ELL students in achievement scores as well as graduation rates. This privilege occurs in the form of English-based testing and in the creation of the "ideal student" model; students whose native-English language ability more easily helps the school in meeting district standards. These accountability standards create control and compliance of schools by threatening a "Needs Improvement Focus School" status. Schools designated as "Needs Improvement" are schools with the largest gaps between subgroups in achievement scores or graduation rates. This status casts the school in a negative light within their community, indicating poor school performance. As such, the strict focus for schools becomes meeting accountability measures. ELL students in particular struggle with fitting the criteria defined by district personnel as a 'good student' and therefore become a liability to school success.

Focusing on School Success

The purpose of educators is to provide equal educational opportunities to all students. According to one administrator, "We're really striving for excellence, what we teach is not that important, it's teaching students how to learn what we teach. We teach excellence, excellence in their effort, excellence in their attitude…." (Interview 5). This indicates that the stated goal of education should be focused on student achievement. "So every day is a challenge and every conversation is focused: what is it we need to do to improve student learning? That's what we try to focus on" (Interview 5). District personnel are charged with educating all students, regardless of ability. Yet several teachers and administrators speak of students' backgrounds and abilities as a challenge to instruction. Some students seem to be more suited for the education system than

others. This is evident in the pursuit of accountability standards by Brookside. District personnel speak of new arrivals coming into the school lacking the same educational abilities as those students already in the district. To some district personnel, some new arrivals present a serious challenge to instruction. "…[B]ut the ones who pull down the [language center] are the ones who are very low, who are just sixth graders, eighth graders, or even, they call them ninth graders from their countries but they, they were not good students…" (Interview 10). By speaking in terms of students 'pulling down the language center', this teacher places the focus on the students' background and academic level as the problem rather than the institution meeting the students' needs. Other individual student issues present challenges to education according to some personnel, and serve to make the school look bad. The same teacher talks about the issue of documentation for some students, "… so those kinds of things you know, that are behind the student and the relatives affect … those tests, and the one who will suffer is the school because the school is getting… good students, bad students… and people will say this school is a better school than [East high] or that one is better than this one…." He goes on to explain, "If they don't furnish us good students, it's not the [language center], it's the kind of students that we'll receive…" (Interview 10). By worrying over whether the schools will be seen as better or worse than the others indicates the primary focus is how well the school is doing and that some students are preferred over others. When the primary focus is on school success, the problem of instruction is placed on the individual student rather than the structure of the institution.

Graduation Rates

According to state accountability measures, students have to graduate from high school within four years; however since this high school only serves tenth through twelfth graders, it reduces that time frame by one year for English language learners. "Ideal students" coming into

the high school from other schools in the district achieve this with relative ease, having already earned high school credits during their ninth grade year. However, ELL's who are new to this country face multiple challenges to this state standard. Many ELL's are coming into Brookside district from countries whose educational trajectory does not mirror our own. In the case of many Latino students, more often than not these students' educations end around sixth grade unless expensive private education is sought (Interview 10). As such, class plays a role in the 'ideal student' model. In Mexico, students who want to continue their education past sixth grade must pay for private education; however many of these families cannot afford private education. If an ELL student has had the opportunity to continue their education and maintain their Spanish literacy before entering the U.S. school system, they will pick up English skills much more quickly than students who stopped their education after sixth grade (Interview 11). The more English skills a student has, the better he or she is able to do on achievement tests. As such, these students will more likely be able to meet achievement standards and graduate on time, ensuring success for the school.

These educational gaps create several issues for ELL students. First, it leaves a gap in academic ability which makes it more difficult for students to enter the United States education system smoothly. ELL students coming into high school will not have the same educational ability as those students their same age. Second, it creates gaps in credits earned toward graduation. While ninth graders in the United States are earning credits which will transfer to high school, most newly arrived language learners have either earned no credits, or have very few credits transfer. According to one teacher, "…they walk in the door, they're automatically behind" (Interview 13). Brookside district recognizes these gaps and indicates a focus to fill them yet places the burden of meeting accountability standards on the students themselves.

"What do you do? You're give 'em good teachers, they're gonna fill those gaps as best they can… and they're gonna push, allow them to access that curriculum even though they've got pieces missing… and some kids work very hard and get there, and some kids don't" (Interview 11). Good students, then, 'work very hard' and are able to achieve ideal status. This places the burden for making up these gaps in language and ability on the students who are least equipped to handle it.

In previous years, graduation rates were based on simply completing the credits necessary to graduate regardless of the years needed to complete them. This ensured that ELL students had extra time to make up for lost credits and complete courses necessary for graduation. The state now mandates that graduation rates be calculated based on on-time graduation, which for this high school means graduating within 3 years. This means ELL students who are already behind with respect to ability and course credits are now having to complete school on a truncated time table. "They have to come in with some credit... with no credit there's no way they'll finish in three years.... therefore they become a statistic, they go against them on the graduation rate" (Interview 11). One administrator indicated Brookside made a request for the state to consider their ELL students as incoming ninth graders in order to allow them extra time to graduate, but the state denied their request. She explains, "[I]t's hard to get the state to change anything. They're more of a stumbling block than a help." (Interview 11) By coming into the system with fewer credits than the upcoming ninth grade students, these ELL students are disadvantaged from the moment they start high school. "If they show up and they're not literate in English... hadn't been to school in two or three years, they're not gonna bring credit" (Interview 11). These ELL students will enter the education system behind on the necessary credits for graduation and will have less time to make them up before the state says they should be graduating. On-time

graduation is not a possibility, unless additional classes are taken to make up for these missing credits. Teachers and administrators spend significant amounts of time trying to get transcripts from other countries in order to fill the gaps in credits. According to one teacher, "… in order to graduate [a student] would have to have credit from their former schools, they rarely bring those transcripts, maybe 50% of the time, so we're working really hard to then get with the family, see if they can get them..." (Interview 6). According to an administrator, "But there's no way they're gonna graduate in three years, there's no way, unless they bring some credit, so I work really hard to try and find credit for them' (Interview 11). Moreover, the students feel the same pressure. "They recognize that they're behind. I mean, they know" (Interview 13). Several teachers and administrators spoke of the difficulty in retrieving academic transcripts from other countries, but they continue trying because it is the only way some of these students will enter Brookside with credits. "The state says that if a kid starts ninth grade this year, that kid has to graduate in four years and any time after that, we are penalized and it looks like we are a bad school" (Interview 6). Again, the main concern for the school is to not "look bad." As a result, the school focuses on trying to collect credits to get kids closer to graduation, ensuring success for the school, rather than focusing on making sure the student has the education needed for post-secondary opportunities.

School administrators must consider incoming students' abilities when making decisions about student placement. Students who enter Brookside unprepared for grade-level work present a threat to school success. One administrator expresses her concern over student placement: "… you know I am very much aware that when I place a 17 year old kid that hasn't been in school for two years at one of our high schools, that that's gonna affect that high school's graduation rate, but because not only do they have to give them the content to graduate and the rigor,

27

they've gotta make up for these two, sometimes three or four years of an inadequate education to prepare that child for high school at this level" (Interview 11). This awareness of how student placement will affect school accountability measures reflects the focus on school success over student needs.

While at an individual level, educators are concerned with the struggles of the students, the structure of the school locks them into a system of segregation for ELL students which leads to the creation of an inequality regime. ELL students lack English language skills, have educational gaps in ability and credits earned, and are kept physically and academically separate from the mainstream student population. Yet, these ELL students are held to the exact same accountability standards as their mainstream peers. Only "ideal students", the most academically adept and hardest working students, will be able to succeed.

English-only Testing

Teachers and administrators both are aware of the issues of standardized testing, but the structural constraints of the accountability standards are not changeable. Therefore, although district personnel acknowledge the issue, the focus continues to be on meeting these standards. According to one teacher, "...that would be great to give them the language first and then hold them accountable for credits, [but] that's not the reality, school's not gonna let us, the state's not going to let us do that, so... we've tried to do the best of both worlds, we've just got a year to really focus on that English..." (Interview 6). According to an administrator,

> "It takes 7-10 years for language acquisition, and the ironic thing about that is, is in our country we think a kid after three hundred and sixty five days can take a literacy exam in OUR language and be proficient in it which is just asinine if you wanna know the truth.... [B]ut for somebody to think that, that one, two, or three years is enough for a student to really acquire a language is ridiculous! Uh, nevertheless, we try to accelerate it the best we can..." (Interview 5).

ELL students have difficulty testing and achieving at proficient or above on standardized tests because the tests they are held accountable for are written in the English language. ELL students are held accountable for test scores after being in the country only one year. Further, those tests are the same for all students regardless of English skill level. When asked about standardized testing, an administrator express frustration:

> They take the same exam as an Advanced Placement English student, the exact same exam, and the only accommodation we give them is we'll give a language learner an English to whatever dictionary… so, that accommodation plus we give them extended time in an already arduously long exam. It's six hours over two days. Three hours each day…. We give them longer time to do it if they don't speak English well. Just doesn't make any sense; give them the same geometry exam, same thing…. Although in geometry we can read to them, we can read the questions to them. We cannot in literacy. Because it's about reading and writing, and so yeah… those policies… I don't understand them. That's cause I don't think they're research-based, and I don't think they have anything to do with language acquisition (Interview 5).

English-based testing disadvantages newly arrived immigrant students. District personnel speak specifically about the language limitations of standardized tests. A teacher describes these limitations, "…it's tough because you want to pass and many of them have the skills to pass, but they don't have the language to pass" (Interview 6). Moreover, these tests are difficult for even native English speakers (Interview 6). The assumption of the "ideal student" as standard is clear. As stated above, accommodations are given to ELL students but longer time limits and translation dictionaries fail to address some of the other issues with English-based testing. All students on the literacy exam are expected to write in a particular style. According to this teacher, "…it's just tough, it's not just about can you read and answer questions, can you write? Instead of just can you write and give a structure… no, no, no, have to have STYLE, you have to have pizzazz in your writing, it can't just be formulaic, or you're just merely 'okay'" (Interview 6). Again, district personnel acknowledge issues with English-based standardized testing. "We're asking language learners, with no functional English skills to take a test in English after 365 days

in this country" (Interview 5). "They're looking for style, they're looking for parallel structure, complex, compound sentence structure. [My] student[s are] just trying to communicate" (Interview 6). English-based tests include concepts which are not well understood by new English language learners. Advanced grammar structures can be unfamiliar to ELL students so when they experience these during testing, the students are unable to negotiate them successfully. Only those students who have already mastered the English language, or come into the school system well prepared will be able to succeed on these tests. What does this say about the type of student who can be successful? If full knowledge of the English language is necessary to be successful on standardized testing, then the accountability model itself privileges native-English language students over language learners. As such, accountability standards become an immobile barrier to ESL students.

THE IDEAL STUDENT AND THE INFLUENCE OF CLASS

Socioeconomic status plays a significant role in English acquisition due to the fact that "…children from high-poverty, less educated backgrounds tend to need more time to acquire English" (Hakuta, Butler and Witt 2000, as found in Crawford, 2004:4). I find evidence that class plays a role in district expectations for educational achievement. One administrator explains the influence of class on the achievement gap. "The gap between their highest performing and their lowest performing is narrower because this side of town tends to be more… you have more economically challenged, more poverty, because… it's just the way it is, I mean look at their poverty rate" (Interview 11). This statement indicates an overall assumption regarding socioeconomic status and its relationship to achievement. By referring to low achievement scores in low poverty areas as 'just the way it is', this participant also indicates the assumption of different abilities as based on class as 'natural.' She goes on to explain the reasons

for the influence of class. "[T]here're a lot of different reasons with poverty, it could be they don't come from an educationally rich family. I mean…I don't know if you have children but I started reading to mine when they were little bitty… I was reading the board books to my kids, we encourage caregivers to do that, and turn off the TV, and you know poverty, children of poverty tend to be placed in that kind of environment a lot more than children of affluence, where their parents have choices…" (Interview 11). Another teacher discusses the influence of poverty on attendance rates when "poorer kids" have parents who do not set school as a priority for their children or cannot enforce school attendance because they are working (Interview 13). As such, the education system sees the "ideal student" as a student with higher family socioeconomic status who will more easily be able to meet school standards for educational achievement. Unfortunately, ELL students are the students least likely to meet these standards.

The education system produces and embeds this model of the 'ideal student' within Brookside; some of the students will more easily fulfill this role than others. Only those ELL students who work extremely hard, already have some English language skills, and whose families appear, according to district personnel, to focus on the 'right' criteria in caring for and raising their children, will be able to successfully navigate the education system. Those students who do not possess these traits will be left behind. Again, if full knowledge of the English language is necessary to be successful on standardized testing, this 'ideal student' model privileges the native English-speaking student in that they already have the skills necessary to fit the mold the education system has created. The 'ideal student' model ensures unequal educational outcomes for ELL students by placing the burden of meeting the achievement gap on those students who are least equipped to bridge it.

CONCLUSION

To maintain a sense of structure, the use of bureaucratic procedures for ordering people and positions is a necessary component in secondary education. However, procedures used in the selection and placement of English language learners into ESL services and into the language center results in segregation and isolation of these students. Moreover, procedures which keep students locked into a system of special services further exacerbate the issues of isolation. While isolating students is a necessary component in the process of language instruction for students who are new to the country, separating them from their peers for the majority of the school day constrains their ability to attain the skills needed to successfully integrate into the mainstream student population. This lack of integration may ultimately translate into lack of integration into U.S. society upon leaving high school.

Likewise, accountability systems are necessary components of secondary education. Schools must be able to measure student growth to determine effectiveness of instruction. However, state-mandated accountability standards seem to privilege the native English-speaking student. Standardized tests were never designed for English language learners (Crawford 2004). As a result, only 'ideal students', those with excellent oral, written, and verbal English skills will receive high scores on achievement tests. English language learners do not have the language skills necessary to do well on standardized testing therefore they are more likely to remain in the lower ranges of achievement scores.

Because of state accountability measures, NCLB frameworks, and English-only policy, Brookside district personnel must place school success as a priority at the risk of lower academic success and lack of integration for ELL students. This structure, quite paradoxically, precludes English language learners from ever achieving 'ideal student' status. As such, these already disadvantaged students are being set up for failure. The combination of race- and class-based

hierarchies that separate language learners from their peers, and maintaining control and compliance of district personnel by the utilization of an English-based accountability system, leads to the emergence of a type of inequality regime which puts English language learners at a distinct disadvantage. This inequality regime is then reflected and reproduced within the school environment and student hierarchies become hopelessly embedded in school culture. The effects of these hierarchies are apparent in post-secondary opportunities. "Identities, constituted through gendered and racialized images and experiences, are mutually reproduced along with differences in status and economic advantage" (Acker 2006:455). I find that the implementation of Arkansas language policy together with meeting school achievement standards creates conflicts for the school by effectively creating a structural barrier to successful integration into mainstream culture for English language learners.

LIMITATIONS OF STUDY

This study is not intended to be an evaluation of the language center itself, nor an evaluation of English language instruction by teachers in West high or the language center. The main purpose of this research was to go beyond the classroom experience and explore the ways in which the implementation of Arkansas' English-only legislation structures the activities of district personnel. In addition, this research could benefit from hearing the voices of other educators outside of language instructors, administrators and district personnel. Gaining this outsider's perspective could give us a glimpse into the actions of personnel who do not have close contact with language learners. As such, comparisons could be made between the activities of language learning personnel and mainstream personnel. As this was a short-term research project, data could benefit from a more longitudinal approach. Looking at how the educators' activities have evolved in response to the increase in ELL students within Brookside district

would show us changes in the organizational structure, and therefore institutional focus with respect to English language learning.

This study was conducted at the end of No Child Left Behind (NCLB). The accountability system in place and discussed with district personnel during my research was NCLB based. Several interviews involved discussion about the new system being rolled out in the district. Common Core was a heavy topic of discussion for teachers and administrators alike, due to the difficulty in juggling everyday activities and adjusting to the new learning curve for a new school curriculum and accountability system. While Common Core is being heavily debated among educators in the United States, I do not address it here. Future research may include how the structure of education has changed due to new Common Core standards. I anticipate a deeper level of discussion with respect to English language learners.

As a researcher, I approached this project as a middle-class, white, native-English speaking, college student. I first became interested in second language learning from my experience as an undergraduate college student. Having to take a second language as a requirement for graduation, and experiencing difficulty with it, gave me reason to be interested in investigating the experiences of those who are new to this country and having no choice but to learn English in order to more easily navigate the culture of this country. Obviously, my path was easier; I was learning Spanish, the acquisition of which is not essential to living life within the United States. Immigrants to this country are placed in a position of being forced to learn English so that they can survive in this country. Moreover, high school-aged students entering the country have to learn English on a truncated timetable. I cannot pretend to understand the entirety of their plight, but here I do attempt to understand their circumstances.

REFERENCES

2010, "U.S. Census Bureau" *U.S. Census Bureau*.
        (http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/05/0566080.html).

2012. "Pew Hispanic Center." pewhispanic.org. (http://www.pewhispanic.org/).

2013a. "2012-2013 District Statistical Data."46.
        (http://springdale.sharpschool.net/cms/One.aspx?portalId=2943042&pageId=5521665).

2013b. *Guide to Understanding Scores on the English Language Development Assessment
        (Elda)*Congress. Arkansas Department of Education:1-12
        (http://www.arkansased.org/public/userfiles/Learning_Services/Student%20Assessment/2
        013/ELDA/ELDA_S_2013_Guide_to_Understanding_Scores_English.pdf).

2013c. Grant proposal provided by district personnel

2013d. Language center informational brochure provided by district personnel

Acker, Joan. 1990. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender
        and Society* 4(2):139-58.

Acker, Joan. 2006. "Inequality Regimes Gender, Class, and Race in Organizations." *Gender and
        Society* 20(4):441-64.

Ballantine, Jeanne H. 2001. *The Sociology of Education: A Systematic Analysis*. Upper Saddle
        River: Prentice Hall.

Callahan, Rebecca, Lindsey Wilkinson, Chandra Muller and Michelle Frisco. 2009. "ESL
        Placement and Schools: Effects on Immigrant Achievement." *Educational Policy*
        23(2):355-84. doi: 10.1177/0895904807310034.

Cammarota, Julio and Michelle Aguilera. 2012. "'by the Time I Get to Arizona': Race, Language,
        and Education in America's Racist State." *Race Ethnicity and Education* 15(4):485-500.

Campbell, Marie and Frances Gregor. 2004. *Mapping Social Relations: A Primer in Doing
        Institutional Ethnography*. Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.

Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. London: SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Covarrubias, Alejandro. 2011. "Quantitative Intersectionality: A Critical Race Analysis of the
        Chicana/O Educational Pipeline." *Journal of Latinos and Education* 10(2):86.

Crawford, James. 2004. "No Child Left Behind: Misguided Approach to School Accountability
        for English Language Learners." Paper presented at the Forum on Ideas to Improve the

NCLB Accountability Provisions for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners.

Ennis, Sharon R., Merarys Ríos-Vargas and Nora G. Albert. 2011. "The Hispanic Population: 2010." *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved: May (http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-04.pdf).

Fetterman, David. 1981. "Blaming the Victim: The Problem of Evaluation Design and Federal Involvement, and Reinforcing World Views in Education." *Human Organization* 40:67-77.

Gandara, Patricia and Gary Orfield. 2010. "A Return to The "Mexican Room": The Segregation of Arizona's English Learners." Vol.: Civil Rights Project / Proyecto Derechos Civiles. 8370 Math Sciences, P.O. Box 951521, Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521.

Hakuta, Kenji. 2001. "The Education of language-minority students." Testimony to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. Washington, DC April 13.

Hakuta, Kenji, Yuko Goto Butler and Daria Witt. 2000. "How Long Does It Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?" The University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Kendall, Diana. 2011. *Sociology in Our Times: The Essentials*. Belmont: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Lutz, Amy. 2007. "Barriers to High-School Completion among Immigrant and Later-Generation Latinos in the Usa." *Ethnicities* 7(3):323-42.

Mann, Horace. 1957. "Report No. 12 of the Massachusetts School Board (1848)." Pp. 79-80, 84-97 in *The Republic and the School: Horace Mann on the Education of Free Men*, edited by L. A. Cremin: Teachers College Press.

McNeil, Lori L. 2008. "Applying Institutional Ethnography to Childcare." *Qualitative Sociology Review* IV(1):109-30.

Neuman, W. Lawrence. 2007. *Basics of Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Edited by J. Laser. Boston: Pearson.

Noguera, Pedro A. 2006. "Latino Youth: Immigration, Education, and the Future." *Latino Studies* 4:313-20.

Rodriguez, Roberto. 2004. "Commentary: The State of Latino Education: A War against Ignorance." *Black Issues in Higher Education* 21(9):84-86.

Rolstad, Kellie, Kate Mahoney and Gene V. Glass. 2005. "The Big Picture: A Meta-Analysis of Program Effectiveness Research on English Language Learners." *Educational Policy* 19(4):572-94. doi: 10.1177/0895904805278067.

Smith, Dorothy E. 2000. "Schooling for Inequality." *Signs* 25(4):1147-51.

Smith, Dorothy E. 2004. "Institutional Ethnography -- Towards a Productive Sociology. An Interview with Dorothy E. Smith." *Sosiologisk tidsskrift* 12(2):179-84.

Stritikus, Tom T. and Ann-Marie Wiese. 2006. "Reassessing the Role of Ethnographic Methods in Education Policy Research: Implementing Bilingual Education Policy at Local Levels." *Teachers College Record* 108(6):1106-31.

Stromquist, Nelly P. 2012. "The Educational Experience of Hispanic Immigrants in the United States: Integration through Marginalization." *Race, Ethnicity and Education* 15(2):195-221.

Tienda, Marta and Ron Haskins. 2011. "Immigrant Children: Introducing the Issue." *The Future of Children* 21(1):3-18.

APPENDIX. Interview Questions.

1. What are your duties and responsibilities?

2. Tell me what a typical day looks like for you.

3. Who do you work with on a daily basis?

4. What do you like most about your job?

5. What is the most challenging part of your job?

6. What specific policies are in place for ELL students?

7. Tell me what you know about the debates over language policy.

8. How does Arkansas' English-only policy work?

9. If you could improve language learning, what would you do?

10. If you could improve education overall, what would you do?

UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS

October 10, 2013

MEMORANDUM

TO: Karen Gober
                       Shauna Morimoto

FROM: Ro Windwalker
                       IRB Coordinator

RE: PROJECT CONTINUATION

IRB Protocol #:   12-10-188

Protocol Title: *What are Teachers' Perceptions of the Challenges and Barriers of Latino Students within the Educational System?*

Review Type: ☒ EXEMPT   ☐ EXPEDITED   ☐ FULL IRB

Previous Approval Period: Start Date: 11/02/2012 Expiration Date: 10/31/2013

New Expiration Date: 10/31/2014

Your request to extend the referenced protocol has been approved by the IRB. If at the end of this period you wish to continue the project, you must submit a request using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. Failure to obtain approval for a continuation on or prior to this new expiration date will result in termination of the protocol and you will be required to submit a new protocol to the IRB before continuing the project. Data collected past the protocol expiration date may need to be eliminated from the dataset should you wish to publish. Only data collected under a currently approved protocol can be certified by the IRB for any purpose.

This protocol has been approved for 20 total participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 210 Administration Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

November 5, 2012

MEMORANDUM

TO: Karen Gober
                                 Shauna Morimoto

FROM: Ro Windwalker
                                 IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #:   12-10-188

Protocol Title: *What are Teachers' Perceptions of the Challenges and Barriers of*
                                 Latino Students within the Educational System?

Review Type: ☒ EXEMPT   ☐ EXPEDITED   ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 11/02/2012 Expiration Date: 10/31/2013

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of
one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you
must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the
expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance
website (http://vpred.uark.edu/210.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months
in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation
to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval.   Federal regulations prohibit
retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to
the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can
give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 20 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications
in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval
prior to implementing those changes.   All modifications should be requested in writing (email is
acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 210
Administration Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

210 Administration Building • 1 University of Arkansas • Fayetteville, AR 72701
Voice (479) 575-2208 • Fax (479) 575-3846 • Email irb@uark.edu

The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution.

40