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ABSTRACT OF DISSERTATION

THE PHENOMENON OF TEACHER LEADERSHIP AND CROSS-CULTURAL CONFUSIONS: WHAT TEACHERS’ NARRATIVES REVEAL ABOUT SCHOOL LEADERSHIP AND INTERGROUP COMMUNICATION

English Language Learners (ELLs) comprise the largest growing subgroup of students in the United States, yet for decades this special population has persistently underachieved as compared to White non-Hispanic students in the public school system. Throughout the nation, ELLs receive an array of services from English as a second language pull-out to sheltered content instruction to dual language education. Much debate has centered on instructional programs for ELLs and the language of instructional delivery. The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of teacher leadership during the adoption and implementation of a one-way dual language education program at a central Kentucky elementary school. This program, designed to develop and maintain literacy in Spanish and English, was the first of its kind for ELLs in the state.

In an effort to understand the factors that influenced the teachers’ thinking, behavior, and interactions as they designed and implemented the program, an exploratory qualitative approach that incorporated heuristic inquiry and narrative analysis was used. Data were collected primarily through interviews and a focus group session along with documents and observation. Analysis of the transcripts involved the identification and interpretation of multiple categories that related to theoretical and emergent themes. Teachers’ stories illuminated the influence of streams of school leadership (relationships, moral purpose, and collective action) throughout the adoption and implementation process. Emergent themes from the data pointed to cross-cultural communication issues
that had an impact on the teachers’ relationships and subsequently, the program’s
development.

Findings in the study point to the need for K-12 schools and teacher education
programs to develop curricula that promotes understanding of teacher leadership theory. More importantly, however, the data showed that attention must also be paid to
promoting cultural responsivity in educators, not only as relates to students but also to
colleagues.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2015), the population of English Language Learners (ELLs) represents the fastest growing subgroup in American schools today with more than 60% growth as compared to 3% for the overall school population in the first decade of this century. Though the majority of states with high percentages of ELLs are in the West, dozens of states across the nation experienced significant growth during this time period. Kentucky is one such state; from 2002-2012, the number of ELLs in Kentucky schools almost tripled (NCES, 2015). This rapid growth has left teachers and administrators grappling with issues related to instructional programming, teacher preparation, and sociocultural conflict.

Though dual language education (DLE) programs are well established in many states across the nation with large populations of immigrant students, the study site has the only DLE program specifically for ELLs in Kentucky to date (A. De Torres Nuñez, personal communication, January 24, 2016). A handful of Kentucky schools offer full or partial immersion, but these programs serve English-speaking students whose families elect to place them in the program primarily for linguistic enrichment. The DLE model for ELLs is based on the belief that development of literacy skills in the home language will serve as a bridge to literacy skills in English and will ultimately produce positive long-term academic and sociocultural outcomes, particularly for students who come from low-income backgrounds (August & Shanahan, 2009; Lindholm-Leary, 2001; Thomas & Collier, 2011).
A qualitative approach was used to understand the essence and meaning of teacher leaders’ experiences working together to bring about instructional innovation for ELLs at this central Kentucky elementary school. Through narrative inquiry and heuristic analysis, the lived realities of the participants were explored. Teacher leaders’ stories were examined through the lens of two related theories of school leadership. Donaldson’s (2006) Three Streams Theory of school leadership (relationships, moral purpose, and action-in-common) and Sergiovanni’s (1992) theory of substitutes for school leadership (collegiality, shared values, and professionalism) played a role in the collective work of these teacher leaders.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of teacher leadership and the personal and contextual factors that influenced the process of adopting and implementing a new instructional program for ELLs. The participants work in a high poverty elementary school; the school website indicates that 92% of the students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch. The student body is predominantly Hispanic and more than half are identified as ELL. In recent years, the school has struggled to achieve state academic targets, resulting in designation as a “Focus School/Needs Improvement” by the Kentucky Department of Education.

Over the past decade, the school experienced multiple administrative turnovers (Warren, 2012). Despite the lack of a consistent principal, the teacher leaders in the study collaborated to adopt and implement a new program for their students. Much of the literature on school leadership indicates that a strong, committed principal is an essential component of school improvement (Danielson, 2006; Donaldson, 2006; Sanders &
Sheldon, 2009; Sergiovanni, 1992; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Thus, a change initiative led almost exclusively by teacher leaders warranted interest and exploration.

**School Leadership**

Scholarly attention to the importance of teacher leadership is a relatively new phenomenon in educational research. Traditionally, studies in the field have focused on the role of the principal (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). However, in this turbulent era of standards-based reform, evaluation, and assessment, there has been a shift away from the hero paradigm to a focus on collaborative structures that involve teachers, administrators, families, and communities (Danielson, 2006; Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2003; Muijs & Harris, 2003; Sanders & Sheldon, 2009). Effective schools of the 21st century encourage shared leadership networks in which teachers play an increasingly vital role (Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser, 2001; Printy & Marks, 2006; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, & Myers, 2007). In the context of this study, the role of the principal was variable, thereby collaborative behavior amongst teachers was a focal point of the data collection and analysis.

Strong networks that emphasize collegiality and shared division of labor have been found to be effective in change initiatives. According to Heller and Firestone (1995), change functions (i.e., vision, obtaining resources, providing encouragement and recognition, adapting standard operating procedures, monitoring the improvement effort, and handling disturbances) are often performed redundantly by various people. Shared instructional leadership practices contribute to student learning, particularly when a healthy tension exists between teacher autonomy and administrative supervision (Printy & Marks, 2006). Furthermore, Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, and Meyers (2007) examined
conversations between teachers through discourse analysis and concluded that distributed leadership is a complex social phenomenon that occurs across many settings. Scribner et al. found that the critical component of distributive leadership is collaborative dialogue amongst teachers. Thus, an understanding of shared labor practices as well as collegial communication was critical to understanding the evolution of this change initiative and its impact on the teachers.

**Theories on School Leadership**

Donaldson’s (2006) three streams of school leadership theory and Sergiovanni’s (1992) substitutes for school leadership theory informed the exploration of the phenomenon of teacher leadership. Donaldson (2006) postulates that effective school leadership is present when three streams flow together: relationships, moral purpose, and action-in-common. According to Donaldson, school communities of the 21st century require a new architecture that invites all members to rally around challenges. In order for this new architecture to be established, schools must be composed of people who actively choose to engage with one another and mobilize around causes, driven by moral purpose and a desire to effect change. Donaldson emphasizes the significant role that teacher leaders play in change initiatives, though his work also consistently underscores the critical role that principals play in cultivating change.

Sergiovanni (1992) proposes a related theory of school leadership in which he explains that it is possible to have “substitutes” for leadership in the place of a solitary leader. Similar to the notion of the three streams, these substitutes (community norms, shared values, and collegial and intrinsic motivation) can coalesce to create effective school leadership. Through this theory of leadership substitutes, Sergiovanni (1992,
2007) builds upon his seminal work regarding schools as communities in which people are bonded to each other as a result of their mutual values, traditions, ideas, and ideals. Drawing on Ferdinand Tönnies’s (1957) concept of gemeinschaft and gesellschaft, Sergiovanni advocates a shift from schools as organizations with bureaucratic structures to schools as communities characterized by commitment and a strong sense of belonging on the part of teachers, administrators, students, and families.

**Dual Language Education**

Spanish–speaking ELLs across the nation have underperformed academically as compared to White non-Hispanic students on state and national assessments for many years (Hakuta, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Mexican immigrant youth in particular are disproportionately represented in high school failure and dropout rates (Dotson-Blake, Foster, & Gressard, 2009). The recent reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act resulted in the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), reaffirming the imperative that the nation’s schools focus on the progress of each individual student, particularly those in need of additional support due to issues of race, income, zip code, disability, home language, or background (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

The protracted underachievement of linguistically diverse learners has marginalized ELLs in the school system and society, leading many researchers to question pedagogical policies and practices regarding their education (August & Shanahan, 2006; Hakuta, 2011). The reasons for this persistent lack of school success are chronic and complex. Proponents of DLE, also historically known as bilingual education, consider English Only environments to be detrimental to ELLs’ school success as well as
their cultural identity and self-esteem (González & Melis, 2014; Gutierrez, 2005; Suárez Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2009; Trueba & McLaren, 2000). According to Gutierrez (2005), excluding the native language in the educational experience of ELLs “exacerbates the inequitable learning conditions of an already vulnerable student population by dramatically reducing and complicating opportunities to learn” (p. 297). DLE experts assert that the use of the native language is affirming and “additive” and serves as a vehicle to bilingualism, biliteracy, and ultimately academic success. Multiple longitudinal studies on DLE programs and practices have established its effectiveness and potential for improving long-term academic and sociocultural outcomes for ELLs (August & Shanahan, 2006; Collier & Thomas, 2004, Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Rolstadt, Mahoney, & Glass, 2005; Thomas & Collier, 2011).

**Culturally Responsive Pedagogy**

DLE represents a culturally responsive pedagogy for ELLs (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995). Culturally responsive theorists assert that culture and language do indeed matter in the classroom setting for “how we teach, how we relate to children and each other, what our goals are – those are rooted in the norms of our culture” (Pai, Adler, & Shadiow, 2005, p.233). According to culturally responsive education theorists Gay (2010) and Ladson-Billings (1995), the European American participation structures that are widely found in American classrooms have a profoundly negative impact on children who are culturally or linguistically different from the mainstream. Culturally responsive teaching practices for ELLs, particularly the inclusion of the native language for instructional use, are instrumental in improving academic, career, and economic
outcomes for ELLs (Brown-Jeffy & Cooper, 2011; Gay, 2010; Reese, Jensen, & Ramirez, 2014).

**Significance of the Study**

As discussed by Scribner et al. (2007), very few studies have examined how leadership emerges from the conversations and actual work of teacher leaders. Most of the empirical work has explored the phenomenon with the principal as a critical component of any change effort (York-Barr & Duke, 2004). In the context of the current study, the process of adopting and implementing a new instructional program for ELLs took place across a time period with multiple transitions in the principal position at the school. This study examined teachers’ stories about the process of adopting and implementing the program and the factors that potentially played a role in the experience. In addition, the study explored the theories of Donaldson (2006) and Sergiovanni (1992) regarding streams and substitutes for leadership.

Donaldson (2006) and Sergiovanni (1992) emphasize the importance of moral purpose for school leaders, an inherent quality of culturally responsive teachers (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 2011). Although Kentucky has historically low numbers of ELLs and subsequently very few teachers and administrators who are knowledgeable of bilingual education practices, the decision was nonetheless made to adopt an instructional model for ELLs in which development of the students’ native language would be central. Exploring the personal and contextual factors that affected this cohort of teachers illuminated the phenomenon of a teacher-led initiative and the factors that compelled them to seek a new model of service delivery for students that addressed their cultural and linguistic needs. Through the stories and conversations of the participants, the study
sought to understand not only the essence of the experience of working together as a team of teacher leaders, but also the critical role that the personal and contextual factors played in developing and sustaining the new program for a cohort of Spanish-speaking ELLs.

**Methodology**

Denzin and Lincoln (2005) recognize the complex task of defining qualitative research and its many strands; put simply, they state, “Qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world” (p. 3). The art of “bricolage” (French for “do it yourself”) is widely accepted in qualitative work with researchers creating a design that helps to explore the phenomenon deeply (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Due to the highly personal, interactive nature of the present study, a heuristic inquiry approach was used with a focus on narrative inquiry techniques.

**Heuristic Approach Informed by Narrative Inquiry**

In heuristic inquiry, the participants are seen as co-researchers while the researcher is likewise positioned as a participant. This form of inquiry “brings to the fore the personal experience and insights of the researcher” (Patton, 2002, p. 107). Moustakas (1994) recommends that the heuristic researcher situate himself clearly in the study via full immersion in the project and full disclosure of past experience. Telling the story of participants’ experiences through retrospective meaning making is the focus of narrative inquiry techniques (Chase, 2008). Polyphonic narrative inquiry has evolved in recent times with an emphasis on the interpretation of multiple perspectives to form an interactive composition of stories. Thus, the weaving together of the stories of the participants (or co-researchers) in this study, along with heuristic reflection by the
researcher, allowed the exploration of the lived reality and lifeworld of these teacher leaders.

Following is a description of the design of this study. An essential element of the architecture of the study was my role as a key instrument (Moustakas, 1994; Ortlipp, 2008). Understanding how and why I think as I do about teacher leadership and the education of ELLs was critical to understanding my interpretation of the data. Thus, my personal experiences over the past three years with the school as a pro bono consultant as well as my professional experience as a bilingual educator guide the study as it unfolds.

**Design of the Study**

**Setting.** The DLE program is being implemented at a central Kentucky elementary school located in a working class neighborhood close to an urban area. Total enrollment is 623 students with approximately three-quarters of the student body identified as Hispanic and 63% as ELL. Due to a high percentage of students from low income families, the school is a Title I school and receives federal funding to support these learners (Kentucky Department of Education, 2016).

**Participants.** The participants were purposefully sampled for this study and were invited based on their role as members of the DLE committee or as teachers who directly assist with implementation of the program. Seventeen teachers were invited to participate via email and eight accepted. The participants represented informal teacher leaders at the site through their voluntary participation in the DLE professional learning community (Danielson, 2006) and fell into two broad categories: ESL teachers and DLE teachers. ESL teachers are certified elementary teachers who have training in teaching English as a
second language. They work with ELLS through pull-out instruction as well as collaborative instruction in the classroom. DLE teachers are certified elementary teachers who are bilingual and able to deliver instruction in two languages.

**Data collection.** The use of multiple data sources is recommended in qualitative research to triangulate the data, thereby enabling trustworthiness and coherence of emerging themes (Creswell, 2009). This study utilized document analysis, reflection logs, memos, interviews, and focus groups to facilitate rich, thick description of the lived experiences of the participants. Responsive interviewing (Rubin and Rubin, 2012) and narrative inquiry techniques (Chase, 2005; Czarniawska, 2004; Riessman, 2008) facilitated the telling of stories in the words of the participants. In addition, the philosophy of heuristic inquiry emphasizes empathic, sensitive conversations between co-researchers (Moustakas, 1994); this played a role in the style and structure of the interviews and focus groups.

**Data analysis.** The intent of the study was to explore the phenomenon of teacher leadership through the stories of the participants. The data were analyzed for evidence of streams and substitutes for school leadership as well as culturally relevant themes. The goal was to arrive at a creative synthesis of the phenomenon and its essence (Moustakas, 1994). Due to my relationship with the participants and experience with the phenomena, I was a key instrument in the interpretation of the data.

In order to arrive at creative synthesis of the data, I utilized the modified Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method (Creswell, 1998) which loosely outlines the steps taken by phenomenological researchers to arrive at an understanding of the essence, i.e., the *what* and the *how* of the experience (Moustakas, 1994). I strived to “emplot” the data in order
to establish a chronological sequence (Czarniawska, 2004). The interviews and focus groups were audio recorded, transcribed, coded, and analyzed for overlapping sequences and common themes. Two of the individual interviews and the focus group session were conducted in Spanish. These transcripts were translated by the researcher to English, then reviewed by a professional translator utilizing back translation methodology (Temple & Young, 2004). In addition, notes made in the reflective journals of the participants and the researchers were narratively coded and analyzed to illuminate the unfolding storyline and emergent themes (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

**Limitations of the Study**

As with any study, there are inherent limitations that must be addressed. First of all, due to the highly inductive, interactive nature of this qualitative study, it lacks generalizability. However, in terms of qualitative research this does not preclude validity, relevance, and authenticity. Another limitation of the study is the time span over which participants were asked to reflect. It had been over two years since the initiative began; it is possible that participants’ recollection of details was affected by the passage of time. Also, a handful of key players in the initiative had left the school by the time the study began. It was hoped that they would accept the invitation to participate and one ultimately did. However, her connection to the school and the program had diminished as a result of her departure. Finally, the study was limited by the small number of participants. Due to the intensive nature of collecting and analyzing data for phenomenological and narrative research, a small number of participants was preferable and necessary.
Summary

In this chapter, the purpose of the study was explained along with a brief overview of the literature and the contribution this work will make to the knowledge base. In addition, the significance of the study was discussed supported by a rationale for its importance in the field of educational leadership and instructional programs for ELLs. Finally, the chapter concluded with an overview of the methodological design. Chapter 2 explores related theoretical literature and empirical work relevant to the study. Chapter 3 provides a detailed description of the methodology employed to explore the phenomena. Chapter 4 presents the results of the research. Finally, Chapter 5 discusses the results, providing a summary of the findings and implications for future research and practice with particular emphasis on the emergent themes related to the literature, findings, and implications regarding cross-cultural communication. Appendices and a list of references follow the final chapter.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Spanish-speaking English Language Learners (ELLs) in the United States have underperformed academically as compared to White non-Hispanic peers for decades (Gutierrez, 2005; Hakuta, 2011; Reardon & Galindo, 2009). One of the theories regarding the persistent underachievement of children who are culturally and linguistically different (CLD) is referred to as the deficit perspective (Bartoleme & Trueba, 2000; Fillmore, 2000). The belief that students from diverse linguistic backgrounds lack cultural capital and school readiness has long pervaded educational research and teacher training programs, leading many to view the home language and culture as the cause of poor achievement for CLD students as opposed to a potential contributor to school success. (González, 2005; Gutierrez, 2005; Trueba & Bartoleme, 2000; Valencia, 1997). The results of this perspective can be devastating for immigrant students, leading to making school a “subtractive” experience for these youth (Thomas & Collier, 2011; Valenzuela, 1999).

Dual language education (DLE), an instructional model ELLs, is often referred to as an “additive” approach to educating second language speakers (Trueba & Bartoleme, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 2011). DLE for ELLs emphasizes the development of literacy in the native language first, serving as a bridge to literacy in English (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Pérez & Torres-Guzman, 2002; Thomas & Collier, 2011). The teacher leaders in this study participated in an initiative to adopt and implement this model of instruction for a cohort of kindergartners at their central Kentucky elementary school. Though DLE has been a common instructional approach in states with high numbers of
ELLs since the 1960s, it is very rare to nonexistent in states such as Kentucky with relatively small immigrant populations. For this reason, the study site is of interest and significance; it is the first, and currently only, dual language education program specifically for ELLs in the state of Kentucky (A. De Torres Nuñez, personal communication, January 24, 2016 and September 11, 2016). A group of informal teacher leaders initiated a collaboration in 2013 to explore the program; their leadership and the personal and contextual factors that influenced the process of adopting and implementing the program was the subject of this study.

In this chapter, the review of the literature on teacher leadership is supported by two separate, but complementary, theoretical frameworks. The first framework, developed by Donaldson (2006) is the Three Stream Model for School Leadership. This model identifies the essential characteristics for school leadership that create positive change: relationships, moral purpose, and action in common. In an effort to relieve the burden of solitary leadership which has proven ineffective for public schools, Donaldson states that the time has arrived to "widen the lens in search of a model of school leadership that is both more productive for schools and more sustainable for those who aspire to lead" (p. 5).

The second theoretical framework for teacher leadership derives from the work of seminal educational leadership theorist Thomas J. Sergiovanni who has long contended that school leadership must focus on transforming schools from organizations to communities. In order for schools to function as communities, Sergiovanni (1992) asserts that leaders and followers must dedicate themselves to purpose, values, and beliefs. In recent years, Sergiovanni (2007) became committed to the belief that public school
leaders must act as servant leaders for the community, thereby leading by outrage. In his last publication before his death in 2012, Sergiovanni (2007) compiled an assortment of essays which he called *Rethinking Leadership: A Collection of Articles*. This compilation portrays Sergiovanni’s vision of school leadership as a moral craft and makes the case that democratic, effective school leadership does not rest in the hands of one person. Rather, there are substitutes that can coalesce to create inspired school leadership, i.e., community norms, professionalism, shared values, collegiality and intrinsic motivation.

For the purposes of this study, Donaldson’s (2006) and Sergiovanni’s (1992) theories were merged into an overarching framework for analyzing and interpreting school leadership that allowed for a more nuanced understanding of the leadership elements of the study. The streams and substitutes were combined in the following way:

![Figure 2.1. A visual model of the theoretical framework for the study as supported by the complementary school leadership theories of Donaldson (2006) and Sergiovanni (1992).](image-url)
This chapter will provide a review of Donaldson’s (2006) and Sergiovanni’s (1992) theoretical work regarding the streams and substitutes for school leadership. Empirical studies of school leadership that emphasize the role of teachers will be discussed as well. In addition, an overview of the dual language education model will be provided along with a brief history of bilingual education in the United States. The chapter concludes with a summary of the literature and how it informed the design of the study.

I began the literature review by conducting a broad scan of the literature, much of which was inspired by assigned readings from my doctoral program on educational leadership as well as my graduate education program in multicultural special education and my elementary teaching degree in Bilingual, Crosscultural, Language and Academic Development (BCLAD). While reading, I kept a detailed research journal in which I paraphrased, summarized, and recorded direct quotes. As the study progressed, a loose outline developed that allowed me to begin to focus my reading on specific theories of teacher leadership and culturally responsive pedagogy. In order to achieve breadth and depth, I reviewed the reference lists of central studies on which I was focusing. I utilized two university library websites to locate numerous books and journal articles as well as various online search engines such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, and the Center for Applied Linguistics database. Notes and quotes regarding the literature were stored using the open-source reference management software system, Zotero.

**Theories of School Leadership**

We're beginning to recognize that schools are special places where people care about teaching and learning. They're not like organizations; you can't
apply organizational principles to places characterized by sandboxes, books, and children. Schools are more like families and small communities where if you can develop the right substitutes, you can throw traditional leadership away. There's no need for it ever again.

(Sergiovanni, 2007, p. xi)

The Three Stream Model for School Leadership

The salient theme of Donaldson’s (2006) theoretical, yet practical, book for school leaders is mobilizing people for moral purposes. His exploration of the three critical streams that flow together to create effective school leadership “wipes clean the old slate…and opens up broad new possibilities for the shared leadership that is so necessary in high performing-schools” (Fullan, 2006, p. vii). Donaldson argues that the time has come for an approach to leadership that is more productive and sustainable. Due to an increasing complex and turbulent environment, the old idiosyncratic view of schools as hierarchical bureaucracies no longer fits. More importantly, viewing schools as composed of managers (principals) and subordinates (teachers) is simply not effective for schools that face a myriad of complex challenges. This new model of leadership involves the active participation of all members in order for a school to achieve goals and institute reform.

Donaldson’s three essential streams are relational, purposive, and action-in-common. When these streams come together, school leaders make strides to fulfill the vision of the school through collective effort, fueled by relationships and moral beliefs. The confluence of these three streams mobilizes stakeholders and galvanizes change efforts.
Stream 1: Relationships. One of the major barriers to innovation is the planetary culture that prevails in most American schools (Donaldson, 2006). Over the past century, teachers have become increasingly isolated in the workplace, intently focused on the obligations of the classroom. Despite the sociocultural context of teaching and learning, American teachers have developed individualistic tendencies. This planetary culture in turn has made the classical model of school leadership particularly challenging. Principals and other formal leaders who attempt to lead using a bureaucratic-rational framework (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Evans, 1995) have been met with frustration and distrust by teachers who value autonomy and independence.

Teachers are reluctant to cede time and effort to matters that do not directly affect daily practice (Danielson, 2006; Gronn, 2003; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Teachers are, however, eager to participate in initiatives that impact their daily practice and improve the education of their students (Merideth, 2006; Smylie, 1995). Thus, it is imperative that contemporary school leaders strive to create teacher willingness to shape and be shaped. This can be accomplished through creating an interdependent culture that merges the streams of relationships, moral purpose, and action-in-common (Donaldson, 2006).

Donaldson’s Three Streams Model acknowledges the inherently social nature of school life and underscores that relationships are the most fundamental of the three streams. Without strong relationships in place, schools struggle to coalesce around issues of moral purpose (Blase, 2006; Donaldson, 2006; Merideth, 2006). School leaders who strengthen collaborative networks remove the solitary burden of leadership. By instilling trust and believing in the strengths of others, leaders build a culture that emphasizes the importance of group affiliation and teamwork. Donaldson’s model is inherently positive
and democratic. All stakeholders must engage with one another and be willing to devote time and energy to collaborative processes.

In order to develop complex, symbiotic relationships, Donaldson (2006) states the following conditions must exist:

- common ethical ideal
- ease of communication
- coordinated work efforts
- direct interactions

Effective school leaders utilize human resource and cultural frames (Bolman & Deal, 2003) to guide their thinking as opposed to a traditional managerial mindset. By placing attention on group work and emphasizing relationship-building as well as a unifying mission, schools can cope with change (Fullan, 1997).

Feminist theorist Nancy Helgesen (1995) describes interdependent school settings as webs of inclusion; her work illustrates that the natural leadership style of women is to place emphasis on relationships and emotions. Given that the vast majority of teachers and administrators in public schools are female (Ingersoll & Merrill, 2010), Helgesen’s web of inclusion philosophy corresponds well with Donaldson’s relational stream. Sergiovanni (2007) likewise emphasizes the feminine component of school leadership. By leading with a focus on caring and sharing, women contribute to community building and sustainable change efforts. Thus, school leaders who place value on building relationships, shared decision-making, and collegiality do justice to the human need for affiliation as well as teachers’ desire for influence and responsibility.
Building relationships can, however, be challenging for a variety of reasons. The isolated, autonomous nature of classroom teaching paired with the hectic pace of the school day hinder interdependency. In addition, school size can be a deterrent; many schools are so large that relationships form within departments or grade levels as opposed to across the school. Hierarchical relationships and policies also diminish the power of relationships in schools, as do formal gatherings that emphasize business matters over issues related to the mission and goals of the school (Donaldson, 2006).

**Stream 2: Moral purpose.** Donaldson’s second stream of school leadership is moral purpose. Many relationships in schools are built upon this element; teachers and administrators seek out others who share a common mission and vision for the future. When educators’ thoughts, values, and dreams align, a drive to focus on purpose arises. Purposing (Vaill, 1989) is essential in the midst of turbulent environments; focusing on moral purpose galvanizes a group to focus on action-oriented plans for the school community.

Educators are by nature a morally motivated population, compelled to make a difference in the world (Blase, 2006; Danielson, 2006; Donaldson, 2006). Committed teachers often go above and beyond the call of duty in order to carry out a goal that will improve the lives of students. In some school settings, teachers cluster in groups around common goals and missions. Effective school leaders inspire the groups to coalesce as an organizational citizenship and pursue a collective vision (Blase, 2006). Leaders who emphasize the moral dimension of education can transform the organization into a community, a covenantal community that plays the role of servant or steward
(Sergiovanni, 2007). By leading with the head, heart, and hand, school stakeholders strive to reculture the school and accentuate the need for action.

Donaldson (2006) shares three ways in which school leaders can invigorate this stream. First, moral leaders articulate a vision that resonates with others. This requires awareness of the pulse of the school; leaders must be attuned to the culture and history of the community. Inspiring others with a powerful vision that captures the hopes and dreams of teachers, students, and families can serve as a lightning rod for change. This vision must, however, be realistic and practical. Thus, the second way in which school leaders can build moral purpose is by building bridges between the vision and the practical realities of teaching and learning. Teachers particularly need to understand how the vision can be brought to life and the logistical steps toward achieving school goals. Finally, strong school leaders must question current commitments and practices in the school to assess whether they serve the articulated mission. This requires a meta-awareness of the school culture and the ability to go to the balcony (Heifitz, 1994) to obtain a different perspective of the scene below.

Leading with a moral purpose is not without its challenges. One of the primary difficulties can also serve to be one of the greatest sources of strength: counterfluences (Donaldson, 2006). Counterfluences are represented in questions, doubts, and objections that linger in the hearts and minds of stakeholders. Skilled school leaders confront counterfluences instead of sweeping them under the rug (Merideth, 2006). The school must discuss, analyze, and embrace dissonance. Another challenge to building collective commitment derives from the inherently individualistic nature of teaching. The mission
can potentially be diffused due to the obligations of the job and the hectic pace of the school day. Capable school leaders find ways to build interdependence and sustainability through teamwork, shared decision-making, and an emphasis on action.

**Stream 3: Action-in-Common.** When strong relationships and commitment to a common mission converge, the current of the third stream, action-in-common, is strong. Donaldson (2006) views action-in-common as "the shared belief that the collective effects of individual actions is greater than their sum" (p. 59). This stream derives from theory on two group phenomena developed by Bandura (1997) and Argyris and Schön (1974).

Self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) involves belief systems that humans develop regarding their own competence. Believing in oneself and the potential effect of one’s actions evolve from various sources, e.g., family, school, and peers. An underlying principle of efficacy theory is that a strong sense of efficacy leads to a sense of empowerment. Thus, an ethos of “success breeds success” (Donaldson, 2006, p. 59) ensues along with a desire to exert influence. Theories of action (Argyris & Schön, 1974) address how humans approach difficult situations and carry out their thoughts and plans. In an effort to achieve desired outcomes, school leaders with a strong commitment to action put their theories and planning to the grindstone, so to speak, and strive to create change. These group theories lead to an understanding of how school leadership teams, forged by strong relationships, are compelled to act based on their moral convictions and shared beliefs.
Action-oriented leaders seek ways to make group work and team problem-solving possible (Donaldson, 2006). By encouraging openness, trust, and group affiliation, leaders inspire staff to rely on one another and collaborate when faced with challenges. Interdependence and collegiality ultimately lead to productivity, particularly when relationships and the shared mission are strong. Teacher leaders are particularly influential in this stream (Danielson, 2006; Donaldson, 2006; Sergiovanni, 2007). Their presence on the front lines of teaching and the team spirit that potentially develops can induce a propensity for action.

However, lack of time and control over administrative issues presents a frequent challenge to teachers who are motivated to act. In addition, action-in-common is hindered by the persistent autonomy and isolation of teachers throughout the work day. This state, coupled with the constantly changing demands on teachers and administrators, can make it very difficult to face a central adaptive challenge before it shifts to a new one (Donaldson, 2006).

As schools strive to improve their aptitude for creating action, they need to improve their functioning as learning organizations (Donaldson, 2006; Serrat, 2009). In order to achieve sustainable change, schools must find new and different ways to engage in conversations about how to improve student learning. Unfortunately, according to Higgins, Ishamaru, Holcombe, and Fowler (2011), the current culture of most American schools does not reflect an internal capacity to learn. Resources are lacking such as time, space, specialists, and budget (Serrat, 2009). In addition, a pervasive tendency to treat teachers as semiprofessionals has not only eroded teachers’ confidence and perception of
themselves as empowered individuals, but also demotivated them to act (Donaldson, 2006). At this time, a paradigm shift in education is needed that emphasizes redesigned systems, shared values about the nature of learning, and confidence in theories of action.

**Substitutes for Leadership**

Thomas Sergiovanni, seminal theorist on school leadership, has long declared the importance of leading with a moral compass. More than two decades have passed since Sergiovanni (1992) offered an alternative view of school leadership that transformed thinking about schools from organizations to communities. Sergiovanni’s notion of *gemeinschaft* emphasizes the role of the school as a covenantal community, one that is rooted in values, collective vision, and a spirit of collegiality. Though he frequently discusses the vital role played by teachers, the principal is central in his discussion of moral leadership.

More recently, Sergiovanni (2007) reexamined his ideas about leadership and although the principal is still a critical figure, Sergiovanni makes it clear that there are substitute concepts for the omnipresent leader in schools. Substitutes for leadership are community norms such as shared values, collegiality, trust, and intrinsic motivation. When these ideals are in place, the burden of leadership is distributed and the school functions as a professional community. Sergiovanni (2007) observes, “The more leadership is emphasized, the less professionalism flourishes... and the inverse tends to be true. The more professionalism is thriving, the less need there is for leadership” (p. xiv). Thus, leadership in the form of a managerial principal is not only unnecessary, but also potentially unproductive.
According to Sergiovanni (2007), effective schools of the 21st century possess four pillars: leaders, followers, ideas, and action. All four are vital to dynamic school leadership. Sergiovanni also emphasizes that school leaders must understand and value the symbolic and cultural elements that make a school tick. In order to form a progressive leadership team, the school culture must be cohesive, mobilized, and committed to students and families. Though Sergiovanni more frequently refers to teacher and family leaders in this work, it must be noted that he highly values a strong, dedicated principal who leads with the heart, head, and hand.

What happens, though, when a school lacks consistent principal leadership? Can teacher leaders mobilize around change efforts when administrative guidance is inconsistent? The literature on school leadership now includes substantive theory and research on the role of teacher leaders. The vast majority of scholars acknowledge the essential role that teachers play in implementing reform in public schools. However, the majority of the writing also approach the leadership effort of teachers as a powerful complement to the strong principal. Studies of change initiatives that do not involve the participation of a principal are rare. The purpose of this study was to investigate a teacher-led initiative at a small urban elementary school that took place in the midst of administrative transition and without consistent, sustained guidance and support from a principal. The personal and contextual factors that motivated these teachers to persevere warranted further exploration.
Teacher Leadership

For decades, the professional literature on school leadership has focused most of its attention on the role of the principal in bringing about school change. However, due to an increasingly complex environment and heightened expectations for accountability, it has become clear that the principal as hero paradigm is unrealistic and ineffective (Danielson, 2006; Gronn, 2003; Heller & Firestone, 1995; Muijs & Harris, 2003). The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) Standards define the principal as an instructional leader as opposed to a manager (Danielson, 2006) and skilled principals must increasingly turn to teachers for guidance and support regarding instructional issues (Heller & Firestone, 1995; Muijs & Harris, 2003; York-Barr & Duke, 2004). Processes such as shared decision-making (Leithwood & Duke, 1991; Meyers, Meyers & Gelzheiser, 2001, 2001) and distributed leadership (Harris, 2003; Gronn, 2003; Scribner, Sawyer, Watson, & Meyers., 2007) are facilitated when teachers are empowered to lead.

Informal Versus Formal Teacher Leadership Roles

Danielson (2006) distinguishes between formal and informal teacher leaders, defining formal teacher leaders as those who are designated to lead in a specific capacity such as coaches, department heads, or mentors. Danielson refers to formal leaders as “quasi-administrators” whose influence within the ranks is ironically diminished by their specially appointed positions. Informal teacher leaders, on the other hand, emerge organically through their own initiative and ultimately earn the trust and respect of others through hard work and experience.
Multiple studies indicate that contemporary principals find it difficult to create systemic change without active leadership participation from teachers (Meyers, et al., 2001; Muijs & Harris, 2007; Printy & Marks, 2006; Scribner, et al., 2007). Innovative school cultures have an ethos of collegiality, interaction, and teacher empowerment. Blase (2006) notes that teachers naturally engage one another in substantive dialogue about school issues. If this natural tendency is enhanced by structures that support and promote group work, teachers will be motivated to act. Therefore, it is critical that all teachers, not just those granted leadership status, feel empowered to take part in leading school initiatives.

Shared Decision-Making

Smylie (1995) states that less structured and more democratic forms of school governance such as learning committees, instructional teams, and site-based decision-making committees have allowed for teachers’ voices and expertise to be shared. The social and interactive nature of group work and the power of the collective allows for meaningful change to occur (Heller & Firestone, 1995) and be sustained through the strength of relationships built upon shared moral purpose (Donaldson, 2006). Schools are better able to address challenges and institute sustainable reform efforts (Waldron & McLeskey, 2010) through dialogue, interaction, and collaboration grounded in teacher involvement and collaboration.

Meyers, Meyers and Gelzheiser (2001) explored shared decision-making utilizing comparative case analysis. By examining decision-making processes at three different schools, the authors of the study found that the effectiveness of the team members was
influenced by role definition and clarity of vision. Teams that shared leadership roles and allowed all voices to be heard made more decisions and reflected on the team experience in a positive light. In addition, clear parameters about the responsibilities of the members and the necessity for collaborative contribution resulted in increased decision-making potential. This study particularly illustrated the negative impact of a managerial, controlling principal; the groups that had a culture of collegial dialogue and turn taking made more decisions and reflected positively on the process at the end of the study.

**Distributed Leadership Roles**

In a comparative case study, Scribner, Sawyer, Watson and Myers (2007) examined distributed leadership roles through discourse analysis. The data revealed a complex network of relationships across school settings that resulted in a wide variety of conversations and collaborations. Effective teacher teams were found to have sufficient autonomy, a clearly defined problem, and established parameters for making decisions regarding instruction and school policy. Gronn (2003) theorizes that in order for leadership to be distributed across schools, a paradigm shift must occur; the principal must move from acting as a solitary leader to a visionary for the school. Power must be spread out across the school and division of labor created in order to establish an ethos of collaboration.

**Change Functions and Leadership Roles**

Heller and Firestone (1995) investigated leadership in eight schools with the specific purpose of exploring sources of change. This study challenged the widespread assumption that persisted for decades that the principal is the primary source of change
leadership in public schools. Various change functions were identified, i.e., providing and selling a vision, obtaining resources, providing encouragement and recognition, adapting standard operating procedures, monitoring the change, and handling disturbances. The functions were examined in the context of the implementation of a new program for problem solving that had been adopted at each school. The study concluded that the leadership functions did indeed need to be performed in order for the program to be well implemented, however not by any specific person. Teachers, central office personnel, and outside consultants all played important roles in the change process with many functions being performed redundantly by multiple people. The authors emphasized that teachers and other stakeholders played complementary leadership roles in the change process.

As the theoretical and empirical work on school leadership demonstrates, the process of moving a school forward requires structures and procedures that allow for distributed leadership and teamwork. However, these mechanisms must be inspired and reinforced by a collective spirit throughout the school. School leaders must lead with a moral compass and a spirit of hope (Fullan, 1997; Serviovanni, 1992).

**Dual Language Education for English Language Learners**

This study will explore the phenomenon of teacher leadership and the personal and contextual factors that influenced the process of adopting and implementing a new instructional program for ELLs in an urban Kentucky school. Language services for this population are typically provided by English as a Second Language teachers (ESL), who are trained to teach the English language and modify instruction for ELLs while they are
still acquiring the second language. ESL teachers in the state are typically White and monolingual speakers of English (Kentucky Department of Education, 2013).

**Terminology and Acronyms Related to Dual Language Education**

**Dual Language Education.** For the purpose of this study, I will refer to the instructional program at hand as dual language education (DLE). However, various terms have been and are currently in use for this pedagogical approach. For many decades, the term *bilingual education* was used to indicate any program in which two languages were being used instructionally. Today the term bilingual education is still in use as an umbrella term under which fall many types of programs. Dual language education refers to the use of two languages in the classroom and represents an umbrella term as well (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2015).

**English Language Learners.** The term English Language Learners (ELLs) is also used throughout this study to indicate the population of students who are learning English as a second language in U.S. schools. However, it is acknowledged that the term Emergent Bilinguals is also currently in use and becoming increasingly accepted in the literature as well as in schools.

**Two-Way Immersion.** Two-Way Immersion (TWI) falls under the heading of DLE and involves the education of children from two different language groups in the same classroom setting. The ideal composition of a TWI classroom is approximately one half native speakers of English and the other half speakers of the partner language as their primary language. TWI can be orchestrated in a variety of ways, i.e., the 50/50 model in which each language is used equally. This can be accomplished through division of
language use by subject, time of day, week, teacher, etc. In the 50/50 model, students typically develop their primary literacy skills in their home language and use that to serve as a bridge to reading and writing in the partner language as the school years progress (Thomas & Collier, 2012).

TWI can also be delivered with a 90/10 model in which the partner language is used 90% of the time and all the students in the classroom develop literacy in the partner language (e.g., Spanish, Navajo, and Mandarin) first. Literacy in English is developed in subsequent years after literacy in the partner language has been established. Research has shown that both models of TWI are highly effective learning contexts for both language groups in the room. Not only do native speakers of English (White, African American, and heritage speakers of the partner language) outperform native English speakers in mainstream classes, but ELLs make tremendous gains in comparison to their peers in other program types, e.g., sheltered ESL, pullout ESL, and submersion (August & Shanahan, 2006; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 2012). An added benefit of TWI is sociocultural in nature. Researchers have found that ELLs in TWI programs develop strong cultural identities and self-esteem (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2010; Thomas & Collier, 2012) while also demonstrating improved socio-cultural interactions and attitudes toward the other language group (Brisk, 2006; Lessow-Hurley, 2013; Collier & Thomas, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

**One-Way Dual Language Education.** Another instructional model for ELLs is called *One-Way Dual Language* or *Maintenance Immersion* or *Developmental Immersion*. These three terms all refer to a program in which a heritage group receives
their instruction primarily in the home language in the early years. English is used incrementally throughout the elementary years in this model. These programs seek to establish literacy in the native language first, supported by research that has shown that students who achieve high levels of literacy in their home language have positive long-term academic and economic outcomes (August & Shanahan, 2006; Lindholm-Leary, 2012). One-way immersion programs are often found in schools with high populations of one language group and also in communities that seek to maintain the native language for cultural and historical reasons, such as Native American schools (Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Due to the high number of Spanish-speaking ELLs at the study site, school leaders elected the One Way or Developmental Immersion approach. Though TWI was originally considered as an option, it was ultimately ruled out due to demographics (C. Ross, personal communication, April 16, 2014). There simply were not enough native speakers of English in the school to support the adoption of a Two-Way Immersion program, though it was considered as the ideal program in terms of academic and sociocultural outcomes.

A Brief History of Dual Language Education in the United States

1700 through mid-1900s. Bilingual education has had a long and tumultuous history in the United States. Though schooling children in a language other than English has occurred throughout the nation since colonization, it was not until the twentieth century that the topic became highly politicized. For two centuries, parochial, private and public schools throughout the nation offered instruction in the language of the local
community. Various European languages were used to instruct children in addition to multiple Native American languages in reservation schools. These programs were not officially designed as bilingual education; it simply made good pedagogical sense to instruct in the natal language of the children. The tide began to turn against diverse languages, though, in the early 1900s with the passage of laws mandating English as the sole language of instruction in 34 states (Brisk, 2006; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

Political, social, and economic factors played a role in the agenda to impose English as the official language of the United States. Despite the fact that bilingual education had long been viewed as an effective educational model in other countries on the American continent, U.S. citizens and politicians became increasingly anti-immigrant as the 20th century progressed. Ironically, when bilingual education has been implemented as an enrichment program (i.e., immersion models) offered to the dominant population, it has been accepted and applauded. It was not until public schools began to offer bilingual education programs for language minority students that the public reacted negatively (Brisk, 2006; Thomas & Collier, 2012).

The latter half of the twentieth century. In the early 1960s, various bilingual education programs were founded in Miami. The success of these schools inspired others throughout the nation and for two decades, bilingual education experienced relative calm. Programs throughout the country flourished in response to the passage of the Bilingual Education Act in 1968. This provision of the Education and Secondary Education Act allowed for funding and support for primarily transitional bilingual education programs (Brisk, 2005; Hakuta, 2011).
During this time frame, a landmark Supreme Court Case was decided that had a dramatic impact on the schooling of immigrants. In 1974, in Lau vs. Nichols, plaintiffs in a civil rights case argued that the “sink or swim” immersion approach was not equitable, appropriate education for ELLs. Sink or swim refers to the complete lack of support services in the native language as well as very little support for English language learning. The Supreme Court ruled that same education was not equal education for this group of learners, establishing ELLs as a protected class and mandating that states had to do more to advance services for ELLs. However, the Court did not specify what types of services were recommended or how they were to be funded (Brisk, 2005; Hakuta, 2011).

Federal funding and public support for bilingual education vacillated throughout the 1980s and 1990s in the U.S., largely dependent on the party affiliation of the president (Brisk, 2005). Research questions arose during this time that concerned the level of effectiveness of bilingual education and the length of time needed for children to acquire a second language (Hakuta, Butler, & Witt, 2000; Hakuta, 2011). Various scholars and educators conducted studies and led initiatives to establish the understanding that second language learners needed five to eight years to learn academic English in order to thrive in the mainstream classroom (Crawford, 1989; Cummins, 1981; Hakuta, 1986; Krashen, 1999). These seminal researchers also produced numerous studies and articles attesting to the long-term positive effects of maintaining the native language of immigrant students in tandem with the acquisition of English (Crawford, 2004; Cummins, 1979; Hakuta, 1990; Krashen, 1981). Meanwhile, opponents of bilingual education rallied as well, supporting English Only movements and publishing counter
studies to demonstrate the effectiveness of ESL programs (Hakuta, 2011; Rossell & Baker, 1996; Rossell, Snow, & Glenn, 2000).

The 21st century and negative legislative action. At the turn of the 20th century, bilingual education suffered in different parts of the nation. First, the state of California passed Proposition 227 in 1998, a ballot initiative also known as the English Language in Public Schools Statute. This proposition mandated that all ELLs in the state be taught exclusively in English and be given one year of support to acquire the language. Bilingual education was eliminated for almost half a million children in the state. Arizona followed suit in 2000 with Proposition 203 which placed similar restrictions on services for ELLs in the state which was then followed by similar legislation in Massachusetts (Hakuta, 2011). Meanwhile, bilingual education, particularly Two-Way immersion flourished in other parts of the nation, but the negative repercussions of Proposition 227 in particular still reverberate through the nation today.

Empirical Studies on Dual Language Education

The astounding effects of dual language education. Virginia Collier and Wayne Thomas (2004) have been advocates for dual language education for decades, so much so that their 18 year study on the effects of DLE was entitled “The Astounding Effectiveness of Dual Language Education for All”. The authors assert that the word “astonishing” was not used lightly; DLE programs were found to have impressive advantages over other program types included in the study (sheltered ESL, content ESL, and submersion). Two goals of the research were to analyze the achievement gap between ELLs and European
Americans and provide substantiation for the data indicating the length of time necessary to acquire proficiency in academic English.

This mixed methods study (Collier and Thomas, 2004) was conducted in 23 districts across 15 states and found large effect sizes in reading and math achievement for learners in DLE programs, particularly those in TWI. Students in English only programs were analyzed as well in order to make the case for DLE. Achievement data from Houston ISD was examined for 1,599 students whose parents had refused bilingual and ESL services, requesting that they be placed in mainstream classes. These students were compared to a comparable cohort of students in California who received English only instruction per Proposition 227 mandates. The groups’ performance was markedly similar, noted by very low achievement throughout high school and dismal graduation rates. This supported the authors’ claims that DLE is superior to other programs, particularly English only. In addition, by analyzing three successful districts, two in Houston and one in Maine, the study helped identify key quality indicators of DLE programs, such as allocation of time for each language, teacher preparation, and equal status of both languages.

The successes and challenges of dual language education. Bilingual education researcher Kathryn Lindholm-Leary (2012) conducted an overview of multiple empirical studies, many of which she was coauthor. Common themes that emerged regard the undeniable message from the academic achievement data: students in DLE programs have substantially higher reading and math outcomes than students in other programs, particularly English Only. Interestingly, DLE students consistently outperformed their
peers in the mainstream classroom and this included the ELL subgroup as well as the native English speakers (NES). Most notably, the studies reviewed by Lindholm-Leary indicated that ELLs were able to achieve gap closure by 5th grade and this positive trend extended into high school with high graduation rates. In addition, high levels of bilingualism and biliteracy were found in both ELLs and NES; positive sociocultural attitudes about the other language group were noted as well.

Several challenges regarding DLE program implementation were outlined. One of the key indicators of a high quality DLE program was that allocation of time to each language is clearly defined (e.g., 90/10, 80/20, 50/50) and adhered to with fidelity. Programs that vacillate in their commitment to time allocation did not produce high rates of bilingualism and biliteracy. In addition, accountability issues presented problems for program implementation. ELLs in DLE programs typically require 5-8 years to acquire academic proficiency in English (Hakuta, 2000; Krashen, 1981) and were therefore not typically ready by 3rd grade to perform well on English academic content tests. The lack of tests provided in second languages also presents an accountability challenge to DLE programs. Content tests in the partner language would not only serve to document learning progress for ELLs in their native language, but also native language proficiency progress for NES. Finally, Lindholm-Leary (2012) notes pedagogical and curricular challenges. She makes the call for extensive research into effective practices for oral language development and biliteracy skills to inform teacher preparation and instructional design.
An executive summary of research on literacy in the second language. In recognition of and concern for the growing achievement gap between Spanish-speaking ELLs and White non-Hispanic counterparts, the U. S. Department of Education Institute of Education Sciences created the National Literacy Panel on Language-Minority Children and Youth in 2002 (August & Shanahan, 2006). The critical charge for the panel was to identify, assess, and synthesize quantitative and qualitative work on the development of literacy in ELLs. The panel was composed of renowned literacy and language acquisition experts and the study was rigorously reviewed by two external agencies prior to publication.

After four years of extensive review of more than 2000 documents, the panel published a report that synthesized the research findings. The following six points regarding literacy instruction for ELLs were emphasized:

• Systematic instruction in the key components of reading (phonemic awareness, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension) is necessary for ELLs.
• The development of oral proficiency must be explicitly taught with an emphasis on academic language use.
• The development of oral language and literacy skills in the first language facilitates literacy development in English.
• Individual differences have an impact on literacy growth in students.
• Literacy skills assessments currently in use for ELLs are inadequate for measuring strengths and weaknesses.
• More research needs to be conducted on sociocultural variables that affect literacy development. (August & Shanahan, 2006)
The panel clearly stated that more research needs to be done, not only on sociocultural variables, but also on the effectiveness of different instructional models for ELLs. The strategic use of the native language to improve outcomes was one of the specific recommendations made by the panel.

**Dual Language Education as Culturally Responsive Teaching**

The work of Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) and Geneva Gay (2010) on culturally responsive pedagogical practices has drawn attention to the critical nature of participation structures and inclusion of home language and dialects in classroom settings. Though discussion regarding the underachievement of marginalized populations is still overshadowed by the cultural and linguistic deficit perspective, theorists such as Ladson-Billings and Gay have shifted the paradigm to a *difference* perspective, one that seeks to affirm a plurality of voices and identities in the school setting.

In order to reverse persistent underachievement trends of CLD students in the U.S., Ladson-Billings (2007) asserts that it is a moral imperative for American teachers to develop cultural awareness and responsivity. According to Ladson-Billings, culturally responsive teachers incorporate the following into their daily practice: (a) expectations for excellence on behalf of teacher and students; (b) inclusion of diverse cultural and linguistic practices in the classroom; and (c) critical consciousness of inequities in the world in which students live.

"Language is incredibly powerful and diverse; it identifies and humanizes, and gives cultures, ideas, and thoughts the capacity to speak" (p. 76). She particularly addresses the issue of instructional programs for ELLs that utilize the native language, referring to them as “English Plus”. According to Gay (2010), the native languages and dialects of students should be recognized, celebrated, and developed in order to facilitate academic success and strong cultural identities in ELLs.

**Summary**

The theory and empirical work presented in this chapter inform the study of teacher leadership and the personal and contextual factors that influenced the process of adopting and implementing DLE for ELLs at a Kentucky elementary school. The work of Donaldson (2006) and Sergiovanni (1992) framed the exploration of school leadership and the potential role of streams or substitutes for leadership. Empirical work was reviewed as well to illustrate the growing body of literature on teacher leadership in particular.

The chapter also reviewed the DLE approach to educating ELLs in order to establish context for the study. Empirical studies of DLE were shared as well as the turbulent history of DLE in the United States. Finally, the philosophy of culturally responsive teaching was briefly reviewed for its potentially relevant contribution to the study of these particular teacher leaders and what compelled them to pursue an innovative program for ELLs in their school. The literature review was inspired by the purpose of the study which in turn guided the methodology. The following chapter provides a thorough description of the methods used to explore the phenomenon of
teacher leadership during the adoption and implementation of a new instructional program for ELLs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The intent of this study was to examine teacher leadership and the personal and contextual factors that influenced the process of adopting and implementing a new instructional program for elementary English Language Learners (ELLs). In 2012, a team of teachers at a central Kentucky elementary school collaborated to plan and implement a dual language education (DLE) program for a cohort of Spanish-speaking ELLs. Dual language education, also known as bilingual education and developmental immersion, is widely found in states with significant immigrant populations. However, according to Alfonso De Torres Nuñez of the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE), this is currently the only example of one way developmental immersion specifically for ELLs in the state of Kentucky (personal communication, January 24, 2016 and September 11, 2016).

According to the Kentucky Department of Education (2015), the number of ELLs in schools across Kentucky has significantly increased in recent years. This rapid expansion has challenged school districts lacking in resources, personnel, and programs to effectively educate this group of learners. Historically, schools in Kentucky have only provided English as a Second Language (ESL) support to ELLs. Thus, a teacher-led initiative to adopt and implement a program for ELLs in which the native language is used warranted interest and study.

Within the context of the current study, two complementary theories of school leadership were explored. Donaldson (2006) argues that a contemporary model of school leadership requires that all stakeholders are willing “to shape and be shaped”, (p. 41).
Teacher leaders play a critical role in Donaldson’s theory; supportive principals are important, but not central, to effective change efforts. Rather, the focus is on three streams of leadership that flow together: relationships, moral purpose, and action-in-common. Sergiovanni (1992) proposes a related theory of educational leadership in which “substitutes” for leadership take the place of the central administrative figure. Substitutes (community norms such as shared values, collegiality, trust, and intrinsic motivation) coalesce to create a familial environment in which real work can be accomplished.

The theory of culturally responsive pedagogy also framed this study. In a grounded theory study of effective teachers of African American students, Gloria Ladson-Billings (1995) found that culturally relevant pedagogical practices rest on three principles: (a) students must experience success in academics; (b) students’ cultural competencies and identities must be developed and maintained; and (c) students must develop critical consciousness and the wherewithal to challenge current inequities in the school system. Ladson-Billings noted the importance of respect for and inclusion of the natal language or dialect of students in classroom participation structures. Geneva Gay (2010) extended Ladson-Billings philosophy of culturally relevant teaching to include specific discussion of ELLs and is commended for putting forth a theory that draws attention to “the discontinuity and disconnection between the European-American cultural orientation of schools and the home and community of culturally and linguistically different students” (Banks, 2010, p. x).

Participants in this study were informal teacher leaders who voluntarily took part in a committee to adopt an alternative program to ESL for ELLs at the school. These
teachers initiated a discussion and consideration of an approach that would utilize the native language of Spanish-speaking ELLs as the primary language of instruction, an approach not used anywhere in the state at the time. Despite the lack of a consistent principal to support and galvanize the effort, the teachers persisted. What factors compelled and motivated them to seek a unique, alternative program for their students? How did their relationships and the school environment affect the change effort?

Although the literature base for teacher leadership has been rapidly expanding in recent years, empirical studies regarding teacher-led initiatives in the absence of a consistent principal are lacking. This study will contribute to the body of knowledge regarding the phenomenon of teacher leadership in schools, particularly teacher leaders that serve students who are linguistically different. Donaldson’s (2006) and Sergiovanni’s (1992) theories framed the investigation of the teacher leaders and the factors that played a role for the participants. The theory of culturally responsive pedagogy (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1995) shed light on the cultural competence of the participants and their understanding of the interaction of communication, culture, teaching, and learning in the classroom.

A description of the research methodology that was employed in this study follows. First, I discuss the qualitative approach being used in the study. Second, the theoretical traditions that undergirded data collection and analysis decisions are provided. The design of the study is then described in detail, which includes information regarding the site and participants. Data sources are discussed at length, with details regarding how data was collected, managed, analyzed, and interpreted. Finally, validation strategies and limitations of the study are addressed in the conclusion to the chapter.
Qualitative Research

According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), defining qualitative research is a daunting, convoluted task for it crosses numerous historical eras and blurred lines of epistemology. Traditionally, qualitative research has been tainted by a colonialist perspective. Researchers, writing from a position of privilege, tended to present their understanding of “the Other” (often people of color) as objective and scientific fact. Denzin and Lincoln discuss multiple historical moments through which qualitative research has passed, arriving at the current juncture between the past, present, and future in which the challenge is to move away from a positivist emphasis on scientific evidence to a focus on critical conversations. Qualitative researchers in this new democratic era seek to understand the hopes and needs of diverse populations. In an effort to make “the world visible in a different way” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 4), qualitative researchers use interpretive, inductive practices in natural settings. This study aimed to utilize this philosophical approach to qualitative research. The objective was to explore and understand the lived realities of the teacher leaders who collaborated and persisted to establish a new instructional program for ELLs; telling their stories and making the process visible to outsiders was a primary goal of the research.

Maxwell (2013) emphasizes the flexible nature of qualitative work; the research design is affected by countless contextual factors and must therefore be malleable and adaptive. Qualitative researchers construct and reconstruct the design of the study in order to explore the research questions thoroughly. This represents one of the liberating characteristics of qualitative research, what Maxwell (2013) terms the “do-it-yourself” (DIY) component. He compares the DIY process to an “off-the-shelf” process found in
most quantitative designs; qualitative researchers quite simply have more freedom to pick and choose the methodologies that are best suited to the purpose of the research. (Creswell, 2013; Maxwell, 2013; Moustakas, 1994). In qualitative studies, it is not essential that the researcher commits to a predetermined sequence at the onset of the study. The reflexivity and flexibility of qualitative methods particularly appeal to those who write from a postmodern or poststructural stance; researchers are empowered to use and adapt methodology to explore sensitive topics and human behavior (Lincoln, 2005).

Maxwell’s (2013) interactive model of qualitative research design places the research question at the center, interacting with the other components (goals, conceptual framework, validity, and methods). When studying human interactions and phenomena, reflexive methodology enables qualitative researchers to explore their interests creatively and robustly. An interactive, reflexive design is central to this exploratory study (see Figure 3.1). Though data collection and analysis procedures are loosely mapped at this time, it is possible that they will be modified in response to participant and contextual information that is discovered.
Figure 3.1: A design map for the study of the phenomenon of teacher leadership during the adoption and implementation of a DLE program for ELLs.

Also central to the design of this study was the notion that "qualitative research is a situated activity that locates the observer in the world" (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005, p. 4). In qualitative studies, the researcher positions herself in the study, openly acknowledging any factors (e.g., personal background, work experiences, cultural history) that may influence interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2013). Open admission of these factors is not only ethically appropriate, but vitally important for the audience to consider as they read the author’s interpretation. The researcher is a key instrument in the data collection and analysis phases of qualitative research; who the researcher is and why she thinks as she does is critical to the process (Moustakas, 1994; Ortlipp, 2008). The extent to which
the researcher is involved in the study depends on the nature of the study and the particular approach being used.

**Theoretical Traditions**

In this exploratory study, there will be a “do-it-yourself” element (Maxwell, 2013) to the design. In order to examine the phenomenon of teacher leadership and the personal and contextual factors that played a role during the adoption and implementation of a new instructional program for ELLs, I strived to elicit stories through narrative inquiry techniques during interviews and a focus group. In addition to narrative inquiry, I explored the data for evidence of streams or substitutes for leadership (Donaldson, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1992). Though these theories were not directly addressed during the data collection process, they formed an undercurrent during the conversations about the change initiative. According to Pinnegar and Daynes (2006), "The method and the inquiry always have experiential starting points that are informed by and intertwined with theoretical literature that either informs the methodology or an understanding of the experiences in which the inquirer began" (p. 5). Due to my personal background and history with the participants, I considered myself to be a participant researcher with close ties and interest in the project. I approached the research from a primarily emic perspective which resonated throughout the study (Creswell, 2013). For these reasons, my methodological design derived primarily from the traditions of heuristic and narrative inquiry.
Narrative Inquiry

Narrative researchers seek to collect, deconstruct, and share stories that paint a picture of the lived realities and life worlds of their participants (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Czarniawska (2004), emphasizes the importance of the deconstructive process in narrative inquiry; the researcher must not only collect the stories, but also examine silences, disruptions and contradictions. The interpretive stance of the researcher is central to the process. The vital question to be pondered is not whether the narrative is valid, reliable or scientific, but whether it is interesting, relevant, or beautiful.

Czarniawska (2004) affirms her hermeneutic approach by stating:

In my rendition, the narrative approach to social sciences does not offer a 'method'; neither does it have a 'paradigm', a set of procedures to check the correctness of results. It gives access to an ample bag of tricks - from traditional criticism through formalists to deconstruction - but it steers away from the idea that a 'rigorously' applied procedure would render 'textbook' results. The use of narrative devices in social sciences should lead to more inspired reading... and inspired writing. (p. 136)

Czarniawska (2004) goes on to describe the evolution of narrative inquiry. Traditionally, the narrative approach involved telling the life story of one participant. Presenting a polyphonic account is now widely accepted (Boje, 1991; Chase, 2005; Czarniawska, 2004; Gabriel, 2000, Pinnegar & Daynes, 2006). The stories of multiple participants may be woven together to create a rich, illustrative account of the process, the context, or the phenomenon. Narrative researchers go through a reflexive process of watching, collecting, and provoking stories (Czarniawska, 2004). Hermeneutic narrative
researchers then concurrently interpret, analyze, and deconstruct the stories with the final phase being to set the stories against one another in order to piece together a chronological account of the experience.

Boje (1991) also advocates the inclusion of multiple voices in narrative inquiry in order to make sense of institutional behavior, particularly in the face of change. Noting the high variability and political nature of organizational stories, Boje asserts that stories reveal the life world of the workplace. The incorporation of multiple voices in the analysis has particular advantages, i.e., the meaning of the story will unfold in situ with the context more richly described, thus compelling the researcher to unpack the story behind the story.

In this study, the use of contemporary narrative inquiry practices allowed me to focus on the multiple voices of the participants and the varied experiences they had throughout the process. My task was a challenging one: to invite participants to be more than just interviewees, but rather narrators (Chase, 2005). As a novice researcher, this was particularly daunting for I had to learn to embrace silences, interpret nonverbal cues, probe for additional information, and most importantly, listen closely (Boje, 1991; Czarniawska, 2004; Gabriel, 2000). The design of my study (the purposeful selection of participants, the data collection procedures, and the instrumentation) were all critical to encouraging the elicitation of stories about the phenomenon of interest.

This approach to data collection fit the goal of the study well. Narrative inquiry helped to illuminate the phenomenon of teacher leadership, particularly the personal and contextual factors of teacher leaders who work with children who are culturally or linguistically different. Narrative inquiry techniques allowed me to transform the
everyday experiences of committed teachers into meaningful stories. Within the stories, I found evidence of substitutes for leadership, i.e., shared values, community norms, intrinsic motivation, collegiality, and strong relationships (Sergiovanni, 1992) as well as emergent themes regarding cross-cultural communication problems. Intertwining the narrative approach with the philosophy of heuristic inquiry allowed me to focus on reflexive conversations with participants, for according to Pinnegar and Daynes (2006), “we become narrative inquirers only when we recognize and embrace the interactive quality of the researcher-researched relationship, primarily by using stories as data and analysis” (p. 7).

Heuristic Inquiry

Gabriel (2000) describes stories as "furtive, fragile, and delicate creatures" (p. 136), thus recommending that the researcher take the stance of fellow traveler on the narrative, one whose role it is to understand the essence of an experience. This viewpoint on the role of the researcher corresponds well with heuristic inquiry as described by Moustakas (1990, 1994). Heuristic researchers, in an effort to deeply explore the essence of a phenomenon, enter into informal conversations “in which both researchers and co-researchers enter into the process fully" (Moustakas, 1994, p. 268). The field of heuristics resonated with Moustakas (1990) due to a personal need to understand the depth of human experience. In his case, he wished to explore the construct of loneliness that he experienced as a result of the prolonged hospitalization of a beloved child. Desiring to understand the essence of loneliness, he sought out conversations with others, finding that his own experiences with loneliness served to enrich and expand his understanding of the experiences of others.
Heuristic interviewing is empathic and flexible. The researcher, in an effort to understand and delve deeper, is free to engage in dialogue with the interviewees, referred to as co-researchers by Moustakas (1990, 1994). This democratic, interpretive position contributes to an interview climate that is compassionate and open-ended. According to Moustakas, the active involvement and expressed understanding on behalf of the researcher leads to honest and detailed elucidation of the phenomenon. This in turn guides the researcher to produce a creative synthesis of the life worlds of the co-researchers that can be communicated with rich, thick description. Similar to the narrative approach to deconstructing and analyzing stories, Moustakas (1994) recommends that “the transcription, notes, and personal documents are gathered together and organized by the investigator into a sequence that tells the story of each research participant” (p. 269).

In the current study, heuristic interviewing techniques melded well with the narrative approach to data collection. Due to my professional and personal relationships with not only the participants, but also the phenomena being explored, I found it natural to enter into dialogic conversations with co-researchers. Chase (2005) illustrates the range of possible researcher roles in narrative inquiry, noting that while some researchers choose an authoritative stance, others may take a supportive or interactive stance. Supportive narrative research “pushes the narrator’s voice into the limelight” (Chase, 2005, p. 665). Interactive narrative research not only features the voice of the narrator, but also the voice, thoughts, and feelings of the researcher. My goal was to explore both roles. I intended to highlight the voices of the teachers and the streams (Donaldson, 2006) and substitutes for leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992) that influenced the experience, while also allowing my own reflections and experiences to be considered. Moustakas’ (1994)
vision of heuristic interviewing follows similar lines; the researcher should know the information inside and out due to personal, intense experience with the phenomenon.

**Design of the Study**

**Site Selection**

The setting was a central Kentucky elementary school located in a working class neighborhood close to an urban area, the only site in the state in which DLE is offered specifically for Spanish-speaking ELLs. According to the Kentucky School Report Card (2016), the racial demographics of the students are as follows:

- 14% White (non-Hispanic)
- 11% African American
- 73% Hispanic
- 2% Other

Total enrollment was listed as 623 students with ELLs representing 63% of the school population. However, this percentage only included students who qualified for ESL instruction due to current language proficiency levels. It was possible that some of the students at the school were formerly ELLs but due to performance on annual assessments were then Redesignated Fluent English Proficient (RFEP); these data were not available. Due to high numbers of students from low-income families (95% free and reduced-price lunch qualifiers), the school was a Title I school and therefore received specialized funding per Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is important to note that the school has struggled to reach academic benchmarks set by the state for several years. Though moderate progress had been made over the past
five years, the school remained a “Focus School/In Need of Improvement” according to the Kentucky Department of Education’s School Report Card. The most recent data from 2014-2015 showed that the school ranked in the 21st percentile in the state accountability index and significantly underperformed district schools as well. Due to the high number of ELLs at the school who consistently performed poorly on state assessments, focusing on language development and academic achievement of second language speakers had been a primary focus for some time. On the website, the DLE program was specifically mentioned as one of the things that made the school special.

Participant Selection

Due to the intent of this exploratory study, purposeful sampling of participants was essential. According to Creswell (2013), qualitative researchers intentionally select participants who can inform an understanding of the phenomenon of interest. Specifically, I utilized criterion sampling in order to assure quality, authenticity, and credibility. Since my goal was to learn about the experiences of teacher leaders involved in the DLE program at the site, only teachers who fit these criteria were invited to participate. Chain sampling (Patton, 2002) was also a potentially viable technique for finding participants. Chain sampling involves asking well-situated people for references to other potential participants, those who fit the criteria and could provide information-rich accounts of the experience (Creswell, 2013). Each participant was asked at the end of the interview whether there was anyone else with whom I should speak about the initiative other than those already participating; no additional suggestions were offered.

All teachers who had a formal role on the planning or implementation committee for the DLE program were invited to participate in the study. According to the state grant
application requesting financial support for DLE, five ESL teachers were part of the original committee; one of these teachers was the project coordinator. In addition, two interventionists and ten classroom teachers were listed on the planning grant. An invitation was sent to potential participants via email that included information about the study and criteria for participants; participants were asked to respond to the email to indicate willingness or to ask questions (see Appendix B). Those who agreed to participate were then provided with a letter of informed consent (see Appendix C). Most invitees responded to the email, many indicating that their contribution to the committee was minimal and others indicating that they were no longer employed at the school and did not wish to participate. Fortunately, five ESL teachers and three DLE teachers agreed to participate; not surprisingly, this group represented teachers who were highly involved in and committed to the initiative.

Data Collection

The design of this research project, specifically the proposed data collection methods, were all driven by the purpose of the study itself. In an effort to understand the lived experiences of the teacher leaders who took part in the DLE program development, I structured data collection procedures with this goal in mind. As a qualitative researcher, I approached the data from a reflexive stance, enjoying the liberties of the interactive design such as described by Maxwell (2013). The paradigmatic shift in qualitative philosophy made it acceptable to employ a "multi-method approach to achieve broader and often better results" (Finley, 2008; p. 152). The use of multiple methods in qualitative research was highly beneficial in order to examine different aspects of the phenomenon as well as to triangulate the data (Creswell, 2013; Maxwell, 2013; Merriam, 2009; Patton,
The following data sources were used to explore the central phenomenon of this study.

**Documents.** According to Creswell (2013), documents have multiple advantages for the qualitative researcher. Public documents such as minutes of meetings, newspaper articles, and official reports allow for easy, unobtrusive access into factual events that could inform understanding of the phenomenon. Private documents, such as email messages, journals, and letters enable the researcher to explore the thoughts and feelings of participants in a format that took more time and reflection on their part. Analysis of both public and private documents has the added benefit of saving time for they do not need to be transcribed.

During the study at hand, I began by analyzing the grant implementation summary for the Kentucky Department of Education. This 16-page document included vital information regarding the members of the planning and supervisory committee for the initiative. In addition, details about the timeline for the program and specific goals to be achieved were included. This information informed my understanding of the early stages of the program as well as the development of interview questions. As a heuristic researcher, it was vital that I was closely in touch with the experience and understood the phenomenon on both a logistical and emotional level (Moustakas, 1990). This document provided a good starting point for me to become grounded in the data.

In addition to the grant summary, I also reviewed agendas for professional development sessions that teachers attended as they conducted research on dual language education. Teachers attended seminars and trainings on DLE models, biliteracy development, and effective instructional methods for ELLs. The review of these
documents provided useful information about the background knowledge and experience of the co-researchers.

**Memos.** Maxwell (2013) emphasizes the depth and breadth of memos, one of the most important techniques for exploratory studies. Memos were kept throughout this study in order to reflect on the reading, fieldwork, and emerging themes. As a heuristic researcher seeking narrative accounts from co-researchers, it was critical to continuously examine my own thoughts, feelings, and reactions to the data. In addition, conscious acknowledgement of my perspectives and biases throughout the data collection and analysis phases allowed me to be transparent about my role as a heuristic researcher, the key instrument of analysis (Ortlipp, 2008). Thus, during my multiple visits to the school during which I observed classrooms, attended meetings, and held conversations with teachers, I kept memos. Throughout the three year duration of the study, I frequently reflected on these memos, particularly contemplating them during the analysis phase of the study. The use of reflective logs and memos therefore contributed to the level of trustworthiness and credibility in the study.

**Interviews.** Rubin and Rubin (2012), qualitative social science researchers for more than four decades, have developed a model for interviewing which they call *responsive interviewing*. This approach falls in line with the heuristic, reflexive perspective of the researcher-participant relationship. Active reflection and participation on the part of the researcher is not only encouraged, but expected. Responsive interviewing is characterized by self-revelation, flexible questions, and open conversations; it is “generally gentle and cooperative, feels respectful, and is ethical”
(Rubin & Rubin, 2012, p. 7). Narrative techniques complement this approach well; Rubin and Rubin consider the weaving together of different stories to be discerning and insightful. Close listening on the part of the researcher is required to figure out the meaning of the phenomenon for the narrator. When the meaning is not readily apparent, the responsive interviewer follows up with clarifying questions and probes.

In this study, I conducted semi-structured interviews with seven co-researchers and one focus group with three co-researchers from the interview cohort. According to Merriam (2009), semi-structured interviews have a mix of open-ended and structured questions that are used flexibly. There is no predetermined order or wording of the questions; probes and follow-up questions are encouraged. Probes may consist of gestures, silences, requests for examples, or encouraging phrases (e.g., uh-huh, yes, I see); follow-up questions are intended to clarify misconceptions, request additional information or confirm a participant’s perspective through echoing (Merriam, 2009; Rubin & Rubin, 2012).

Pilot testing of interviews. The interview protocol was pilot tested and refined via interviews of teacher leaders unconnected to this study at another site. The four teachers who participated in the pilot interview were informal teacher leaders involved in the implementation phase of a new program for students called the Leader in Me. The interview questions were presented to the group with the request to reflect and briefly answer each one. If teachers found the question unclear or difficult to answer, they were asked to discuss any confusion or ambiguity. After meeting with the teachers, one question was reworded for clarity and an additional question was added to the protocol
per suggestion. By testing the questions with this group of teachers, I established that the questions for co-researchers involved in the study were clear and valid.

**Interview protocol.** The interview protocol was loosely followed to guide the conversations (see Appendix D). However, according to Rubin and Rubin (2012), responsive interviewers often depart from what they call the conversational guide in order to follow a path opened up by the participant. In order to form good questions that would lead to information regarding the phenomenon of teacher leadership, I considered various typologies. Whereas Rubin and Rubin (2012) refer to three question types (main questions, follow-up questions, and probes), Patton (2002) suggests six types that emphasize the following:

- experience and behavior,
- opinion and values,
- feelings,
- knowledge,
- sensory,
- background/demographic information.

For the purpose of this study, questions regarding experience, knowledge, and values were clearly relevant to examining the teachers’ personal involvement with the phenomenon.

Creswell (2013) recommends that interviews begin with ice-breaker questions that are easy to answer, followed by four to five questions and potential probes, and conclude with a request for other recommended interviewees. This was also considered
in the development of the following list of preliminary questions for the responsive interview:

- Tell me about your experiences with second language learners.
- How did the discussion about DLE as a program option come about? (Do you recall who was involved in the initial discussions? What was going on in the school and district at the time?)
- Tell me about your role during the adoption of DLE. (What has been your role during implementation?)
- Have there been any challenges to establishing the DLE program? (How were these overcome?)
- Tell me what the experience of being on a team of teacher leaders has been like for you.
- Can you talk about the impact that the DLE program is having on students? (… families? … the school community?)
- Is there anyone else that you recommend I speak with regarding this experience?
- Is there anything else that you would like to share about this experience?

In addition to these questions, the interview guide also included tag questions, follow-up questions, and potential probes (see Appendix D). Preparing the protocol and guide proved to be very helpful during the actual interview for it provided structure to the conversations. However, due to my collegial relationships with the co-researchers, the conversations had a natural flow to them and subsequently took interesting turns as the findings will show.
Audio recording, transcription, and translation. The interviews were audio recorded and transcribed by me soon after the event in order to enhance accuracy and credibility. I intentionally made no notes during the interviews. According to Reissman (2008), the most vital aspect of a narrative interview is “the interviewer's emotional attentiveness and engagement and the degree of reciprocity in the conversation” (p.18). Three of the nine transcripts (two individual interviews and the focus group) were conducted in Spanish. These conversations were transcribed in Spanish and translated to English by the researcher, then reviewed by a professional translator who is a fluent bilingual. The technique of “back translation” (Brislin, 1970) was utilized to confirm the researcher’s understanding of the content of the discussions. Though translation in cross-cultural research is acknowledged to be a complex endeavor, trustworthiness was enhanced by the level of bilingualism of the researcher which was supported and confirmed by the translator. Only two phrases, very idiomatic in nature, had to be corrected by the translator from more than two hours of audio.

Focus groups. One focus group session was conducted with three DLE teachers. The request for a focus group with ESL teachers was made several times, but due to complicated schedules, could not be arranged. According to Merriam (2009), focus groups are constructivist in nature in that the data are socially created by the group. The role of the researcher is simply to facilitate while the participants exchange ideas and share stories. Ritchie, Lewis, Nichols, and Ormston (2013) refer to focus groups as group discussions in the social sciences, emphasizing the give and take of conversations that center around a topic of mutual interest.
The initiating question for the focus group session echoed the substance of the interviews: the overarching theme of working together as teacher leaders. When initially asked to discuss the adoption and implementation of the DLE program, teachers chatted briefly about the logistics. However, when asked to reflect on any challenges encountered, the conversation became very animated and passionate. Throughout the hour long focus group, the researcher often participated in the turn of topics, particularly when a door was opened by the co-researchers. For example, when a story about a parent was shared, a request was made to talk more about the impact of the program on families. Later, a teacher brought up a misunderstanding with another grade level teacher. At this point, teachers were asked to expand on what it was like to work as a team implementing a new approach amidst a much larger, school-wide team of teachers. Fortunately, the teachers’ comments segued well into a variety of topics that were of interest regarding school leadership and collaboration amongst teachers.

One of the primary benefits derived from the focus group session was the sparking of memories of events and interactions that had occurred over the three years since the adoption of the program. Group conversations have the particular advantage of triggering stories that are poignant and relevant. As a narrative researcher, the intent was to draw out stories from the co-researchers. The focus group allowed this to occur and presented numerous opportunities for expressions of joy, frustration, and even humor. A surprising effect of the focus group was its impact on the research in terms of cultural communication. Witnessing first-hand the level of collegiality and trust amongst the DLE teachers led to enhanced reflection during the analysis stage on cultural communication patterns. Similar to the interviews, the focus group was audio recorded and immediate
notes were made in the reflective journal. The audio was then transcribed in Spanish, translated to English, and checked with the professional translator to ensure accuracy.

**Reflection logs.** Reflection logs represent rich documentary data sources that were used in the study. According to Merriam (2009), reflection logs allow researchers to reflect and expand upon what was said in the context of the interview. Clandinin and Connelly (2000) refer to this type of journal as an “interim account”, a vital component of the interpretative process as the writer moves from field notes to research writing. The log used in the study (see Appendix E) was researcher-generated and provided an opportunity to review what was discussed during the interview, record wonderings, and question misconceptions that arose. These logs were referred to repeatedly during the coding process.

**Data Analysis**

Moustakas (2014) eloquently states,

The focus in a heuristic quest is the recreation of the lived experience, that is, full and complete depiction of the experience from the frame of reference of the experiencing person. The challenge is fulfilled through examples, narrative descriptions, dialogue, stories, poems...One completes the quest when one has had the opportunity to tell his or her own story to a point of natural closing (p. 264).

The purpose of the study at hand, to explore the phenomenon of teacher leadership during the process of adopting and implementing a new program for ELLs, guided the design at each step of the way. Thus, as the intent of the study influenced the both choice of
narrative inquiry with a heuristic stance and the means for data collection, so have these philosophical traditions influenced how data were analyzed.

**Creative synthesis in heuristic inquiry.** The goal of heuristic inquiry is to arrive at a creative synthesis that paints a rich portrait of the phenomenon (Moustakas, 1994). In order to do this, the heuristic researcher operates from the position that she serves as the primary instrument and that much of the essential data comes from the experiences of the researcher. As a former DLE teacher, I was personally interested and passionate about the program. In addition, I had been invited to consult and plan with teachers at the school during the early implementation phase and subsequently conducted various projects with teachers at the site. My involvement with the school and the data being collected was complex and multifaceted. While taking into account the value and importance of my own perspective and experiences, I also strived to achieve horizontalization which, according to Moustakas (1994), means to give equal value to each statement made in the data collection process. This was particularly important during the analysis, during which I worked to explore and understand all comments made, not solely those to which I had a personal reaction.

**Methodological sequence.** Creswell (1998) affirms the vital role of the researcher in phenomenology and recommends utilizing a modified Stevick-Colaizzi-Keen method as follows:

1. Data analysis begins as soon as the first set of data is collected.

2. The researcher exercises horizontalization, the practice of assigning equal value to each statement which in turns represents a segment of meaning.
3. Segments of meaning are grouped into themes. These segments and themes constitute what Moustakas (1994) refers to as textural description, i.e., “the what”.

4. The textural description is then examined from various perspectives, utilizing imaginative variation, ultimately discovering a way to apply structure to the what. This leads to the structural description of the experience, i.e., “the how”.

5. Textural-structural descriptions for the participants can then be compared and utilized to form a creative synthesis, i.e., “the essence”.

As a novice researcher, the general outline of this phenomenological method was effective. Analysis began immediately following, if not during, the first interview and continued iteratively throughout the seven interviews and focus group. The first objective upon analysis of the transcripts was to emplot the program’s evolution. The next step involved coding for theoretical themes related to the school leadership framework on streams and substitutes. The final phase, significantly more involved and complex than the first two, involved the exploration of the transcripts for emergent themes that allowed me to arrive at a description of the “what” and the “how” of the experience for the participants (Moustakas, 1994).

**Emplotment in narrative inquiry.** According to Czarniawska, (2004), emplotment involves the piecing together of multiple narratives to introduce chronological structure to a narrative while maintaining an emphasis on context, information, thoughts and feelings. Following the first reading of the transcripts, comments related to the timeline of the adoption and evolution of the DLE program at the school were coded in a particular color and considered for relevance and impact. The objective was to tell the polyphonic story of the adoption and implementation of the DLE
programs through the voices of the teacher leaders. Their comments and stories were woven together to explain how the program had evolved over the three years under consideration.

According to Czarniawska (2004), stories serve a pragmatic function and can tell organizational sagas. Thus, the story line that is revealed in the next chapter will explain how the experience unfolded and how decisions were made. While some participants revealed elements of the chronology in a somewhat haphazard fashion, others proceeded in a more sequential manner. It was the goal of the researcher to reorder or emplot the story, searching for a meaningful sequence that portrayed the lived reality for the group.

Throughout this constructive process to discover the chronology of the story and its essence, I took great care to “stand under” the text with humility (Czarniawska, 2004), representing the participants fairly and accurately throughout the interpretation. This was accomplished through the use of “interruptive interpretation” which Czarniawska (2004) describes as the “how of the what” (p. 92). In order to truly understand the phenomenon at hand, it was critical to continuously reflect (or interruptedly interpret) on the lifeworld of the co-researchers and how what had happened had been influenced by personal and contextual factors. As a narrative researcher, I asked myself the following questions as I explored the data:

- What does it say?
- Why and how does it say this?
- What do I think? (Czarniawska, 2004)
The emplotment of teacher narratives was followed by theoretical coding regarding school leadership and ultimately led to coding for emergent themes. Many of the emergent themes crystallized during this first critical phase of coding for emplotment.

**Theoretical coding.** Approaches to narrative and phenomenological analysis are diverse and varied, though in general, they do not emphasize the use of detailed, systematic coding processes (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Czarniawska, 2004; Moustakas, 1994; Riessman, 2008). Thus, the decision was made to code by hand for the broad theoretical themes of school leadership streams and substitutes. Specific colors were assigned to the three categories: relationships, collegiality, and trust; moral purpose and shared values, and; action-in-common and professionalism. Comments related to these categories were highlighted and considered for their relevance to the theoretical framework. Evidence was found in all three categories; however, the comments that were analyzed during the theoretical coding phase led to inspection of differences across teacher groups and ultimately, the discovery of many of the emergent themes.

**Coding for emergent themes.** Much of the data encapsulated in the words of the co-researchers regarding the chronology and theoretical themes segued into the phase of coding for emergent themes. The transcripts had revealed evidence in all three theoretical categories, yet a distinct difference in behavior and insight between the two groups of teachers (ESL and DLE) had emerged. This led to multiple close readings of the transcripts in search of broad categories that could explain this variance. Through creative synthesis and much reflection on the meaning behind the stories and words of the co-researchers, it became apparent that there were cross-cultural communication issues that were affecting the school, the teachers, and the program’s evolution. As this broad
category emerged and stories and phrases were highlighted, the researcher made the
decision to specifically explore the themes of cultural orientation and high versus low-
context communication style.

**In Vivo Codes.** As the transcripts were reviewed repeatedly for stories and
phrases related to cultural orientation and communication style, the comments of the
DLE teachers were the most frequently highlighted as relevant to the themes. In fact,
many of their comments were found to be incredibly powerful and poignant, thus leading
to the decision to utilize “in vivo” codes in Spanish to explore cross-cultural
communication. According to Maxwell (2013), the use of in vivo codes

> provides you with an understanding of the meaning that these things,
> actions, and events have for the people who are involved in them… these
> meanings and perspectives are not theoretical abstractions; they are real,
> as real as people’s behavior, though not directly visible (p. 67).

The compelling comments and often eloquent phrasing of the DLE teachers inspired not
only their use as in vivo codes in Spanish, but also the incorporation of endnotes that
could preserve the integrity and import of their words. The ultimate goal of the coding
was to discover rich, thick description of the lived realities of the co-researchers through
their stories and voices. This was far better accomplished through discussion and
interpretation of their comments in their native tongue.

**Role of the Researcher**

In this study, my role was that of participant observer. As a bilingual educator in
California and Texas in the 1990s, I have a long professional history with dual language
education and ESL. In addition, I have been involved at the school site for some time, serving as a pro bono consultant, colleague, and advocate. I am a teacher leader myself and therefore, distinctly interested in and inspired by other teacher leaders. Lastly, I am a friend and a confidante to many of the teachers at the school. The process of adopting and implementing a new and somewhat controversial program has not been without its challenges. Over the past few years, I have established trust with the participants and have served as a sounding board as they worked to keep this initiative alive. This evolving relationship has significant influence on the approaches to data collection and analysis that I used to explore the phenomenon of streams or substitutes for leadership.

Though I considered attempting to approach the data more objectively by bracketing my personal experience from the analysis, I realized that would be extremely difficult. I also believed that bracketing myself out of the analysis would hinder thoughtful, reflective interpretation; my understanding and appreciation of what these teachers were attempting to do for immigrant children comes from my heart as well as my head.

**Validation**

The constructivist approach to qualitative research assumes a relativist stance, i.e., the understanding and appreciation of multiple realities (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005). Thus, establishing validity in constructivist studies relies upon the use of well-defined and well-documented procedures in order to convey accuracy and credibility. Reflecting a paradigmatic shift away from positivist criteria, narrative and phenomenological researchers concern themselves with strategies that enhance the relevance and authenticity of the data (Czarniawska, 2004). There are a host of strategies used by qualitative researchers to validate their work; Creswell (2013) recommends that
researchers select the strategies best suited to the nature of the study. In this study, I employed the following techniques to validate my work.

**Triangulation**

Triangulation involves the use of different methods to substantiate conclusions and reduce the risk of researcher bias (Maxwell, 2013). In qualitative research, researchers use multiple data sources, methods, and techniques to verify and corroborate the data analysis (Creswell, 2013). Finley (2008), a narrative researcher, recommends “a multi-method approach to achieve broader and often better results” (p.152). Thus, in an effort to validate my synthesis of the data, I relied on interview data from multiple participants, document analysis, reflective journals, and memos. In addition, I reviewed the content of the interviews and focus group conducted in Spanish with a professional translator in order to verify my interpretation.

**Member Checking**

According to Moustakas (1994), participants in heuristic studies are considered “co-researchers”; the researcher and participant enter fully into the conversation regarding the phenomenon. In an effort to interview responsively and empathically, I immersed myself in the dialogue as opposed to taking notes. I wrote in a reflective journal immediately following each interview in order to capture preliminary thoughts, questions, and wonderings. Interviews were transcribed within one week and transcriptions were made available to participants via email in order to verify and clarify the accuracy of the data (Creswell, 2009). At that point, participants were also asked to provide additional information if they wished; none opted to do so.
Rich, Thick Description

One of the primary goals of the study was to produce rich, thick description of the phenomenon of teacher leadership in this context. I strived to provide detailed information regarding the setting and the experiences of the multiple participants. Not only did I provide thick description regarding my own interpretation, but the emphasis of the narrative approach was to retell the story using the words of the narrators. The abundance of detail was a result of the varied data sources, particularly the transcripts of the interviews and focus group session, as well as the documents, reflection logs, and memos (Creswell, 2013).

Clarifying Bias

As noted above, I was personally and professionally connected to the study. I spent prolonged time in the field and was motivated to explore the phenomenon for various reasons. I openly disclosed my support of the project to provide native language instruction for Spanish-speaking ELLs and declared my role as an advocate for the future development of similar programs in the area. For these reasons, a constructivist approach using narrative and heuristic techniques was appropriate in that it allowed me to situate myself in the study. In addition, reflecting on my bias at the outset clarified not only the methodological decisions that were made, but also the interpretation of the data.

Limitations

As with any small scale research project, there are limitations that constrain the study. In this context, one of the primary limitations was the time span over which participants were asked to reflect. The initiative to adopt and implement the DLE
program began over two years ago; the participants’ memories of the experiences were potentially impeded by the passage of time. In addition, during the time that had passed, some of the key players in the initiative had left the school site. It was hoped that all would agree to participate; however, their connection to the project diminished with their change of context. Though the data was rich and abundant, it was somewhat limited by the small number of people involved. Nonetheless, I am confident that the stories the co-researchers told were relevant, informative, and worthy of consideration for other social science researchers, particularly those interested in the education of children who are culturally and linguistically diverse.

Summary

The methodology of a doctoral study is the fundamental core of the research. Communicating a detailed research plan with specific explanation of data collection and analysis procedures is necessary to persuade readers of the soundness of the study. In this chapter, I have explained the rationale for the qualitative approach employed in this study as well as information regarding the traditions of narrative and heuristic inquiry. The participants and setting of the study were described in detail, followed by explanation of the data sources used. Finally, the data collection and analysis procedures were discussed and substantiated by explanation of validation strategies and limitations of the study. In the next chapter, I will discuss the findings of the study.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

Research and theory regarding the practice of teacher leadership has received increasing attention over the past three decades (York-Barr & Duke, 2004) with particular attention now being paid to the role of teachers in school reform and change efforts (Fullan, 2000; Silva, Gimbert, & Nolan, 2000). Silva, Gimbert, and Nolan (2000) illustrate the evolution of teacher leadership in three distinct phases or waves. The first wave was marked by teachers’ formal roles in unions and management during the first half of the twentieth century. This wave was followed by an increase in appointed teacher leaders in schools in the form of grade level or department heads, mentors, and instructional coaches during the late 1900s. We are now in the midst of the third wave in which opportunities to engage in leadership practices are directly related to the particular knowledge and skills of practicing teachers. Despite the increased interest in the phenomenon of teacher leadership, few studies have been conducted on how a school’s culture or leadership structure impacts the work of teacher leaders (Elmore, 2000; Smylie and Denny, 1990; York-Barr, 2000).

This study explored the phenomenon of teacher leadership during the process of adopting and implementing a dual language education (DLE) program for English Language Learners (ELLs) in an elementary school in central Kentucky. Though DLE is found in thousands of schools across the United States (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2015), this program is believed to be the first of its kind in Kentucky (A. De Torres Nuñez, personal communication, January 24, 2016). The factors that motivated, challenged, and sustained the teachers throughout this tumultuous process warranted
exploration in order to illuminate the lived experiences of the participants, or co-
researchers. Existing theory on school leadership (Donaldson, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1992)
framed the exploration of leadership practices while theory and empirical work on DLE
provided understanding of the program itself and its potential benefits for the school, the
teachers, and most importantly, the students (Cummins, 1981; Lindholm-Leary, 2012;
Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Pérez & Torres-Guzmán, 2002; Thomas & Collier,
2012). Emerging themes regarding cross-cultural interactions amongst the participants set
in motion further exploration into the literature base on cultural dimensions and cross-
cultural confusions amongst coworkers.

This chapter presents the results of the analyzed data. It begins with a brief
discussion of the central phenomenon of study, followed by a review of the
methodological approach and a rationale for why this approach was meaningful and
appropriate for this particular study. A conceptual framework that emerged from the data
is shared both visually and narratively. Finally the data are organized in two ways and
presented via the words of the co-researchers and the reflections of the researcher. First,
the stories are emplotted and presented in a chronology in order to illustrate the timeline
of the adoption and implementation of the program. The co-researchers’ stories and
researcher reflections are then further explored in order to discuss theoretical and
emergent themes that became known through creative synthesis.

The Central Phenomenon

This study explored the phenomenon of teacher leadership during the adoption
and implementation of a new instructional program for elementary ELLs. The teacher
participants in the study have taken part in something unique and innovative in their
region and state; the adoption of this program represents a break from traditional instructional approaches for ELLs in Kentucky. Therefore, as the school moved through the phases of development of the program, the co-researchers were presented with new challenges and issues, yet had very few local experts to whom to turn for guidance and support. In addition, during this three year time frame, the school experienced multiple administrative turnovers, leaving teachers without consistent principal leadership for the majority of the time. Nonetheless, the DLE program continued to move forward.

The central question explored in the study was: What professional, contextual, and personal factors affected these teacher leaders’ thinking, behavior, and interactions during the process of implementing an innovative program for ELLs? This question was grounded in complementary school leadership theories on streams (Donaldson, 2006) and substitutes (Sergiovanni, 1992) for school leadership that emphasize the following factors: (a) relationships, collegiality, and trust; (b) moral purpose and shared values; and (c) action-in-common and professionalism. Many of these factors, such as moral purpose and within-group relationships, played a supportive role, motivating and sustaining the teachers during difficult times. Other factors, however, presented challenges or barriers to the progress of the program. For example, the data showed that relationships across cultural groups was found to be problematic and that this in turn had a negative impact on collective action.

Figure 4.1 illustrates the interrelated theoretical and emergent themes that presented in the data and the simultaneously productive and counter-productive effects these themes had on the teacher leaders and the program’s development. The figure indicates the themes that were explored regarding Donaldson’s (2006) streams of school
leadership and Sergiovanni’s (1992) substitutes for leadership. It also demonstrates the themes that emerged during the interviews and focus group regarding cultural dimensions and cross-cultural confusions in the work setting. The process of working together on the adoption and implementation of the new program for ELLs was affected by the lack of cultural congruity and understanding between the ESL teachers who all identified as European American and the DLE teachers who were all Hispanic. The purpose of this study was to explore these interrelated theoretical and emergent themes in order to elucidate the phenomenon of teacher leadership.

Figure 4.1. Conceptual framework of professional and contextual factors affecting teacher leaders.
Exploring the Phenomenon through Heuristic and Narrative Inquiry

A heuristic lens (Moustakas, 1990) was coupled with narrative inquiry techniques (Chase, 2008; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Czarniawska, 2004) to guide this inductive study of teacher leadership. The piecing together of qualitative techniques is consistent with the practice of bricolage (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005), a do-it-yourself approach, that allows methodological decisions to be driven by the central question and emerging themes. In the context of this study, a heuristic lens was appropriate and meaningful due to my past experience as a dual language educator in California and Texas and my involvement at this school site over the past three years as a participant researcher. My autobiographical connections played an important role in the data collection and analysis processes. According to Moustakas (1990),

From the beginning and throughout an investigation, heuristic research involves self-search, self-dialogue, and self-discovery; the research questions and the methodology flow out of inner awareness, meaning, and inspiration… until an essential insight is achieved, one that will throw a beginning light onto a critical human experience. (p. 11)

Thus, as a heuristic researcher, I approached the interviews and the analysis of the data with critical subjectivity, allowing my own experiences and inner reflections to play a role in the explication and discussion of the co-researchers’ lived experiences (Moustakas, 1994).

Narrative inquiry techniques were employed to paint a vivid picture of the lifeworlds of the co-researchers. Narrative inquiry involves
not only the valorizing of individuals' experience but also an exploration
of the social, cultural, and institutional narratives in which individuals'
experiences were constituted, shaped, expressed, and enacted... in a way
that begins and ends with inquiry into the storied lives of people involved.
(Pinnegar & Daynes, 2006, p. 42)

Emplotment of polyphonic stories is widely used in narrative research in order to apply
structure and coherence to the narrative (Czarniawska, 2004). In this study, multiple
accounts were woven together in a meaningful sequence for the researcher and readers.
The stories told by the eight co-researchers will not only chronicle the evolution of the
program, but will also illustrate the complex and sometimes differing perceptions of
events that transpired over more than three years.

Emplotment

The Adoption and Planning Phase, 2013-2014 School Year

As an adjunct professor of a graduate course entitled ESL Teaching Methods and
Materials, I frequently met practicing ESL teachers in the region. In the fall semester of
2013, I serendipitously met a young kindergarten teacher who shared that her school had
recently received a grant from the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE) to plan and
implement a dual language program for a small cohort of students entering kindergarten
the following year. This teacher, later to become one of the co-researchers in the study,
invited me to visit the school, learn about their work, and engage in discussions with the
committee. Thus began my involvement with the school as an advisor, colleague, and
primarily as a participant researcher. Although the ideas for the study were still forming
in my mind, I was fortunate to be present and privy to the early discussions regarding the program.

The adoption of the program was the result of school leaders’ creative interpretation of a state requirement regarding world languages instruction. According to an ESL teacher who was one of the two coauthors of the grant application,

It started to crystallize out of a meeting about the world languages program at that point – it has since changed, the requirements for schools…My friend and the interim principal were in the world languages meeting and noticed a gap there and decided to build more on the cultural background of our students by building up the Spanish and so, they knew of a grant potentially for exploring the idea of the immersion program.

Another ESL teacher added to this information in her individual interview by clarifying the concept of immersion that was beginning to evolve or “crystallize” in teachers’ minds:

We’re not really like an immersion – Spanish immersion like what we’ve seen in the county. There was always the question from the district, “What is this program you’re trying to do?” I think we, we realized that KDE was providing grants for research and development of these programs. That was when we really got interested in it and decided let’s really try this and see what we can do.

The county had indeed been implementing partial immersion programs for years; in 2016, the twentieth anniversary of the first partial immersion program at a local
elementary school was celebrated. However, the target population for partial immersion programs has typically been native speakers of English who wished to develop proficiency in Spanish. An immersion, or dual language program that sought to develop bilingualism and biliteracy for ELLs, designated a *gap group* by KDE, was something new to the state. The interested group of ESL teachers moved forward despite the lack of experience or knowledge in the area about such a program for ELLs. One ESL teacher involved in the adoption and planning phases commented, “Even our contacts downtown didn’t understand what we were trying to do” and when asked whether she felt they wanted to understand, she replied,

I think they did, but they wanted a program like Sunset Elementary (partial immersion for native speakers of English). That’s what they were pushing us toward – doing a partial immersion program, but we did not want that for our school because our school is really a neighborhood school. We want to help our students; we really don’t want students coming from outside – from around the city being bused in. We didn’t want that…we didn’t want to break our school apart. We didn’t want our kids going somewhere else and bring these other kids in. We wanted to keep our population.

However, this view about how to structure the program and student population was not universally held. Other teachers interested in helping establish the program believed that a two-way immersion program could be the very thing the school needed. In two-way programs, native speakers of both target languages (English and Spanish) share the same classroom setting and develop literacy in both languages. At that point in the
evolution of the program, prior to the initiation of this study, I met twice with teachers to present and discuss the different models of dual language programs for ELLs and the issue of how to structure language usage in the classroom. Conversations, though not contentious, were animated regarding which model would work best for their students. The new principal, who was fairly forthright at that time about his preference for a 70/30 model, i.e., 70% Spanish/30% English, for native speakers of Spanish only, decided to survey certified teachers at the school about this critical decision. One of the co-researchers later reflected on this survey during her interview for the study,

And it was interesting, too. We did a vote, and I feel like the staff was really on board for the 50/50 model. And when, I think that when, it was interesting for the staff to learn about the 70/30 and the 90/10, but as a staff, we never saw the results, so I do kind of wonder what the vote was because we know what the administrator chose.

Another ESL teacher reflected on this decision as well by saying,

My vision, and it’s still my vision, I still feel like our school should be 50/50 and I wish it would be two way as well because my own child would come here because I know the long term effects of that. But my reasons for that are #1, these kids, most of them, have been born in the United States, according to the paperwork. We do have newcomers, yes, but most of them have been here. Secondly, many of them have been to daycare and preschool, so they come in knowing social language, so that’s my biggest push for 50/50 as well as the lack of Spanish-speaking – quality Spanish-speaking – teachers in this area.
As will be shown later in the emplotment, the issue of language use percentage continued to be problematic for ESL and DLE teachers through the first two years of implementation as well.

One point of agreement amongst all the co-researchers was that something different needed to be done in order to help students make academic progress. Despite hard work and commitment on behalf of ESL and classroom teachers, the data were clear; students at the school were not performing well on state assessments (Kentucky Department of Education, 2015). From 2011-2014, the school repeatedly ranked below the 10th percentile in reading and math on the KPREP, the state accountability measure for elementary schools, while the district was consistently above the 65th percentile from 2011-2014. The student population was composed of multiple “gap groups” and therefore, the pressure to improve performance was strong. According to the Prichard Committee (2012), non-duplicated gap groups are defined as “Groups of students combined into one large group whose scores will be used to determine whether schools/districts are closing achievement gaps” (p. 24). The Kentucky School Report Card for 2014-2015 indicated that the school body was composed of the following percentages in terms of gap groups:

- 12.7% African American
- 69.3% Hispanic
- 57.9% English Language Learner
- 11.6% Special Education
One co-researcher reflected on the challenge of trying to close the gap for ELLs while coteaching in a first grade classroom years earlier,

No matter where those kids’ language levels were, and especially if they had a disability, drilling them, drilling them, drilling them does not help.

And I was just noticing that it is not working, no matter how hard I work, or how great of a teacher I am, it was kind of like, “Uh… (sigh), it’s always a downer at the end of the year to think, ‘It didn’t do it. How come I didn’t do it?’”

Ultimately, the school settled on a developmental immersion model that would emphasize literacy development in kindergarten in Spanish with 80-90% of the school day conducted in the first language (L1). The remainder of the day would be taught in English during special areas (i.e., art, music, science lab, and library) and ESL lessons with a collaborating teacher. The intention at that time was for students to move through the school years, gradually increasing the amount of instruction in English until 3rd grade, at which time the school day would be 50/50, with 50% of the curriculum delivered in English and 50% in Spanish. This balance of the two languages would then continue through 5th grade. Meanwhile, the school hired a teacher from Spain through the Visiting Teachers Program in the fall of 2013 who would become one of the kindergarten DLE teachers the following year. This teacher, unfamiliar with DLE teaching philosophy at that time, understood that she had been hired to develop literacy in the students’ L1, saying in her interview,

The teachers had decided they were going to change. They didn’t have it very clear yet, but the teachers had decided that the program they had
wasn’t working. The kids were failing, they weren’t learning what they had to learn. And so they all came to the conclusion that it was, if they were lost in kindergarten, they didn’t learn. Kindergarten was just a lost year.¹

The new principal at that time was eager to launch the new program even though the school was still in need of another DLE teacher in addition to a distinct need for training. Teachers were concerned with his suggestion that the new teacher from Spain enter a classroom immediately upon arrival from Spain; many thought she should serve as an interventionist while getting to know the school, teachers, and students. An ESL teacher highly involved and committed to the planning process stated,

He kind of jumped, he pushed us to go faster than we wanted to. Um, I felt like we kind jumped in too deeply, too quickly. We really wanted to make sure that we had the research base, that we could develop a solid program.

The concerns of the teachers prevailed and the decision was made to give the new teacher, in her words, “a year of practicing”; she would work as a literacy interventionist, providing support to Spanish speaking kindergartners in a small group setting while also attending trainings and learning about the DLE approach.

Throughout the planning year, the school sent a group of teachers to visit DLE programs in Illinois and worked with visiting professionals from New Mexico to

¹ No lo tenían muy claro cómo, pero los maestros ya habían decidido que el programa que estaban haciendo no funcionaba. Que los niños (puff- sound) caían – no aprendían lo que tenían que aprender. Y todos llegaron a la conclusión que era, si están perdidos en kinder – no aprenden. El kinder es un año perdido.
formulate a working plan for the next school year. The new principal had managed to secure funding from the district to hire consultants from Dual Language Education of New Mexico (DLeNM). This group defines itself as “a grass-roots educational non-profit organization…who wish to develop, refine and/or implement dual language education programs” (DLeNM, 2015). A significant amount of time and money was dedicated to work with one DLeNM consultant in particular, David Rogers, who visited for two days in December of 2013. In addition to working with the staff as a whole to establish understanding and support for the initiative, Rogers also spent a day discussing logistics with the DLE committee. As a participant observer at the latter meeting, I witnessed the presentation and discussion of numerous options regarding curriculum and also the recommendation for the establishment of a firm plan that would be carried out with fidelity. At this time, the school also committed financially and instructionally to a summer 2014 training with Project GLAD (Guided Language Acquisition Development), a DLeNM professional development model for language acquisition and literacy strategies for ELLs (Project GLAD, 2015).

As is often the case, the second semester of the year at any public school passed by in a rush for the school. An instructional assistant from Chile was hired to be the other DLE kindergarten teacher and the original committee of ESL teachers involved with the DLE initiative began to sense that decisions and plans for the program were moving ahead without their input. One ESL teacher commented, “I feel like it started to become this thing of our principal. He has a plan. And it became his vision and not so much our vision.” When asked if she felt that he fully knew what his vision was, she responded, “No. And it became, well, he and the assistant principal took it on and ran
with it.” I questioned further whether the new DLE teachers were part of this emerging plan; the response was “As far as I’ve heard, the teachers, they just followed his directives” and unfortunately, the original DLE committee was “disbanded”. As co-researchers were asked to look back and reflect on whether formal plans were being put in place, with or without their input, one ESL teacher commented, “We were under the impression that things were being developed and put in place, and they were not” while another ESL teacher stated,

So, I kind of wonder if there was a plan, and it was never shared, and then when everybody got disbanded… the administration, they were the only ones who knew the plan. I mean, it had to be somewhere….but I don’t know what happened to it. And so, no one ever saw the plan and that built a lot of mistrust too.

DLE Implementation Year 1, 2014-2015 School Year

As the 2014-2015 school year commenced, approximately 50 Spanish-speaking kindergartners enrolled in one of the two DLE classrooms being taught primarily in Spanish by a native speaker of the language. These two professionals, one a veteran teacher and speech pathologist from Spain with years of experience in early childhood education and one a former engineer turned missionary from Chile, spent countless hours during the summer planning and preparing for the new program. Though the ESL teachers on the committee felt that a firm plan had not been established, the DLE teachers were committed to a developmental model and felt supported by the administration in this commitment. One of the DLE teachers illustrated this by saying, “And so we planned for it to be 90/10. After we went to the training in Chicago with Karen Beeman (national
expert in bilingual education and biliteracy), we returned with all this information, we
returned with all these strategies.”² The other DLE teacher concurred, “We have the idea.
We went to the trainings, to all the courses. They gave us the idea of how we had to run
it.”³ And so they did, with the full support of the principal and assistant principal, who in
their minds, “had a lot of knowledge and a lot of interest”⁴. The new principal
particularly involved himself with the DLE program and teachers, prompting one of the
DLE teachers to reflect, “He took care of us and the program and he took charge of the
others to clarify what was being done. It was more or less clear with everyone and if they
didn’t get it, they were quiet.”⁵

Unfortunately, things were not clear with everyone and the ESL teachers felt that
decisions were made too quickly and without consensus. One teacher shared that she felt
“left out” of the process and frustrated with the lack of communication occurring school
wide. Although my study had not formally commenced at this time, I frequently attended
trainings, meetings and family events. I noted signs of communication breakdown
between the ESL teachers and the DLE team as well as growing concern from the ESL
teachers regarding their increasing exclusion from the program. Nonetheless, the program
itself appeared to be thriving and contributing to an increase in family engagement. A
team of Latino college students and a colleague from a regional university attended

² Y entonces planeamos para hacer el porcentaje de 90/10. Después de que nosotros
fuimos al entrenamiento en Chicago con Karen Beeman, volvimos con toda esta
información, volvimos con todas estas estrategias.
³ Porque nosotras tenemos la idea. Hemos ido a las formaciones, a todos los cursos.
Todos nos dio la idea de cómo teníamos que llevarlo.
⁴ tenían mucho conocimiento y muchas ganas.
⁵ Él nos cuidaba y cuidaba el programa y se encargaba que a la gente clarificarlo que se
ponía. A todo el mundo lo tenía medio claro o si no lo tenías, se callaba.
multiple family nights with me, serving as translators and working at booths.

Observations I conducted in kindergarten DLE classrooms showed that the teachers were building students’ literacy skills in Spanish and engaging their hearts and minds on a daily basis. Though the DLE teachers admitted that they were often overwhelmed that first year with adjusting to expectations for teachers in the U.S. and the lack of resources, they were clearly working hard to create a welcoming, language-rich environment for their students.

The second semester of the 2014-2015 school year proved to be problematic, however. First the assistant principal left the school mid-semester for unexplained reasons, soon to be followed by the principal’s unplanned departure in April. After just a little over a year and a half with a leadership team, the school was once again without a permanent principal. ESL and classroom teachers were left reeling as KPREP testing approached and the DLE teachers in particular felt “abandoned” by the loss of the principals. Due to the dissolution of the original DLE committee, the beginnings of a planetary culture began to develop. ESL teachers continued to work with their students in the other classrooms, the DLE teachers wrapped up the year with their first cohort of students, and the school year ended on a very negative, fractured note. Looking back, one ESL teacher commented,

I think if it was left alone, it would have created a real cohesive team, but cohesive teams were a struggle that year and I think are still a struggle. It takes a lot to build that cohesive team and we were on that track and it just kind of broke right apart.
DLE Implementation Year 2, 2015-2016 School Year

Unable to locate a satisfactory candidate for the principal position that summer, the school’s site-based decision making council opted to put a veteran district principal in place as interim administrator and hire an instructional coach to assist him. Though neither of these administrators had much experience working with ELLs, their work was appreciated and complimented by many. One ESL teacher remarked on the fact that both “have come on board and educated themselves”. She particularly commended them for being “really honest about what they didn’t know” and turning to the teachers for guidance. As far as helping with making decisions about the DLE program’s future, however, these administrators for the most part, remained noncommittal in anticipation of the hiring of a new principal for the 2016-2017 school year.

Meanwhile the DLE program advanced to its second year, adding two new 1st grade teachers, one from Spain who had been working at the school the previous year as an ESL teacher and the other a Mexican American woman who attended the school as a child and received her teaching credential at the state’s flagship university. The four DLE teachers supported one another and worked as a team throughout the school year, sharing ideas and resources. At the same time, collaborating with other teachers in the school did not come as easily. During the first year of implementation, the DLE teachers often felt that the other kindergarten classroom teachers were trying to “program” them, making them follow their curriculum and their unit plans. Due to a lack of experience and knowledge of biliteracy development, the regular classroom teachers often advocated for approaches and content that did not translate well to the DLE setting. This year, however, one of the DLE teachers noted improvement, saying,
These two years have helped them (kindergarten teaching colleagues) to understand how we work and what we need…I think we’ve come together these past two years in that sense. But I do think they understand what the children need and how we work. You know what I mean? As much as we would like yet? No…But the meetings have not been as, like last year, they programmed us and we tried to take notes, but they didn’t ask us anything until we said, (smacks table for emphasis), “Maybe we need to separate.”6

One of the first grade DLE teachers described a grade level team relationship that was functional and professional, though not warm. From the beginning of the year, the team planned together when it was appropriate and relevant to both groups, for example in mathematics. She was grateful that consultants from Project GLAD had helped them to delineate the working relationship as she described here:

I do believe that it helped us a lot when they came from GLAD because we sat down with our group and they said, they themselves told us, “You can’t plan everything together”…I believe that from that moment on, it helped us a lot because we were able to go, “Okay! We’re okay with

6 Estos dos años les han ayudado entender como funcionamos y que necesitamos… Creo que estos dos años, nos ha juntado un poco más en este sentido. Pero creo que han entendido lo que necesitan los niños y como trabajamos. ¿Vale? ¿Igual como ya nos gustaría? No, pero las reuniones no son tan, como el año pasado, que las reuniones eran - ellas programaban a nosotras y intentábamos de tomar alguna nota, no se nos preguntaba hasta que decimos, “Quizás necesitamos separar.”
what we’re going to do and you all are okay with what you’re going to
do.”  

This improvement in grade level team planning was a sign that collaboration had improved, but it was by no means indicative of improved communication overall as later discussion will show.

During the second semester of the 2015-2016 school year, the interim director suggested that the DLE committee begin meeting again to discuss multiple issues, particularly the recurrent topic of the need for a formal plan for language usage as the DLE students moved up to 2nd grade. There was disagreement amongst committee members regarding the percentage of English and Spanish to be used in instruction at each grade level. According to one co-researcher, the primary goal of the committee was to get a long range plan into place so that we know when the kids get into 1st grade, this is what is happening, this is how many minutes they’re receiving in English versus how many minutes they’re receiving in Spanish, and it’s not this back and forth discussion and debate about scheduling.

ESL teachers involved on the original committee had been long wishing to be involved again in the DLE initiative again and saw this as an opportunity. When asked to reflect on the process of working with other teacher leaders, one of the ESL teachers commented,

---

7 Creo que nos ayudó mucho cuando vinieron las personas de GLAD porque se sentaron con nuestro grupo y dijeron, ellos mismos dijeron, “No se pueden planear juntas en esto”…Creo que desde ese momento nos ayudó mucho porque nos…pudimos, “Okay! Estamos todas bien con que nosotras vamos a hacer esto y están todas bien con eso.
I think it’s been good because like I said, we’ve all had what’s best for the kids in mind and so it’s easy to come back to that. There have been tough moments where people definitely have had different opinions and we’ve had such a lack of administration - consistent administration - that it’s been hard to get support for those decisions that were being made. And so I feel like it’s kind of been that every teacher has been pulled in different directions and kind of making their own decisions so now we’re trying to come back together and make those decisions as a committee and as a team.

Another ESL teacher expressed her renewed commitment to the DLE program and poignantly reflected, “So many times in education, I feel like we get caught up in our own opinions and desires for what we want a program to be. Just really focusing on student needs and having that lead us, in my opinion” is the driving force.

Throughout the second semester, ESL, DLE, and other interested teachers met a handful of times to discuss issues such as enrollment of DLE students, identification of DLE students with learning disabilities, and the problematic topic of instructional language use percentage in DLE classrooms for each grade level. ESL teachers from the original committee were hopeful that consensus could be established at some point so they could take steps forward as they had during the adoption phase. DLE teachers missed having a principal who made decisions and quieted critics. Reflecting on this, one DLE teacher commented,

Last year, we talked more directly with the principal and the assistant principal. They controlled that. They more or less told us what to do. This
year, there was no leader, so the meetings have been a group of people stating their opinions about a lot of things without much knowledge.

Well, everyone is talking, but it’s really more like criticizing than talking.  

One of the ESL teachers involved in the meetings concurred that meetings have not been productive. Though she did not seem to sense the critical nature described by the DLE teacher above, she worried that the meetings have not been effective, saying,

I still don’t feel like we’re empowered to make decisions. I still don’t feel like any decisions are being made. Well again, administration is in transition, so that’s a big obstacle when you didn’t already have a structure in place. So everybody questions the authority of everybody else, so unless we were all unified in our vision. But, we’re not all unified in our vision, so that just leads to back and forthing.

These comments occurred during conversations with co-researchers in April; the end of the school year was right around the corner. The teachers were in agreement that something needed to be settled, but how? One of the DLE teachers worried that the decision about language usage in 2nd grade would be made for them by the ESL teachers due to a differing philosophy, lack of knowledge about developmental DLE programs, and sheer numbers. The DLE teachers were a distinct minority group in the school, and frequently felt this. When asked if she felt they had power in the midst of a

---

8 El año pasado, hablábamos mucho más directamente con los directores. Ellos controlaban eso. Ellos más o menos nos decían que hacer. Este año, no había ningún líder, entonces las reuniones han sido un grupo de gente opinando de muchas cosas sin mucho conocimiento. Pues, todos hablan pero realmente más critican que hablan.
predominantly European American faculty, one DLE teacher quickly replied, “Well, there are four of us and them – 70. So then, no, we don’t have the same power.” A new principal for the 2016-2017 school year had recently been hired, but teachers heard he had little to no experience with DLE programs. DLE teachers were longing for an advocate, someone who had knowledge of DLE programs as one of the teachers said during the focus group:

That’s what we have said so many times, but nothing has happened.

Right? We ask for help and we want someone with experience with this – how an immersion program works and with years of experience from Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Utah.

ESL teachers were generally noncommittal about discussing what they hoped for from a new principal, one commenting that she hoped for a “functional relationship” and another saying, “We’ll see.”

The year ended with a decision regarding the thorniest topic of all – language percentage in the DLE second grade classrooms (co-researcher, personal communication, July 2, 2016). Although a formal vote was not taken by the committee, the interim principal felt that the consensus was that 2nd grade DLE classrooms should be 50/50 (as supported by the ESL teachers) as opposed to 70/30 (as advocated by the DLE teachers). In addition, this instruction would be provided through one Spanish-speaking classroom teacher and one English-speaking classroom teacher. DLE teachers

9 Pues, nosotras somos cuatro. Y ellos – 70. Entonces, no, no tenemos el mismo poder.
10 Eso lo hemos dicho bastantes veces pero no hemos ido allá. ¿Verdad? Que pidamos ayuda y que tenga experiencia con esto. Que sabe cómo anda un programa de inmersión y tiene años de experiencia. Tejas, Nuevo México, Illinois, Utah.
had seen the writing on the wall about this decision the previous month; one teacher had commented, “But we still haven’t met for them to tell us what the percentage will be, but I am sure they are going to do what they want, that it will be 50/50 in 2nd grade.”\textsuperscript{11} This decision was made despite the DLE teachers’ view that a program such as this one, intended to support students from underprivileged backgrounds, should develop literacy fully in the first language before emphasizing reading and writing in English. One teacher lamented that it was just too soon for this population of students and shared, “We think it would be better for it to be 50/50 in 3rd grade, but our voice is not going to be heard.”\textsuperscript{12}

**School Leadership Themes**

Two complementary theoretical frameworks undergird the presentation of findings regarding school leadership: substitutes for school leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992) and the three streams model of school leadership (Donaldson, 2006). The consideration of two similar theories on school leadership was necessary in order to fully explore and analyze the complex nature of the interactions amongst participants as well as the development of the DLE program over time. Data are organized in three categories that meld these two frameworks: (a) relationships, collegiality, and trust; (b) moral purpose, shared values, and commitment; and (c) action-in-common and professionalism. Co-researchers’ stories and comments shared during individual

\textsuperscript{11} Pero todavía no hemos reunido para que nos digan qué porcentaje va a haber, pero ya seguro que van a hacer lo que quieren, que es 50/50 en segundo grado.

\textsuperscript{12} Queremos que mejor sería 50/50 en tercer grado, pero como nuestra voz no se va a oír.
interviews and the focus group were explored for evidence of these themes. In addition, critical subjectivity of the researcher remained present throughout the analysis.

**Relationships, Collegiality, and Trust**

According to Donaldson (2006), the relational stream is the most critical of the three streams, the foundation upon which the others are built. Sergiovanni’s (1992) conceptualization of substitutes for school leadership likewise emphasizes the spirit of collegiality and trust upon which strong relationships are built. Following are excerpts from individual interviews and the focus group session that demonstrate the presence of this stream or substitute for school leadership, yet the complexity of the relationships and the lack of overall trust are of note as well.

**Relationships, collegiality, and trust amongst ESL teachers.** As mentioned earlier, the impetus to consider adopting a DLE program derived from a meeting on World Language and Global Competency program review. The Kentucky Department of Education (2016) requires that all public schools in the state demonstrate the inclusion of world language instruction as part of the accountability system for school performance. The interim principal and an ESL teacher in attendance realized that in order to comply with the requirements of program review, they could pursue the option to build on the linguistic and cultural background of their ELLs by offering core instruction in Spanish. Excitement built throughout the school after the interim principal presented this option and according to one co-researcher, “Everyone was on board and the staff wanted to do it, thought it would benefit our kids”. Out of genuine interest and enthusiasm for the initiative, a voluntary team was formed composed of ESL and
classroom teachers; two ESL teachers then took the lead and wrote the grant for funding from KDE.

The original group initially worked as a “cohesive team” that planned and worked together to secure funding and resources from the state. One of the writers of the implementation grant shared,

And we just took it upon ourselves. We were the ones who were motivated to fill out the paperwork and get it going. We knew we had a new principal and so, we thought maybe we can get him to support this effort. And he did.

As the 2013-2014 school year began, so did an adjustment phase with the new principal. Though he had no direct experience with DLE, he was very supportive of the project and threw himself into it full force. However, the complex nature of the program and the multiple decisions that needed to be made presented distinct challenges. The principal engaged himself primarily with out-of-state consultants, the DLE teachers, and the assistant principal. Though the ESL teachers still wanted to be included in the discussions and decision-making, they soon began to realize that they were going to be “shut out of a lot of it…shut out of everything.” This feeling was echoed by others and called “discouraging” and “frustrating”. Asked if she felt there was a turning point in the relationships in the school, one co-researcher commented,

The relationships were definitely stronger before. I felt like we were a team and then, all of sudden, it turned into “the teachers who teach English” and “the teachers who speak Spanish” and although there was a
little bit of conversation for a while, maybe a couple of weeks, a month. Then it turned into no conversation at all. We knew nothing about what was happening… (The principal) just thought if they were the ones teaching it, he wanted to keep it confined to that, and didn’t want too many people helping with that decision.

Ultimately, the ESL teachers stopped pushing to be included and went about their jobs supporting other classroom teachers and students throughout the school. Meanwhile, the DLE program had entered its first year and the new kindergarten teachers were working to build a strong program and relationship.

**Relationships, collegiality, and trust amongst DLE teachers and with grade level colleagues.** Beginning a new school year with kindergartners is challenging in and of itself; however, starting a new instructional program with few resources and little expertise can be overwhelming. For this reason, the kindergarten DLE teachers quickly formed a close bond with one another and collaborated on a daily basis. Although one of the DLE teachers had experience with teaching and speech pathology in Spain, the other teacher had been an engineer in her first career and had only begun working as a teaching assistant in recent years. In one of my memos, I noted that the latter teacher, though several years older than her colleague, ironically referred to her co-teacher as being like her “mother” instructionally. She appreciated her guidance and support immensely and together, they forged a strong philosophy and commitment to the program as she noted here:

We have a vision of how to work with kids, how to lift them up. So we both see this the same and the things that we see differently, we
complement one another well, and we respect one another a lot. So sometimes - but it’s always a job done together. I believe this is super important to move the program forward because it hasn’t been that this is my class and this is your class. For the kids, this sense of belonging has been super important.\textsuperscript{13}

During the second year of implementation, with a new interim principal and instructional coach at the helm, the DLE teachers continued to work closely and enjoyed having two new DLE colleagues in the 1\textsuperscript{st} grade teachers. The DLE team frequently met to discuss resources and plans, meanwhile the kindergarten DLE teachers noted improvement in their collaboration with colleagues on the kindergarten team. Fortunately, they had come to an understanding about the similarities and differences in their instructional programs. The 1\textsuperscript{st} grade DLE teachers had established a “line” so to speak early in their first year working with the grade level team and did not have to struggle through the same issues as the kindergarten team had during the first year of implementation as one co-researcher conveyed here:

From the beginning, we had a line, or that is to say, we were going to plan, to try to plan everything together except for the Spanish and the English parts. Then, from the beginning, go do what you’re doing in Spanish, follow the program you’re doing, Senderos, and we’ll try to

\textsuperscript{13} Tenemos una visión de cómo trabajar con los niños, como levantarlos. Entonces, las dos lo vemos igual y las cosas que vemos distintas, nos complementamos muy bien, y nos respetamos mucho. Entonces, a veces trance yo trance ella. Siempre un trabajo junta. Creo que es si es súper importante para sacar adelante el programa. Porque no ha sido mi clase, tu clase, y para los niños, este sentido de pertinencia ha sido súper importante.
work together on math, in everything else. It’s worked pretty well because we don’t have a lot of meetings. (laughter noted)\textsuperscript{14}

It is of interest to note that one member of the 1st grade DLE team is bicultural; she is Mexican-American, having grown up in the United States. Her ability to communicate and relate to American colleagues may be influenced as a result. Not only is she a fluent bilingual, speaking both languages with equal proficiency, but she also attended K-12 schools in the United States as well as the local university. Her experience interacting in English with European Americans quite likely has an effect on her ability to understand and be understood, as opposed to the other DLE teachers, who are not only culturally diverse (Spanish and Chilean), but also consider Spanish to be their dominant language.

\textbf{Relationships, collegiality, and trust between ESL and DLE teachers.} During the first year of implementation, the kindergarten DLE teachers faced challenges outside of the classroom. Both teachers struggled to understand the requirements and paperwork required to complete teacher certification in the United States. In addition, due to their lack of language proficiency and their culturally-diverse communication style, the teachers often experienced communication breakdowns with English-speaking colleagues. Thus, they were receptive to help and intervention, if you will, from the principal and instructional coach. The first year was particularly difficult as the ESL teachers’ sense of exclusion from the program grew and the DLE teachers’ perceptions

\textsuperscript{14} Pero, desde el principio, tuvimos como una línea, o de decir, vamos a planificar, trata de planificar, todas juntas excepto por la parte de español o la parte de inglés. Entonces, desde el principio dijeron Uds. vayan a hacer lo que Uds. vayan a hacer en el español, siguen el programa que están haciendo, Senderos, y tratamos de, de trabajar juntas en matemáticas, en todo lo demás. Y ha funcionado más o menos bien porque no tenemos muchas juntas (laughter noted).
of staff concerns developed. Turning inward to protect the program and their students, the teachers were happy to simply “follow the directives” of the principal, although in a co-researcher’s opinion, “he just kind of created a divide”. One of the ESL teachers noted that the DLE teachers “worked well together” but that she felt “pushed out” of the program due to the lack of time allowed for ESL and discouragement from the principal for others to get involved in the DLE classrooms. By the spring of that year, however, this principal and coach would be gone, however, and an interim principal and coach would take their places.

As the second year of implementation progressed, it became apparent that issues related to the formal plan for the DLE program would cause problems with collegial interaction and relationships amongst DLE and ESL teachers. The lack of interpersonal trust was particularly evident at occasional meetings throughout the year which were run by teachers and attended by the interim principal and coach. During the spring semester, ESL teachers in particular felt that it was absolutely necessary to formalize a plan and “build consensus among the staff of what we need to do”. DLE teachers, however, were wary of faculty meetings in which they often felt powerless and confused. One DLE teacher noted the following about the committee meetings that year:

Since it’s a school program, we want everyone to participate. It’s okay.

But it’s different than how (the former principal) ran things last year because he had a lot of knowledge and a lot of interest. Now it’s a lot of people that get together and we get disoriented because the original idea for the program has changed. It’s different. It’s complicated… But now
there are so many minds talking, it’s, it’s not better nor worse, it’s just
different.\textsuperscript{15}

In the focus group conversation, one of the DLE co-researchers agreed that the meetings
lacked coherence and understanding, noting that

there is something really strange to me, well, not strange but incredible,
that at this school we have so many people who are not, they’re not
against it, but they don’t educate themselves to know more about the
program, or they don’t know, or they just don’t want to know, I don’t
know, how good this program is or maybe they don’t want to see it. You
see at the meetings a lot of, I don’t know, ignorance…?\textsuperscript{16}

Of the five ESL teachers, only one seemed to note the discord felt by the DLE teachers
when she said,

So that’s definitely been challenging, the decision-making process. Um,
and of course, our immersion teachers are on our committee, and I think,
they feel like there’s a divide because they’re teaching this program and
everybody else is in this program, and so I think that’s been hard.

\textsuperscript{15}Como es un programa de la escuela y queremos que todos participen. Está bien. Pero es
muy diferente que a lo que lo llevaba S el año pasado porque tenía mucho conocimiento y
muchas ganas. Ahora es mucha gente – la que se junta - y a nosotras nos desorientan
porque la idea inicial que teníamos del programa ha cambiado. Es diferente. Es
complicado. Pero ahora que hay tantas mentes hablando – está, no es mejor ni peor
simplemente es diferente.

\textsuperscript{16}Pero hay algo que me hace tan raro, bueno no tan raro pero tan increíble que esta
escuela, que tengamos tantas personas que no están – no en contra pero no se educan a
saber que es este programa, no se educan o no saben o no quieren saber, no sé, de que tan
bien es este programa o quizás no la quieren ver, no sé. Se ven en las juntas, a veces se
ven mucha, no sé, ¿ignorancia?
Potential contributing factors to the communication breakdowns at these meetings will be discussed at a later point.

**Moral Purpose, Shared Values, and Vision**

In his seminal work on organizational leadership, Vaill (1989) refers to the alignment of one’s hopes and values with another’s as “purposing”. This sense that the members of a community have coalesced around something and that they are in agreement on what they are working toward and why is a critical component of any change effort (Donaldson, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1992). In this study, shared values and a sense of moral purpose were abundantly evident in all the co-researchers’ interviews. Though they differed on some of the finer points of how to bring about their hopes and dreams for their students, their mission was clear: they quite simply wanted what was best for the kids.

**Consensus regarding the DLE program.** One co-researcher defined the purpose for the DLE program eloquently, and even more beautifully in Spanish (see below), when she said, “Well, this program, although it isn’t their salvation, it’s a pathway.”\(^{17}\) Throughout the interviews and focus group session, it was clear that the co-researchers all believed that something different had to be done to help “our kids” and the DLE program would be a means to a better future. ESL teachers at the site were painfully aware that the school’s students were not faring well on state exams, particularly the ELLs, as one co-researcher described here:

\(^{17}\) Pues, este programa, aunque no es su salvación, es un camino.
Just the fact that our school is a persistently low performing school and
despite the fact that we have six, and now we’ll have seven ESL teachers
next year, what we are doing here is not effective. Our kids are not
performing up to state standards. We’re a focus school. Just that fact has
made us realize that we need to think outside of the box and try to find
what is best for our kids.

Data from across the nation made an impression on the teachers as well. In search of
better methods and programs for their students, several of the co-researchers and
colleagues attended professional development on ELLs in Indianapolis. One ESL
teacher was particularly struck by the data from a longitudinal study on ELLs in the
U.S.:

I think the biggest “Ah ha” was the charts saying that our kids are
failing. All these kids you’ve been teaching for the last 15+ years,
they’re dropping out, they’re failing, you’ve seen them. You’ve seen
them – you know that they’re not in school or they’re having babies
already and I think we knew in the back of our heads…yes, they are
failing and we need to change something.

This drive to find a better program, or pathway, if you will, led the teachers to quickly
latch on to the grant opportunity to begin a program that emphasized literacy in the
native language as a bridge to literacy in English.

The idea that what they were doing “hadn’t produced the results we wanted” was
echoed throughout interviews with ESL teachers. One teacher pondered the issue of
literacy in general and the possibility that a major part of the problem for ELLs was their lack of literacy in their first language:

We knew that they needed the English to perform better on state testing…The problem that we were having was the kids getting into 3rd and 4th and 5th grade and it was consistent, they were not native-like in either language. So we were like, “We kind of need to build both at the same time.”

The original vision for the program also incorporated a long-term plan to have DLE students continue developing literacy in both languages through the high school years. Other elementary DLE programs in the area that served native speakers of English had established a K-12 model in which students continued developing academic Spanish language proficiency through secondary math and science instruction in a district “magnet” program. The power and promise of a longitudinal program such as this gave the teachers great hope for the future. However, despite the former principal’s assurances that this had been arranged, the teachers found out after his departure that “the district has never heard of that and these kids will not go” to that high school. Very disappointed that this would not work out for their students, one ESL teacher commented,

That’s really scary and sad, but I don’t want to drop them in 6th grade.

That’s a big negative for me. If we don’t have a place for them and we should, we should fight that…because you don’t see what’s so awesome about it, all things being equal, until you compare kids that stay in (DLE)
programs through high school. You don’t see that big blossoming off until middle school and high school.

Despite the discrepancies in their beliefs regarding how to make the vision a reality, the ESL and DLE teachers were in complete agreement about the purpose: to do something different and to build a bridge to a brighter future for these kids through DLE. As one ESL teacher stated,

That’s my hope. That’s my big hope – that we can sustain this program and that it can be effective and that we can show (our) county and Kentucky that this type of program can be effective. I mean, we have to start thinking outside of the box. ELLs are our biggest gap group. What we’re doing – other strategies that we’ve tried – have not been effective.

**Differing elements of co-researchers’ sense of moral purpose, shared values, and vision for the DLE program.** Clearly, the ESL teachers involved in the adoption and initiation of the DLE program agreed on a mission to improve long-term outcomes for their students. Throughout the interviews, the discussion of the data and what it meant in terms of academic achievement was prevalent. This was also an important point for DLE teachers, this notion that

this is an opportunity for these children, for getting them ahead. It’s the opportunity for them to be career-ready which is so important in this culture. It’s a little different in our countries. But no matter what country
we’re from, we have to prepare them for being here. They must be prepared for that river they still must cross.\textsuperscript{18}

Metaphorically speaking of the river that separated the two cultures, languages, and worlds in which the children lived, this co-researcher and others displayed a strong sensibility for the sociolinguistic challenges faced by immigrants in the U.S. Though they were focused on improved academic outcomes for their students, there was another layer to the moral purposes shared by the DLE teachers as opposed to the American ESL teachers.

In individual interviews and the focus group session, DLE teachers conveyed a profound concern for the self-esteem, cultural identity, and well-being of the children. One of the DLE teachers reflected on the stress felt by monolingual Spanish-speaking students in the regular classrooms and the differences she sees in DLE students receiving instruction in Spanish,

I was here that first year, and I saw the kids in kindergarten, lost. I see them now (in DLE kindergarten) and it’s like, “Quiet! Get quiet for a second!” And yes, I see a very, very important change…They are happy, they are sure of themselves, they don’t look so scared…And now a looseness. It’s very good; they’re in their comfort zone.\textsuperscript{19}

\textsuperscript{18} Esto es la oportunidad para estos niños, de ponerse a la altura. Es la oportunidad para ellos para estar, en esta cultura, es bien importante estar career ready, que a lo mejor en nuestros países es un poco diferente. Pero independiente de que sean nuestros países, hay que prepararlos para estar acá. Hay que prepararlos para el río que le falta nadar.

\textsuperscript{19} Yo estuve aquí el primer año, y veía a los niños en kinder, perdidos, los veo ahora y es, “¡Calla! ¡Calla un rato!” Y sí, veo un cambio muy, muy importante…Se les ve felices, se
Another teacher, very pensive and reflective after sharing several handwritten notes from parents regarding the DLE program, poignantly stated:

Many of them speak of, well, a better future and not forgetting their roots, being able to communicate with their family, and I believe that it really shows the fact that they feel considered, well not considered, valued. And the feeling that they don’t have to forget who they are just because they are here. I’ve told you about when we were in Elgin for our very first trip and I saw a banner in the school that said, “A child should not have to lose the first language to learn another” and this struck me profoundly because losing your language is losing your roots, losing the connection to your parents, your grandparents, your aunts and uncles and there’s nothing to keep you connected. This fight to be American, when you cut yourself off from everything. When you can be…? I always say, we have the good fortune of having the best of both worlds (audible consensus around table). We can choose.20

20 Muchos de ellos hablan de que, bueno, un mejor futuro y no perder sus raíces, poder comunicarse con su familia, y yo creo que eso es súper valeroso del hecho de que ellos se sienten considerados, no considerados, valorados. Y el sentido de que no tienen que olvidar quienes son por estar acá. Yo te he comentado que cuando estuvimos en Elgin el primer, primer viaje y vi en la escuela una bandera que dice “Un niño no debería perder su idioma para aprender otro” y a mí llego tan profundamente eso porque al perder el idioma es perder sus raíces, perder la conexión con sus padres, con sus abuelos, con sus tíos y se transforman en nada. Esta lucha por querer ser americano, cuando cortando todo esto acá. Cuando podemos ser, …? Yo siempre te digo, tenemos la bendición de tener lo mejor de los dos mundos. (consensus around table) Puede elegir.
Recognizing, maintaining, and celebrating children’s cultural identities is inextricably intertwined with the language of instruction and the culture of the teacher, in the DLE teachers’ opinions. The teachers commented on the negative effects that could proceed from reducing the amount of Spanish used during the school day or the hiring of a teacher who is not of Hispanic origin. As opposed to the ESL teachers, the DLE teachers communicated a dual vision with emphasis on academic achievement and a focus on the ethnic identity of students for, in the words of one of the DLE teachers: “Now the family, the reunion of the family, the reassessment of the language, the culture of who I am as a Latino. This is part of what we are doing. It is an enormous job.”

**Action-in-Common and Professionalism**

The third stream, action-in-common, stems from the belief that collective action, based on strong relationships and shared values, can and should result in progress for the school (Donaldson, 2006). Sergiovanni (2007) described professionalism as an attribute of school leaders that derives from a sense of obligation and commitment to the work they do with children. This drive to create change is often facilitated through committee work or professional learning communities. However, Fullan (2000) warns that one of the main enemies of education reform is overload and fragmentation, a problem that the study site certainly encountered and continues to face.

**Collective action during the adoption and planning year.** As described in the emplotment section, teacher leaders were the driving force in the campaign to start a new program for the school. Supported by the interim principal and encouraged by the grant opportunity from KDE, ESL teachers at the school “really got interested in it and decided let’s really try this and see what we can do”. Another ESL teacher on the grant-
writing team stated that soon after “our leadership had changed and it was time to actually implement it, we wrote another grant for the implementation that next year and so it evolved”. This phase passed by very quickly for the teacher leaders as they conducted research, attended professional development on DLE, and made plans for implementation while simultaneously going about the business of providing instruction to students on a daily basis. One of the co-researchers, who had been away on maternity leave during a portion of the planning phase remarked on the rapidity of the initiative by saying,

When I came back it was just full-fledged. I thought, “We’re doing it! This is awesome!” So, I don’t know, it came really quick I guess, thinking back on it. Wow – we started this really fast. But, I also feel like I was part of the research and I understand the background of it.

**Collective action during the implementation years.** The spirit of teamwork and collegiality amongst teacher leaders that pervaded the planning year was not as prevalent during the implementation years. Challenges related to administrative intervention and then turnover ultimately led to a schism between ESL and DLE teachers. As mentioned previously, a formal plan had never been created, or if it had, it had never been shared outside of the principal’s office. One ESL teacher reflected on the mysterious nature of the formal plan regarding implementation issues such as student recruitment, resources, language percentage, etc., by saying, “I know these things existed. I mean, I know we were doing these things and I’m sure other teachers helped with other things…In my opinion, it had to be somewhere.”
However, “the ball was dropped” when the principal and coach left abruptly during the first year of implementation and teachers were left to carry on. When differences of opinion arose regarding how to run the program, there was no plan to fall back on; this resulted in many months of mistrust and skepticism. DLE teachers were steadfast in their belief that the program was “always planned for it to be 90/10”\textsuperscript{21}, with approximately 90% of the instruction to be delivered in Spanish in kindergarten. The DLeNM consultant that visited had recommended this according to the DLE teachers, but ESL teachers only recalled his recommendation that the staff come to some agreement about instructional language use as the plan progressed through the years. Regardless of whether they would ever really know if a formal plan existed, it became clear in the second year of implementation that they needed to move toward creating one.

Spurred by recommendation from the interim principal that the DLE committee reconvene, DLE and ESL teachers began to test the tumultuous waters of making decisions about program delivery during the second year of implementation. This renewed effort to work collectively had mixed results. Many ESL teachers who had previously felt “shut out” of the program’s development, were glad to be part of the planning again. One co-researcher commented,

\begin{quote}
I feel that many of our teachers, I know I can speak for myself – I’m excited about the program. I feel, I believe that this program is what is right for our school and I will support it however I can and I’m willing to
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{21} siempre planeamos el programa como 90/10
jump back in there and help out in any way that I can to get it going again.

Another ESL teacher referred to the confusion over the existence of a long-range plan as “a mess” but was relieved that “it’s coming back together”. At this point, the coresearcher said it was critical to focus on decisions that we didn’t anticipate, like what do you do with kids who need special education? What about kids who need speech services? I just, we didn’t think about those things before we started this and so, those decisions are harder to make now because we’re in the middle of it.

ESL teachers, in an effort to be inclusive and transparent, encouraged any interested teachers to attend the meetings and be “part of the team”.

DLE teachers, on the other hand, did not view the revival of the committee in such a positive light. Concern was expressed throughout their individual interviews and focus group session that the ESL teachers were placing undue emphasis on increasing the amount of English use in DLE classrooms. The DLE teachers, committed to establishing “solid Spanish and then solid English” worried that decreasing the amount of Spanish used for instructional purposes would have negative long-term effects on the students’ developing literacy skills. Reflecting an understanding of dual language philosophy, one coresearcher stated, “The fact that they are learning Spanish first does not mean that they are not going to learn English. It means that they are going to learn it...

22 Sacar el español sólido y después el inglés sólido.
Referring to built-up frustration with communicating with her English-speaking colleagues, one DLE teacher said,

It’s very difficult. So, because there are a lot of people talking and their main worry is that the kids aren’t going to learn English, we don’t know how to tell them that the kids know English. My kids know, they can communicate in English. They have specials in English. They are surrounded by English and they have ESL classes. They know English. Sometimes even more than I do after studying it for 20 years.

Despite the lack of consensus between the two groups of teachers, the decision was announced by the interim principal that the 2nd grade DLE classrooms would be 50/50 for the upcoming school year. DLE teachers foresaw this imminent decision; they frequently felt powerless in situations such as these when their voices were outnumbered. Potential explanations for this power differential will be discussed in the next section on emerging themes regarding cross-cultural confusions.

Emergent Themes Regarding Cross-cultural Confusions

From its onset, this study was intended to be an exploration of teacher leadership as related to a change effort for ELLs. Through narrative inquiry and a heuristic lens, ample data emerged to support analysis of streams or substitutes for school leadership.

23 El hecho que están aprendiendo español primero no significa que no van a aprender el inglés. Significa que lo van a aprender mejor.
24 Es muy difícil. Por eso, porque hay mucha gente hablando y su principal preocupación es que los niños no van a aprender el inglés. No sabemos cómo decirles que los niños saben inglés. Mis niños ahora saben, pueden comunicarse en inglés. Tienes las especialidades en inglés. Viven en un torno en inglés y tienen clases de ESL. Ellos saben inglés. A veces, algunos más que yo, que llevo 20 años estudiándolo.
Also, the teachers’ lived stories about the development of the program allowed for development of a chronology from adoption through the second year of implementation. The unexpected element, however, that emerged via interviews, conversations, and the focus group session was that the co-researchers were experiencing cross-cultural confusions at the work site, a factor which likely impacted the relationships, collegiality, and ability to work collectively.

Theories regarding cross-cultural confusions (Delpit, 2006) and dimensions of cultural continua (Lustig & Koester, 2013; Lynch & Hanson, 2013) provide the framework for understanding the underlying meaning of the emerging themes. Cultural themes were explored using in vivo codes that are first presented in their original form, i.e., Spanish with an immediate translation to English. The reason for presenting the Spanish first is to maintain the authenticity and pragmatic power of the statement. Pragmatic and sociolinguistic functions of language have been well documented through theoretical and empirical work (Levinson, 2000; Robinson, 2003) and the inherent messages communicated through the co-researchers’ comments play a role in understanding how this initiative evolved.

**Emergent Theme 1: Individualism Versus Collectivism and Related In Vivo Codes**

One of the critical components of Hofstede’s (2011) cultural taxonomy, developed after a longitudinal meta-analysis of IBM employees from more than 70 countries, is individualism versus collectivism. This dimension refers to group members’ preference for a loose social framework in which emphasis is on individuality and independence; self-image in individualistic cultures is defined in terms of “I”. Collectivist cultures, on the other hand, are characterized by loyalty to the group; a “we”
consciousness is evident at this end of the continuum (Lynch & Hanson, 2013).

According to Hofstede’s (2011) research, the United States is one of the most highly
dividualistic countries in the world whereas many Spanish-speaking countries, and
subsequently Hispanic cultures, are highly collectivist.

Various comments made during interviews and the focus group session reflect
this cultural continuum, particularly as relates to the role of the family in the lives of the
DLE students. Interestingly, the topic of the family rarely came up in conversations with
the American ESL teachers who all identify as European American. Family was,
however, frequently mentioned in the interviews conducted in Spanish despite the fact
that the questions asked of the co-researchers were very similar. Following are in vivo
codes that emerged regarding the cultural dimension of individualism versus
collectivism, particularly as relates to family and care of the child.

**In vivo code: “La confianza de las familias” (The confidence of the families).**

In response to a coresearcher’s heartfelt reflection on what language maintenance could
mean for these children, one DLE teacher added, “Now parents understand the concept
that if they learn from what they know, it is much easier.”25 As their confidence with the
program’s mission grew, she recognized that families became much more involved. In
contrast, the co-researcher shared, Spanish-speaking parents of children in the regular
program were not as participatory. An ESL teacher confirmed this in response to my
question about what she has noticed in terms of family involvement.

---

25 Ya los padres tienen entendido el concepto de que si ellos aprenden desde de lo que
conocen, es mucho más fácil enseñarles cualquier otra cosa.
I think you’ve hit on a huge positive. They are so much more involved! They’ve done a phenomenal job of bringing families in and just, oh, walking around the school building, they seem much more comfortable, but it’s not that that isn’t going on in other rooms, but that has quadrupled in those classrooms.

At the end of the second year of implementation, DLE teachers received an outpouring of support and commendation after requesting notes that could be shared at the twentieth anniversary celebration of the immersion programs in the county. The handwritten notes were written on festive paper with this prompt at the top: “The best part of the Spanish Immersion / Lo mejor de la inmersión en español”. One of the parents responded, “The idea of reading books with a different theme on a daily basis is great! I love this activity because I can read to my child and she also practices her reading every day. Many thanks for the books.” The simple act of sending books home in the family’s language enabled parents to take a more active part in their child’s education; their gratitude and sense of efficacy was evident in many notes.

**In vivo code: “La reunión de la familia” (The reunion of the family).**

According to Lily Wong-Fillmore (2000), an expert on the education of language minority students, primary language loss can lead to a breakdown in communication and deteriorating family relations for immigrant children. The assimilation process has a profound impact on ELLs who sense the lower status of their home language through

---

26 ¡La idea de leer libros diariamente con tema diferente es genial! Me encanta esta actividad porque puedo leerle a mi hija y también que ella practique su lectura cada día. Muchas gracias por los libros.
societal messages and the absence of their language and culture at school (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez Orozco, 2009). One of the co-researchers reflected on the negative effects of language loss by saying,

For the families, it has been… Well, the kids here lose their language and this is, they can’t communicate with their extended families in Mexico and they can’t even communicate with their parents. And they begin to disfavor their roots and this is heartbreaking.\textsuperscript{27}

The co-researcher continued, then, with a story of hope for the family through shared literacy experiences in the home language:

We have a little library here and books go home every day and a mom, at the last parent-teacher conference, told me, “Teacher, thank you so much for the books because my older child, who also took classes here, cannot read in Spanish. Nevertheless, Alex comes home with his book and it is so important for us to sit together as a family and read the kindergarten book and Alex reads it. And when his father comes home from work, we eat dinner and again the book that Alex has brought from kinder, the family gathers together to read the book.” This has produced a reunion of the family unit and for this, we are happy.\textsuperscript{28}

\textsuperscript{27} En el lado familiar, ha sido… Bueno, los niños aquí pierden su idioma y eso es, no saben comunicar con sus ancestros o sus familias en México y no se pueden comunicar aunque con sus padres. Y empiezan a desfavorecer sus raíces y eso es “heartbreaking”.

\textsuperscript{28} Nosotras tenemos una pequeña biblioteca y van libros todos los días a la casa con libros y una mama, en la última conferencia, me dijo, “Maestra, tantas gracias por los libros… porque mi hijo mayor, también hizo clases aquí pero él no sabe leer en español. Sin embargo, llega Alex a casa con su libro y es tan importante para nosotros que se junta
The lack of stories about DLE students’ families from the ESL teachers may be due to factors such as communication barriers and cultural differences. However, the role of cultural identity – individualism and collectivism – likely figured into the emphasis placed on family by the DLE teachers in their interviews.

**In vivo code: “Falta de empatía (Lack of empathy).** Not surprisingly, individualistic cultures highly value independence and individuality in children. This belief that children should become self-sufficient at a relatively early age often leads to a lower level of nurturance in highly individualistic cultures such as European American. Latino cultures, on the other hand, tend to be more nurturing and affectionate toward children, placing less emphasis on independence and self-sufficiency in the early years. Affectivity, the showing of emotion, also highly varies according to cultural orientation, with collectivist cultures tending to display their emotions and care more openly. In the context of this study, this cultural dimension was evident in the amount of discussion that centered on the children’s level of comfort and well-being in the classroom and the value and quantity of Spanish language use.

One of the DLE co-researchers shared her opinion that their colleagues were not fully aware of the challenges faced by second language speakers, saying during the focus group session, “English is the universal language and the transition, the necessity. I think there is a lack of empathy for how hard it can be for others.”29 One of her colleagues quickly added, “Yes, I think you really don’t get it unless you speak two...
languages.”

It clearly was a source of pride for the DLE teachers that their students felt safe and content in their classrooms because they could understand and participate. Reflecting on how hard this can be for little ones, one of the kindergarten teachers shared this story:

I have students, especially the ones that were here for preK last year, they were in an English classroom and one of the preK teachers said to me, “Does he talk?” and I said, “He doesn’t stop talking!” And last year he didn’t talk at all. I said, “Sure. You were speaking in English. He was like, “Aaarghh!” It’s madness. They were teaching the letters in English – everything in English – and that’s fine if they can sing the songs and move around, but if not, they just sit there like little pieces of furniture.

The empathy that the DLE teachers felt as ELLs themselves fueled their sense of moral purpose to educate students in the home language. Being able to relate and comfort their young students as they adjusted to school was important to these early childhood educators. As one of the DLE teachers said,

The first experience in school is so important because it gives you the vision of how, the impression of what school is like, you form it from.

---

30 Sí, creo que realmente no la entiendan si no hablas dos lenguas.
31 Yo tengo los niños, especialmente los niños que el año pasado estaban en prekinder, estaban en inglés y una de las maestras me decía, “¿Habla?” y yo digo, “No calla.” Y el año pasado no hablaba nada. Y digo, “Claro. Estabas hablando en inglés. Estabas como “Aaaahh!” Es locura. Les estaba enseñando las letras en inglés – todo en inglés – está muy bien y ellos pueden cantar las canciones y moverse pero ellos si no, se quedan allí como mueblecitos.
Emergent Theme 2: High- and Low-Context Communication Patterns and Related In Vivo Codes

Cultures vary in the amount of meaning communicated in context versus words. The continuum of high- and low-context communication patterns is a hallmark of Hall’s (1976) cultural taxonomy and addresses where the burden of meaning falls in communicative exchanges. In high context cultures, the burden is on the listener to understand the meaning; nonverbal cues and contextual details such as where it was said, the circumstances in which it was said, and to whom it was said are critical (Zaharna, 2000). Japanese, African American, and Latino cultures all tend toward the high-context end of this continuum. In low context cultures, such as European American, the message is expected to be communicated explicitly and overtly. The burden of meaning is on the speaker. When participants in a conversation differ in the amount of context used to communicate, misunderstandings or communication breakdowns may be a result (Lynch & Hanson, 2013).

As described earlier, communication between ESL and DLE teachers was not going well during the second year of implementation. Members from both groups shared stories of confusion or concern about coming to a shared understanding. Following are in vivo codes that emerged during the interviews and focus group that demonstrate the

32 La primera experiencia en la escuela es tan importante porque te da la visión de cómo, la impresión de lo que es la escuela, la formas de allí. Entonces el hecho de que ellos se sienten seguros y contentos porque pueden entender. Yo creo que eso hace muchísimo.
possibility that cultural differences, such as high- and low-context communication patterns, may have been had a negative impact on intergroup relations.

**In vivo code: “La misma sensación” (The same feeling).** Of the four DLE teachers, all are very proficient in English with one being a full bilingual, i.e., a native-like speaker of both languages. The lack of native-like fluency for the majority of the group and the feeling of diminished power often affected their motivation and ability to participate in committee meanings run by ESL teachers. One of the DLE teachers had the following story to tell about how she often felt at such meetings. Not only does her comment reflect her empathy for her students, but also the clash of high-context and low-context speakers.

> When the kids - it’s not that they’re stupid, it’s that they can’t talk. It’s not that they aren’t intelligent. It’s that they can’t talk. Personally, it’s what I feel a lot of the time, when we’re in a big group with our colleagues and they start taking in English and they’re talking fast about their data and their acronyms and they’re all, “Bee chee bu chi toochi too” and I say, “I’m not saying anything” and I feel dumb. So this the feeling the kids get, the feeling of being in this environment. Personally I feel like I’m just not going to talk because I might stick my foot in my mouth. I’m not going to say anything because I don’t know anything. And that’s how it is for the little guys, it’s the same feeling.33

---

33 Cuando los niños - no es que sean estúpidos, es que no pueden hablar, no es que no son inteligentes, no es que no pueden. Yo personalmente es lo que siento muchas veces, cuando estamos en un grupo grande, con otras compañeras, y empiezan a hablar en todo inglés, y están hablando rápido de sus datos, sus siglas, porque hablan en todo “Bi chi bu
The use of acronyms, data, and detailed language is characteristic of low-context communication, particularly in the workplace. The dominance of this communication style affected another DLE teacher as well who commented,

It feels like there are very few voices sometimes and sometimes lots of voices, but they’re not saying anything. At times one feels a little intimidated because they don’t let you talk and they don’t know how to communicate. With some colleagues, if they haven’t had this experience, it’s very difficult to try to understand another, the point of view of another person.\footnote{Se sienten muy poquitas voces de veces y a veces muchas voces y no dicen nada. A veces se siente intimidado un poquito porque no dejan hablar y no saben comunicarse. Con algunas compañeras, que no se podían, si no tienen esta experiencia, es muy difícil de tratar de entenderle a otra persona, a otra, el punto de vista de la persona.}

The ESL teachers, for the most part, were either unaware of or unsympathetic to the DLE teachers’ confusion. Only one indicated she understood the feeling of being left out of communication when she shared, “I’m trying to learn Spanish, just for conversational purposes, for families, because I think that’s such a key piece and that’s what we’re left out of. That’s what we’re cut out of, so that means everything.”

**In vivo code: Las rápidas / The fast ones.** Communication in high-context cultures is often very specific and intentional. Speakers not only want to clearly state their case, but they do not leave much to the interpretation of the listener (Lustig & Koester, 2013). As members of a collective culture that is characterized by a “we”
consciousness, DLE teachers were more concerned with coming to a respectful consensus on issues than with getting decisions made quickly. In more than one instance, DLE teachers referred to American teachers in the school as las rápidas, the fast ones, in reference to their style of communication and decision-making.

In the following exchange amongst DLE teachers during the focus group session, their self-deprecating humor made it clear that they were aware of the difference in their intragroup relations.

DLE teacher A: But you know how there are always fast people at every workplace? We aren’t very fast. (laughter) When we try to do something, we always go 7-8 steps forward and then a few steps backward.

DLE teacher B: They think what? But we’ve already decided.

DLE teacher A: But no one told us! (laughter) It always passes us by. When we try to do something, we take our time. What do you think? You and you and you?

DLE teacher B: It’s because we want to do things in a considerate, peaceful way that will be beneficial.

DLE teacher A: But there are always people who move on ahead and make the decision for the rest.35

Though this exchange portrays the situation in a humorous light, the reality for the DLE teachers, who were heavily invested and committed to their work with the children, was quite difficult at times. One DLE teacher felt that no one had taken the time to understand her or the program as she conveyed here:

I get tongue-tied talking in English, even more so when there are people saying, “What? What did you mean?” I want to say so many things and that, “Come see us work. Come inside our walls, come see our kids, ask them questions”, but when there are so many people talking, it’s like, “Okay, what do you want? Okay.” (quiet, contrite voice) Yes, if I don’t speak as well as they do, I feel it. And I think that the more nervous I get, I start to get like this (angry voice) and it comes out badly. I’m not able to say it, I can’t get my point across, so I’m quiet.36

The cross-cultural confusions that resulted from differing cultural orientation and communication style influenced the way these groups of teachers interacted, for the most part having a negative impact on intergroup relationships and collective action.

---

36 Quiero decir tantas cosas y que, “Vengáis a vernos trabajar. Venir dentro de nuestras paredes, venir a ver nuestros niños, preguntarles, pero cuando hay tanta gente hablando – tal vez – es como, “Okay, what do you want? Okay.” Sí, yo no hablo igual, no me siento. Y yo creo que, además que me pongo tan nerviosa que me pongo así, me sale mal. No puedo hablarlo, no puedo transmitirlo y me callo.
Summary

This chapter explored the stories and lived experiences of the eight teacher leaders involved in the adoption and implementation of a new instructional program for ELLs at their school. First the stories were placed in chronological order, using a narrative inquiry technique called emplotment (Czarniawska, 2004). Although the stories told by the co-researchers did not necessarily unfold in a sequential manner during the interviews, it was my role as an interviewer and participant researcher to put it into understandable order. A heuristic viewpoint allowed me to then explore theoretical and emerging themes in the data. A discussion of the experiences of the teacher leaders in regards to two complementary theories of school leadership (Donaldson, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1992) was illustrated by stories and excerpts from the co-researchers’ interviews. The chapter culminated with the investigation of emerging themes regrading cultural confusions and cultural dimensions that derived from coding and creative synthesis of the data (Moustakas, 1994). In the following chapter, I will use these theoretical and emerging themes to discuss implications for researchers and practitioners.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter will provide a summary of the study’s purpose, the methodological approach, and its key findings. The summary is followed by discussion and interpretation of the findings as well as their relationship to the literature base on dual language education (DLE), school leadership theory, and intercultural communication. The chapter will conclude with recommendations for practice and future research.

Summary of the Study

English Language Learners (ELLs) represent the fastest growing subgroup in American public schools, yet they are persistently underachieving (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). Of particular concern is the data that reflects disproportionately high dropout rates and low college-completion rates for ELLs (Olsen, 2014). Despite significant expansion of federal and state policy on accountability and standards-based practices for ELLs, the achievement gap between Spanish-speaking ELLs and their White non-Hispanics has continued to widen over several decades (Hakuta, 2011; Ladson-Billings, 2006; National Center for Education Statistics, 2015). In 2006, the National Literacy Panel (August & Shanahan, 2006) produced a report synthesizing hundreds of research studies on the education of language minority youth. One of the primary findings of this report was that ELLs who develop oral proficiency and literacy in their first language through the provision of bilingual instruction perform better academically throughout the K-12 years (August, Shanahan, & Escamilla, 2009).

The purpose of this study was to explore the phenomenon of teacher leadership and the personal and contextual factors that influenced the process of adopting and
implementing a dual language education (DLE) program for ELLs in Kentucky, the first of its kind in the state (A. De Torres Nuñez, personal communication, January 24, 2016). This exploratory study utilized narrative inquiry techniques through a heuristic lens. This melded approach allowed the researcher to investigate the lived experiences of the teacher leaders through their stories while also bringing to the fore personal and professional experiences with the phenomenon. Though no specific research questions were addressed, the data were analyzed for evidence of school leadership streams or substitutes (Donaldson, 2006; Sergiovanni, 1992) as well as for emerging themes that elucidated the impact of cross-cultural confusions amongst teachers.

Methodology

According to Czarniawska (2004), one of the strengths of narrative inquiry is its ability to uncover the lived reality of co-researchers through the deconstruction of their stories. Rather than emphasize the validity or reliability of the data, Czarniawska advocates that the researcher and audience ask: Is it relevant? Is it interesting? Is it beautiful? Through the establishment of an account, or “emplotment” in Czarniawska’s terms, the researcher reveals the unfolding storyline and its various complexities and revelations. Riessman (2008) recommends a thematic approach to narrative inquiry that involves attentive listening and later, close reading of the data to uncover the messages or themes within participants’ stories. Lastly, Pinnegar and Daynes (2006) state that narrative methods have experiential starting points that are informed by the literature and intertwined with theory throughout the inquiry process. The methodology of this study incorporated elements of these approaches to narrative inquiry in order to explore the storied lives of the participants and the phenomenon at hand.
Moustakas (2014) suggests that the heuristic researcher brings a “wondering gaze” to the research and immerses himself in not only the collection and analysis of the data, but the very experience itself. Throughout the process of studying the phenomenon, the researcher is involved in self-dialogue and self-discovery in an effort to creatively synthesize the how and the what, i.e., the essence, of the phenomenon. Through the use of an open-ended approach that involves conversational interviews and empathic listening, Moustakas (1994) believes that heuristic researchers allow the process to unfold in its own way.

Thus, this study is an example of qualitative “bricolage”, an approach that enabled the researcher to design a study that corresponded to its purpose (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005; Maxwell, 2013). Due to my personal experience as a dual language educator and a teacher leader who collaborated at the site for years, I approached the collection of stories with a heuristic perspective; the conversations that occurred involved responsive, reflective questioning and discussion between the co-researchers and researcher. Data from documents, interview transcripts, and memos were analyzed and coded to establish a chronology and to explore themes in two primary categories: theoretical and emergent.

**Discussion of Findings Regarding School Leadership Theory**

Theories on school leadership streams (Donaldson, 2006) and substitutes (Sergiovanni, 1992) for school leadership were used to frame the exploration of the phenomenon of teacher leadership in this study. These complementary frameworks were organized in three categories: (a) relationships, collegiality, and trust; (b) moral purpose, shared values, and vision; and (c) collective action and professionalism.
Relationships, Collegiality, and Trust

The data revealed that close relationships and collegiality were present, but within separate groups for the most part. ESL teachers collaborated closely with one another, particularly during the adoption phase while DLE teachers displayed close relationships and trust during the implementation phase. Unfortunately, the teachers did not collaborate well across the two groups. Willingness to “shape and be shaped” (Donaldson, 2006, p. 53) requires high levels of trust and strong relationships; this level of trust was found to exist amongst ESL teachers and amongst DLE teachers, but unfortunately, not across the two groups. The chronological emplotment of the teachers’ stories demonstrated that during the adoption phase, ESL teachers worked together as friends and colleagues while collaborating on the grant applications for the planning and implementation years. Similarly, DLE teachers collaborated closely during the two years of implementation, depending on one another for support with daily planning and classroom management. DLE teachers also developed functional collegiality, albeit not close relationships, with non-DLE colleagues on their grade level teams during the second year of implementation.

Collegiality and trust faltered, however, in the realm of relationships between the ESL and DLE teams. Despite their common ground in terms of values and goals for their students, these two groups of teachers struggled to agree on many important issues such as language use and identification of children with learning disabilities. During the first year of implementation, the findings showed that the lack of collegiality amongst teachers may have been due to over-involvement of the principal and instructional coach. Relationships and communication across the groups did not improve during the second
year of implementation. Although the principal and coach left abruptly in the spring of the previous year, the teacher leaders continued to experience communication breakdowns when meeting as a committee which will be discussed in depth at a later point.

According to Donaldson (2006), the relational stream is the most important of the three streams and requires openness, trust, and commitment. In order for school leadership to thrive, Donaldson states, “the relationships among the school’s members must be sufficiently strong to withstand the stresses and to seize the opportunities the school will encounter” (p. 67). Though the data showed that collegial relationships were in place within the teacher groups and played an important role at various stages of the DLE program’s evolution, the relationships were not consistently strong across groups. True school communities, according to Sergiovanni (2007), have an ethos of support and collegiality. It must, however, be a give and take for “teachers have the right to expect help and support from other teachers when they need it; they are also obliged to give the same” (Sergiovanni, 2007, p. 93).

Strong networks defined by collegiality and shared division of labor have been found to be effective in change initiatives. According to Heller and Firestone (1995), change functions are often performed redundantly by different members of a team. At the study site, various people indeed performed a variety of functions during the process of adopting and implementing the program. However, these change functions were dictated for a time by the principal and coach and then left abruptly to the teachers upon their departure. Teachers were frustrated with the lack of a formal plan and attempted to address this through committee work. However, the lack of strong relationships across
groups and interdependent cooperation stymied their efforts. Printy and Marks (2006) state that a moderate degree of tension between teacher autonomy and administrative supervision is healthy for a school. In this study, administrative supervision vacillated from one extreme to the other, ultimately creating a planetary and relatively unhealthy environment for collaboration.

Unfortunately, teacher groups at the site struggled to perform effectively as a unified team. According to Pettigrew (2004)’s discussion of intergroup contact, “attainment of the groups’ common goals should be an interdependent effort without intergroup competition” (p. 772). Though the teacher groups did profess the common goal of improving academic outcomes for their students, they disagreed on many points. This disagreement ultimately created miscommunication and friction which was exacerbated by cross-cultural communication confusion, an emergent theme that will be discussed at a later point.

**Moral Purpose, Shared Values, and Vision**

The teachers in the study reflected a strong sense of moral purpose, shared values and vision, making this the most salient stream of school leadership for the co-researchers. Data from the individual interviews and focus group demonstrated that teachers were united in their mission to improve academic outcomes for students at the school. It was resoundingly clear that all the teachers cared very much for the school’s ELLs and agreed that a change was needed to make a difference in their academic performance and outcomes. Co-researchers from both the ESL group and the DLE group expressed a vision for the future that emphasized long term participation in a DLE program with the ultimate goal of biliteracy and positive academic achievement.
Blase (2006) refers to teachers as an “organizational citizenship”, strongly motivated by moral purpose and compelled to make a difference in the lives of children. Sergiovanni (2007) describes this quality of leadership in his discussion of “servant leadership” which is characterized by those who lead by outrage. There was indeed this sense of mission, motivation, and even mild outrage in the teachers who came together to explore the DLE initiative in the early years. Determined to find a program that would make a difference for their students, they moved forward to adopt the program with little consistent support from school and district administrators. A co-researcher described it well when she referred to the teachers’ “courage of conviction”.

Where the vision diverged for these two groups, however, was in regards to the cultural identity and sense of well-being for the students. DLE teachers strongly believed that the program served a dual purpose – to prepare the kids academically and to maintain their identities as Latinos. DLE teachers spoke frequently of the important role of the families and the extensive feedback that they had received regarding how grateful parents were to be able to connect, read, and interact with their child and his/her teachers. The importance of the family and cultural identity was discussed very little by ESL teachers.

Clearly, teaching and learning is a linguistic activity, but according to Gay (2000), there is much more at stake here, for "language is incredibly powerful and diverse; it identifies and humanizes, and gives cultures, ideas, and thoughts the capacity to speak" (p. 76). DLE teachers served as cultural and linguistic mediators as their students learned to function in a foreign land; their empathy for and understanding of the complex experiences that immigrants face was evident in their discussions. Though ESL teachers
realized that instructional use of Spanish would help the school’s ELLs succeed academically, they did not seem to comprehend the impact of the cultural component.

DLE teachers believed DLE to be a linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogy, one that was essential to the children’s well-being and future. As one of the co-researchers beautifully said, “Although we can’t say this program is their salvation, it is a pathway”. Various studies exploring the academic outcomes for ELLs in DLE support this claim. Not only have such studies demonstrated the positive academic impact that DLE has on immigrant learners, but the literature also puts forth the concept that maintaining the home language has tremendous socioemotional import for the children as well (August & Shanahan, 2009; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005; Gutierrez, 2005; Hakuta, 2011; Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001; Reese, Jensen, & Ramirez, 2014). Culturally responsive pedagogies such as DLE affirm and celebrate the language and culture of students, leading to what Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (2009) call a “bicultural style” of adaptation. This adaptive style allows children to maintain their cultural and familial identity while navigating the linguistic and cultural terrain of a diverse world.

**Action-in-Common and Professionalism**

Evidence regarding the stream of collective action was the weakest of all three streams. Due to the lack of strong relationships across the groups and stress related to administrative intervention and transition, a planetary culture developed. ESL teachers continued to collaborate with one another and teachers outside of the DLE program.

---

37 Este programa, aunque no es su salvación, es un camino.
Meanwhile, DLE teachers banded together to keep the program afloat in the absence of support and direction upon the departure of the principal and coach. Data from interviews and the focus group demonstrated that teachers found it difficult to move forward with the lack of structure and documentation available to them during the implementation years. Though both groups behaved professionally with continued dedication to their students, the lack of cohesive relationships across the two groups of teachers impeded action-in-common.

The ability to work collectively is predicated on the existence of relationships and collegiality; without this substitute for leadership in place, it is difficult to coalesce around a mission and move forward. Study of group phenomena has shown that conviction and efficacy drive action-in-common (Donaldson, 2006). Though conviction was clearly ingrained in the teachers, the belief that success breeds success, or put differently, that a collective effort would be greater than the sum of individual efforts, was not established at the site. Cooperative interdependence had not been part of the school culture for years, largely due to years of administrative inconsistency and turnover. After being asked to consider how the teacher leaders have handled change and how they will move forward, one ESL teacher commented,

I’m not sure that it’s working the best way that it can right now. I know there are some things that need to change and I’m not sure, whatever that is that you’re talking about that would help us to move forward, I think that’s what’s missing right now. I think part of it is the lack of outside leadership, the lack of administration, and the lack of support from the district. That’s made it really hard to bring change about.
Discussion of Findings Regarding Cultural Confusions

The themes that emerged through reflection, analysis, and creative synthesis were related to cross-cultural interactions and what Delpit (2006) calls “cross-cultural confusions”. Interpersonal communication is inherently complex due to individual differences in outlook and communication style and "even more difficult when we attempt to communicate across social differences, gender, race, or class lines, or any situation of unequal power" (Delpit, 2006, p. 135). Ethnically mixed conversations frequently engender misunderstandings or miscommunication, particularly if one or both of the involved parties has what Delpit calls a “that’s the way it is” mentality. Frequent intergroup contact is needed to diminish prejudice and improve communication (Pettigrew, 2004). However, if interactions are frequently marked by negative features such as stress or power differentials, the results of intergroup contact can be increased distance, and even prejudice (Schofield, 2004).

After multiple close readings of the transcripts, it appeared that communication barriers had arisen that were potentially related to the groups’ different cultural lenses, i.e. ways of viewing the world. Emergent themes were illustrated by in vivo codes in the findings section. In vivo codes are terms or concepts drawn directly from the words of participants. For the purpose of this study, the use of in vivo codes was invaluable, primarily because they served to draw out and illuminate a hidden and surprising theme regarding cross-cultural confusions. In addition, in vivo codes presented in Spanish, the native language of the DLE teachers, allowed me to highlight the importance of language for the co-researchers, not only in terms of empowerment of their students, but also in regards to their own sense of power and status in the school.
The in vivo codes were grouped in two categories: individualistic versus collectivist orientation and high-context versus low-context communication. The in vivo codes, shared first in Spanish and then English, revealed that teachers’ world views and interaction patterns seemed to differ according to their cultural orientation and their communication style; cultural confusions occurred as a result.

**Cultural Orientation: Individualism Versus Collectivism**

Analysis of the transcripts revealed comments and behaviors on the part of the two teacher groups that may have been related to their cultural orientation. Though cultural differences must be considered along a continuum or spectrum, social scientists have found that individualistic cultures, such as European American, place emphasis on independence and individuality while collectivist cultures, such as Latino, place importance on belonging to a group. Many differences in behavior and communication have been attributed to this dimension of culture (Hofstede, 2010; Lustin & Koester, 2013; Zaharna, 2000). In this study, three in vivo codes were identified that illustrated this aspect of culture. In vivo codes were presented first in Spanish in order to maintain their impact and integrity, then translated to English.

**La confianza de las familias (confidence of the families).** Comments of DLE teachers demonstrated that as Latinas, they understood the importance of the families to the program and vice versa. Multiple stories and notes were shared that made it clear that DLE families not only were highly involved, they were also extremely grateful to the teachers for this opportunity for their children. Family involvement was rarely brought up during the conversations with ESL teachers, although the question was asked of each one.
Due to linguistic and cultural differences, the interaction between families and ESL teachers appeared to be minimal.

La reunión de la familia (reunion of the family). Multiple handwritten notes were shared regarding parents’ appreciation for being able to have shared reading experiences at home with their children. In addition, DLE teachers shared stories told to them by family members regarding communication with extended family in Mexico and the pride and joy that parents felt when their children could write and speak well to their grandparents in Spanish. DLE teachers’ comments showed that they recognized the extent to which the program was impacting the home lives of the children. As members of a collectivist culture, they realized the importance of family in their students’ lives. Stories related to extended family interactions and reading together in Spanish were not shared by ESL teachers.

Falta de empatía (lack of empathy). Throughout conversations with DLE teachers, it was repeatedly discussed that the children were emotionally well and thriving in the DLE classrooms. The sense of security and contentment was, in the opinions of the co-researchers, directly related to the language of instruction. Through stories from the teachers about their own struggles to learn a second language and navigate a foreign culture, it became clear that they felt deeply for what young ELLs experience when starting school. It was stated by a co-researcher, and confirmed by others during the focus group, that in their opinion, monolingual Americans do not understand the challenges of
functioning in a non-native language because “English is the universal language and the transition, the necessity… there is a lack of empathy for how hard it can be for others”.38

High-context Versus Low-context Communication

Two in vivo codes were discovered that related directly to the cultural dimension of high-context versus low-context communication. It should be noted that there is a strong connection between cultural orientation and communication style. Thus, many members of collectivist cultures reflect a high-context style of speaking and individualists often reflect a low-context pattern of speaking.

The continuum that ranges from high to low context communication is characterized by the amount of meaning conveyed through context versus words (Hall, 1976). High-context cultures display dependence on paralinguistic features, such as rhythm, intonation, gesture, emotion, humor, and sense of metaphor (Delpit, 2006). Collectivist cultures, such as Latino and African American, frequently communicate in this manner. Low context cultures, e.g., European American, tend to communicate explicitly through words; the structure and content of what is said is far more important than emotional tone (Lustig & Koester, 2013).

Congeniality and consensus-building is critical to groups that utilize high-context communication patterns. Interactions between in-group members of collectivist cultures are often characterized by what Gay (2000) calls “preambling” or “stage setting”. For example, Latinos often “begin their task interactions with colleagues by inquiring about

38 El inglés es el idioma universal y la transición, la necesidad. Pienso que hace una falta de empatía de lo difícil que puede ser para otros.
the families of the other participants and their personal well-being” (Gay, 2000, p. 108).

Interestingly, this pattern was noted in the individual interviews with co-researchers in this study. Though the researcher had known both groups of teacher for roughly the same amount of time, the interviews with DLE teachers began and ended with personal discussions; this did not occur during the interviews with ESL teachers who reflected a more business-like approach to the interview.

Following are the in vivo codes that emerged regarding high- and low-context communicative style. Again, the codes are presented first in their original form, i.e., Spanish, in order to maintain the integrity and meaning of the phrase.

**La misma sensación (the same feeling).** This phrase was selected for its impact related to intergroup communication problems that DLE and ESL teachers experienced during committee meetings. Making their voices and opinions heard during meetings was challenging, even intimidating, for DLE teachers at times. This code came from a story in which a co-researcher shared that like the children, she often had the feeling of being tongue-tied and frustrated when trying to communicate in English. As Latinas, the low-context nature of the meetings, which were filled with acronyms and data, was unfamiliar and uncomfortable.

**Las rápidas (the fast ones).** During the focus group session, DLE teachers joked about what they considered to be their group’s slow decision-making processes. Being collectivists by nature, they sought agreement and support from one another when making decisions for the group, which often took time. Referring to European American teachers as “las rápidas” in a humorous manner conveyed that the tendency to talk quickly and make decisions without consensus was an outgroup behavior to them. The
committee meetings often felt rushed and intense to them; one co-researcher described it well by saying, “It feels like there are very few voices sometimes and sometimes *lots* of voices, but they’re not saying anything”.39

Not only was the tendency to operate quickly and rush decisions affecting the discussions at meetings, it was also having a negative effect on the program’s progress. At multiple points in the interviews, DLE teachers expressed concern that the ESL teachers did not understand the program and the importance of deep, extended development of literacy in the home language. As this comment by one of the DLE co-researchers demonstrates, the ESL and regular education teachers expected results fast:

> This has been the battle from the beginning because, it’s that, I don’t know, having begun something and then it scares you and then… So, it’s been very difficult for us because the vision was not clear that this is a long term program. It’s not going to happen tomorrow. It takes time. It takes time. It’s … It is an investment, but it will bear its fruit.

> Absolutely.40

Thus, the in vivo code of “las rápidas” was representative of the individualistic cultural orientation of the European American teachers in addition to their differing communication style.

---

39 Se sienten muy poquitas voces de veces y a veces muchas voces y no dicen nada.
40 Eso ha sido una lucha desde el principio porque, es como, no sé, como haber, empezar algo y después le da susto y después… Entonces, ha sido muy difícil para nosotras porque no existía la visión de que esto es un programa de largo plazo. No es mañana. Toma tiempo…toma tiempo. Es una inversión, un esfuerzo. Pero rinde su fruta absolutamente.
Limitations of the Study

Heuristic inquiry involves a journey in which autobiographical connections play an important role in the process. Additionally, narrative inquiry involves empathic listening and interviewing techniques, by its nature drawing the researcher in as well. Though these methodological elements allowed the researcher to explore the phenomenon through creative synthesis, these techniques likewise rendered the study to be highly unique. Every effort was made to establish trustworthiness and credibility. However, due to the inherent nature of this study, the interpretation of the phenomenon as well as the teacher leaders’ stories are quite simply, a representation of the author.

Other potential limitations to this study are the time span over which teachers were asked to reflect and the small sample size. In order to understand the program’s evolution, it was necessary to ask teachers to review past events. The researcher’s document analysis facilitated this discussion as did the researcher’s involvement with the program since its early days. The small sample size was necessary to enable narrative inquiry which involves a large quantity of data and thereby, significant time to transcribe. In addition, three out of the eight interviews as well as the focus group were conducted in Spanish and required translation to English, followed by back translation with a native speaking translation for verification. Finally, it is regrettable that no focus group was conducted with ESL teachers. This was attempted several times, but the busy lives of the teachers prohibited this from being scheduled.

Implications for Practice

Kenji Hakuta (2011), seminal researcher of second language acquisition and psycholinguistics, proffers this analogy to legislators, policymakers, and educators of
second language learners across our nation: “If you were in the Christmas tree business, and you found some land on which pine saplings were already growing, would you (a) bulldoze the area and plant new saplings, or (b) take care of the land and cultivate the saplings?” (p. 172). Long term researchers and advocates for dual language education (August & Shanahan, 2009; Genesee, Lindholm-Leary, Saunders, & Christian, 2005; Gutierrez, 205; Thomas & Collier, 2012) would say the answer is obvious and extremely relevant to English Language Learners (ELLs) in the United States. Cultivating the existing sapling makes good business sense in terms of profit margins and care of the land; likewise, nurturing the existing language and knowledge base of young children leads to positive academic and socioemotional outcomes for ELLs. Thus, the decision to adopt a DLE program for this traditionally marginalized group of learners was relevant and to be commended. These teacher leaders acted on their sense of moral purpose and vision to make a difference in the lives of their students.

The implications for practice will be discussed in three categories. First, the issue of DLE for ELLs will be reviewed and recommendations for the school and its leaders will be shared. Next, the implications regarding collaborative leadership and the sustainment of change efforts will be discussed. Finally, the emergent findings regarding cross-cultural confusions will be reviewed with suggestions for practitioners on how to improve intergroup relationships in the school setting, particular when colleagues are culturally different from one another.

Dual Language Education for English Language Learners

As the program enters its third year of implementation, it is still the only DLE program in the state specifically designed for ELLs. Academic data reported from teacher
leaders in the study demonstrated that despite the limited amount of instruction in English in the classroom, the students are performing on par with their peers in English-only classrooms at the school site on reading and math probes administered in English. In reaction to this data that showed the children are indeed acquiring English, despite the concerns of ESL teachers that they must have more ESL instruction, one DLE teacher remarked,

The other kids hear English all day, mine just hear it a half hour per day, but they’ve learned it nonetheless. So, don’t tell me my kids need more English. Look at the report and you will see, my kids are here (gesture indicating a high level).  

It can only be imagined how the students would perform if assessed in their native language. This is a recommended next step for the school in order to inform instruction and document progress. Regular progress monitoring and benchmark assessment of literacy gains in English and Spanish are needed to substantiate and inform instructional decisions under consideration.

In order to produce the long-term results they desire, it is recommended and hoped that the school stay the course and implement dual language instruction throughout the elementary years. Research shows that native language literacy leads to “academic resiliency” in the high school years (Lindholm-Leary & Borsato, 2001). Thus, the school should continue to strive to find opportunities for their students to receive dual language

---

Note: The original text contains a numbered note (41) that is referenced in the context. The translation of the note is included in the text for completeness.

41 Ellos escuchan el inglés todo el día, los míos escuchan media hora al día. Esta cosa que están aprendiendo, sin embargo. Entonces, no me digan que mis niños necesitan más inglés. Mira tú los reportes y lo ves, que mis niños están acá.
instruction in the middle and high school years. In order for this to happen, it will be
important that school leaders build relationships and bridges with district and state
agencies that can support and expand their efforts to create avenues for secondary and
post-secondary academic opportunities for their students.

School Leadership

According to Sergiovanni, (2007), "The legitimate instructional leaders, if we
have them, ought to be teachers. And principals ought to be leaders of leaders: people
who develop the instructional leadership in others" (p. xiii). The site for this study lacked
a consistent “leader of leaders” and the development of the program suffered as a result.
As theory on school leadership has changed over time, there has been a shift away from
what Gronn (2003) calls the hero paradigm, one in which the principal acts as
hierarchical or bureaucratic chief. A new structure for schools in which leadership is
shared, labor is divided, and decision-making is distributed is necessary in order for
schools to thrive in the turbulent, rapidly changing realm of American public education
(Gronn, 2003; Meyers, Meyers, & Gelzheiser, 2001; Printy & Marks, 2006; Scribner,
Sawyer, Watson, & Myers, 2007; York-Barr & Duke, 2004) Primary challenges that
faced this school involved the lack of a consistent leader, but also the lack of structures
and systems for collaborative practice.

Establishing committees and naming chairpersons is not enough to create change.
According to Fullan (2000), effective schools form professional learning communities
that focus on student work via assessment and change their practice accordingly. In order
for schools such as the one in this study to move forward, teacher leaders must become
assessment literate and driven. Due to the lack of expertise in the district and state,
teacher leaders struggled to find appropriate assessments for ELLs in the program; thus they lacked data to drive instructional decisions. This lack of data led to speculation and posturing over issues such as language use and academic achievement which created numerous interpersonal problems. To avoid a deterioration in collegial climate such as this, collaborative structures need to be built through reculturing of the school. According to Fullan (2000), “School improvement will never occur on a wide scale until the majority of teachers become contributors to and beneficiaries of the professional learning community” (p. 5). In order for the majority of teachers’ voices to be heard, it is critical that the faculty develop cross-cultural awareness and interpersonal skills, as will be discussed later.

School leaders involved in change efforts must develop the ability to assess the situation by being mindful and using diagnostic thinking. According to Puccio, Mance, and Murdock (2011), problem solving involves three iterative stages through which individuals go when faced with an open-ended problem: clarification, transformation, and implementation. Tools to encourage convergent and divergent thinking in a professional, collegial manner are recommended. For example, Puccio et al. share dozens of tools for assessing the situation, exploring the vision, formulating challenges, exploring ideas, formulating solutions, and exploring acceptance. These tools, or protocols, enable school leaders to hone in on the situation and focus on relevant data and needs. In addition, the use of protocols (Holman, Devane, & Cady, 2007) contributes to a democratic, collaborative environment during committee meetings, enabling all voices to be heard through built-in structural safeguards.
Cultural Confusions

Metawareness and multicultural competency are an integral component of effective working groups composed of diverse people (Delpit, 2006). Theory and empirical work on culturally responsive teaching emphasizes the need for teachers to be aware and responsive to students’ cultural backgrounds (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1995; Montgomery 2001). However, this awareness and sensitivity also needs to extend to collegial interactions. As data from the study demonstrated, adults are also vulnerable to cultural discontinuity and miscommunication. Thus, it is recommended that schools, as well as colleges involved in teacher preparation, strive to develop cultural competency and intergroup communication skills in teachers. Professional development on topics such as cultural orientation and communication style is needed to raise consciousness about cross-cultural differences. Such training is particularly important for members of the majority group who are also often in a position of power.

Despite the tremendous ethnic and linguistic diversity in American society, the United States is nonetheless characterized by a mainstream culture with “the predominant ideas, values, and behaviors of ‘Americans’ being those of the white middle class” (Althen, 1988, p. xiii). Educational progress is impeded by misconceptions that arise from popular knowledge acquired in the wider society and it is therefore imperative that universities and schools are sensitive and vigilant regarding the messages sent to colleagues and students about cultural norms. Schools and universities involved in change efforts must reculture themselves in order to promote collaboration and progress, with teachers leading this effort personally and professionally (Fullan, 2000; York-Barr, 2000). Data from this study demonstrate that collaboration is not color-blind; colleagues
must be cognizant and attuned to others’ cultural orientation in order to truly work well
together.

The communication breakdowns between European American and Latino
teachers in this study was the most surprising finding for the researcher. Though the co-
researchers were relatively skilled at working with children who are linguistically and
culturally different, they nonetheless struggled to collaborate well with diverse adults.
According to Schofield (2004), positive intergroup relations are characterized by multiple
factors, such as cooperative interdependence, crosscutting social identities, and
personalization of outgroup members. It is recommended that schools engage in
professional development that includes cultural self-assessment measures, study of the
history of the U.S.’s educational system from a pluralistic perspective, and skills for
intergroup contact. It is critical that school leaders promote cultural cohesion through
equal status interactions amongst teachers so that all voices can be heard and valued.
What better way is there for teachers to teach students how to communicate and
collaborate with others than by example?

**Recommendations for Future Research**

The protracted underachievement and marginalization of linguistically diverse
learners in the school system, the fastest growing subgroup in the United States, should
concern practitioners, researchers, and laypersons as well (August & Shanahan, 2006;
Hakuta, 2011; Olsen, 2014). The intent of this study was to explore the phenomenon of
teacher leadership during the adoption and implementation of a program that has proven
effective for ELLs in other states. The influence of these teacher leaders and the impact
of the program is of academic interest not only in terms of its immediate impact on this
school, these teachers, and these learners; related study is also warranted to explore its implications for schools, families, and policymakers in general.

**Further Study of Dual Language Education Programs**

The reasons for the persistent underachievement of ELLs are chronic and complex. Proponents of DLE, also historically known as bilingual education, consider English Only environments to be detrimental to ELLs’ academic success as well as their cultural identity and self-esteem (González & Melis, 2014; Gutierrez, 2005; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2009; Trueba & McLaren, 2000). According to literacy expert Gutierrez (2005), excluding the home language and culture of ELLs from the school setting compounds the academic challenges already faced by a vulnerable, marginalized population, dramatically affecting their levels of literacy and school achievement.

Furthermore, Wong-Fillmore (2005), long-time researcher of the education and socialization of language minority students, reflected in an essay that “the dilemma facing immigrant children, however, may be viewed as less a problem of learning English than of primary language loss” (p. 203). When the school system fails to support, include, and foster development of bilingualism, biliteracy, and biculturalism in linguistically diverse students, not only do they fail to thrive in school, but the effects on their social and familial relationships are far-reaching.

**Academic outcomes for ELLs in DLE.** It is recommended that further study be conducted at the school site and others like it regarding the achievement of the learners in the DLE program. A longitudinal case study on the cohorts of students moving through the program would provide useful information regarding the academic effects of the program. It would be particularly interesting to conduct comparative research at the site
to measure long-term outcomes for student groups involved in ESL (English Only) classrooms versus the DLE classrooms.

**DLE as culturally responsive pedagogy.** In addition, there is a gap in the empirical literature on DLE programs as culturally responsive pedagogy. Utilizing existing rating scales such as the Culturally Responsive Instruction Observation Protocol (Powell, Cantrell, Malo-Juevera, & Correll, 2016) to study native language instructional settings compared to English only settings would add to the literature base in this field. Research conducted in this area could serve to establish the viability and potential for DLE programs to thrive in the region and state, making a significant impact on linguistically diverse children’s lives.

**School-family partnerships in DLE programs.** According to Epstein (2011), research has shown a positive relationship between what she describes as “school-like families” and “family-like schools”. Furthermore, empirical studies have demonstrated that immigrant families want to be informed and participatory, but cultural and linguistic barriers often discourage their involvement (Hidalgo, Sui, & Epstein, 2004). Findings from this study indicated that family support and participation in the DLE program were strong. Further research into the impact of the program on families and vice versa would be informative and enlightening, particularly if the study involved an ethnographic approach that investigated funds of knowledge from the home that could be integrated into the school program (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2006).
Further Study on Cross-Cultural Communication

The emergent theme of cross-cultural confusions also warrants further study. Teachers at the site were driven by shared values and moral purpose; their vision to create a program to empower their students was admirable and courageous. However, the lack of a consistent, supportive principal caused unexpected turbulence during the implementation years and intergroup relations were affected as a result. Study of discourse and communication within and across diverse teacher groups would provide important information as to the types of cross-cultural and interpersonal professional development that teachers need. In addition, study of democratic forms of school governance such as communities of practice and professional learning communities should continue to be studied with a particular focus on the voices and input of culturally and linguistically diverse faculty members. As Schofield (2004) states, “Cooperation toward achieving a shared goal cannot be accomplished without the contribution of members of all groups” (p. 803).

According to seminal multicultural education researcher James A. Banks (2004), there is wide agreement in the field that pedagogical and curricular reform that makes a difference in outcomes for culturally and linguistically diverse children is needed. Studies have found that “children come to school with misconceptions about outside ethnic groups and with a white bias.” (Banks, 2004, p. 23). However, youngsters’ racial attitudes can be transformed through educational experiences much more easily than adults (Banks, 2001). Therefore, the findings in this study indicated that cultural awareness and intergroup relations skills were in need of further study, particularly as regards the
development of coursework and professional programs that promote cross-cultural understanding between adults.

Early in the study one of the co-researcher’s shared the impact of a statement she read on a banner at a high-performing DLE school in Illinois: *No child should be obligated to lose one language in order to learn another.* The potential that lies within young ELLs as emergent bilinguals should be celebrated and developed, not disregarded. Dual language programs provide a pathway, a “camino” as one co-researcher said, to bilingualism, biliteracy, and a bicultural identity for these youngsters. It is my hope that such a road will open to more ELLs through the work of innovative, culturally responsive school leaders in the district, state, and nation.
Appendix A:

IRB Approval Letter

Initial Review

Approval Ends: April 12, 2017

IRB Number: 16-0272-P4S

TO: Jennifer Green
    424 Three Forks Road
    Richmond, KY 40475
    PI phone #: (859) 248-8653

FROM: Chairperson/Vice Chairperson
      Non-medical Institutional Review Board (IRB)

SUBJECT: Approval of Protocol Number 16-0272-P4S

DATE: April 14, 2016

On April 13, 2016, the Non-medical Institutional Review Board approved your protocol entitled:

The Phenomenon of Teacher Leadership During the Adoption and Implementation of a Dual Language Education Program for English Language Learners

Approval is effective from April 13, 2016 until April 12, 2017 and extends to any consent/assent form, cover letter, and/or phone script. If applicable, attached is the IRB approved consent/assent document(s) to be used when enrolling subjects. [Note, subjects can only be enrolled using consent/assent forms which have a valid "IRB Approval" stamp unless special waiver has been obtained from the IRB.] Prior to the end of this period, you will be sent a Continuation Review Report Form which must be completed and returned to the Office of Research Integrity so that the protocol can be reviewed and approved for the next period.

In implementing the research activities, you are responsible for complying with IRB decisions, conditions and requirements. The research procedures should be implemented as approved in the IRB protocol. It is the principal investigators responsibility to ensure any changes planned for the research are submitted for review and approval by the IRB prior to implementation. Protocol changes made without prior IRB approval to eliminate apparent hazards to the subject(s) should be reported in writing immediately to the IRB. Furthermore, discontinuing a study or completion of a study is considered a change in the protocol’s status and therefore the IRB should be promptly notified in writing.

For information describing investigator responsibilities after obtaining IRB approval, download and read the document "PI Guidance to Responsibilities, Qualifications, Records and Documentation of Human Subjects Research" from the Office of Research Integrity's IRB Survival Handbook web page [http://www.research.uky.edu/ori/IRB-Survival-Handbook.html#PIrespsibilities]. Additional information regarding IRB review, federal regulations, and institutional policies may be found through ORI's web site [http://www.research.uky.edu/ori]. If you have questions, need additional information, or would like a paper copy of the above mentioned document, contact the Office of Research Integrity at (859) 257-9428.

N. Van Tubergen, PhD/ah
Chairperson/Vice Chairperson

Office of Research Integrity
IRB, IACUC, RBRC
315 Kinkead Hall
Lexington, KY 40506-0057
859 257-9428
fax 859 257-8995
www.research.uky.edu/ori/
Appendix B:

Email Invitation to Participate in Doctoral Study:

April 15, 2016

Hello!

My name is Jennifer Green and I’m a doctoral candidate at the University of Kentucky in Educational Leadership. The focus of my study is teacher leadership and the immersion program at your school. You were one of the participants on the original planning and implementation committee and so I am writing to you in the hopes that you would be willing to be interviewed regarding the experience. I will be conducting individual interviews that will last 30-45 minutes as well as a focus group session (45-60 min). These meetings will take place at your school at a time convenient to you; you are welcome to participate in both the interview and the focus group or just one. Your participation would be greatly appreciated and will contribute to the growing body of literature on teacher leadership and innovative programs for ELLs.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns. If you are willing to participate, please reply to this email and I will be in touch shortly to arrange the meeting time(s) and to provide you with more details.

Looking forward to hearing from you.

Jennifer Green
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Informed Consent Letter for the IRB

Consent to Participate in a Research Study

TEACHER LEADERSHIP DURING THE ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF A DUAL LANGUAGE EDUCATION PROGRAM FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS

WHY ARE YOU BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH?

You are being invited to take part in a research study about teacher leadership during the adoption and implementation of the developmental immersion program at your school. You are being invited to take part in this research study because documentation indicated that you were part of the immersion committee that formed in 2013. If you volunteer to take part in this study, you will be one of about 6-8 people to do so.

WHO IS DOING THE STUDY?

The person in charge of this study is Jennifer Green of the University Of Kentucky Department of Educational Leadership. She is being guided in this research by Dr. Wayne Lewis.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY?

By doing this study, we hope to learn about the personal and contextual factors that influenced the teacher leaders to collaborate on the immersion initiative. Theoretical literature indicates that school leadership may be affected by streams (Donaldson, 2006) and/or substitutes for leadership (Sergiovanni, 1992). Streams of leadership are represented in relationships, moral purpose, and action-in-common. Substitutes for leadership are found in community norms, shared values, and intrinsic motivation. The purpose of this study is to explore teachers’ backgrounds, stories, and behavior in order to learn if streams or substitutes played a role.

ARE THERE REASONS WHY YOU SHOULD NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?

None

WHERE IS THE STUDY GOING TO TAKE PLACE AND HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?
The research procedures will be conducted at Cardinal Valley Elementary School in Lexington. The researcher will come to the site to meet with you 2 times during the study. Each of those visits will take about 45-60 minutes. The total amount of time you will be asked to volunteer for this study is 2 hours over the next month.

**WHAT WILL YOU BE ASKED TO DO?**

The researcher will conduct individual interviews with willing teachers as well as one group focus session with interested interviewees. The substance of the discussions will center on the process of working on this initiative and the challenges and successes the team experienced along the way.

Individual interviews will last 45-60 minutes and will take place at your school site at your convenience. The interviews will be transcribed soon after the event and submitted to you along with researcher notes via email for verification. Your review of the transcript is appreciated, but not required. You will also be given a reflection log in which you will be encouraged to record any thoughts, questions, or wonderings after the interview and review of the transcript. This reflection log will become part of the data set.

The focus group session will take place after school during the same time frame with approximately 5-8 teachers from your school. This meeting should last approximately 60 minutes and will be recorded and transcribed as well. During this conversation, you will be encouraged to discuss with the immersion team memories and stories you have about the program’s initiation and growth, particularly your roles as teacher leaders throughout the process. A transcript of the focus group session will be submitted for your review as well.

**WHAT ARE THE POSSIBLE RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS?**

To the best of our knowledge, the things you will be doing have no more risk of harm than you would experience in everyday life.

**WILL YOU BENEFIT FROM TAKING PART IN THIS STUDY?**

There is no guarantee that you will get any benefit from taking part in this study. However, some people have experienced personal satisfaction and improved collegiality as a result of reflective discussions about professional work. Your willingness to take part, however, may help society as a whole to better understand teacher leadership and instructional innovation for ELLs.

**DO YOU HAVE TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY?**

If you decide to take part in the study, it should be because you really want to volunteer. You will not lose any benefits or rights you would normally have if you choose not to
volunteer. You can stop at any time during the study and still keep the benefits and rights you had before volunteering.

IF YOU DON’T WANT TO TAKE PART IN THE STUDY, ARE THERE OTHER CHOICES?

If you do not want to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

WHAT WILL IT COST YOU TO PARTICIPATE?

There are no costs associated with taking part in the study.
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You will receive a small gift in gratitude for taking part in this study upon fulfillment of the interview and/or focus group session.

WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION THAT YOU GIVE?

We will make every effort to keep confidential all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law.
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We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information, or what that information is. The data are formatted such that identifying data will be kept in separate files or tables from any research information about the persons involved. All files are password protected in addition to the laptop having a password.

We will keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. We may be required to show information which identifies you to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; these would be people from such organizations as the University of Kentucky.

CAN YOUR TAKING PART IN THE STUDY END EARLY?

If you decide to take part in the study you still have the right to decide at any time that you no longer want to continue. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study.
The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw you from the study. This may occur if you are not able to follow the directions they give you or if they find that your being in the study is more risk than benefit to you.

**WHAT IF NEW INFORMATION IS LEARNED DURING THE STUDY THAT MIGHT AFFECT YOUR DECISION TO PARTICIPATE?**

If the researcher learns of new information in regards to this study, and it might change your willingness to stay in this study, the information will be provided to you. You may be asked to sign a new informed consent form if the information is provided to you after you have joined the study.

**WHAT ELSE DO YOU NEED TO KNOW?**

There is a possibility that the data collected from you may be shared with other investigators in the future. If that is the case the data will not contain information that can identify you unless you give your consent or the UK Institutional Review Board (IRB) approves the research. The IRB is a committee that reviews ethical issues, according to federal, state and local regulations on research with human subjects, to make sure the study complies with these before approval of a research study is issued.
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Interview Protocol and Guide

Opening Comments:

Hello. Thanks so much for agreeing to participate in this study on the role of teacher leadership during the adoption and implementation of the immersion program at your school. I have a personal and professional background in the field of instructional strategies for ELLs and am also interested in the influence of informal teacher leadership on change initiative in schools, particularly schools with similar demographics to your school.

First I have a few standard questions to ask and then we can begin our conversation.

- How many years have you been teaching?
- How many years have you been teaching at this site?
- What was your official position at the time of adoption? And now?
- Please tell me about your certification areas and professional degrees.
- Before we begin, do you have any questions or concerns to share with me regarding the study?

Interview Questions and Tag Questions (in parentheses)

- Tell me about your experiences with second language learners and their families.
- How did the discussion about DLE as a program option come about? (Do you recall who was involved in the initial discussions?)
- Tell me about your role during the adoption of DLE? Tell me about your role during implementation.
- Tell me what the experience of being on a team of teacher leaders has been like for you.
• Have there been any challenges to establishing the DLE program? (How were these overcome?)
• Can you talk about the impact that the DLE program is having on students? …families? …the school community?)
• Is there anything else that you would like to share about this experience?
• Is there anyone else that you recommend I speak with regarding this experience?

Follow-Up Questions
• When did that happen?
• Can you tell me more about that?
• What do you mean by that?
• Give me an example of that.
• Could you walk me through that?
• Could you describe a typical…?
• You mean that…?
• And then...?

Probes

• Silences (used judiciously)
• Uh-huhs and head nods
• Yes...
• Really?
• Go on...
Closing Comments:

Thank you so much for agreeing to talk with me today about your experiences with developmental immersion. This interview will be transcribed and sent to you via email for your perusal. You are welcome to read and respond to the transcript if you wish. I also would like to provide you with a reflective log. This is a means for you to record any additional thoughts, comments, or wonderings that may occur to you after this conversation. If completed, this reflection log can be given to me in hard copy or sent to me via email. It will become part of the data set, though your name and identity will not be directly tied to the comments in the log.
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Researcher Interview Reflection Log

Participant
(Letter assigned)

**Doctoral Research Topic:**
Teacher Leadership during the Adoption and Implementation of a Dual Language Education Program for English Language Learners

**Investigator:**
Jennifer Green / University of Kentucky Department of Educational Leadership

Reflective notes to be taken during or immediately after the interview:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic / Theme</th>
<th>Observations / Comments / Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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