ABSTRACT


The purpose of this multi-phase, mixed methods study was to explore the extent to which World Language classes function as sites of inclusion for historically marginalized students. In Phase I, middle school and high school World Language enrollment data from four, large, Southeastern school districts was analyzed. Results indicated that African American and Latino male students were significantly underenrolled. In Phase II, survey data was collected from 188 practicing World Language teachers. Findings from cluster analyses and MANOVA indicated that teachers’ orientations towards diversity varied systematically: three clusters held orientations that appeared to perpetuate status quo education for students of color and other historically marginalized student groups, and one cluster held beliefs that appeared to be more inclusive. In Phase III, interviews were conducted with five practicing World Language teachers. Findings indicated that four of the five participants appeared to typify the cluster orientations identified in earlier analyses. Integrated findings indicate that World Languages appear to exclude certain groups of students systematically, and these findings support central tenets of Critical Race Theory in education. Implications for policy, teacher preparation, and professional development are discussed.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Upon first entering graduate school and building new relationships, my colleagues, classmates, and professors (both White and of color) were often intrigued by my ‘former life’ as a public high school French teacher. Frequently, they would share their own experiences with me: “Oh, I took two years of French in high school! ... Don’t speak a word of it now!” Or, “I took Spanish when I was younger... I was terrible at it!” Or, “I LOVED my German teacher in high school!” It seemed the experience of learning a language left a lasting impression, albeit positive or negative. Despite the variation in our experiences, we shared a commonality: we were each afforded the access to enroll in World Language in high school. In fact, in order to be admitted to a four-year college or university, we were most likely expected to complete some number of language credits.

World Language study is not a requirement for high school graduation in North Carolina. However, two semesters (or credits) of the same language is a required minimum component for students who plan to attend a four-year college or university in the UNC system (NCDPI, 2013). As such, this curricular area can be seen as a gateway to entry to certain institutions of higher education (Kubota, 2005). Some research has been conducted to explore the extent to which access to math and science curricula functions as a gateway to higher education. Students of color are less likely to be enrolled in rigorous math courses, and are more likely to attend schools where less advanced math and science courses are offered (Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, 2014). Algebra 1 specifically has been called a "critical filter" (Sells, 1978), and some have even called access to high quality math instruction a "civil rights issue" (Moses, 2001). Indeed, according to recent study
conducted by the Department of Education, findings from an analysis of data over the last 15 years indicated that: “A quarter of high schools with the highest percentage of black and Latino students do not offer any Algebra II courses, while a third of those schools do not have any chemistry classes” (Motoko, 2014, p. 1). Since students' demographic characteristics (i.e., ethnoracial, socioeconomic, disability status) often predict access to school curricula (Anyon, 1980; Blanchett, 2006; Brantlinger, 2003; Kozol, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1994) and specifically World Language classes (ACTFL/CALS, 2011; Finn, 1998; Kubota, 2005; Kubota & Catlett, 2008; Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011), more research is needed to explore variability of access for historically marginalized students. Evidence suggests that African American students may be underrepresented in World Language programs (for a review, see Moore, 2008), and teachers of color are underrepresented in the World Language field (Ellison, 2011; English, 1996; Moore & English, 2008; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). But there are few large-scale studies to date that examine enrollment patterns in World Language classes, and none conducted since the implementation of No Child Left Behind and Race to the Top policies.

As a French teacher at a predominately African American, consistently “low-performing” public high school (according to NCLB standards), I had the unique opportunity to teach all students. Frequently, students in my French class were ‘dumped’ there because they had failed other electives. Many students did not anticipate applying to college, and some undocumented students had few options to do so. However, by and large, my students consistently scored at or above district benchmark levels and spoke French in and out of the classroom. Often, my students experienced academic success in a school that had been
stigmatized. I perceived that my French classroom served as an equalizer for many of my students. They needed no prior knowledge, experience, or achievement to succeed, and had no baggage from prior negative experiences with the content, because most had never studied a language before. These anecdotal experiences support the claim that students enrolled in World Languages classes experience many positive academic and developmental outcomes (for a review, see Curtain & Dahlberg, 2010).

After developing an understanding of adult development and the research on teachers’ beliefs about diversity, I recognize that many teachers have internalized dominant, negative discourses about students of color. However, while a practicing public school teacher, I was consistently challenged by the belief systems that some teachers and administrators appeared to espouse regarding our students of color. Some students were not expected to be successful in our school, their lack of success was attributed to myriad factors: assumptions about parents who ‘don’t care’, low socio-economic status, lack of prior achievement, and assumptions about students who didn’t ‘want to learn’. I began to wonder if there were other language teachers who, like me, held high expectations and embraced asset-based thinking regarding student groups who are historically marginalized in public education.

Because of my own teaching experiences, and my knowledge of the extant research on the benefits of World Language study, I envision World Language classrooms as potential sites of student achievement and learning, specifically for students who may have experienced little academic success. Language classrooms also have the potential to be sites of critical pedagogies, in which teachers and students can examine societal and cultural
norms and practices in the context of learning about languages and cultures that comprise the World Languages discipline (abroad). These pedagogies can be extended to further critique and analyze our own languages, societal and cultural norms, and practices (at home).

I believe that, in order for students to achieve and critically examine their world, however, World Language classes must be accessible, and must be taught by educators who embrace and understand diversity and are prepared to meet the needs of their students. Students of color may have needs that differ from their White peers in schools (Ladson-Billings, 1994). More research is needed to understand the implications and ramifications of an educational system that employs a largely static teaching force (e.g. White, middle-class, female, and Christian), but serves a growing body of students of color (Howard & Aleman, 2008). As such, the purpose of this mixed methods study is twofold: 1) to explore the extent to which students of color are enrolled in World Language classes by analysis of extant enrollment data; and 2) to investigate practicing World Language teachers’ beliefs about their practice and their conceptions of meeting the needs of diverse learners through both surveys and interviews.

**Critical Race Theory: A Framework for Understanding Educational Inequity**

The theoretical underpinnings of this research are grounded in Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theory was developed by legal scholars Derrick Bell, Alan Freeman, and Richard Delgado during the mid-1970s as a response to the failure of the legal system to adequately address the effects of race and racism in the United States. There are several overarching premises of Critical Race Theory (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012). First, a basic
tenet includes the centrality of race and racism, which posits that racism is ordinary (Bell, 1980); experiences with racism are an everyday, lived realities for people of color; and Whites enjoy certain privileges due solely to the color of their skin. Thus, Whiteness acts a form of property in society (DeCuir-Gunby, 2006; Harris, 1993). Furthermore, the intersectionality of multiple identities, such as race and gender or sexual orientation, can create multiple forms of oppression (Crenshaw, 1989) depending on context. Next, race is viewed as a social construction (Omi & Winant, 1994), and racial categories are manipulated by society as needed to preserve the status quo. Due to this desire to preserve the status quo, Critical Race Theory is also premised on the idea of interest convergence (Bell, 1980): change to the status quo only comes about when White, mainstream society serves to gain from it. Critical Race scholars also critique liberal ideologies such as colorblindness, equal opportunity, and incremental change by asserting that these approaches fail to recognize the central nature of racism in society, and that small changes to the system are likely to be absorbed into the hegemonic system and yield little results (Bonilla-Silva, 2002; Gotanda, 1991; Solórzano & Yosso, 2002). Finally, counterstorytelling (Bell, 1989; Delgado, 1992) is an important part of Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theorists, in their work, create space for voices that have been traditionally marginalized to counter dominant narratives.

The use of Critical Race Theory as a framework has expanded into other disciplines, including education (e.g. Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Critical Race Theorists in education assert that social inequality and school inequity are based on three central propositions: (1) Ethnoracial status (Frederickson, 2002) continues to be a significant factor in determining inequity, (2) Whiteness is a form of property and the dominant cultural capital
in schools (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), and (3) the intersection of race and property creates an analytic tool through which we can understand social and school inequity (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Through this specific lens, a CRT approach to education includes a belief that schools perpetuate societal inequities in a systematic way, and these inequities are intricately linked to perceptions about ethnoracial status (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Critical Race theorists in education view the public school system as a primary mode of transmission of racist ideology and practices (Harrell, 1999) and White supremacy. Schools exacerbate racial stereotypes in that they “create race for everyone, regardless of ethnic or racial affiliation” (Duncan, as cited in Ladson-Billings, 2005, p.118) in an essentialist, monolithic way. Critical Race scholars in education also reject underlying assumptions in the education system such as objectivity, meritocracy, equal opportunity, and color/gender blindness (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004). Finally, Critical Race theorists in education point to the ways in which schools can empower students of color, given the right teachers and tools (Howard, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1994).

It is important to note that critics of Critical Race Theory posit that in some instances, focusing narrowly on the construct of race may de-emphasize the role that socioeconomic status plays in the experiences of students, teachers, and other stakeholders in education. Thus, researchers must recognize that the intersectionality of race and class (and other statuses) is omnipresent in schooling contexts. As Darder and Torres (2004) note, “race ideas, racial differences and racism are entrenched in the political economy of capitalism, producing racialized class relations” (as cited in Kubota & Lin, 2009, p. 11). As such,
socioeconomic status may be an important variable in understanding inequity in World Language enrollment.

It is also important to note that many Critical Race scholars often reject the use of quantitative methodologies to generate knowledge about educational outcomes, as these methodologies are rooted in positivist/postpositivist traditions; the objective stance of discovering some absolute ‘truth’ about educational causes and effects is regarded as false. Moreover, reducing students and educational outcomes to numbers and data may serve to create seemingly causal relationships between and among students’ demographic backgrounds and outcomes where none are present, thus reinforcing a deficit perspective of certain groups of students (Gillborn, 2010; Perry, Steele, & Hilliard, 2003; Sleeter, 2008). Indeed, in many statistical models, researchers ‘control’ for other predictor variables that may conceal the effects of institutional policies and practices (Gillborn, 2010), when the practices themselves may be the systemic manifestations of oppression. Instead, researchers in the critical paradigm largely embrace qualitative methodology as the only appropriate approach (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Since all knowledge is value-laden, value-mediated, and shaped by hegemony (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1994), it follows that interpretivist methods are used to include marginalized discourses that may be absent in positivist, empirical approaches. Critical Race theorists may be skeptical of using numbers to create a narrative (Parker & Lynn, 2002), since CRT emphasizes the experiences of the individual and ‘counterstorytelling’, which provide alternative perspectives to the dominant narrative (Solorzono & Yosso, 2002). While “legal criticisms have dismissed the use of narrative and storytelling in CRT, positing that stories about racism are unreliable, unverifiable” (Parker,
1998, p. 49), CRT creates space for validation of an individual’s experiences, and centers the conversation on race and racism (Bernal, 2002; Delgado, 1995).

However, there are some scholars who have begun to experiment with the use of quantitative methods within the critical paradigm. Specifically, this group of critical researchers emphasizes the possibilities of using quantitative methods and statistics to reveal dominant discourses and question their genesis and evolution (e.g. Baez, 2007; Carter & Hurtado, 2007; Gillborn, 2010; Stage, 2007; Teranishi, 2007). For example, “quantitative criticalists” (Stage, 2007, p. 8) have advocated for “consciously choosing questions that seek to challenge” while maintaining a perspective dominated by quantitative data collection and analysis. Irwin (2008) also agreed that researchers can use empirical data to “reinterrogate, expand, or change our conceptualization” of constructs that are derived from theory (p. 416). Baez (2007) calls for education research that is “critically transformative” in that quantitative analyses can provide opportunities for critique, and ultimately change, by recognizing that the contexts of research are political (p. 19). By acknowledging the political nature of education research, scholars can begin to recognize which knowledge constructions have privilege and power.

To address the underlying tension in combining quantitative methods and CRT, DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-DeVose (2013) suggest a mixed methods approach. They build on Mertens’ (2009) transformative-emancipatory focus, which allows for research that critiques power structures and involves community participation (DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-DeVose, 2013, p. 255), and draw from Johnson and Turner’s (2003) assertion that methods should be combined to complement one another and balance strengths and weaknesses. The
current study is situated in “the need to expand the traditional counterstory to include a variety of methodological approaches, including critical quantitative methods, particularly through the use of mixed methodology” (DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-Devose, 2013, p. 257).

**Subjectivity Statement Regarding Positionality and CRT**

As a White woman who embraces Critical Race Theory as a guiding theoretical orientation, I am aware of the tension that surrounds this relationship (e.g. Bergerson, 2003). I also recognize that, as a White woman who intends to write a dissertation using CRT as a framework, I will have to defend my position in the face of those who may believe that CRT is a “trendy” or “sexy” area of study at the moment (Ladson-Billings, 2013, p. 44). Finally, I also realize that, by choosing to incorporate quantitative methods, which are largely derived from a White, male-dominated, positivist worldview, (Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008), I further complicate my position as an emergent researcher. However, as Bergerson (2003) suggests, I can use the framework and tenets of CRT to inform how I think about race in my life and my research, though my White privilege prevents me from fully understanding (p. 59) the lived experiences of people of color in a racist, racialized society. And although I know I can never fully understand the lived experiences of people of color, I can practice empathy (Warren, 2013) and work as a White ally (Tatum, 1994) to engage in antiracist practices in my life and work as a researcher and teacher educator. Indeed, my ideas for this dissertation were inspired by first-hand experiences of deeply entrenched, racialized teacher belief systems that my classmates exhibited during the course of my teacher education program almost 10 years ago. As I experienced an awakening and a new understanding of
White privilege and White supremacy, many of my White classmates defended their positions and beliefs about race and racism vehemently. The current study is part of my attempt to understand why some teachers, distinguished by certain belief systems, experience growth and changes in their thinking, while others ‘dig in’ to keep their prior belief systems intact.

**Key Terms**

In the following sections, these key terms will appear:

*Critical Race Theory*: CRT is a theoretical framework that centers race, and its relationship to power, privilege, and hegemony, as a tool for understanding inequity in society (Bell, 1992). In education, CRT provides a lens for examining the ways in which schools perpetuate the status quo and marginalize students of color, but may also be transformative spaces to empower students as change agents (Howard, 2008; Ladson-Billings, 1994).

*Intersectionality*: Multiple identity statuses may lead to multiple forms of oppression (Crenshaw, 1989). In order to understand the relationship between power and privilege, it is necessary to engage in “the examination of race, sex, class, national origin, and sexual orientation and how their combinations play out in various settings” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 51).

*White privilege*: First coined by Peggy McIntosh in 1988, White privilege (derived from Male Privilege) names the inherent benefits and access that comes with being perceived as
racially White. By acknowledging their racial privilege, White people can move towards a deeper understanding of the ways in which racism (e.g. institutional, cultural, and individual/aversive) are embedded in American society as they interrogate that privilege.

World/foreign language teaching and learning: First designated as a core subject area under No Child Left Behind (2002), and comprised of modern spoken languages taught as second languages in traditional public school settings. According to Watzke (2003), “the high school grade range (grades 9 through 12) represents the point at which most Americans begin formal language study; it accounts for more enrolled students than K–8 and higher education combined” (cited in Watzke, 2007, p. 64).

Enrollment: In a public middle school or high school setting, a student is deemed to be enrolled in a World Language course if they are registered on a class list for the term (e.g. semester, year) and this course will be registered on their official transcript upon completion (Finn, 1998).

Access: Certain student groups are systematically excluded access to certain classes and courses by way of teacher recommendation and/or tracking (Oakes, 1990). This exclusion stems from both institutionalized policies and practices that marginalize certain student groups and teachers’ beliefs and expectations about students, and may be compounded by the absence of an advocate for the student group or individual student.
**Historically marginalized students**: From an historical perspective, students in North Carolina that have been, and continue to be, marginalized by institutional policies and practices and individual teachers include groups of students whose characteristics are perceived to be incongruent with middle class, White, Christian, heteronormative, able-bodied school culture. For example, African American students, and students who are perceived to be racially “Other”, face institutional barriers in education (Omi & Winant, 1986). Furthermore, students who are English Language Learners, who have a documented disability, who identify as LGBTQ, and who practice non-Christian faiths often experience marginalization and discrimination in Southeastern schools (Eccles, Wong, & Peck, 2006; Fisher, Wallace, & Fenton, 2000; Neblett et al., 2006, Powell & Ariolla, 2003).

**Teachers’ beliefs**: The collections of views that teachers hold and attitudes that they exhibit about teaching, learning, and their expectations for students (Pajares, 1992) are systems that are often dynamic and shaped by prior experiences. For the purposes of this study, teachers’ beliefs are specifically related to teachers’ perceptions about dimensions of student diversity, motivation, ability, and achievement (Woolfolk-Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006). These belief systems are often entrenched, and are informed by teachers’ prior experiences, and by the racist, patriarchal, heteronormative, hegemonic system in which we live and work.

The following chapter provides a review of relevant literature pertaining to World Language as a curricular area of focus, research that details World Language enrollment patterns for students of color, and the existing work that reports on World Language teachers’ beliefs about diversity and diverse students.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

For the purposes of this study, a review of several literature streams is necessary. In the first section, this literature review will briefly chronicle the emergence of World Languages as an area of curricular focus and contemporary fluctuations in offering and enrollment. The next section will review the limited literature that reports on African American students’ enrollment and experiences in World Languages. The final section will provide an analysis of the literature about World Language teacher preparation programs and language teachers’ beliefs about diversity and their students, and will contextualize the purpose of the current study.

A Brief History of World Language Education

World (foreign\(^1\)) language study has always held a prominent place in the American education system, though its merits are constantly debated and the rationale for its importance has shifted over time. Scholars at the post-secondary level have traditionally viewed language study as a way to enable and enhance a more in-depth study of high art: literature, poetry, visual art, music, etc. The common wisdom for post-secondary institutions for many years seemed to be that, in order to be truly “educated” and a well-rounded academic, one must endeavor to study foreign languages. Osborn (2003) asserts, “Although such arguments are not often articulated today, these ideas still hold a level of attraction for language educators, since we recognize the contributions our own language learning has

\(^1\) Though “World Language” is the preferred contemporary nomenclature (for a discussion on the shift in terminology, see Wagner & Osborn, 2010), I use “foreign language” when citing National Standards and/or authors whose work includes the phrasing.
made to our worldviews” (p. 41). Indeed, in an analysis of post-secondary attitudes toward foreign language study, most university faculty members polled (who did not teach languages) responded that “knowing another language enhances one’s knowledge of the world and its many cultures, makes one a more informed person, and gives one certain advantages” (Wilkerson, 2006, p. 312).

However, while post-secondary institutions have maintained a fairly consistent attitude towards the inherent value of foreign languages as an area of study, university level offerings have fluctuated over the last hundred years (Schulz, 2002). The socio-political context of the United States in relation to the rest of the world has affected enrollment levels and student/parent decisions about which language to study over the last century. For example, at the height of World War II, German and Japanese enrollment increased dramatically, as did Russian during the Cold War (Anderson, 1943; Müller, 1986). More recently, third-tier languages, such as Arabic and Urdu, have gained prominence since 9/11 and the American government’s subsequent involvement in regions where these languages are spoken (Allen, 2007; Blake & Kramsch, 2007). Language offerings of this type are often billed as being in the interest of national security (Allen, 2007). In addition, issues with budgeting and funding have led to fluctuations in university course offerings in World Languages. Many universities have chosen to eliminate positions, and some universities have simply shut down language departments in favor of sending students abroad to study (Schulz, 2002).

Similarly, both socio-political and economic factors have greatly affected public school K-12 curriculum in World Languages over the last century. At the turn of the 20th
century, the Committee of Ten solidified the study of foreign languages as part of the canon of essential subjects to be learned for Americans in school, thus securing its place in public schools (Hadley, 2001). In 1918, the NEA Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education further validated the discipline, and gave recommendations for improving the curriculum (Osborn, 2003). Events such as World War II, the Cold War, and the more recent influx of Spanish-speaking students from Latin American countries have also affected second language availability and choice at the elementary and secondary levels. In North Carolina specifically, a fall 2013 briefing from the State Board of Education detailed some of the fluctuations in language offerings and enrollment:

Today’s language learning numbers appear impressive on the surface. Fifteen different languages are offered in K-12 public schools; one in four K-12 students are enrolled in languages, though the majority of that is comprised of high school enrollment; more than 2,000 North Carolina teachers are certified to teach world languages; and there are almost 60 dual language/immersion programs in the state. But, from the perspective of where we’ve been, the numbers are less inspiring. Between 1994 and 2004, K-12 world language enrollment decreased 23%, from over 414,000 to fewer than 319,000. Enrollment has slowly improved since 2004, but at just on 350,000 in 2010-11, is still down 15% versus mid-1990s levels. (NCDPI, 2013)

Students who plan to attend a four-year college or university in the UNC system in North Carolina must complete at least two credits of the same language to be considered for admission. Given that World Language study is a gateway to higher education, these
numbers contextualize current problems in access and resources across schools contexts in North Carolina.

**World Language Education: For whom?**

Enrollment in World Languages courses is a critical factor for students who plan to attend a four-year college or university in North Carolina (NCDPI, 2013). Traditionally, high school World Language programs are comprised largely of students on a college-prep track (Moore & English, 2008; Reagan & Osborn, 1998). By contrast, at some schools, World Language course enrollment is open to all students, beginning in Kindergarten, and continues with vertical articulation throughout a student’s school career (Center for Applied Linguistics, 2008). As such, it is necessary to apply a critical lens to World Languages as a content area with respect to access and equitability.

In his analysis of high school foreign language offerings in relation to tracking policies, Finn (1998) found a significant difference between low-SES and high-SES schools in the number of foreign languages offered at the introductory level and the number of advanced languages available for study. He also found great variability related to school size: students who attended larger high schools were more likely to be exposed to more languages, for longer amounts of time. Ten years later, a large-scale survey by the Center for Applied Linguistics (2008) reported that Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs decreased from 24% in 1997 to 15% in 2008 (Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011). Middle school programming dropped from 75% to 58% over the same time period, and high school programming remained fairly constant, though offerings according to language differed over
that time period. However, a notable finding from the survey was that, over the same time period, rural schools and low SES schools were less likely to offer foreign languages than other schools. Furthermore, the authors found that, “…the gap has widened between the haves and the have-nots. A large number of elementary and middle school students in this country, especially those in rural or low SES schools, do not have the opportunity to study foreign language at all” (Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011, p. 7). Participants and researchers have cited a number of reasons for this difference over the years. Some of those reasons include: lack of adequate funding to start foreign language programs, lack of trained teachers in the content area, and lack of pedagogical materials (Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011). Other reasons are more abstract, and are often used by critical theorists, who explain that World Language education is a function of high status in society. For example, Kubota (2005) posits:

The rationale for teaching foreign language is often tied to promoting international business, diplomacy, and national security, a type of work typically engaged in by elites. Thus, foreign language education works to maintain the socioeconomic status quo as well as the cultural capital of the wealthy, functioning as elite education (p. 35).

Indeed, much educational literature, and even some mission statements in schools, includes contemporary buzzwords such as “global citizenship” or “21st century learning.” Foreign language programs and departments in schools often position themselves as a means to this end, and as such, offer World Language classes to those students who are perceived to be college-bound.
Variance of curriculum and course content based on social class and socioeconomic status is not new. In Social Class and School Knowledge, Jean Anyon (1981) highlighted vast differences in curriculum in schools that served different classes of citizens in that community; specifically, what she characterized as a “working-class school,” “middle-class school,” “affluent professional school” and “executive elite school.” She concluded, “This study has suggested…that there are class conflicts in educational knowledge and its distribution” (p. 38). Since African American students are more likely to be of lower socio-economic status, and attend schools with other students of low SES (Moore & English, 2008; National Center for Education Statistics, 2007), one can infer that class-based differences of curriculum have important implications with the intersection of race; specifically, restricted availability and access for students of color.

**African American Students in World Language Classes: Enrollment**

To date, there are very few studies that detail the enrollment patterns of students of color, and more specifically African American students in World Language classes. While there is some literature to support the notion that African American students are underrepresented in World Language courses (Finn, 1998; Pratt, 2012), “The National K-12 Foreign Language Survey,” the only large-scale national survey of its kind, only reported World Language enrollment demographic information about students’ socio-economic status in its executive summary (CALS, 2011). Ethnoracial composition of schools surveyed exists, but that information is not publicly available. Instead, it must be purchased, and it is unclear if ethnoracial information is given for those students actually enrolled in World
Language classes, or for the greater school contexts. Despite the absence of this official national demographic information about African American students’ enrollment in World Language classes, a cursory observation of any school district website reveals the varied offerings by school. This variation is telling, given that African American students are more likely to attend schools that have a narrowed curriculum (Ladson-Billings, 2000).

In the most comprehensive study of its type, Finn (1998) analyzed high school language course catalogs across 340 public, private, and parochial schools and corresponding high school transcripts from 1994 graduates (n=24,000). He found that African American students were less likely than their White peers to be enrolled in language classes, despite school size and socioeconomic characteristics of the school. He also found significant interactions by race/ethnicity and school type: specifically, while all students were more likely to take languages in private schools than in public schools, African American students in these schools were only just as likely to take languages as their peers in public schools. Interestingly, African American students who attended urban public schools were more likely to be enrolled in language courses than in suburban public schools. Finally, African American students in Catholic schools were more likely to take languages than their peers in other private or public schools. Most notable from the public school data in the study was that students’ “school track” (e.g. academic, vocational, p. 291) had the greatest impact on their enrollment in language classes. Since African American students are more likely to be in lower-tracks in public schools (Delpit, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1994), this finding has serious implications for students of color. While a review of the complete tracking literature (e.g. Oakes, 1990) is beyond the scope of this particular project, it is clear from Finn’s study
that tracking will be a critical contextual variable to consider when analyzing enrollment data in North Carolina.

The few other studies that have reported on African American students and World Language enrollment were conducted in university settings. For example, Moore (2008) studied African American students enrolled at the University of Texas at Austin. She found that while very few African American students had been exposed to World Language programming at the elementary level (FLES), all students had compulsory World Language in high school. However, none of those students had been motivated to continue study of a language at the university level. The students in the sample reported that they were not encouraged to enter fields where languages may have been considered useful or necessary. Conversely, in a study conducted at Spelman college, Dahl (2000) reported that female African American students had begun to enroll in World Language courses at higher levels than in the prior decade, due to “willingness of faculty to attend to student needs, interests, and specific Black heritage” (p. 30). After analysis of this literature stream, it is unclear to what extent African American students are enrolled in university World Language courses, and how enrollment patterns may or may not have fluctuated over time, as is reported in the wider literature. Though there is a lack of longitudinal reporting in the literature about specific attitudes, experiences, and performance of African Americans in World Language classes, Hubbard (1980) wrote a retrospective account of foreign language and its relationship as a curricular area to African American students. She reported that:

… black students are being counseled out of foreign language study…in some instances because of weak English skills, but especially for a variety of untenable
reasons – including their racial (physical) features – harmful to the self-esteem of the student. The aura of elitism and difficulty which have accompanied the study of a foreign language left no doubt in the minds of school administrators, counselors, and foreign language teachers that black students would receive no value from foreign language study, for they would not go to college, would not travel abroad, would fail the course anyway, or if successful, foreign language study would nevertheless be a waste of their time. This negative attitude was strengthened and the teaching of foreign languages to black Americans was further eroded by the report of Conant in 1961 and by the sociologists and the psychologists of the period who, in probing the characteristics of the disadvantaged child, reported that teaching foreign languages was ‘educationally futile’” (p. 76).

**African American Students in World Language Classes: Experiences**

In 1992, James Davis, in *African American Students and Foreign Language Learning*, provided a comprehensive review of the literature to that point, and determined that only six studies had been conducted from 1940 to 1991 that pertained to African American students’ “perceived needs, performance, and attitudes toward foreign language study” (p. 3). Of those studies, two reported that Black students enrolled in foreign languages at Black colleges and universities did not perform as well as their peers at other institutions (Worthington & Carter, 1941 and Nyabongo, 1946, as cited in Davis, 1992). One study reported that Black foreign language students at Indiana University performed as well as their White peers (Brigman & Jacobs, 1981, as cited in Davis, 1992). The other studies
(LeBlanc, 1972; Clowney & Legge, 1979, Davis & Markham, 1991) reported that overall, African American students expressed positive attitudes toward foreign language study (as cited in Davis, 1992). However, in the 1991 study, Davis and Markham found that some African American students reported discontentment to language study, and that this discontentment stemmed from pedagogical practices. In 1994, Guillaume asserted that World Language enrollment of African American students remained low because of the inherent notion that foreign languages taught in contemporary American schools were “spoken by White Europeans” and that the “failure to include an Afro-centric perspective in instruction, and to teach languages spoken in Africa, has had negative effects” (Guillaume, as cited in Moore, 2008, p. 192). Similarly, Peters (1994) continued to theorize that low enrollment was perhaps due to “social and cultural distances” between the students and the content.

Little research has been conducted about African American students’ experiences in K-12 World Language classes. In a case study of African American middle school students who were learning Arabic, Moore and English (2008) reported that students developed proficient language skills, and that their teachers incorporated the students themselves into their lesson planning and activities, and into the teaching of the content. Furthermore, the authors gave some recommendations for successful second language pedagogy, which included discovery learning and multi-sensorial activities. They concluded that, despite decades of research that theorized to the contrary, the African American students in their study were highly capable of learning a second language. In another study, Pratt (2012) focused specifically on African American students enrolled in high school Spanish classes,
and their levels of motivation towards learning the content. She found that while initial enrollment in Spanish classes was high, African American students tended to withdraw from language classes more quickly than other students of color and their White peers. She concluded that these students experienced demotivation because of a “lack of a parental support system, role models [who were proficient in the target language], appropriate career counseling, and opportunities to achieve communicative competence stemming from difficulties in the classroom environment” (p. 116). Again, much remains to be explored in terms of African American students’ enrollment and experiences in World Language classes.

**Race and Restricted Access: Implications**

By offering a World Language curriculum to students who are primarily racially White and of higher socioeconomic status, schools limit the opportunities of our students of color to gain access to World Language classes. The inequity of course offerings across schools and districts by socioeconomic status supports some contemporary critical theorists’ claim that:

> The prevailing practice of education perpetuates existing social relations by preparing disadvantaged students to fill lower strata vocations within the current job market framework. It dashes hopes and dreams of both disadvantaged students and their parents. It promotes the social status quo by limiting the opportunity for economically disadvantaged learners to increase their understanding of the world.

---

2 Specifically, the percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch, (FRPL) which is the variable most often used in most reporting. This variable, however, is not to be conflated with students’ ethnoracial status.
through a richer understanding of the contextual nature of language, and how language shapes our worldview. (Dale & Hyslop-Margison, 2011, p. 129)

Similarly, in their seminal work, Bowles and Gintis (1976, 2002) asserted that, “the people production process - in the workplace and in schools - is dominated by the imperatives of profit and domination rather than by human need” (p. 53). It would seem that, in the hopes of providing legitimacy for World Languages as a content area, advocates have fallen victim to this market ideology. By advocating that some World Language is better than none, educators and policy-makers have perpetuated a system that is not equitable to all learners. Osborn (2003) writes, “This ideology misapplies the logic of the marketplace as a guiding principle for educational programming, rather than referring simply to a greater public and democratic good” (p. 42), such as allowing all learners, including all students of color and all students attending schools with a high percentage of Free or Reduced Price Lunch recipients, the opportunity to participate in World Language learning.

Because dominant groups in society racialize non-dominant groups in ways that coalesce with labor market demand (Delgado & Stefancic, 2012), a prevailing discourse in education is to solve the problem of “at-risk” youth; this terminology, in many circles, is racial code for ‘students of color’. In the current frenzied climate of testing and subsequent failure, especially with students of color placed “at-risk”, and who are also highly concentrated in low-performing schools (as defined by NCLB and/or RttT standards), academic success can sometimes be rare.

However, language advocacy professionals have the opportunity to frame validation for the content area not as a product of market ideology based on necessary skills for the 21st
century learner/worker, but in terms of boosting student achievement. Second language learners may experience an array of cognitive benefits. An annotated bibliography published by the Georgia Department of Education highlights journal articles that demonstrate the positive effects of enrollment in foreign language programs on standardized test scores in “core” areas such as reading and math (Webb, n.d.). These peer-reviewed articles span a wide variety of grade levels, diverse schools, and programs of instruction. Cognitive psychologists have evidence to support claims that learning languages at young ages supports development of the actual “hard-wiring” of the brain (Bialystok & Craik, 2010; Genesee & Cloud, 1998; Robinson, 1992). Preliminary research from a program at Duke University, which analyzes cognitive effects of bilingual and second language learning in young children, is promising in terms of its potential implications in closing the achievement gap for African American and Spanish dominant English Language Learners (M. Wilbourn, personal communication, December 2, 2011). In addition, high school students in World Language classes score consistently higher on the ACT and SAT (ACTFL, 2014). Researchers have also studied the effects of foreign language learning not only as it relates to achievement in other content areas, but also how it relates to improvements in high school students’ self-efficacy and attitudes about school (Armstrong & Rogers, 1997; Cooper, 1987; Garfinkel & Tabor, 1991; Samuels & Griffor, 1979; Saunders, 1998). Advocates can use this evidence to push for middle school and high school World Language programs that not only create more cognitively advanced learners, but also allow for more pronounced cognitive gains in traditionally marginalized populations. Moreover, expanding access to World
Language will narrow the “opportunity gap” (Milner, 2010) between White students and their peers of color, which is the true source of the ‘achievement gap’.

**Language Classrooms: Sites of Critical Pedagogy and Multicultural Education**

Many students do not possess background knowledge in languages before arriving to the World Language classroom. As such, student success in beginning language classes is not predicated on prior achievement or performance in the way that it may be in other content areas. In this way, students may experience success in an academic setting when they have not before. Muirhead (2009) has highlighted the critical need for language teachers to make language learning “accessible to students” (p. 247) because of the inherent benefits of second language study. These benefits may only take place, however, when teachers use their knowledge of student diversity, combined with culturally relevant teaching practices (Ladson-Billings, 1995) and critical pedagogies (McLaren, 2005), to inform their language teaching practice. Indeed, Crookes (1997) argued that “even relatively innovative Second/Foreign Language teacher preparation programs, including ESL programs, usually reflect a more general tendency in education: a technocratic orientation that makes it difficult to provide new teachers with an understanding of their sociohistorical context, of themselves as political actors, and of the idea that the classroom is not a given” (p. 71). After careful case-study analysis of two practicing language teachers, Burnett (2011) found that White teachers in her study who attended and completed a Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) program (for which she was a teacher educator) were not adequately prepared for the cultural mismatch they experienced as teachers in predominately African American schools. This
fundamental cultural misunderstanding on the part of the teachers took the form of stressful
classroom management situations, lowered expectations for students, and tense parent-
teacher interactions. As such, Burnett called for more explicit instruction about diversity in
the MAT program, and advocated for more community-based practicums and activities for
student teachers.

Osborn and Regan (1998) argued that there is a clear overlap between the fields of
multicultural education and foreign language education, though there is little scholarly work
that addresses these shared goals. Multicultural education and competency have been
conceptualized in many ways. However, at its core, multicultural education is best summed
up by Banks: “A major goal of multicultural education, as stated by specialists in the field, is
to reform the schools and other educational institutions so that students from diverse, racial,
ethnic, and social-class groups will experience educational equality” (Banks, 2005, p. 3).
Since teachers’ beliefs are predictors of their behavior (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Nadelson
et al., 2012), proponents of multicultural education argue that the need for preservice
teachers to develop multicultural competencies is imperative, with regard to both the
changing demographics of the public school system (Howard & Aleman, 2005; Nadelson, et
al, 2012; Sleeter, 2008; Zumwalt & Craig, 2005), and the potential impact that these
competencies may have on student learning (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Sleeter, 2008).
Reagan and Osborn (1998, 2002) argued further that using foreign language classrooms as
sites of critical pedagogies and multicultural education can serve to raise “critical language
awareness” (p. 2, 2002) and provide an entrée into larger discussions of cultural bias, power
dynamics, and hegemony. However, there is little research that examines the extent to which
language teachers espouse the ideas and practices of multicultural education and critical pedagogies.

**World Language Teachers’ Beliefs about Teaching Diverse Populations**

With the continued shifts in demographics in American public schools, it is inevitable that student populations will become more diverse (Zumwalt & Craig, 2005). As such, it will be important to continue to investigate the relationship between a largely White, middle class teaching force and classrooms comprised predominately of students of color. Specifically, there is a body of work that highlights the importance of teacher beliefs about cultural diversity and student characteristics because of the relationship between beliefs and practice (Pajares, 1992). Nadelson et al. (2012) posit that, “identifying the nature of teachers’ beliefs, attitudes, and values are paramount to understanding their future choices, decisions, and effectiveness regarding issues of diversity, social justice, and equity” (Bowser-Brown, 2007; Brown, 2004; Pajares, 1993; Rokeach, 1968; as cited in Nadelson et al., p. 1193).

Preservice teachers bring existing beliefs about the nature of teaching and learning, schools, and the purpose of schools to their teacher education programs, based on their own experiences as students (Lortie, 1975). These beliefs become problematic when:

Preservice teachers enter programs treating political and economic inequalities as natural or unproblematic (and if they are not successfully encouraged to critically examine these issues during their program), we may have part of the explanation for the tendency among teachers to function as professional ideologists, i.e., apologists.
for at least preservers of the status quo. (Ginsburg & Newman, 1985, as cited in Pajares, 1992, p. 323)

Furthermore, some scholars argue that prior beliefs act as “filters” or “screens”, which impact the way that preservice and practicing teachers construct new knowledge (Causey, Thomas, & Armento, 2000; Fives & Beuhl, 2012) and, as such, “teacher educators cannot ignore their students’ entering and developing beliefs” (Villegas, 2007, p. 373). Many teacher education programs, while they may include courses of study in multicultural education or program diversity requirements, fail to adequately prompt White students to interrogate their Whiteness and the ways in which ‘Whiteness as property’ contributes to systemic inequities, specifically in education (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Harris, 1993; Sleeter, 2001).

Teacher candidates inevitably bring entrenched values and beliefs to the profession as a function of the racialized contexts in which we live and work. Teachers’ implicit beliefs about student diversity can be characterized in different ways: a meritocratic system wherein ‘hard work conquers all’ (Causey, Thomas & Armento, 2000); “an absolute democracy” (Finney & Orr, 1995; Nieto, 1998; O’Grady, 1998) or a “ naïve egalitarianism”, that embraces that notion that ‘kids are kids’ and advocates for a one-size-fits-all approach (as cited in Woolfolk-Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006, p. 719); or a colorblind racism (Bell, 2002; Bonilla-Silva & Dietrich, 2011; Delpit, 1995; Milner, 2003), which downplays the competing levels of cultural capital inherent in a diverse classroom. Implications for these belief systems include teaching behaviors that may marginalize students of color, students of low socio-
economic status, and/or students who are ethno-linguistically diverse (for a review of the literature about teachers’ beliefs about diversity and achievement, see Sleeter, 2008).

By contrast, there exist sets of teacher beliefs characterized by frameworks for social justice (e.g. Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 2009; Cochran-Smith, 2009; Kincheloe, 2000). Teaching for social justice can involve “self-sustaining, generative change [which] frequently entails teachers making changes in their basic epistemological perspectives, their knowledge of what it means to learn, as well as their conceptions of classroom practice” (Franke et al., 1998). Moreover, teachers for social justice adopt critical pedagogies and work to establish classrooms as democratic spaces for hope and interruption (Freire, 1970; Giroux, 1998; McLaren, 2005). Teachers for social justice approach their work from a critical lens, and work to ‘survive and subvert’ the dominant school structure within their classrooms, and through their advocacy for their students (Stone, 1996).

In a comprehensive review of literature about World Language teachers’ beliefs, Arnett and Turnbull (2007) asserted that researchers in the field still have much work to do in specifically articulating the conceptual understanding of teachers’ beliefs with which they approach their individual work. Many of the studies they reviewed did not treat ‘beliefs’ (also referred to as ‘assumptions’, ‘knowledge’, ‘cognition’, and ‘personal theories’ in the literature) as constructs to be grappled with, defined, and operationalized. This oversight, they argued, is indicative of the theoretical arguments that exist in the broader literature about teachers’ beliefs.

Until this point, the empirical research literature on World Language teachers’ beliefs has focused primarily on philosophical perspectives surrounding implementation of the
National Standards (1999), and on teachers’ alignment of pedagogical beliefs and instructional practices with these standards (e.g., Allen 2002; Bartz & Singer, 1996; Bruning, Flowerday, & Trayer, 1999). The majority of these studies analyze practicing World Language teachers’ responses to instruments that were designed to measure these teachers’ pedagogical decision-making, and to measure the supposed change in these decisions since the implementation of the national standards. In another study of language teachers’ beliefs about teaching and learning, Bell (2005) identified 44 congruent beliefs about effective language teaching practices across a sample of 457 experienced language teachers. These beliefs centered around ‘best pedagogical practices’, such as a focus on communicative competencies and authentic curricular materials to be presented in the target language. In a similar study, Brown (2009) identified many of the same beliefs held by language teachers about the effectiveness of their instruction. In a mixed-methods study about language teachers’ beliefs, Kissau, Algozzine, and Yon (2012) found “uniformity in beliefs across L2 teachers” in comparison to findings from previous studies (p. 591). The only finding which treated the topic of diversity was that all language teachers believed they needed to use varying strategies to “address diverse student needs and interests”. It is unclear from this study under which conditions language teachers perceive they need to adopt a variety of strategies.

While it is beyond the scope of this current project, much work has been done regarding teachers of English as a Second (TESOL) and their beliefs about the populations of students who come to their classes to learn English (e.g. Fox, 1996; García, 1992; Kubota &
Lin, 2009). It could be argued that many policies and principles that govern English as a Second Language programs in the United States approach teaching and learning from an assimilationist or subtractive (Valenzeula, 1999) model, or a “paternalistic”… “apparent altruism” in teaching English to immigrant students (van Dijk, 1993, p. 95,) that may perpetuate racial and linguistic hegemony (Kubota & Lin, 2009; van Dijk, 1993). That is, students ‘need’ to learn and master the English language, often implicitly at the expense of their heritage and culture, in order to be ‘successful’. Thus, there are inherent political dynamics about teaching students whose first language is a language other than English that may generate a different set of belief systems in ESL teachers. Auerbach (1991) and others have also argued that ESL teachers in the United States are often marginalized because the population they serve is inherently not a part of dominant culture. This also could lead to different belief systems in ESL/TESOL teachers as compared to World Language teachers.

By contrast, World Language programs purport to ‘broaden students’ horizons’ and introduce other, valid ways of knowing and living (ACTFL, 2013). However, little theorizing and even less research has been conducted in relation to how World Language teacher candidates and practicing teachers treat the ethnoracial, cultural, and linguistic diversity that their individual students bring to the World Language classroom (Kubota, Austin, Saito-Abbott, 2003). Indeed, many teacher candidates are unaware that teaching second languages has historically been a “direct instrument of colonialism” (Crookes, 1997, p. 74; Phillipson, 1988; Pennycook, 1990; Tollefson, 1989, 1995).

---

3 This body of work does not specifically treat World Language teachers’ beliefs about diversity in their classrooms.
Some researchers have begun to perhaps implicitly measure World Language teachers’ beliefs about teaching diverse populations, but few studies aim to do specifically that. In a study conducted with practicing teachers, Allen (2002) found that some World Language teachers believed that language study could benefit all students. These findings varied according to teachers’ education level and teaching context:

Teachers with a BA or MA believed more strongly than teachers who held a PhD or EdD ($F = 7.326, p < .001$) that foreign language study should not begin in high school [but earlier]...Teachers in private schools were more likely than teachers in public schools to believe that all students, regardless of career objectives, can benefit from studying a foreign language (statement 32, $t = 3.58, p < .001$). (p. 524)

A function of World Language preparation programs is to prepare candidates to effectively teach a diverse student population (Muirhead, 2009; Moore & English, 2008; Osborn & Reagan, 1998; Wilbur, 2007). A review of the literature reveals that it is unlikely that language teacher candidates are prepared to establish language classrooms as unique sites of student learning for all learners, especially for student populations who are traditionally underserved or marginalized. Preliminary findings from a qualitative case study of practicing language teachers’ beliefs and anecdotal personal experience suggest that some World Language teachers may regard their content area as an elite academic subject, and may harbor many of the implicit biases that the general population of teachers hold towards students of color. These implicit biases may take the form of deficit views of students of color, or a ‘colorblind’ racism (Milner, 2002) and subsequent espousal of the myth of meritocracy (McNamee & Miller, 2009). In other words, World Language teachers may hold
lowered expectations for students of color and may display a lack of awareness of issues surrounding diversity in their own classrooms, despite their attempts to ‘teach’ cultural pluralism in the context of a modern World Language. As such, a review of the research about World Language teachers’ beliefs reveals that there are gaps in the literature related specifically to World Language teachers’ beliefs about diversity, equity, multiculturalism, and opportunities to learn.

**World Language Teacher Preparation**

Many White teacher candidates, when asked about their ‘culture’, do not identify with the concept. With respect to White, American, native English speaking World Language teachers (who comprise a majority of the language teaching population), I hypothesized that ‘culture’ remains an extraneous, exotic concept, despite the work that teacher candidates do to construct understandings of the target culture. While attempts in World Language teacher preparation programs are made to incorporate the culture of the target language, little emphasis is placed on a teacher candidate’s own culture, or the cultures with which students arrive to public schools in the United States (Kubota, 2005). In some cases, study of another culture may lead to insights about one’s own culture; however, when not analyzed critically (Byram, 2008; Guilherme, 2002; Diaz-Greenberg & Nevin, 2003), these insights may be generic in nature, and refer to ‘American’ culture in a way that is monolithic. These generic insights neglect to critically examine the White, middle-class underpinnings of an ‘American’ designation, and may ultimately lead students to determine that ‘American’ culture is superior (Pufahl, Rhodes, & Christian, 2000). Moreover, Kubota and Lin (2009)
assert that the field of second language teacher education suffers from ‘colorblindness’. In a ‘colorblind’ society, or when working with teachers who operate under the assumption that students experience the world in qualitatively similar ways, or that we should perhaps minimize differences between people, it is essential that we prompt discussion about culture based on race, gender, disability status, sexual orientation, and other dimensions of diversity in a way that does not present culture as monolithic by groups or reinforce stereotypes.

Several scholars have begun to make recommendations specifically for language teacher preparation programs to address the need for teachers to serve all students. After analysis of methodology course syllabi across 32 postsecondary institutions, Wilbur (2007) determined that preservice language teachers were not equipped with the pedagogical content knowledge to meet the needs of diverse learners, whether the diversity was due to “students’ ages, learning styles, cultural backgrounds, physical challenges, special needs, emotional wellness” or “at-risk categories” (p. 91). In response to this determination, Wilbur called for more methodology courses to keep “learner diversity in mind while considering the Standards, SLA theories, and how those theories translate into best practices” (p. 96). Zephir (2000) called for integration of ethnic studies and ‘ethnic literacy’ components into foreign language teacher preparation programs. Zephir situated her argument in the demographic shifts of the population, and presented it as an alternative to the assimilationist model. Instead of homogenization of differences, she asserted the need to embrace the paradigm of cultural pluralism, and posited, “Understanding that landscape and gaining familiarity with the ‘ethnic’ student’s world should be one of the priorities for foreign language teachers if they are to provide an effective and meaningful education to their students” (Zephir, 2000, p.
Similarly, Diaz-Greenberg and Nevin (2003) emphasized the need to elicit student teachers’ ‘voices’ to develop an understanding of the challenges that they face in teaching culture in the foreign language classroom. Fox & Diaz-Greenberg (2006) have theorized about how multicultural education and critical pedagogy can help World Language teachers in teaching culture and in teaching diverse populations. They identify two foci for development in language teacher candidates, which include: 1) “creating connections between and among curriculum, language acquisition and proficiency, students’ abilities, and backgrounds, and the teacher’s background, values, and beliefs” and 2) “experiential learning” and “acquisition of cultural knowledge that extends beyond the ‘food and facts’ to a deeper level” (Fox & Diaz-Greenberg, 2006, p. 406).

Summary of Literature Streams

World Languages, as an area of curricular focus, has experienced fluctuations in offering and enrollment due to both external sociopolitical forces and events, and developments within the field, such as the adoption of the National Standards. It is unclear from prior research the extent to which World Language classrooms function as a mechanism of inclusion for historically marginalized students. A review of the literature on World Language teacher preparation and beliefs reveals that language teachers may have internalized dominant negative discourses about historically marginalized students and may embody implicit biases towards students of color and students whose identities are not consistent with the ‘norm’.
As such, the purpose of this study was to explore potential variations in access at the school and classroom level, and the extent to which historically marginalized students are enrolled in middle and high school language courses in North Carolina’s school districts. In addition, this study examined the ways in which practicing middle and high school World Language teachers in North Carolina act as sites of inclusion for their students and the many diverse characteristics that they bring to language classrooms. The following chapter details the methodological approach and design of the study.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to explore the extent to which World Language classrooms may operate as sites of inclusion (or exclusion) for historically marginalized students in North Carolina. Three data collection techniques were employed to explore specifically: 1) how access to language curricula and courses varied across school contexts in North Carolina in 2013-2014; 2) how practicing World Language teachers’ self-reported beliefs reflected different dispositions which may or may not be adaptive for meeting the needs of diverse learners who enroll in language courses, and how these orientations relate to their language teaching practices; and, 3) how practicing language teachers made sense of variability in access to their classes and the students who are in their classrooms. Critical Race Theory was used as an interpretive lens to frame the ways in which this data about access and teachers’ beliefs aligned with or contradicted existing discourses about race, marginalized student groups, and equity in educational research.

Design

Overarching Framework

This mixed-methods study is grounded in Critical Race Theory. This framework centers race as the issue of focus, and explores the intersectionality of other identity statuses with race, such as gender, faith, sexuality, and socioeconomic status. Critical Race Theory posits that racism is a normal, permanent fixture of American society (Bell, 1980; 1992). It manifests on different levels and in different ways, such as structural or institutional racism, cultural racism, and individual racism (Jones, 1997). As applied to education systems, racist
practices can be seen at work in structural mechanisms and policies (e.g. tracking; differentials in disciplinary practices), cultural assumptions of what is the ‘norm’ and what is ‘the other’ (e.g. in curricular materials), and in individual interactions between teachers, administrators, and students (e.g. differentials in disciplinary practices and expectations of academic achievement) (Howard, 2008; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Tatum, 1997).

Since schools are often sites of exclusion for non-White students, the first phase of the study consisted of analysis of enrollment patterns in high school World Language classes and interrogation of the extent to which course offerings and enrollment in World Languages may operate under a racialized structure. Practicing World Language teachers were asked to reflect on these findings from the enrollment data analysis during interviews in the third phase of the study. Furthermore, since teachers’ beliefs about students’ ethnoracial status (and other identity statuses) may inform the way in which they approach their interrelational work with students (Hoy, Davis & Pape, 2006), their curricular and pedagogical choices (Fives & Beuhl, 2012), and the expectations they have for student achievement (Delpit, 1996), the second phase of the study explored practicing language teachers’ beliefs about dimensions of student diversity that they may perceive to be different from the ‘norm’ (i.e. White, middle-class, Christian, heterosexual, able-bodied). A critical quantitative perspective was used in selecting the survey instrument for this study, and was used to analyze both enrollment and survey data. Qualitative data included semi-structured interviews with a purposive sample of practicing World Language teachers.
Mixing Methodologies

This study employed a multiphase, exploratory, sequential design (quan→QUAN→QUAL) (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; DeCuir-Gunby & Walker-DeVose, 2013; Morse, 2003), and both quantitative and qualitative data were collected (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Figure 1 details the design of the current study. Phase I consisted of secondary quantitative data analysis that was used to inform qualitative aspects of Phase III. Phase II consisted of survey data of Likert-type items. Phase III consisted of semi-structured interviews with a smaller, targeted sample of participants who completed the survey in Phase II. Data from Phase I was analyzed first, and participants were asked to reflect on the findings from this analysis during Phase III (see appendices for survey items and interview protocol).
Figure 1. Research Design.

**PHASE I**
quan analysis: descriptives; independent samples t-tests

**PHASE II**
QUAN analysis: descriptives; EFA; correlations; cluster analysis; MANOVA

**PHASE III**
QUAL analysis: Constructivist Grounded Theory Approach

---

quan data sources: World Language enrollment data from 4 large districts in North Carolina

QUAN data sources: Survey data (FLEQ, TSR-MD); self-reported demographic info

QUAL data source: semi-structured interviews

*Figure 1. Research Design.*
Critical Race Theory informed the design of this study, and each component was integral to the interpretation of the data. Since schools act as powerful forces, capable of reproducing cultural and economic norms, statuses, and hierarchies (Anyon, 2009; Bowles & Gintis, 1976, 2002; Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990, Giroux, 1983a; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Howard, 2008), analysis of enrollment patterns was used to reveal systematic policies and practices that contribute to inequity (Gillborn, 2010). Since teachers’ beliefs may be predictors of behavior (Fives & Buehl, 2012; Kozel, 2007; Nadelson et al., 2012; Woolfolk-Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006), exploration of teachers’ beliefs about their students revealed the ways in which they did or did not position their work and their classrooms as sites of inclusion for diverse students. DeCuir-Gunby and Walker-DeVose (2013) suggest a mixed methods approach to research that can situate both critical quantitative analyses and qualitative analyses within a Critical Race framework. The combination of both quantitative and qualitative components served to interrogate patterns of inequity that emerged. Finally, these different data sources were used to triangulate findings about the ways in which language teachers have internalized discourses regarding historically marginalized students, and how these discourses manifested at both a macro level (in the form of systemic policies and practices) and on a micro level (in the form of teachers’ beliefs).

**Research Questions**

Specifically, this study addressed the following questions:

1) To what extent are historically marginalized students enrolled in middle and high school World Language courses in large districts in North Carolina?
2) How do high school World Language teachers’ orientations toward diverse learners contribute to the inclusion of historically marginalized students?

3) How do high school World Language teachers’ descriptions of the typical and atypical types of students in their classes contribute to our understanding of the inclusion of historically marginalized students in language classes?

4) How does analysis of high school World Language student enrollment and teachers’ beliefs data contribute to our understanding of the discourses that World Language teachers may be internalizing about historically marginalized students?

Critical hypotheses for the study included the prospect that access to World Language classes may be another form of White privilege in schools, and that enrollment practices may be racialized and a manifestation of institutional racism. Furthermore, teachers’ beliefs about diverse student characteristics may be implicitly derived from ethnoracial biases and the intersection of other forms of diversity that do not align with mainstream student characteristics (e.g. White, middle-class, Christian, heterosexual, able-bodied). After reviewing the literature on World Language teacher preparation, I expected that there would be no difference between language teachers’ beliefs regarding historically marginalized student groups and the beliefs articulated by the general teaching population.

**Subjectivity Statement**

Because a researcher’s subjectivities influence the design and interpretation of a study, they should be explored and articulated (Peshkin, 1988). As a critically conscious
White woman, I approached this research with a particular, critical lens. I am aware of my privileged statuses, but I am also aware that many White (hetero, able-bodied, middle/upper-class, etc.) people are not. Moreover, after developing an understanding of the research literature, I am aware that many teachers, in particular, are not aware of their own privileged statuses. Although I tried to approach this study and my participants from a developmental perspective, I often struggled to reconcile the beliefs I perceived practicing teachers in the sample to exhibit with my own values and attitudes towards World Language education, diverse students, and schools as sites of inclusion and critical pedagogies.

It should be noted as well that, as an emergent researcher, I am conscious of the ways in which quantitative methodologies and statistical analyses have been used to marginalize diverse groups and perpetuate status quo ideologies (Gillborn, 2010). Although the analyses I employed in this study are grounded in a patriarchal, positivist, Euro-centric paradigm, I used them to interrogate the equitability of educational practices viewed through a specific lens. When viewed through other lenses, such as a positivist or an ‘objective’ research perspective, findings could be interpreted in other ways that do not serve to illuminate hierarchies and power structures, and that could be antithetic to the goals of this study. I also am aware that focusing on structural inequities places marginalized groups in a position of ‘victim-hood’, instead of focusing on ways that marginalized groups can be empowered and affect change. However, this study served to illuminate structural inequity and document the mechanisms by which marginalization comes into being as a first step to use as a catalyst for reflection and change.
As a former World Language teacher of primarily students of color, I have biases that needed to be articulated and clarified before the study began. I believe that languages should be accessible to all students, and that language teachers should interrogate their own privilege, work to build relationships with the communities in which they teach, and adopt culturally responsive teaching practices to meet their students’ needs. As a teacher for social justice, conducting interviews for this study was particularly difficult for me. I have been immersed in the literature about teachers’ beliefs about diversity; I have heard countless preservice teachers in my own classes express views that do not reflect critical consciousness; I am well aware of the racist “smog”, the patriarchal oppression, able-bodied, heteronormative, and cis-gender privilege and the ways in which many teachers benefit and are unaware.

Yet, it was still surprising to interview teachers who interact with middle and high school students every day, and know that these interactions were approached with the best of intentions, but were perhaps uninformed by an understanding of schooling in a sociopolitical context. It was trying to hear practicing language teachers make stereotypical comments about students of color, or to explain away systemic inequities by focusing on perceived individual failures and shortcomings, and to be unable to hold them accountable for these comments (ie. refraining from ‘calling them out’). While conducting some interviews, it was difficult to hear teachers underscore their care and concern for their students, yet articulate how powerless they felt to advocate or to affect change. It was also difficult to hear language teachers, some of whom had completed the same teacher preparation I had, embrace language teaching practices that were outdated and did not always support student learning.
Conversely, it was reassuring to hear one participant who staunchly identified as a teacher for social justice, and who was working to advocate for her students as best as she saw fit at the time. In order to bracket my subjectivities, I was careful to allow participants to speak to their own experiences as language teacher during our interviews, and not to project my experiences onto theirs. It was important that I created space for participants’ voices, regardless of whether or not I perceived my own worldview to align with theirs.

**Phase I**

**Participants**

The first phase of the study was made possible by data collection procedures of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. For Phase I, the four largest Local Education Agencies (LEAs) were selected purposively from North Carolina. These districts were selected due to the increased likelihood of financial support for a variety of language programs. Districts reflected diverse student populations and varied with respect to the number and type of World Language course offerings across school contexts. All LEAs included some middle schools that offered languages to students, and some that did not. Table 3.1 details characteristics of all middle schools in the LEAs in the sample.
Table 3.1
*LEA Characteristics – Middle Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Range of number of students</th>
<th>Range of number of languages offered</th>
<th>Range of percentage of students of color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>59-1749</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>27.38%-85.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>120-1252</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>25.50%-97.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 3</td>
<td>233-1638</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>23.09%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 4</td>
<td>72-1196</td>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>14.82%-98.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most high schools in all LEAs offered at least one language to students, though offerings varied widely across districts. Table 3.2 details characteristics of all high schools in the LEAs.

Table 3.2
*LEA Characteristics – High Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEA</th>
<th>Range of number of students</th>
<th>Range of number of languages offered</th>
<th>Range of percentage of students of color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>164-2644</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>26.04%-95.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>59-2032</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>25.28%-95.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 3</td>
<td>137-2775</td>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>22.08%-99.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 4</td>
<td>13-2001</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>21.59%-99.11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School sizes, language department staff, and the number of languages offered varied widely as well. In order to protect the relative anonymity of individual schools within each
LEA, districts were assigned numerical values, and only ranges of school and district characteristics are reported. Table 3.3 reports characteristics of all secondary schools in the sample.

Table 3.3
*LEA Characteristics – Middle and High Schools*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Range of number of students</th>
<th>Range of number of languages offered</th>
<th>Range of percentage of students of color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All LEAs</td>
<td>13-2775</td>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>14.82% – 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 1</td>
<td>59-2644</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>26.04% – 95.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 2</td>
<td>16-2032</td>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>25.28%-97.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 3</td>
<td>107-2775</td>
<td>0-8</td>
<td>22.08%-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA 4</td>
<td>13-2001</td>
<td>0-7</td>
<td>14.81%-99.12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Procedures**

To answer the first research question, I requested secondary data generated from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI) about student demographics in World Language courses in four large Local Education Agencies (LEAs) in North Carolina. A report with specific demographic variables (gender, race/ethnicity, and Free/Reduced Price Lunch status) for students enrolled in World Language courses, by LEA, school, and grade level was requested for the most recent academic year available (2013-2014). Data obtained from NCDPI included all variables requested, except for students’ Free/Reduced Price Lunch
status, which was not available to the public. The data provided by NCDPI did not include schools in the LEAs where no languages were offered. As such, I obtained a separate list of all schools in each LEA and merged the two files to determine the total number of schools in the district, and the total number of schools where World Language programming was present.

Data was obtained in multiple worksheets generated by Microsoft Excel. Specifically, data included student counts by race/ethnicity and gender, and intersectionality of both (e.g. count of female students, count of African American students, count of female, African American students, etc.), for all individual language classes at each school in each LEA (both level and language of instruction, e.g. French 1). Data was prepared for analysis by summing these counts to generate a total number of students enrolled in language courses across each school, a total number by gender, and a total number by ethnoracial subgroup, and a total number of each subgroup intersectionality (e.g. Hispanic female). Next, total enrollment data for each school in the four LEAs for the 2013-2014 academic year was drawn from the public website of NCDPI (http://www.ncpublicschools.org/data/). This data was also in the form of an Excel spreadsheet, and included students’ ethnoracial status and gender.

Using both the World Language counts and the general total enrollment data retrieved from NCDPI, I juxtaposed and compared total World Language enrollment data by race and gender subgroups to total school enrollment by race and gender subgroups. Proportions were calculated in Microsoft Excel to reflect the percentage of total students, and by subpopulation, enrolled at each school, and percentages of subpopulations of students
enrolled in World Language. I created binary, or dummy, variables to represent certain characteristics about each school: specifically, whether the school was a middle school or high school; whether or not the school had a language program; whether the school had only introductory levels of language (e.g. Spanish I & 2), introductory and Honors levels of language (e.g. Spanish I, 2, 3Honors, 4Honors), or Advanced Placement courses offered (e.g. AP Spanish Language) in addition to introductory and Honors classes; and whether or not the school had an International Baccalaureate program, which has corresponding curricula for language learning.

In addition, I coded schools according to ‘majority/minority’ student percentage based on Orfield and Lee’s (2005) work on school segregation; specifically, schools were grouped by 1) if the school population included 50% or more White students; 2) if the school population included between 50 and 89% non-White students; 3) if the school population included between 90 and 98% non-White students; and 4) if the school population included between 99 and 100% non-White students. School segregation has important implications since students of color disproportionately attend schools with a narrowed curriculum (Anyon, 1994; Ladson-Billings, 2000) and less qualified teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2000), and Orfield and Lee (2005) reported that 73% of students of color attend ‘majority-minority’ schools.

**Data Analysis**

After subgroup enrollment and total proportions were calculated in Excel, the dataset was pulled into the SPSS statistics package for further analysis. First, frequencies were
generated to determine the total number of high schools and middle schools in the four LEAs. Next, frequencies were generated for the total number of high schools and middle schools where languages were offered, the number of languages offered at high schools and middle schools, and characteristics about the language programs (e.g., whether introductory courses and honors were offered, whether or not AP courses were offered, and whether or not schools were part of an IB program).

Schools were also grouped according to demographic percentages of students and frequencies were also generated by school segregation ‘type’ (Orfield & Lee, 2005). Segregation, or the extent to which non-White students are systematically separated from White students, remains a relevant construct in public education because students of color (73% in 2005) who attend ‘majority minority’ schools are less likely to have access to educational resources, teachers who are licensed, and certain curricula, such as AP courses (Orfield & Lee, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Perry, Steele, & Hilliard, 2003).

Finally, descriptive statistics were generated to calculate the average proportion of each subgroup in schools in the LEAs, which varied by language level offering and the percentage of ‘minority’ students that comprised each school. These average proportions were used as test variables to allow comparison of observed and expected student enrollments. One sample t-tests were then used to determine if student enrollment numbers in World Language classes were significantly different than the rate at which they comprised school populations.

Critical Race Theory informed enrollment data analysis in that enrollment data was interrogated for signs of inequity for historically marginalized groups of students. Based on
the existing literature about the ways in which schools have the potential to marginalize students who do not embody the ‘norm’ (e.g. White, Christian, middle class, heterosexual, able-bodied, etc.), and data which indicates that students of color are often exposed to a narrowed curriculum (e.g. Ladson Billings, 2000; Perry, Steele & Hilliard, 2004), I hypothesized that middle and high schools in large districts in North Carolina would function by similar mechanisms. If access to World Language courses were equitable across student groups, comparison of enrolled student groups to student groups at the school would be the same.

Phase II

Participants

The second phase of the research study was made possible by the Foreign Language Association of North Carolina (FLANC), the World Language coordinator of the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction (NCDPI), and Division 15 of the American Psychological Association (APA). World Language teachers were recruited to participate in a survey about their beliefs via four email listservs maintained by the World Language consultant at the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. Included in these listservs were all district World Language coordinators in the state, and individual World Language teachers across the state who had opted in to the listserv. The NCDPI consultant asked district coordinators to forward on the email (including a link to the online survey) to middle and high school language teachers in their districts. Participants were offered a $5 Amazon gift card as compensation for completing the survey, funded by a dissertation grant award
from Division 15 of the American Psychological Association. In order to maintain participants’ relative anonymity and confidentiality in the study, participants were directed to an outside survey link via Qualtrics where they were instructed to enter the email address where they would like to receive their gift card so that no identifying information was associated with their survey responses. In order to avoid duplication of compensation, I cross-referenced the email lists with the time stamps of the completed surveys, and adjusted the settings in Qualtrics so that the survey could not be completed more than once from the same IP address.

In addition, I attended the fall 2014 FLANC conference on October 2-3, 2014 in Winston-Salem, North Carolina to actively recruit participants. Twenty-six participants filled out a paper questionnaire during the conference, and I distributed 75 paper copies of the survey link to conference attendees. Participants who filled out and returned a paper copy of the survey were given a $5 Starbucks gift card. I also contacted former World Language colleagues in the field via email and/or telephone and forwarded them the link in order to obtain a snowball sample of participants.

Including the paper questionnaire responses, which were manually inputted to the dataset, a total of 226 participants completed all items in the survey from October 2 until the survey close date on November 15, 2014. The primary criterion for inclusion for Phase II data analysis was that participants must have been teaching a language in a middle school or high school in North Carolina. Some World Language teachers in the dataset reported that their current teaching assignment was in elementary school; however, I only analyzed item responses for World Language teachers in the dataset who reported current teaching
assignments in middle grades or high schools, as these language classes represent the greatest variability in student enrollment, and thus the greatest potential for student exclusion. Some participants also reported that they were currently teaching in public charter schools (n=9) and private schools (n= 20). These participants’ responses were retained in the data set since each of these school ‘types’ may represent other ways in which students have access to certain curricula. Participants who did not complete more than 75% of the survey were dropped from the dataset. Additionally, responses that appeared to be generated by ‘web-crawlers’, such as those with garbled text or with illogical demographic information, were dropped from the data set. These criteria for exclusion resulted in 188 cases for data analysis.

Descriptive statistics indicated that the demographic characteristics reported by language teachers in the sample largely paralleled the general teaching population in that a majority of the teachers identified as White, middle class, Christian females from the United States (Howard & Aleman, 2008; Zumwalt & Craig, 2008). Specifically, teachers in the sample were 76.6% female (n=144), which is a slightly lower percentage than the rate at which female teachers comprise the general population of teachers. Also represented in the sample were small groups of teachers who reported that they identified as having; an African American heritage, a Latin American heritage, an African heritage, an American Indian or Native Alaskan heritage, and an Asian heritage. Some teachers chose not identify with any provided ethnoracial categories, and instead self-reported in text. Table 3.4 on the next page includes teachers’ selected and self-reported ethnoracial statuses.
### Table 3.4  
*Language Teachers’ Self-reported Ethnoracial Status*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnoracial Status</th>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Percentage of total sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>European heritage</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American heritage</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American heritage</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African heritage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian/Native Alaskan heritage</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian heritage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white American caucasian*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white – US citizen*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White/Hispanic*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mestiza*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanese*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European and Native American heritage*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>213</td>
<td><strong>113.1%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* * Teachers reported these statuses in a text box in lieu of choosing from the categories provided. **Because teachers were allowed to “select all that apply”, these numbers do not align with the total number of cases in the dataset (n=213).

In addition, the survey responses captured many teachers who may live and work in centers of affluence. Specifically, 73.4% of the teachers in the sample reported that they were “middle class”, while 25.5% of the teachers reported that they identified as “working class”. See Appendix A for complete demographic information of all teachers in the sample.
Measures

To answer the second research question and in an attempt to obtain a holistic picture of teachers’ beliefs about diversity dimensions and their World Language teaching practices, I selected both broad and content-specific measures for this study. In order to explore World Language teachers’ beliefs about their students’ diverse characteristics, I selected and employed the Teachers’ Beliefs about Multiculturalism and Diversity scale (TSR-MD; Kozel, 2007). In order to explore World Language teachers’ beliefs about teaching practices specific to their content area, I selected and employed the Foreign Language Education Questionnaire (FLEQ; Allen, 2002). The two measures were administered via the NC State University online Qualtrics survey portal from October 2 – November 15, 2014.

In the middle of the TSR-MD measure in Qualtrics, teachers self-reported their own demographic information which first mirrored the dimensions of diversity about which they were asked in the TSR-MD (e.g. gender, ethnoracial status, socioeconomic status, faith, sexual orientation, disability status, and cultural identity). They were also asked to provide demographic information specifically related to their identities as language teachers (e.g. immigration status, native speaker status, highest degree obtained, pathway to licensure, years of experience in education, and school type). Due to the length of the overall survey, demographic information was requested at the midpoint of the survey in order to generate participant profiles in the event that participants did not complete the entire survey.

Participants’ survey responses were exported directly from Qualtrics to an Excel file. Paper questionnaire responses collected from participants at the FLANC conference were
manually inputted into the Excel file. All survey responses in the Excel file were then imported into SPSS for analysis.

**Teachers’ sense of responsibility for multiculturalism and diversity (TSR-MD).**

The first measure included in the Qualtrics survey was the TSR-MD scale: a global measure designed to understand how teachers conceptualize and “make meaning of ambiguous terminology (e.g. multiculturalism, diversity, and culture)” and to distinguish teachers’ orientations towards their responsibility for meeting the needs of diverse learners (Kozel, 2007; Silverman, 2009; Silverman, 2010⁴). Furthermore, these Likert-type scale items attempt to distinguish between teachers’ efficacy, responsibility, and advocacy for multiculturalism and diverse student groups. Items are intended to measure both teachers’ individual beliefs and their beliefs about schools’ responsibilities for the inclusion of multicultural teaching practices and teaching diverse learners.

In this study, only the first set of scales specific to teachers’ beliefs about, and responsibilities for, including and addressing dimensions of diversity in their classrooms and diversity were administered. These scales were chosen because they centralize teachers’ beliefs about students’ diverse characteristics as the areas of focus rather than teachers’ beliefs about their efficacy for teaching diverse populations, which comprised the second set of sub-scales. There are 58 items in the sub-scale selected for use in this study, on a six point Likert-type scale (see Appendix C). All subscales of the TSR-MD were developed and

---

⁴ This study included prior research conducted by a researcher under the moniker “Silverman”, who later changed her name to “Kozel”. Thus, references to work done by “Silverman” and “Kozel” are references to the same researcher. She is referenced as “Kozel” for the rest of the dissertation.
normed on preservice teacher candidates, but there was some preliminary reliability and validity information for administration of the instrument to practicing teachers. Cronbach’s alphas for each factor were reported as follows: race, .59; socioeconomic status, .69; gender, .75; disability, .62; sexual orientation, .89; faith, .75; culture, .75; multiculturalism, .89; and diversity, .78. Since these alpha coefficients were derived from administration of the entire instrument (e.g., all six subscales) to the sample of practicing teachers, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine the strength of the item loadings.

*Dimensions of diversity and exploratory factor analyses.*

Although it is desirable to have a sample size of 300 or greater to employ exploratory factor analysis (Tabachnik, 2007), opinions vary widely in the literature. Indeed, in the social sciences, many researchers now use the strength of the data (i.e. high communality values and low incidence of cross-loading of factors) to justify sample size and the use of factor analysis (Costello & Osborn, 2005). For this study, data were analyzed from 188 cases. After data preparation and cleaning, I analyzed the means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis for each item (see Appendix B). Items were flagged for signs of non-normality if skewness and kurtosis were > +/- 2. All survey items evidenced normal distribution except for two items related to race, one item related to disability, and all five of the eight items related to culture. I hypothesize that language teachers in the sample were likely to frequently report that culture it is an important construct because it has been heavily emphasized in World Language curricula and standards, especially since the adoption of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (ACTFL, 2014) in 1999. In other words,
“culture” has become a buzzword in World Language learning, and this emphasis may possibly create a more concentrated response than it would with a cross-section of teachers across all content areas.

To explore factor structure, I began by examining the dimensionality of each set of items individually. I submitted all items for each diversity dimension separately to principal axis factoring to verify the extent to which the items coalesced around a single latent construct. Principal axis factoring is a process by which data can be explored, and is usually employed when the researcher hypothesizes that variables in the dataset are related in some way (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2012). For the purposes of this study, principal axis factoring was preferred to principal components analysis because of these hypotheses; principal components analysis is often employed simply as a data reduction technique and does not account for analysis of the shared variance of variables (Costello & Osborne, 2005, p. 2). Factor analysis was employed in this study to explore the extent to which variables seem to explain the same variance, or to form groups of variables based on participants’ survey responses.

Preliminary analyses indicated that for certain dimensions of diversity, a one-factor solution was sufficient. Specifically, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 52-69% of total variance with regard to items about students’ socioeconomic status, faith, and sexual orientation. However, for items related to other dimensions of diversity such as race, gender, disability status, and culture, the scales appeared to split into two factors.
When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about socioeconomic diversity in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 52.09% of the total variance. When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about faith in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 57.66% of the total variance. When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about sexual orientation in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 69.41% of the total variance.

When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about racial diversity in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 46.47% of the total variance. Eigen values indicated that a second factor was present; after re-running the items using principal axis factoring and Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalization, a two-factor solution emerged and accounted for 66.25% of the total variance and correlated at -.23.

When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about gender diversity in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 55.49% of the total variance. Eigen values indicated that a second factor was present; after re-running the items with Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalization, a two-factor solution emerged which accounted for 68.23% of the total variance and correlated at .65.

When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about disability in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor
solution accounted for 43.88% of the total variance. Eigen values indicated that a second factor was present; after re-running the items with Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalization, a two-factor solution emerged which accounted for 58.42% of the total variance and correlated at .06.

When analyzing the items that asked teachers to report on their beliefs about cultural diversity in their classrooms and in schools, pattern matrices indicated that a one-factor solution accounted for 46.65% of the total variance. Eigen values indicated that a second factor was present; after re-running the items with Oblimin rotation with Kaiser normalization, a two-factor solution emerged which accounted for 61.12% of the total variance and correlated at .07.

**Verifying latent constructs on the TSR-MD.**

In her prior development of, and work with, the TSR-MD, Kozel (2007, 2009) explored the ways in which preservice and practicing teachers perceive and ascribe meaning to diversity, and indicated that teachers may distinguish between and among different dimensions of diversity. These dimensions may lie on a continuum for some teachers, and may be based on perceptions about the extent to which diverse characteristics are an immutable part of identity or a ‘choice’. These perceptions have the potential to influence teachers’ sense of importance of different dimensions.

Based on Kozel’s prior findings regarding teachers’ perceptions about the importance of different dimensions of diversity, I hypothesized a structure with a seven-factor solution. Overall, data suggested there could be between seven and ten factors. When a seven factor
solution was forced for all items in the data using principal axis factoring with Oblimin rotation, results revealed a structure matrix that converged in 25 iterations at $\delta = 0$ and accounted for 65.9% of the total variance. An oblique rotation was employed because, theoretically, latent variables in this study (i.e., dimensions of diversity and teachers’ beliefs about them) were expected to correlate. See Table 3.5 for the correlations among the seven factors.

Table 3.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TSR-MD Factor Correlation Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


To verify the seven-factor solution, I also conducted a scree test by graphing eigenvalues and identifying the “number of datapoints above the ‘break’” (Costello & Osborn, 2005, p. 3). Since the scree test indicated that ten factors were possible, additional models with eight, nine, and ten factors were tested. However, no new conceptual factors
emerged; instead, these models appeared to split variance attributed to two distinct factors in the seven-factor solution. See Table 3.6 for factor loadings by item.

Table 3.6
Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Oblimin Rotation for Teachers’ Sense of Responsibility for Multiculturalism and Diversity (TSR-MD) Instrument (n = 188)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Relevance /Role</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Culture</th>
<th>Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>School Responsibility</th>
<th>Faith</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, race is relevant to me.</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ race will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.679</td>
<td>-.160</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.070</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>-.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, economic status is relevant to me.</td>
<td>.769</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>-.105</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ economic status will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.558</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>-.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>-.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, gender is relevant to me.</td>
<td>.903</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ gender will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.687</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>-.138</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>.563</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>-.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, disability is relevant to me.</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, sexual orientation is relevant to me.</td>
<td><strong>.608</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.608</strong> -1.01 .016 -2.17 .040 -.002 -.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ sexual orientation will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td><strong>.590</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.590</strong> -.091 -.010 -3.75 .103 -.018 -.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ faith will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td><strong>.207</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.207</strong> -.203 .090 .091 .032 .045 -.555</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of faiths are represented</td>
<td><strong>.017</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.017</strong> -.039 .169 .047 -.241 -.060 -.652</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith is relevant to learning.</td>
<td><strong>.187</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.187</strong> -.145 .055 -.006 .043 .021 -.613</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of</td>
<td><strong>-.046</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-.046</strong> .044 .096 -.061 -.179 .018 -.756</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faiths are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address</td>
<td><strong>.061</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.061</strong> -.284 .020 -.144 .082 -.040 -.682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faith in their classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences</td>
<td><strong>.067</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.067</strong> -.169 .050 -.205 .022 .081 -.578</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among faiths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of races are represented</td>
<td><strong>.204</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.204</strong> -.042 .045 .014 -.769 -.115 .038</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of races are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>.060 -.022 .059 -.054 -.724 .081 .072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of economic statuses are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.157 -.060 .169 .033 -.469 .078 -.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of economic statuses are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>.020 .002 -.042 .039 -.443 .318 -.387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of genders are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.168 .049 .087 -.116 -.538 .094 -.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of genders are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>.092 .171 .012 -.142 -.569 .211 -.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address genders in their classrooms.</td>
<td>.152 -.126 .022 -.165 -.342 .189 -.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of disabilities are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.031 -.113 .151 .142 -.341 .314 -.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of disabilities are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>.080 - .070 .171 - .033 - .374 .231 - .111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, faith is relevant to me.</td>
<td>.151 - .043 -.027 .501 .214 .020 -.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of sexual orientations are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.239 - .016 .073 - .646 -.051 .042 -.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>.451 - .210 -.057 - .476 .073 .068 -.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of sexual orientations are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>.243 - .007 .090 - .692 -.054 .058 -.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address sexual orientation in their classrooms.</td>
<td>.284 - .125 .069 - .658 .041 .020 -.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among sexual orientations.</td>
<td>.219 - .066 .064 - .672 .046 .229 -.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools are responsible for addressing the differences among races.</td>
<td>.100 - .159 -.095 - .223 -.099 .428 -.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ disabilities will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.326 .179 .073 .176 -.075 .473 .061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.6 continued</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>.260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address disabilities in their classrooms.</td>
<td>-.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among abilities.</td>
<td>-.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among economic statuses.</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among genders.</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, culture is relevant to me.</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ culture will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of cultures are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>-.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.6 continued

| Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of cultures are represented in the content curricula. | .041 | .042 | **.708** | .006 | -.322 | -.197 | .021 |
| Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address culture in their classrooms. | -.127 | -.084 | **.576** | -.188 | -.097 | -.103 | -.205 |
| In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among cultures. | -.071 | -.069 | **.541** | -.176 | .000 | .172 | -.064 |
| Various races need to be represented in teaching only if students of those races and ethnicities are present in the classroom. | .048 | **-.746** | -.050 | -.093 | .216 | .021 | -.085 |
| Various economic statuses need to be represented in teaching only if students of those economic statuses are present in the classroom. | .048 | **-.860** | -.069 | .015 | -.049 | .084 | .063 |
| Various genders need to be represented in teaching only if students of those genders are present in the classroom. | .026 | **-.883** | -.057 | -.029 | -.071 | .014 | .018 |
| Various faiths need to be represented in teaching only if students of those faiths are present in the classroom. | .042 | **-.785** | -.075 | .034 | -.041 | .031 | -.146 |
Table 3.6 continued

Various disabilities need to be represented in teaching only if students of those disabilities are present in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern Coefficient</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Factor 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Various sexual</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>-.825</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientations need</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to be represented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in teaching only if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students of those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are present in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various cultures</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-.537</td>
<td>-.156</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represented in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching only if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students of those</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultures are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>present in the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Naming substantive factors on the TSR-MD.

When interpreting factor loadings in exploratory analyses, it is the job of the researcher to use theory to give meaning to the possible underlying constructs that the data represent (Costello & Osborne, 2005). While I was unable to replicate the exact seven factor structure that Kozel (2007) found in her prior work on teachers’ orientations toward diverse learners, a similar factor structure emerged. I drew on both Kozel’s prior work and the literature on teachers’ beliefs about diversity and diverse student characteristics (for a summary, see Woolfolk Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2005) to conceptualize latent constructs.
Twelve items loaded onto a factor which I labeled “Relevance and Role” (M=3.62; s=1.19, α=.93). Conceptually, this factor is related to teachers’ perceived relevance of each dimension of diversity to themselves as individuals, to the role that students’ diversity will affect their teaching practice, and its relevance to learning. This factor represents relevance of traditional sources of student diversity; specifically, teachers reported conceptually similar beliefs about the relevance of race, socioeconomic status, and gender to themselves and their teaching. I hypothesize that teachers may have reported that these dimensions of diversity are relevant, and may have grouped them together, because they are the most talked about and most addressed in both teacher preparation programs and in multicultural professional development programs for practicing teachers (e.g. ‘race, class, and gender’; ‘culturally relevant’ teaching practices). These dimensions are also often addressed in school discrimination policies, and much educational research and literature is devoted to them. As such, these dimensions of diversity may be more ‘high-profile’, or more frequently discussed by practicing teachers. Also included in this factor are items related to teachers’ perceived relevance of disability and sexual orientation to themselves, and the role that students’ sexual orientation will play in their teaching practice.

Nine items loaded onto a factor labeled “Responsibility Immediacy” (M=4.41; s=1.03, α=.91). This factor is related to teachers’ perceptions about their responsibility for inclusion of dimensions of diversity: specifically, whether they are responsible for representing race, economic class, and gender in their teaching; and the extent to which curriculum developers are responsible for including these diversity dimensions. This responsibility is ‘immediate’ in that it is situated at the classroom level, and the locus is
within the teacher’s control (ie. whether or not to represent the dimension of diversity or to implement the curricular materials). In addition, the item about the extent to which administrators are responsible for ensuring that teachers address gender in their classroom loaded onto this factor. Again, this may indicate that teachers in the sample may have viewed some dimensions of diversity as distinct and more/less important than others.

Seven items loaded onto a factor labeled “Representation Immediacy” (M=2.62; s=1.31, α=.93). This factor can be understood as teachers’ beliefs about whether a specific dimension of diversity should be represented in their teaching practices. More specifically, the factor illustrates the extent to which they believed that each dimension of diversity should be represented only if students in their classroom embody that dimension. Thus, a low score would indicate a more inclusive perspective.

Six items loaded onto a factor labeled “Faith” (M= 3.38, s=1.34, α=.93). This factor represents the extent to which teachers in the sample reported that their students’ faith, as a dimension of diversity, would play a role in their teaching practice; that faith is relevant to learning, and the extent to which various stakeholders, including administrators and curriculum developers, are responsible for including faith. The item related to representation of various faiths in teaching practices loads on a separate factor. This separation of faith as a construct may indicate that teachers viewed it as a different ‘type’ of diversity. Also, because the item related to perceived individual relevance did not load on this factor, some teachers in the sample may have viewed faith as a dimension of diversity that, while personally relevant, may not be appropriate for classroom inclusion.
Seven items loaded onto a factor labeled “Culture” (M= 5.04, s=.78, α=.85). All items related to the role and relevance of culture, and both teachers’ and schools’ responsibility for addressing culture load onto this factor. The item related to representation of various cultures loads on a separate factor. Because language teachers view ‘Culture’ as an integral part of language teaching practice, they may have been more likely to rate this dimension of diversity as more important than all others, as is evidenced by the grand mean of the overall scale.

Six items loaded onto a factor labeled “Sexual Orientation” (M= 3.24, s=1.22, α=.82). The items related to relevance to learning, and responsibility and representation of sexual orientation coalesce in this factor, but the item related to relevance of sexual orientation to teachers’ individual identity loaded on the “Relevance” factor. Interestingly, the item related to the relevance of faith to teachers’ individual identity loaded on this factor with many of the items regarding sexual orientation. This indicates that, for language teachers in the sample, beliefs about faith and sexual orientation may have been intricately linked.

Seven items loaded onto a factor labeled “School Responsibility” (M=4.35, s=.87, α=.83). Included in this factor are items related to the extent to which schools are responsible for addressing differences among races, abilities, economic statuses and gender. Items related to the role and relevance of disability also load on this factor. These factor loadings indicate that teachers in the sample may have viewed these types of diversity as inherent characteristics of students, and external from students’ control. As such, they may have perceived schools as having a pivotal role in the mechanisms by which society embraces/excludes students who embody these dimensions.
Summary of properties of the TSR-MD.

Results from exploratory factor analysis indicated an internal consistency of \( \alpha = .87 \) for all subscales on the TSR-MD. Broadly speaking, these item groupings conceptualize practicing teachers’ orientations towards diversity. These factors illustrate the extent to which teachers in the sample may have viewed particular dimensions (e.g. faith, culture, sexual orientation, and disability) as conceptually separate and distinct from other types of student diversity, which indicates variation in teacher belief orientations. Grand means for all factors and for all teachers in the sample are illustrated in Figure 2.

![Figure 2](image)

*Figure 2.* Raw grand means for TSR-MD subscales (including standard deviations).
Foreign language education questionnaire (FLEQ).

The next survey measure, the FLEQ, was designed as a Likert-type scale with six sub-scales, intended to measure World Language teachers’ beliefs about students, the curriculum, pedagogical practices, instruction in the target language, and ideal student enrollment time. During data collection, all sub-scales of the FLEQ were administered, which included 32 items on five-point Likert-type scale. For this study, data were analyzed from the same 188 cases. After data preparation and cleaning, I analyzed the means, standard deviations, skewness, and kurtosis for each item (see Appendix). Items were flagged for signs of non-normality if skewness and kurtosis were $> +/-$ 2 (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2012). All survey items evidenced normal distribution.

This FLEQ was developed by Allen (2002), and her exploratory factor analyses conducted with the original measure resulted in regrouping of statements to indicate alignment (or misalignment) of responses with the national standards. Cronbach’s alphas for each factor were reported as follows: student profile, .78; curricular elements, .83; textbook/language system, .75; language of instruction, .69; and total instrument, .87. The FLEQ survey was piloted and normed with a small sample of practicing World Language teachers. While survey items that attempted to measure certain factors on the instrument went through several iterations, it was unclear to what extent the instrument would accurately measure the beliefs of a large sample of World Language teachers. As such, exploratory factor analysis was conducted to determine whether or not the instrument was reliable.
Exploratory Factor Analysis resulted in a four factor solution. Eigen values indicated that there could be up to seven factors. Additional models were tested with five, six, and seven factors, but each model appeared to split variance originally attributable to three distinct factors across the others. When a four factor solution was forced for all items in the data using principal axis factoring with Oblimin rotation, results revealed a structure matrix that converged in 29 iterations at δ =0 and accounted for 52.64% of the total variance. An oblique rotation was again employed because, theoretically, latent variables in this study (ie. language teachers’ beliefs about teaching practices and inclusive dispositions towards language students) were expected to correlate. See Tables 3.7 and 3.8 and for the pattern matrix and the correlations among the three factors.
Table 3.7  
*Factor Loadings for Exploratory Factor Analysis with Oblimin Rotation for Foreign Language Education Questionnaire (FLEQ) Instrument (n = 188)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Traditional Language Teaching</th>
<th>Standards Based Teaching</th>
<th>All Students Can Benefit</th>
<th>Specific Error Factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The major curricular focus of effective foreign language programs is on the adopted textbook and accompanying ancillaries.</td>
<td>.657</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In effective foreign language programs, nearly all of class time is devoted to learning the language system (i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and syntax).</td>
<td>.748</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English is the dominant language of instruction in effective foreign language programs.</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>-.105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only college-bound students should enroll in foreign language classes.</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>-.257</td>
<td>-.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ideal time to begin the study of a foreign language is in high school.</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>-.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary focus of effective foreign language programs is on the development of vocabulary and knowledge of grammar.</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of the effective foreign language teacher is to help students learn what is in the textbook.</td>
<td>.851</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chapter tests that accompany the textbook provide an adequate means of assessment in effective foreign language programs.</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.038</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language study is not for students who have difficulty with learning in general.</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>-.435</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no benefit for students who have learned a language other than English somewhere other than in school to take courses in that language.</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.218</td>
<td>-.275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study of foreign languages enhances only certain professions.</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>-.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The role of cultural instruction in effective foreign language programs is secondary to that of vocabulary and grammar.</td>
<td>.640</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

76
Table 3.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The focus of assessment in effective foreign language programs is on students’ knowledge of vocabulary and grammar.</td>
<td>.690 - .203 .080 .041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for interdisciplinary learning. (i.e., relating the content of the foreign language class with that of other school subjects).</td>
<td>-.052 .419 .225 .264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language instruction incorporates authentic materials.</td>
<td>-.195 .448 -.050 .236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective foreign language teacher uses the foreign language as the dominant language of instruction.</td>
<td>-.159 .471 -.039 .077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In effective foreign language instruction, some time is devoted to teaching students how to use specific communication strategies (e.g. circumlocution, approximation, gestures).</td>
<td>.089 .644 -.117 -.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language programs include opportunities for students to access a variety of technologies.</td>
<td>.053 .383 .180 .165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to explore topics of personal interest through the foreign language.</td>
<td>-.218 .652 .095 .119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective language programs provide students at all levels of instruction with opportunities to use the target language for real communication, both in the school and beyond.</td>
<td>-.146 .504 -.005 .458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective instruction in the foreign language class is designed to promote the use of critical thinking.</td>
<td>-.043 .445 .099 .313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language instruction is related to students’ real lives within the school, community, family, and peer group.</td>
<td>-.207 .582 .177 -.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language teachers plan instruction on how to use specific learning strategies (e.g., previewing, skimming, inferring information.)</td>
<td>.055 .443 -.051 -.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.7 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$r_{ij}$</th>
<th>$r_{ij}$</th>
<th>$r_{ij}$</th>
<th>$r_{ij}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language instruction uses open-ended activities (e.g., portfolios, demonstrations, presentations, projects) to determine a portion of the students’ grade.</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td>.278</td>
<td>-.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective instruction in culture leads to an understanding of the underlying values and beliefs of the target society (societies).</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language instruction defines and assesses cultural learning objectives just as systematically as grammatical and lexical learning objectives.</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.355</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective foreign language teacher creates opportunities for learning that relate foreign language instruction to that which the students already know.</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>-.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who have learned a language other than English somewhere other than in school can benefit from taking courses in the language they have learned elsewhere.</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students, regardless of future educational plans, can benefit from studying a foreign language.</td>
<td>-.155</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who have learning difficulties can be successful foreign language learners.</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>-.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students, regardless of career objectives, can benefit from studying a foreign language.</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ideal time to begin the study of a foreign language is in early elementary school.</td>
<td>-.113</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exploratory factor analyses for this data did not replicate Allen’s four factor solution.

When I forced an extraction of four factors, only one item comprised the fourth factor: a specific error factor. In addition, the item related to the extent to which “students who knew a language other than language could benefit from more language instruction” appeared to load higher on the second factor; however, its loading was $<.40$ and its variance was split
across the second and third factors. As such, I combined this item with the third factor, which included conceptually similar items related to students and benefits of language learning. Based off this data, I then calculated reliability estimates for the three factors with multiple items. I renamed them in an attempt to situate the constructs in the context of teachers’ beliefs and orientations towards diversity.

**Naming substantive factors on the FLEQ.**

The first factor, “Traditional Language Teaching”, included thirteen items (M=2.98, s=1.06, α=.93). This factor represents language teaching practices that are teacher-centered, focused on grammar and textbook constructs, and protects language learning as an elite academic activity for certain groups of students.

The second factor, “Standards Based Teaching”, included fifteen items (M=5.10, s=.47, α=.84), and represents teaching practices that are learner-centered and emphasized in the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning. These practices are focused on communication in the target language and authentic materials; and developing lessons that are culturally relevant, interdisciplinary in nature, and designed to connect with students’ lives, interests, and prior knowledge.

The third factor, “Benefits for All”, included four items that related to the extent to which language teachers reported that different student groups could benefit from language learning (M=5.22, s=.60, α=.66). Correlations among the factors (including the fourth specific factor) are detailed in Table 3.8.
Data Analysis

**Identifying homogenous groups of language teachers.**

After factor analyses were conducted for both the TSR-MD and the FLEQ, I calculated correlation coefficients to examine relationships between and among language teachers’ self-reported demographic and teacher preparation characteristics and TSR-MD outcomes. I next employed a clustering technique in order to attempt to group teachers in the sample based on TSR-MD outcomes and identify potential patterns of orientations toward diversity. Clustering is a common data analytic technique in marketing research (e.g. Wedel & Kamakura, 1998), political science research (e.g. Filho et. al, 2014), and has been used in educational psychological research (e.g. Davis, DiStefano, & Schutz, 2008). Cluster analysis (Tryon, 1939), as an exploratory method, allows for analysis of groups of cases based on survey responses (outcome variables) in a similar way that exploratory factor analysis allows for grouping of variables that seem to explain the same variance (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). Cluster analysis uses algorithms to create groups of cases that are homogenous within

---

**Table 3.8**

*FLEQ Factor Correlation Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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the group, but heterogeneous to other groups of cases in the dataset (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). Patterns of participants’ responses are identified, and cases are grouped not only based on these patterns, but also based on the distance between their profiles, or Euclidean distance.

In this study, cluster analysis was employed in lieu of other data analytic techniques, such as regression models, due to the nature of the underlying conceptual meaning ascribed to variables and scales, and the desire for a participant-centered approach. Instead of using correlations to verify the extent to which variables relate to one another, or regressions to predict variables that may independent of one another, cluster analysis situates the level of analysis in determining intraindividual dimensions (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997; DiStefano & Kampaus, 2006). Moreover, teachers’ beliefs are not independent of one another; instead, teachers hold multidimensional sets of beliefs, or belief systems (Pajares, 1992; Rokeach, 2008).

I chose to use a two-step clustering method beginning with hierarchical clustering (instead of a non-hierarchical method) because the exact number of groups was not known a priori. I submitted participants’ mean responses on TSR-MD subscales (factors identified during EFA) to a hierarchical cluster method in SPSS using a combination of Ward’s method and k-means clustering (Huberty, DiStefano, & Kamphaus, 1997). This combination allows for clustering by overcoming the limitations inherent in one method or the other (Davis, DiStefano, & Schutz, 2008; DiStefano & Kamphaus, 2007). Ward’s method is employed to group cases in a way such that the Euclidian distances (or measures of similarity) are used, but that each additional case added to the cluster creates the least amount of variance
(Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984; Ward, 1963). However, Ward’s method is limited in that it does not reassign cases after the initial pass. *K*-means clustering uses centroid values, or seed points (Anderberg, 1973) to assign cases to clusters based on the nearest centroid value, and creates clusters that are as heterogeneously different as possible from one another. In addition, *k*-means partitioning can use the solution from Ward’s method as seed points to generate a fixed number of clusters in an iterative fashion (DiStefano & Kamphaus, 2007).

Although opinions vary widely in the literature regarding ideal sample sizes for clustering techniques, some researchers recommend using heuristics employed in latent class analyses, such that no less than $2^k$ cases, where *k* represents the number of variables in the analysis (Formann, 1988, as cited in Dolnicar, 2003) are used. In this study, *k* is equal to the seven scale variables derived from exploratory factor analysis; so: $2^7$=128. Data from the 188 cases selected for analysis were submitted to this two-step clustering method. I drew from the prior research literature about practicing teachers’ belief systems (e.g. Kozel, 2007; Woolfolk-Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006), the extant literature about preservice teachers beliefs (e.g. Sleeter, 2001), and my own experiences as a teacher educator, to hypothesize that clusters would emerge based on systematic variation of orientations towards dimensions of diversity and diverse student characteristics.

**Making sense of inclusivity in teaching practices.**

After extracting a four-cluster solution, I conducted multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) to explore the extent to which participants’ assigned clusters differed significantly, and how these differences accounted for the variance in their outcomes on the
FLEQ subscales. More specifically, I was interested to see if participants’ orientations
towards diversity, as defined by their cluster, were related to the specific language teaching
practices they espoused, as indicated by their FLEQ responses. MANOVA was selected as
an analytical technique because there were multiple independent and dependent variables (i.e.
FLEQ subscales), and the dependent variables were correlated, but not highly so.
MANOVAs test the extent to which multiple dependent variables (e.g. reported language
teaching practices) are affected by independent variables (e.g. clusters), and the ‘power’ of
this effect (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2012).

Wilks’ Lambda was used to determine whether or not there was a significant
difference in centroid values among the clusters’ outcomes. This statistic is commonly used
in social sciences, and is a measure of the proportion of variance in dependent variables (in
this case, reported language teaching practices on the FLEQ) that is unaccounted for by the
grouping of independent variables (in this case, participants’ orientations towards diversity,
as indicated by their cluster membership). As such, a small Wilks’ Lambda value indicates a
significant difference in group means, and an effect on the dependent variable (Tabachnick &
Fidell, 2012). Results from cluster analyses and MANOVAs were considered in conjunction
with findings from interview data in order to create profiles of participant clusters.

After reviewing the literature on World Language teacher preparation from a Critical
Race perspective, I hypothesized that: 1) practicing teachers in the sample would have
internalized many of the overarching racialized discourses in education about historically
marginalized students (e.g. deficit thinking) and would not view their curricular area as a
particular site of inclusion; and 2) it was unlikely that practicing teachers in the sample
received explicit instruction in diversity or meeting the needs of diverse populations that was sufficient to reframe the entrenched belief systems with which they may have entered their preservice programs, and 3) that teachers would attribute students’ enrollment in language courses to micro factors, such as individual student characteristics like motivation or merit, and/or macro factors, such as tracking or college-prep statuses. Both of these attributions have to the potential to eschew specific foci on students’ ethnoracial statuses and the ways in which perceptions about these statuses may contribute to systematic underrepresentation.

I also hypothesized that language teaching practices, from a critical perspective, would include culturally relevant pedagogy employed by teachers who are critically conscious (Reagan & Osborn, 1998). In other words, if language teachers did not report employing language teaching practices that supported student learning in culturally relevant ways, but may have reported relevance of and responsibility for diversity, these teachers may not have actually been inclusive.

**Phase III**

**Participants**

For Phase III interviews, I invited a purposive sample of five practicing World Language teachers who represented the LEAs for which I obtained enrollment data. These teachers were all women, and represented three different languages. Table 3.9 gives an overview of self-reported demographic information for each participant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethno racial status</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Disability status</th>
<th>Sexual orientation</th>
<th>Native speaker status</th>
<th>Pathway to licensure</th>
<th>Years of Experience</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>Other identifiers</th>
<th>School context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Able-bodied</td>
<td>Heterosexual</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>3, 1st year at current school</td>
<td>Middle school French: exploratory, French I</td>
<td>“Middle-aged” – 38 years old; divorced, single mom</td>
<td>2 languages offered on an exploratory model; HS credit for 7th and 8th grade continuation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Heterosexual and married</td>
<td>Native Italian speaker, married to a native Spanish speaker</td>
<td>NC Teach</td>
<td>5 years at current school</td>
<td>High School Spanish 3H, 4H, Spanish for Native Speakers</td>
<td>Has two children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>“Straight”</td>
<td>N/A (Latin); learned Hebrew as a child Yes</td>
<td>M.A.T. in Latin</td>
<td>10, 5th year at current school</td>
<td>High School Latin</td>
<td>“Ally”; Safe Space Trained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>Mexican; Dual US/ Mexican citizen</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>Married to an American</td>
<td>Worked previously as a school counselor; certified to be an English teacher</td>
<td>Teaching Fellow</td>
<td>9, 2nd year at current school</td>
<td>High School Spanish II and 3H</td>
<td>Language magnet school (8 languages offered, 4 via NCVPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Able-bodied, has “a child with special needs”</td>
<td>Bisexual, married to her female partner</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20, 6th year at current school</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Middle class</td>
<td>3 languages (1 via NCVPS); some AP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table note.* All descriptors are taken from interview data with participants.
Procedures

To gain a holistic understanding of World Language teachers’ perceptions of their students, semi-structured interviews were used in Phase III. Interviews were conducted at the completion of survey data collection for Phase II. Quantitative analyses from Phase I were used to target specific participants for the qualitative phase of the study. When analyzing student enrollment data, I calculated proportions of individual student groups as they related to the overall World Language enrollment population, and the broader demographic makeup of the school. I cross-referenced teachers who volunteered to be interviewed (as indicated at the end of the Qualtrics survey) with the LEA enrollment data I had obtained, and targeted participants who taught at schools in the four LEAs where 1) students of color were underrepresented or underenrolled in language classes 2) students of color were enrolled at approximately the same rate in languages as they comprised the larger school population. (There were no schools where all groups of students of color were overrepresented in language classes). As such, I attempted to identify and sample “best” participants to interview by analyzing certain demographic information at the schools where they taught a World Language, in hopes that these participants would be able to contribute to a perspective that may be related to variables within their particular school profile (Plano Clark et al, 2008, p. 370).

Of the list of survey participants who volunteered to be contacted for a follow-up interview, I emailed 40 language teachers to learn more information about their teaching assignments. I asked them to respond to my initial email with the name of their school, and
the language(s) and level(s) of language instruction for which they were primarily responsible. From the initial group of teachers emailed, 22 responded, and represented teachers in varying parts of North Carolina and varying instructional levels. From this group of 22, I selected five teachers who taught at either middle schools or high schools in one of the four LEAs for which I had obtained and analyzed enrollment data in Phase I. Three of the participants interviewed taught at schools where all student groups of color were underenrolled, and two participants taught at schools where some student groups of color were equitably enrolled.

Once the teachers agreed to participate, I scheduled phone interviews and emailed them an informed consent form for participation. In addition, I created a school profile spreadsheet in Excel that included enrollment numbers by students’ ethnoracial status and gender for the prior academic year (2013-2014). I sent this data to them via email in advance of our interview in order to give them time to reflect on the enrollment data and in an effort to avoid putting teachers on the defensive, or creating a ‘gotcha’ context for the interview.

Semi-structured interview questions were related to teachers’ perceptions of the importance of their content, broadly speaking; their perception of the importance of their content at their school; the ‘types’ of students in their classes; reports about demographics of their classes; and perceptions of motivation and success in class across student groups. Teachers were also asked to discuss their interpretations of the demographic enrollment information obtained in Phase I, relating to which students are over/underrepresented in World Language classes (see Appendix E for interview protocol for each participant). Specifically, teachers were asked about their attributions for enrollment across and among
student groups (e.g. ethnoracial status and gender), and their perceptions about how and why students enroll in their classes (e.g. student choice, guidance counselor, teachers’ recruitment, etc.). Finally, teachers were asked to articulate perceived benefits for students who study a World Language. Saturation was reached after the fifth interview when teachers described students in ways, and made attributions student enrollment, that I determined were indicative of the four cluster orientations towards diversity found in Phase II.

To conduct interviews, I used an iPhone app that enabled me to call participants and record our conversations. I also talked to each participant on speakerphone and made a backup recording using an app for iPad. All audio files of interviews were sent to an online transcription company called CastingWords to be transcribed after recording. After receiving ‘rough’ transcripts of each interview, I listened to the audio files and edited each transcription for accuracy. While editing, I made notes and memos in the margin, and began to segment data into meaningful chunks.

Data Analysis

After editing, I began to analyze the data using elements of a constructivist grounded theory approach (e.g. Clarke, 2005; Charmaz, 2012), which situates research and interpretation as inherently political activities, and emphasizes the importance of the researcher’s reflexivity in the process of data analysis. Methodological techniques from a grounded theory approach were used in order to identify and categorize key meanings of the data transcripts, to explore how participants’ interview responses may have reflected their beliefs about student diversity, and how findings about these belief systems triangulated with
the cluster findings from Phase II. Findings were then used to create a framework or general explanation of the points of access that students may face with respect to World Language study in public schools in North Carolina.

While some grounded theory purists argue that it is inappropriate to approach data analysis with a theoretical framework in mind, constructivist grounded theorists assert that all researchers bring knowledge and experiences to the analysis, and help to co-construct theory as derived from their data and experiences with participants (e.g. Charmaz, 2006). As such, I used Critical Race Theory as the guiding lens by which I approached data analysis. An a priori framework for the qualitative data analysis process was operationalized from tenets of Critical Race Theory, the extant research on preservice and practicing teachers’ beliefs about diversity, and cluster findings from Phase II. I coded in gerunds whenever possible to illustrate the meaning-making process between researcher and participant, and to situate the participants as “actors” (Charmaz, 2012, p. 5) in their own educational contexts.

Specifically, I drew from a central premise of CRT that racism is permanent and pervasive, and can be both a conscious and an unconscious act (Lawrence, 1995, as cited in DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27) to hypothesize that practicing language teachers who I interviewed would make some type of attribution about enrollment of students of color in language classes at their schools that reflected an internalization of dominant racist discourse about achievement and school engagement of students of color. I explicitly searched for instances when language teachers appeared to stereotype and make negative assumptions about students of color I drew from another premise of CRT that critiques liberal legal ideologies to hypothesize that teachers may have also internalized a discourse that embraces
a ‘colorblind’ attitude about students (Gotanda, 1991, Milner, 2010). I also coded instances in each interview where language teachers referred to the language teaching practices they employed, and categorized those practices as either ‘traditional’ or ‘standards-based’, as indicated by the extant literature on World Language pedagogy (e.g. Allen, 2002) and the latent constructs on the Foreign Language Education Questionnaire. I considered the extent to which ‘traditional’ and ‘standards-based’ language practices could be inclusive for diverse learners, and compared these espoused practices to the belief orientations towards diverse students that each teacher appeared to exhibit. Finally, I categorized codes for each participant’s interview in an attempt to identify the extent to which each teacher epitomized or differed from the four clusters in Phase II. Exemplary quotes were selected to represent each code.

To ensure trustworthiness and credibility, I crafted a subjectivity statement for reflexivity and to clarify my own biases. In addition, I coded interviews in multiple iterations to come to parsimonious coding schemes. Peer debriefs were also included in the coding process and throughout all stages of data analysis. Finally, transcripts of the interviews were provided to all five participants to clarify meaning and to solicit participant feedback. Two of the five teachers I interviewed made clarifying statements about prior comments they had made either during the course of the interview or had feedback about some of the survey data items.
Integrating Mixed Methods Data

This study employed three data collection techniques over three phases. Data were analyzed using a critical quantitative perspective, and a constructivist grounded theory approach. Data from each phase were analyzed for convergences and discrepancies as compared to one another, and as compared with the overarching theoretical framework. Findings from both quantitative and qualitative aspects of the study were integrated to create a narrative and representative model about points of access in World Language study. This narrative revealed underlying assumptions and practices in World Language education, how these practices contributed to the inclusion (or exclusion) of historically marginalized populations of students, and how individual teachers navigated and negotiated these discourses. Furthermore, when viewed from a Critical Race perspective, findings indicated the extent to which participants in the study had internalized dominant discourses and stereotypes about students of color and public education. The following chapter reports findings from each phase of the study.
CHAPTER 4: FINDINGS

This study explored the extent to which World Language classrooms may operate as sites of inclusion (or exclusion) for historically marginalized students in North Carolina. Specifically, I first analyzed extant data regarding student enrollment in World Language courses in four, large, Local Education Agencies. Next, I analyzed survey data regarding language teachers’ beliefs about diversity and espoused language teacher practices. Finally, I analyzed interview data regarding language teachers’ recognition of a spectrum of diversity in their classrooms, their espoused language teaching practices, and how they made sense of enrollment data at their school (generated in Phase I). After analyses were complete, critical examination of findings (Gillborn, 2010) was conducted by considering qualitative interview responses in conjunction with quantitative results, and how integrated findings related to central foci of Critical Race Theory in education.

The following chapter is organized by findings from each phase of the study. In the first section, I share results from World Language student enrollment analyses from data obtained from the North Carolina Department of Public Instruction. In the second section, I share results from survey data analyses regarding systematic variation in teachers’ beliefs about dimensions of diversity and language teaching practices. I also review the ways in which cluster analyses seemed to indicate specific, different orientations towards diversity and language teaching practices, and how those orientations may be more or less inclusive of diverse student groups. In the last section, I present findings from interview data that details the extent to which participants appeared to typify, or contrast, clusters of language teachers derived in Phase II. Findings from each interview are presented to portray the overarching
themes in the data, including the ways in which the language teachers’ recognized a spectrum of diversity, enacted espoused beliefs, and made sense of enrollment patterns.

**Phase I: Interrogating World Language Enrollment in North Carolina**

The aim of the first phase of the study was to explore the extent to which historically marginalized students are enrolled in middle and high school World Language courses in large districts in North Carolina. To answer the first research question regarding enrollment in World Languages, I requested data pertaining to four large school districts for the 2013-2014 academic year that were established and profitable enough to offer World Language programming. The data included student enrollment by gender and race/ethnicity. Other demographic variables, such as socioeconomic status (as measured by the percentage of students receiving Free or Reduced Price Lunch) were unavailable. The four Local Education Agencies (LEAs) selected purposively for analysis included 214 secondary schools, of which 188 offered World Language programming of some kind. Of the 108 high schools in the sample, 103 offered World Language programming. Of the 103 middle schools in the sample, 82 offered World Language programming. The remaining three schools offering languages were classified as neither high schools nor middle schools, as each school served students in grades ranging from K-12 to 6-12.

**High School World Language Programming**

Of the 103 high schools (grades 9-12) with World Language programming, 17% (n=18) offered only introductory language courses (levels 1 and 2). Forty percent (n=41)
offered advanced/honors levels of language courses. Forty-three percent (n=44) offered introductory, advanced/honors, and Advanced Placement language courses. Finally, 16\% (n=16) offered International Baccalaureate programs of World Language study. Figure 3 details the overall profile of high schools in the sample.

*Figure 3.* High school (n=103) World Language programming summary.

Enrollment data was analyzed using Orfield and Lee’s (2005) definitions of school segregation; schools were grouped according to demographic percentages of students: 1) school population included 50\% or less non-White students (non-segregated school); 2) if the school population included between 50 and 100\% non-White students (predominately segregated); 3) if the school population included between 90 and 100\% non-White students.
(intensely segregated); and 4) if the school population included between 99 and 100% non-White students (extremely segregated). Segregation, or the extent to which non-White students are separated from White students in schools “as a statistical fact (Orfield, 1983, p. 3), remains a relevant construct in public education because students of color who attend ‘majority minority’ schools are less likely to have access to educational resources, teachers who are licensed, and certain curricula, such as AP courses (Orfield & Lee, 2005; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Perry, Steele, & Hilliard, 2003). In the LEAs selected for study, the number of languages available to students, and the levels of language courses offered, varied by school population characteristics.

Results from frequencies generated in SPSS indicated that there were meaningful discrepancies in the number of languages offered by school in these LEAs, according to school demographic makeup. These findings are detailed in Table 4.1. In 2013-2014, students of color often attended high schools where fewer languages were offered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages offered</th>
<th>50-100% White students</th>
<th>50-89% non-White students</th>
<th>90-98% non-White students</th>
<th>99-100% non-White students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, frequency data also indicated that there were meaningful discrepancies in the levels of languages offered at high schools in the LEAs, according to school type. These findings are detailed in Table 4.2 on the next page. At schools where over 50% of the student population was White (n=24), no schools offered only introductory courses (levels 1 & 2); six schools (25%) offered advanced/honors levels of study (levels 3 and above of language courses); 17 schools (71%) offered Advanced Placement language courses; and one school was an IB school.
Table 4.2
Levels of Language Courses Offered by School Type at High Schools in Four Large LEAs, including North Carolina Virtual Public School (NCVPS) Courses, 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School counts where each level of languages was offered</th>
<th>50-100% White students</th>
<th>50-90% non-White students</th>
<th>90-98% non-White students</th>
<th>99-100% non-White students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intro (levels 1&amp;2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced (level 3 &amp; above, Honors)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Placement</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Baccalaureate Program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *In each of these two groups, there was one new school that was only enrolling students through 10th grade during the 2013-2014, which may impact the levels of language offered at their particular school sites. As such, those schools were not included in the counts.

By contrast, in high schools where the population was ‘predominately’ segregated, comprised of 50-89% non-White students (Orfield & Lee, 2005) (n=57), 13 schools (23%) offered only introductory courses (levels 1 & 2); 24 schools (42%) offered advanced/honors levels of study (levels 3 and above of language courses); 20 schools (35%) offered Advanced Placement language courses; and 13 schools (23%) had IB programs.
In high schools where the population was ‘intensely’ segregated, comprised of 90-98% non-White students (Orfield & Lee, 2005) (n=17), four schools (24%) offered only introductory courses (levels 1 & 2); seven schools (41%) offered advanced/honors levels of study (levels 3 and above of language courses); six schools (35%) offered Advanced Placement language courses; and one school had an IB program.

In high schools where the population was ‘extremely’ segregated, comprised of 99-100% non-White students (Orfield & Lee, 2005), n=5, one school offered only introductory courses (levels 1 & 2); three schools offered advanced/honors levels of study (levels 3 and above of language courses); one school offered Advanced Placement language courses; and one school had an IB program.

**Middle School World Language Programming**

The number of languages offered by school type at the middle school level varied as well. Of the 82 middle schools (grades 6-8) with World Language programming, 99% (n=81) offered only introductory language courses (levels 1 and 2). One percent (n=1) offered advanced/honors levels of language courses. The only school to offer an advanced language course served a population of predominately White students (61%). Three of the middle schools offered International Baccalaureate programs of World Language study. Table 4.3 details these variations on the next page.
Table 4.3
Number of Languages Offered by School Type at Middle Schools in Four Large LEAs, including North Carolina Virtual Public School (NCVPS) Courses, 2013-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Languages offered</th>
<th>50-100% White students</th>
<th>50-89% non-White students</th>
<th>90-98% non-White students</th>
<th>99-100% non-White students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student Enrollment Patterns

After building the dataset that detailed language enrollment in each school in the four LEAs, I calculated the average proportion of student subgroups enrolled in the school during the 2013-2014 school year to use as a test variable for comparison of language enrollment by subgroup. Expected enrollment was compared to observed enrollment in order to interrogate the extent to which student groups were equitably enrolled. If equitability in enrollment existed across student groups, one would expect similar enrollment between student groups at the school, broadly speaking, and student groups in World Languages.

Results from paired samples t-tests indicated that expected proportions of certain subgroups in World Language courses differed significantly from observed enrollment in these LEAs during the 2013-2104 school year. Specifically, in schools where over 50% of
the student population was White, male African American students were, on average, under-enrolled in language courses, $t(23)=-3.96, p=.001$ (two-tailed). Similarly, in schools that offered more advanced levels of language study, including AP courses, male African American students were, on average, under-enrolled, $t(42)=-2.56, p=.014$ (two-tailed).

In schools where between 50-100% of the student population was non-White, male Latino students were, on average, under-enrolled in language courses, $t(55)=-2.46, p=.017$ (two-tailed). In schools where between 90-100% of the student population was non-White, male Latino students were, on average, under-enrolled in language courses, $t(16)=-3.21, p=.005$ (two-tailed). In schools that offered both introductory and honors levels courses, male Latino students were, on average, under-enrolled in language courses, $t(40)=-2.69, p=.01$ (two-tailed). In schools that offered AP courses, male Latino students were even less likely to be enrolled, $t(42)=-4.15, p<.001$ (two-tailed).

**Summary of Findings**

Findings from this phase of the study indicated that students of color in the four LEAs were more likely to attend schools where less both languages were offered, and less levels of language were offered. These findings support previous research indicating that African American students are underenrolled in both language courses (Finn, 1998; Moore, 2008) and that African American and Latino students are underenrolled in AP courses, broadly speaking (Solorzano & Ornelas, 2004). Furthermore, because language courses are a ‘gateway’ to higher education in North Carolina, these findings have implications for students of color who are not on a college/preparatory track in these four LEAs in that it may
be more difficult to plan to attend a four year college or university if not enrolled in a school where languages and levels of languages are offered equitably. Since schools tend to be a primary site of inequities and disparate practices for students of color, and particularly African American students (Ladson Billings & Tate, 1995), these findings highlight the ways in which language enrollment practices also serve as mechanisms by which students are marginalized, and support the notion that students of color are provided a narrowed curriculum in public schools (Ladson-Billings, 2000).

To explore language teachers’ perceptions about the differing rates of enrollment among and between student groups in language courses, I presented Phase I findings regarding individual school contexts during interviews in Phase III of the study. Those teachers’ attributions for student enrollment will be reported along with broad findings from interview data analysis later in the chapter.

**Phase II: Interrogating Language Teachers’ Beliefs about Diversity Dimensions**

The aim of Phase II of the study was to examine the belief orientations of World Language teachers in North Carolina with regard to diversity and inclusion of historically marginalized populations. I hypothesized that the broader types of belief orientations observed in the general teaching population (e.g. Kozel, 2009) would also be reflected in the World Language teacher population. I derived this hypothesis from central tenets of Critical Race Theory, which posits that racism is normal, ordinary, and embedded in society (Bell, 1980), that the intersectionality of race and other identity statuses (Crenshaw, 1989) create ways in which students can experience multiple forms of oppression depending on context,
and that Whiteness (and other forms of dominant identity statuses) serve as forms of property (Harris, 1993) in educational systems (Tate, 1995; Howard, 2008). In addition, after reviewing the literature on World Language teacher preparation, I hypothesized it unlikely that language teachers who came to teaching via traditional pathways (ie. four-year undergraduate degree in education) completed sustained work relating to teaching for social justice, multicultural education, or creating inclusive classes for diverse learners. Findings from this study indicated that a majority of language teachers in the sample appeared to be similar to the broader teaching population with regard to their beliefs in that teachers appeared to have internalized dominant discourses about student diversity and schools as a function of operating in a racist, inequitable system. However, one group of teachers may have held more inclusive belief structures for specific dimensions of diversity. These belief structures seemed to vary systematically. When engaged in research that asks teachers to report their beliefs and attitudes about their work, it is in the ‘differences’ in data that the critical researcher can engage in interrogation of the practices and processes by which inequities and marginalization come into being (Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2008; Kozel, 2009).

**World Language Teachers’ Sense of Responsibility for Multiculturalism and Diversity (TSR-MD)**

Grand means calculated for each subscale of the TSR-MD indicated that, overall, teachers in the sample viewed some dimensions of diversity as more relevant to their teaching practice, and they felt more responsible for including representations of those dimensions in their classrooms, regardless of whether or not their students embodied those
dimensions of diversity. It is important to note that, due to the way in which items regarding representation of diversity in the classroom were written, a lower mean on the representation factor indicated more inclusive practices. In other words, teachers who reported that dimensions of diversity should be represented in their classroom, regardless of whether or not those students were presented, would have lower scores on this factor. Teachers rated items on a 6-point Likert-type scale with the following meanings: 1) Strongly Disagree; 2) Disagree; 3) Somewhat Disagree; 4) Somewhat Agree; 5) Agree; 6) Strongly Agree. Figure 4 details grand means for all subscales.

![Figure 4](image)

**Figure 4.** Grand means for TSR-MD subscales (including standard deviations).

After grand means were calculated, I conducted analyses to determine correlations between teachers’ self-reported demographics in the sample and their scores on TSR-MD
subscales. Findings indicated that there were some significant relationships between teachers’ demographic characteristics and TSR-MD outcomes, which are displayed in Table 4.4. For example, as language teachers’ annual incomes increased, perceived relevance of dimensions of diversity such as race, socioeconomic status, gender, and disability, and the role each should play in teaching practices decreased, $r = -.19, p < .05$, (two-tailed). As teachers’ reported income increased, perceived relevance of faith to themselves as individuals and to learning decreased, $r = -.19, p < .05$, (two-tailed). As teachers’ reported income increased, perceived relevance of students’ sexual orientation to learning decreased, as did the perceived responsibility of curriculum developers and schools for addressing sexual orientation, $r = -.15, p < .05$, (two-tailed). However, as teachers’ income increased, they were more likely to report that dimensions of diversity should be represented in teaching
Table 4.4  
**Summary of Correlations: Language Teachers’ (n=188) Self-reported Demographic Characteristics and TSR-MD Outcomes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teacher Sex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher Income</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teacher SES</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teacher Faith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teacher Sexual orientation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Disability</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Relevance/Role</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Responsibility Immediacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>School Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Representation Immediacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *p<.05 (2-tailed). **p<.01 (2-tailed).*
practices only if students who embodied those dimensions were present in the classroom, \( r = -.36, p < .01 \), (two-tailed).

Significant relationships were also found between language teachers in the sample who reported that they were a member of practicing faith and TSR-MD outcomes. As the likelihood increased that language teachers in the sample were of a practicing faith, perceived relevance of diversity dimensions to themselves and their teaching practices decreased, \( r = -.15, p < .05 \), (two-tailed). As the likelihood increased that language teachers in the sample were of a practicing faith, perceived relevance of sexual orientation to learning decreased, \( r = .14, p < .05 \), (two-tailed), as did perceived responsibility of schools to address differences in dimensions of diversity, \( r = -.17, p < .05 \), (two-tailed).

Significant differences also emerged with respect to language teachers’ self-reported gender and TSR-MD outcomes. Male language teachers in the sample (coded as sex = 0 in the dataset) were less likely to report that sexual orientation is relevant to learning, \( r = -.21, p < .01 \), (two-tailed). Male teachers in the sample were also more likely to report that dimensions of diversity should be represented in teaching practices only if students who embodied those dimensions were present in the classroom (indicated by a higher score on the Representation Immediacy factor), \( r = -.25, p < .01 \), (two-tailed).

Significant relationships also emerged between specific language teaching characteristics and TSR-MD outcomes, displayed in Table 4.5.
Table 4.5  
Summary of Correlations: Language Teachers’ (n=188) Self-reported Teaching Characteristics and TSR-MD Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Language taught</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Native speaker status</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Grades taught (Middle/High)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Years of Experience</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pathway to licensure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Prep location*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>School typeb</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relevance/Role</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Responsibility Immediacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>School Responsibility</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Representation Immediacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p<.05 (2-tailed). **p<.01 (2-tailed). *Teacher prep location: 5=NC public, 6=NC private, 7=out of state, 8=online, 9=TFA. *School type: 1=public, 2=charter, 3=private.
Teachers who reported being native speakers were more likely to report that dimensions of diversity are relevant to themselves, \( r = .16, p < .05 \), (two-tailed), and teachers, curriculum developers and administrators have a responsibility to include diversity dimensions, \( r = .23, p < .01 \), (two-tailed). Native speakers in the sample were also more likely to report that schools have a responsibility to address differences in diversity dimensions, \( r = .30, p < .01 \), (two-tailed), and that culture is an integral construct to their teaching practices and to student learning, \( r = .14, p < .05 \), (two-tailed).

Finally, high school teachers in the sample were less likely to report that schools are responsible for addressing differences in diversity dimensions, \( r = -.15, p < .05 \), (two-tailed).

There was a positive relationship between teachers’ years of experience and the reported relevance and role of diversity dimensions to them as individuals and to their teaching practices, \( r = -.26, p < .01 \) (two-tailed). In fact, as teachers in the sample reported more years of experience, they reported less perceived individual responsibility or school responsibility for all dimensions of diversity. Conversely, there was a positive relationship between years of experience and the perceived need to represent diversity dimensions only if those students were present in the class, which indicates inclusivity. In other words, more experienced teachers in the sample were more likely to represent differing dimensions of diversity in their class regardless of whether or not their students embodied those dimensions \( r = -.31, p < .01 \) (two-tailed).

Significant relationships also emerged between the location of teacher preparation and TSR-MD outcomes. As the likelihood that teachers were prepared in an institution outside of North Carolina or online increased, perceived relevance of faith to teaching
practices and learning decreased $r = -.15, p<.05$ (two-tailed), as did perceived responsibility of schools to address dimensions of diversity $r = -.18, p<.05$ (two-tailed).

Significant relationships emerged between teachers in different school contexts and TSR-MD outcomes. Private school teachers reported lower perceived relevance of dimensions of diversity to themselves as individuals and a decreased role of diversity in their teaching practice, $r = -.27, p<.01$ (two-tailed). There was also a negative relationship between school type and the Faith factor $r = -.16, p<.05$ (two-tailed), such that, as the likelihood increased that language teachers in the sample taught at private schools, the perceived role and relevance of faith to student learning decreased. Finally, private school teachers in the sample reported lower perceived responsibility for schools to address diversity dimensions, $r = -.20, p<.001$ (two tailed).

**Identifying World Language teachers’ belief orientations towards diversity and inclusion.**

I next submitted all cases included for analysis (n=188) to a two-step hierarchical clustering technique to group teachers in the sample based on profiles of TSR-MD responses. This clustering process was employed in order to explore the extent to which variations in their orientations towards inclusivity varied systematically. In step one, initial agglomeration coefficients and dendograms from Ward’s method indicated that there could be between four and five well-defined clusters in the sample. Analysis of scale means for each group indicated that, from a theoretical perspective, a four-cluster solution was the best fit for the
data. Figure 5 on the next page details grand means for clusters derived from Ward’s method.
Figure 5. Raw means on TSR-MD outcomes resulting from Ward's method of cluster analysis.
In the first step, I selected the four cluster solution to best represent what appeared to be four distinct orientations towards diversity and meeting the needs of diverse students. Broadly, three of the four orientations that emerged could be considered to perpetuate status quo education. Only one cluster appeared to indicate an orientation that could be perceived as congruous to the broad goals of social justice and inclusivity, and this orientation could be characterized as emergent. That is, teachers in this cluster appeared to place more importance on some of dimensions of diversity than others. While these findings do not exactly replicate Kozel’s (2009) six cluster solution, they are similar in that her six clusters of teachers appeared to vary systematically in their orientations towards student diversity. Broadly, her six cluster were divided into three orientations: a first belief orientation that appeared to locate teachers as responsible for addressing diversity dimensions; a second orientation that appeared to locate both teachers and schools as having shared responsibility; and a third orientation which appeared to indicate that neither teachers nor schools were responsible for addressing diversity dimensions.

In order to conceptualize the clusters of language teachers in the sample, I drew from Kozel’s (2009) prior work on practicing teachers’ belief orientations, the extant literature on preservice teachers’ beliefs about teaching diverse students (e.g. King, 1991; Sleeter, 2001), both preservice and practicing teachers’ beliefs about the nature and meaning of diversity (for a review, see Woolfolk-Hoy, Davis, & Pape, 2006), and my own experiences as a practicing public school teacher and an university-based preservice teacher educator. In her prior work with practicing and preservice teachers and the TSR-MD, Kozel (2009) found that teachers in her sample aligned with a six-cluster solution, and that each cluster displayed
highly different orientations with regard to diversity and teachers’ sense of responsibility, although three overarching responsibility orientations emerged from the six clusters. Since factor analysis of TSR-MD responses in my sample did not replicate the eight subscales Kozel used, I expected that the clusters that emerged from the sample might also differ.

**Cluster 1: Colorblind.**

Teachers in this cluster reported scores that were below the mean for the sample on all subscales on the TSR-MD, except culture. I labeled this cluster *Colorblind* because, while teachers in the cluster indicated that they, and schools, were responsible for diversity to a certain extent, they also indicated that dimensions of diversity, such as race, socioeconomic status, and gender were less relevant to their individual identities, to their teaching practices, and to learning. The *Colorblind* group may have scored at the mean for the *Culture* factor because ‘culture’, as it pertains to World Languages, is heavily emphasized in national and state teaching standards. This cluster also indicated that faith and sexual orientation were less relevant to them as individuals, to their teaching practice, and to learning.

The juxtaposition of lower scores on all dimensions of diversity with mean scores on *Culture* indicates that this group of teachers may have viewed ‘culture’ as something that is extraneous to their students. In other words, this group of teachers may have felt responsible for teaching about the cultures where their target language is spoken, but did not consider the culture that was present in their own classroom. This indicates a particular definition of ‘culture’ that is consistent with Kozel’s (2009) findings about the meaning that teachers make about diversity under the assumption of a post-racial context, and with the extant
literature about teachers who minimize the experiences and identities of students in their classes in a naïve attempt to treat students equally, rather than equitably, (Milner, 2003; Tatum, 1997) which precludes them from having to acknowledge their own privileged statuses.

**Cluster 2: Dysconscious.**

Language teachers’ scores in this cluster fell almost 1.5 standard deviations below the mean on all subscales except the *Representation Immediacy* factor, as indicated in Figure 4. These scores indicate that teachers in this cluster did not view schools as appropriate sites of inclusion for any dimensions of diversity. Moreover, these teachers indicated that dimensions of diversity were not relevant to them, to teaching, or to learning; nor were curriculum developers, administrators, or schools at large responsible for addressing diversity. Dysconscious teachers, according to King (1991), are unable or unwilling to critically evaluate the systems within which they live and work, and ultimately preserve and perpetuate the status quo.

**Cluster 3: Conflicted.**

Language teachers in this cluster reported that traditional sources of diversity, such as race, class, and gender, were relevant to them, their teaching practices, and to learning. They reported that teachers, administrators, curriculum developers and schools all had a responsibility in addressing these diversity dimensions. However, teachers in this cluster appeared to hold belief systems that may have been conflicted or incongruous, specifically with respect sexual orientation and faith as diversity dimensions. They reported lower
scores for these two dimensions of diversity, which indicates that they may espouse inclusive beliefs regarding more visible sources of diversity. Because teachers’ beliefs act as filters (Fives & Beuhl, 2012) that may impact their work with students and their instructional practices, it may be that teachers in this cluster, who identified mostly as Christian, hold beliefs about sexual orientation that are shaped by their religious beliefs, and vice-versa. These personal belief systems may then impact the perceived relevance of these dimensions of diversity to teaching and learning. Finally, these language teachers reported scores that were above the mean for the sample with respect to the notion that dimensions should be represented in teaching practices regardless of whether or not students who embodied those dimensions were present in the classroom (ie. a lower mean score on the Representation factor, indicating a propensity towards inclusivity).

**Cluster 4: Aware, but not advocates.**

Language teachers comprising the fourth cluster held inclusive orientations towards all dimensions of diversity, but also reported that they needed to represent those dimensions of diversity in their teaching practice only if students in their class embodied those diverse characteristics. Teachers in the fourth cluster indicated that all dimensions of diversity present in the measure were relevant to them, to teaching practices, and to learning, and their scores were almost a full standard deviation above the sample mean in some cases. These teachers also indicated that teachers, schools, curriculum developers and administrators were all responsible for diversity, as indicated by almost two full standard deviations above them mean. As such, it is difficult to reconcile their views about why diversity dimensions, if so
important, should only be represented in teaching practices if those students are present, as indicated by a score of almost two full standard deviations above the sample mean. This finding could be interpreted in several ways: 1) teachers in this cluster may have reported what they thought to be socially desirable responses; 2) teachers in this cluster who reported inclusive orientations and scored high on the representation factor may have misinterpreted or misread the question; or 3) teachers in this cluster may have a fundamental misunderstanding about teaching for social justice and multicultural education practices (which would include representing as many dimensions of diversity in their teaching practices, regardless of their student population). As I drilled down into this fourth cluster to explore demographic characteristics, frequencies indicated that almost all of the language teachers who comprised cluster four were native speakers. These native speakers represented multiple languages, but a majority were Spanish teachers. In addition, a majority indicated they had attended a four-year public or private college or university in North Carolina. It should be noted that a cross-section of demographic groups (gender, socioeconomic status, self-reported cultural identity, sexual orientation, etc.) in the sample were broadly represented in the other three clusters.

Because almost all of the teachers in this cluster were native speakers of their languages, and ostensibly ascribed to cultural practices other than those that could be considered ‘American’, perhaps they had particular views about cultural pluralism. That is, I hypothesize that these teachers’ approach to diversity may have included reasoning that it is not feasible to include and represent all cultures, so the students present in the class, and the dimensions of diversity they embody, are the ones who teachers are responsible for
representing in teaching practices. I derived this hypothesis from comments made by preservice teachers in my foundational teaching courses, and the extant research on culturally relevant teaching. While these preservice teachers were White and native English speakers who sought teaching certification in a variety of areas, this line of thinking is a common response to prompts about implementing culturally relevant teaching practices (Goodman, 2001).

Z-scores are helpful in interpreting data from the clusters because they display the highest and lowest scores on TSR-MD outcomes as ways to differentiate clusters. Z-scores on the TSR-MD indicate that teachers in the Colorblind and Dysconscious clusters reported diversity dimensions as less relevant to themselves, to teaching practices, and that schools, administrators, and curriculum developers have less responsibility for addressing dimensions of diversity. The Dysconscious cluster had the lowest scores of all the language teachers with respect to inclusivity. By contrast, teachers in the Conflicted and Aware, but not Advocates clusters reported diversity dimensions as more relevant to themselves and to their teaching practices. The Aware cluster had the highest scores of all the language teachers with respect to inclusivity. However, teachers in the Aware cluster reported that they were only likely to represent diversity dimensions if a student who embodied that group was present in their class. Teachers in the Conflicted cluster reported that, while faith and sexual orientation may have been relevant to them as individuals, they may not be relevant for teaching practices. Three of the four clusters (Colorblind, Dysconscious, and Conflicted) indicated that they may represent certain dimensions of diversity in their teaching practices regardless of whether or not students who embodied those dimensions were present in their
classrooms. Figure 6 on the following page shows standardized z-scores to illustrate cluster membership based on TSR-MD subscales and distance from the sample mean.
Figure 6. Standardized means (z-scores) on TSR-MD outcomes resulting from Ward's method of cluster analysis.
Summary of cluster findings.

Preliminary cluster findings from language teachers’ survey responses indicated systematic variations in belief systems about dimensions of diversity. Consistent with Wilbur (2007), findings from these data indicate that language teachers in the sample did not appear to be prepared to meet the needs of diverse learners. These findings substantiate claims by Zephir (2000) and Fox and Diaz-Greenberg (2006) regarding more intensive multicultural education in language teacher preparation and calls by Kubota, Austin, and Saito-Abbey (2009) and Moore and English (2008) for targeted coursework to understand and integrate sources of student diversity into language teaching practices.

To distinguish clusters of teachers as much as possible from one another, I employed another step in cluster analysis using k-means procedures. And, while I analyzed data from each phase of this study separately, I found that at least one of the five participants I interviewed epitomized each of these four clusters. As such, in the next section, results from k-means clusters, and the effects of cluster assignments on reported language teaching practices, are integrated with qualitative data from Phase III interviews to create profiles of the language teachers in each cluster.

Examining Systematic Differences in Espoused World Language Teaching Practices as a Function of TSR-MD Belief Orientations

After initial clusters were conceptualized and named, I employed step two of the clustering technique using k-means to create the most distinct clusters. Specifically, means from Ward’s method cluster memberships were used as seed values in k-means clustering,
which reassigned cases to the nearest centroid value. Results from $k$-means clustering reinforced a four-cluster solution, and final cluster membership indicated four theoretically defensible groups of teachers that displayed homogeneity within groups and heterogeneity across groups. Figure 7 on the following page shows raw TSR-MD means from $k$-means iterative partitioning.
Figure 7. TSR-MD outcomes from clustering by $k$-means iterative partitioning.
After cluster analyses were complete, descriptive statistics were conducted for subscales in the Foreign Language Education Questionnaire (FLEQ). Grand means for all teachers in the sample are displayed below.

![Figure 8. Raw grand means for FLEQ subscales (including standard deviations).]

Broadly speaking, language teachers in the sample embraced *standards-based* teaching practices (e.g. focusing on communication, teaching in the target language during instruction, incorporating authentic cultural materials, building on students’ prior knowledge, and creating interdisciplinary opportunities for language use \((M=5.10, SD=.47)\) more than *traditional* teaching practices (e.g. focusing on grammar instruction, the textbook and ancillary materials as the source of content and assessments, and English as the dominant language of instruction \((M=2.99, SD= 1.06)\). These findings are consistent with previous
research regarding language teachers’ beliefs about their teaching practices after the adoption of the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning (1999) (Allen, 2002; Bell, 2005; Brown, 2009; Kissau, Algozzine, & Yon, 2012). Also, consistent with Allen (2002), findings from these data indicate that teachers in the sample perceived all students to benefit from language study, regardless of future educational plans, future career plans or disability status ($M=5.22$, $SD=.60$).

After running descriptives on FLEQ outcomes for all teachers in the sample, I wanted to explore the extent to which language teachers’ reports about language teaching practices differed according to cluster. Average espoused teaching practices by cluster membership are displayed in Table 4.6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cluster 1: Colorblind</th>
<th>Cluster 2: Dysconscious</th>
<th>Cluster 3: Conflicted</th>
<th>Cluster 4: Aware, but not Advocates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Teaching</td>
<td>Mean: 2.75, SD: 0.60</td>
<td>Mean: 2.63, SD: 0.74</td>
<td>Mean: 2.50, SD: 0.74</td>
<td>Mean: 4.82, SD: 0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards-Based Teaching</td>
<td>Mean: 5.00, SD: 0.49</td>
<td>Mean: 4.96, SD: 0.54</td>
<td>Mean: 5.27, SD: 0.35</td>
<td>Mean: 5.07, SD: 0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated that there were significant differences among the clusters with regard to espoused language teaching practices (FLEQ outcomes), $F (9, 443) = 26.14$, $p<.001$; Wilk's $\Lambda = .36$; partial $\eta^2 = .29$. After Bonferroni adjustments (using a $p$-value of .017 to reflect the three dependent
variables in the FLEQ instrument), results indicated that cluster membership accounted for approximately 60% of the variance in reported *traditional* language teaching practices, $F(3) = 90.76$, $p<.001$; partial $\eta^2 = .597$, and approximately 7% of the variance in reported *standards-based* language teaching practices, $F(3) = 4.85$, $p<.001$; partial $\eta^2 = .073$. Post-hoc tests indicated that there were significant differences between the *Colorblind* and the *Aware*, *but not Advocates* clusters, (clusters 1 and 4); the *Dysconscious* and the *Aware* clusters (clusters 2 and 4); and the *Conflicted* and *Aware* clusters (clusters 3 and 4), with respect to *traditional* teaching practices. As seen in Table 4.7 on the following page, the *Aware* cluster, comprised of mostly native speakers, reported significantly higher espoused traditional language teaching practices than other three clusters.
Table 4.7  
MANOVA Post Hoc results: Mean Cluster Differences Regarding Espoused Language Teaching Practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Mean Difference between Clusters</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traditional Teaching</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2.07**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2.19***</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-2.32***</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards Based Teaching</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.31*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Mean differences significant at *p*<.05; **p**<.005; ***p***<.001.
Cluster 1 = Colorblind; Cluster 2 = Dysconscious; Cluster 3 = Conflicted; Cluster 4 = Aware, not Advocates.

There were also significant mean differences between the Colorblind and Conflicted clusters (clusters 1 and 3); and the Dysconscious and Conflicted clusters, (clusters 2 and 3), with respect to espoused standards-based teaching practices. Teachers in the Conflicted cluster reported higher espoused standards-based teaching practices.
Summary of Findings

Analysis of Phase II survey data indicated that belief structures of language teachers in the sample seemed to vary systematically, and that belief orientations were related to espoused language teaching practices. These findings are consistent with the literature to date regarding the relationship between teachers’ beliefs and their practices (Pajares, 1992). Three of the four clusters in the sample appeared to perpetuate status quo education; the fourth cluster may have included participants that were more likely to identify as teachers for social justice, or teachers who viewed their language classrooms as sites of inclusion for historically marginalized student groups and who espoused culturally relevant, learner-centered language teaching practices. These findings are consistent with the literature to date regarding teachers’ beliefs about diversity in that a majority of secondary teachers of all content areas may be critically unaware of the ways in which public education replicates cultural norms and hierarchies (King, 1991; Sleeter, 2001), and may espouse ideologies such as ‘colorblindness’ (Milner, 2010) as their approach to diversity. Furthermore, findings from survey data support a Critical Race perspective in education that asserts that teacher perceptions about students’ ethnoracial status continue to be significant factors in educational inequity (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Lynn & Dixson, 2013).

Phase III: Language Teachers as Mechanisms of Inclusion and Exclusion

Teachers, as collections of identities with differing saliences depending on context and experience, can be expected to identify with an amalgamation of orientations both
towards diversity and language teaching practices. For the purposes of this study, I chose to use participants from Phase III interviews to represent each of the four clusters to the extent that each typified a belief orientation. This is not to say that these teachers can only be defined with one cluster membership. Moreover, each participant in the study cannot be expected to fit perfectly within each orientation (Kozel, 2009), nor is her cluster orientation static; rather belief systems and orientations are understood to be fluid and dynamic.

Figure 9 shows clusters of language teachers’ orientations towards the relevance and role of dimensions of race, class, gender, and disability to themselves, to their teaching practices, and to student learning; the relevance and role of faith and sexual orientation; teachers’ perceptions about their own, administrators’, and curriculum developers’ responsibility for diversity; teachers’ perceptions about schools’ responsibility; and the extent to which teachers should represent diversity in teaching only if students in their class embody those specific dimensions of diversity (specifically, a lower score on Representation Immediacy indicated that teachers reported diversity dimensions should be represented regardless of students in the class).
Figure 9. TSR-MD Outcomes after k-means iterative partitioning, by cluster.
The overarching research question that guided qualitative data collection was: How do high school World Language teachers’ descriptions of the typical and atypical types of students in their classes contribute to our understanding of the inclusion of historically marginalized students in language classes? In order to answer this question, I selected five practicing language teachers at schools where students of color were inequitably enrolled (n=3), and somewhat equitably enrolled (n=2), according to Phase I enrollment data analysis. Specifically, I asked language teachers to make sense of student enrollment patterns from Phase I data regarding their school, and to make attributions about how and why students take their classes. I also asked them questions about their language teaching practices to explore the extent to which this data would triangulate with cluster differences and Foreign Language Education Questionnaire outcomes, and the extent to which these language teachers appeared to meet the needs of diverse learners through inclusive teaching strategies.

An *a priori* framework was derived from Critical Race Theory as applied to educational contexts, which posits that schools largely function as sites of inequity students of color because of the hierarchy that racism creates in all institutions (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004) and the notion that individual teachers may have internalized discourses about students of color that can marginalize groups based on perceptions about race and ethnicity.

I also used the cluster findings from Phase II of the study to guide my interpretation of teachers’ responses, and explored the extent to which the data from language teacher interviews converged and triangulated with, or was discrepant from, the findings from Phase II. I chose language teachers in the study to represent each cluster orientation from Phase II based on my interpretations of their articulations of inclusivity and propensity towards
specific language teaching practices, which may also be sources of inclusivity (Moore & English, 2008). Table 4.8 details overarching themes from interview data collected from five language teachers.
### Table 4.8

**Overarching themes: Gerunds derived from CRT framework and Constructivist Grounded Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Belief Orientation</th>
<th>Colorblind</th>
<th>Dysconscious</th>
<th>Conflicted</th>
<th>Boundary Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language teacher</td>
<td>Allison</td>
<td>Cheryl</td>
<td>Beth</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recognizing diversity dimensions of students in the classroom</strong></td>
<td>Motivational differences, gender</td>
<td>Race, SES</td>
<td>Race, gender, SES, disability, Native speakers</td>
<td>Race, gender, SES, disability, LGBTQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making attributions: How students enroll</strong></td>
<td>Unaware; Implicit attributions to administration/school programming decisions related to student achievement</td>
<td>Unaware</td>
<td>Guidance counselors</td>
<td>Guidance counselors; explicit attributions to administration/school programming decisions related to student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making attributions: Why students enroll</strong></td>
<td>Level of student interest, teacher recruitment efforts (in class)</td>
<td>College-prep status/tracking</td>
<td>Department recruitment efforts</td>
<td>College-prep status/tracking level of student interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Endorsing language teaching practices</strong></td>
<td>Mix of traditional and standards-based</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Mix of traditional and standards-based</td>
<td>Standards-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Making sense of enrollment data</strong></td>
<td>Expressing desire to advocate for language program; Embracing expansion of program/access</td>
<td>Struggling with advancement of languages and their program</td>
<td>Advocating for certain student groups</td>
<td>Advocating for certain student groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internalizing dominant discourses</strong></td>
<td>Stereotyping historically marginalized students</td>
<td>Stereotyping historically marginalized students</td>
<td>Advocating for certain student groups</td>
<td>Advocating for certain student groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Broadly, three of the five language teachers appeared to espouse beliefs about students that perpetuated status quo education; furthermore, these teachers espoused traditional language teaching practices, such as teaching from the textbook, focusing on grammar, and linking students’ grades to behaviors (such as turning in homework on time) rather than to student mastery of content. Two of the five language teachers appeared to espouse beliefs about students that were representative of more inclusive teaching practices; furthermore, these teachers actively advocated for certain non-privileged student groups, such as students who are ‘Native Speakers’ and students who identified as LGBTQIA. The following sections detail findings from interviews with the five teachers as they represented clusters identified in Phase II.

**The Colorblind Teacher: Allison**

In many ways, Allison appeared to exemplify the *Colorblind* belief orientation identified during analysis of Phase II survey data. She was a middle-grades French teacher in a large school where two languages were offered on an exploratory model: students could choose to take either French or Spanish during 6th grade, and then continue on in one language for both their 7th and 8th grade years to earn one high school credit; however, only 16% of the total school population was enrolled in a language. Refer to Table 3.9 for complete self-reported demographic information regarding Allison and the four other language teachers interviewed in Phase III.
**Recognizing diversity dimensions in the classroom.**

When describing types of students in her class, she first spoke to her perceptions about their motivation: “I tend to get a lot of high achievers, I think. Most of them that are there are taking it because they really want to take it and they really want to learn French and have an interest in France, or something like that.” When pressed to describe the demographic makeup of her classes, she talked about gender differences: “I have one class of sixth graders…It’s like 22, and there’s only five girls in it and it’s all boys. They drive me nuts.” Allison described the area surrounding the school as “not very diverse”, and that, “as far as the school goes, it’s a pretty White school”. Demographic data for the prior year at Allison’s school detailed 38% non-White students. When Allison described her classes further, she explained:

As far as my eighth graders I think I only have one boy who's African American, and then the sixth graders there's more but they have to take it, they don't have a choice. I don't know if I would count that as much. But for seventh and eighth grade out of all my kids, and that's like 80 kids or so, there is only one African American boy. I didn't even realize that.

Data suggest that Allison did not consider the various identities and cultures that students brought to her class beyond their gender presentation.

**Endorsing language teaching practices.**

Like teachers in the *Colorblind* cluster who espoused greater propensity to *traditional* language teaching practices than two of the other identified clusters ($M=2.75$, $SD=.60$), Allison described her teaching as textbook-centered. She often did not teach in the target language, and her grading practices were based on perceptions of effort and behavioral
components, rather than on student mastery of content or communicative language competencies (Allen, 2002):

I tend to be pretty lenient about grades as long as they are making an effort and they are trying. Homework grades and things like that. Most of that is all about effort. So, like are you working on things? More of the grades will come in.

She also used grades as a motivational and management tool:

I call it a weekly performance grade. They have a bell ringer every day when they come in. So, they’ll get 20 points a week, four points each day, and one is there bellringer, and one point is just coming prepared to class, bringing the stuff that they need. The other two points are like, how much they participate, and their use of French in the classroom. And I can say, "Oh, you are not going to get your points for today," and they will change.

Allison indicated that her school had been a recipient of Race to the Top funding for iPad integration, though it was unclear the extent to which she used iPads for language teaching. She referenced a multiple choice game that students like to play, and also indicated that she would allow students to play iPad games at the end of class if they had time. She used this time as an incentive for students to complete their work, and said, “It takes away from class time a little bit, but if we are getting done everything that needs to be done, then I’m OK with that.” Allison did adopt some standards-based teaching practices, such as asking her students to make cultural comparisons between the United States and France after showing videos, and she also showed her students pictures of her time in Morocco. She also tried to integrate some themes from the 8th graders’ Language Arts unit on the Holocaust in her French classroom.

Because the enrollment numbers of her French classes were so low, she was currently teaching a remedial reading class for one period a day. Allison expressed that she felt
completely unprepared to teach the class: “The reading class…I have no idea what I’m doing…like, total mystery.” Allison also perceived that the student population her in her remedial reading class was “completely different” from her French classes. She said her administration planned to send her to workshop about reading on one of the upcoming teacher workdays. Allison expressed an awareness that she needed to keep her numbers “beefed up” to avoid having her French program eliminated.

**Making attributions about student enrollment.**

Allison was unaware of how students enrolled in her 6th grade exploratory class. She hypothesized that students decided before their 6th grade year whether or not they wanted to enroll in the exploratory language model, which consisted of 9 weeks of French and 9 weeks of Spanish:

> They require every sixth grader to do this unless they take, and I don't know why, but if they take chorus or if they take band then they're in chorus or band for the whole year, and they don't do this ‘wheel’ exploratory. They call it the ‘wheel’. I guess it’s just to give them the taste of all the possible hardcore classes that they could have.

She acknowledged that her exploratory class was, however, the site of recruitment for students who would choose to continue on with French 1 during their 7th and 8th grade years (taught over both years). Rarely did students who had not been in the exploratory classes in 6th grade choose to take French 1 during their 7th and 8th grade years. She joked, “Hopefully I’ve won over enough of them that I will be able to have two full classes next year!”

When making sense of the enrollment data at her school, Allison described mild surprise that students were not equitably enrolled. When pressed to articulate why that may
be, Allison hedged the question a bit, and responded: “I don’t tend to look at things that way. I don’t really think about it. The kids are here in front of me, I don’t really care what they are.” These reactions appear to support the notion that Allison viewed ‘colorblindness’ as an appropriate approach to student diversity in her classes.

Allison, like Martha, attributed the underenrollment of African American boys in language courses to lack of interest: “I don’t want to make too much of a generalization, we have a lot of computer classes and technology classes that I know interest the kids a lot”. She also made attributions about enrollment that pertained to perceived career plans, and said that she tried to stress to her exploratory classes that, if they wanted to go a to a “good school”, they “need to take a language in middle school and high school to get a lot of credits”. Finally, Allison made attributions to sociopolitical contexts when asked about why enrollment numbers may have been so low at her school:

I don't see it as being their fault of the students at all. I don't think it's because of them making choices. I don't even necessarily blame the County as such, or even maybe the State, where they talk about how they want our kids to be more global, and they get rid of the requirements of having foreign language. It's the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard. Knowing how in other countries, like their kids start taking foreign language, a second language, a third language. You can't even graduate high school in France without having three languages. They start so much younger, but they don't give us time to do that because they'd rather just give standardized tests.

This suggests that Allison, like some of her fellow participants, may have felt little sense of agency in building her program and increasing her enrollment numbers. She recognized that she had to “hook” some students in her exploratory classes in order for her 7th and 8th grade classes to be full, but did not participate in other types of recruitment.
The Dysconscious teacher: Cheryl

Cheryl seemed to typify the *Dysconscious* orientation to student diversity identified during Phase II survey data analysis, as she appeared unable to critically examine and locate the systemic sources of marginalization at her school.

*Recognizing diversity dimensions in the classroom.*

Cheryl described the demographic makeup of her school as “almost qualifying for Title 1”, meaning that many of her students qualified for Free or Reduced Price Lunch. She also used descriptors of her students such as “fragile”, “coming from a broken home”, and “low socioeconomic status”. She said that the school had experienced a shift after several new high schools had been built in the area that had “pulled off more of our middle and upper class students”. She also described her perception that some of her administrators:

- feel that every student should be in the college ready track but that’s not the track that most of our kids... We do send kids to college all the time. The majority of our kids that sign up for postsecondary education are going to community colleges. Lots of them are not going to postsecondary education at all.

These comments suggest that Cheryl took the ‘tracking’ process for granted, and had not evaluated it from a critical perspective. Cheryl described the demographic makeup of her classes as “a third, a third, a third… A third Hispanic, a third Black, and a third White. That’s what they feel like to me, probably.” According to demographic data analyzed in Phase I of the study, there were approximately 68% students or color during the prior academic year at Cheryl’s school, and students of color were equitably enrolled in language classes. She also said that, from a racial perspective, her class compositions were a “good mix”, but that she wished that there was more socioeconomic variation in her classes. Her descriptions of the
school population, coupled with demographic data about the school, suggest that Cheryl 1) held deficit views of students of color, 2) often conflated race and socioeconomic status, and 3) viewed socioeconomic status, but not race, as the locus of marginalization at her school. This data triangulates with cluster data regarding race and socioeconomic status as diversity dimensions that were often grouped together conceptually.

Cheryl identified as a White woman, who was “bi” or “gay”, but struggled with whether or not to portray her identity as a “gay woman” in the classroom:

I am very clear about what is and is not acceptable language and treatment of races and religions, and sexuality and disability. The thing that I could do better, is I could ‘come out’ myself as a general rule to all of my students and make a stand for it. For example in the way that I do with disabilities. The first time I ever hear a kid go, “You're stupid”, or “You're a retard” or whatever, I lash out. I say “No, I have a child who truly is labeled mentally retarded. This is what it means to me and my family, and you would not use that word in my class and that’s not how we will treat each other. I don't do the same thing on a personal level with ‘gay’. Sometimes I feel that I should, so that they say, “Look it's my teacher, she’s normal, she’s BORING really.” I really am...just about the most boring person on the planet. I look at it and I think they should see, like, you don't have to be drag queen and a hipster from San Francisco, to be gay. That's not what gay is. “My teacher is normal, she's got two kids and she's going camping this weekend. She's just a normal person and she's gay too…. I can be normal”, that sort of thing. And I have done it specifically. I have a child that was kicked out of her home because she ‘came out’ to her parents. I’ve had some pretty significant things happen. I've come out one on one, which is how kids have found out about being me on the grapevine, but I have never made some sort of announcement. That's my own personal cowardice. In that sense, I'm not a complete up stander, but I guess I'm more than upstander than a by stander, or at least I try to be.

This suggests that Cheryl, like teachers in the Dysconscious cluster, may have viewed sexual orientation as an identity status that is inappropriate for inclusion in public schools classrooms. Although it may have been relevant to her students, to their perceptions about
her, and to their perceptions of themselves and one another, Cheryl expressed discomfort when she described the extent to which this status should be incorporated into her classroom:

Part of me doesn't really want to make it an issue in my classroom. Part of me wants to say “we're here to learn to speak French and to learn about all these different cultures”. And part of me doesn't really want to make the class about (my) sexuality, I mean, for lack of a better way to phrase it. So that's an issue that I struggle with consistently.

Findings suggest that Cheryl would rather not address something that she knew some of her students to be struggling with themselves. Although she was aware of their struggles, and had perspective and experience with them herself, she was unwilling to commit class time or emotional resources to explore the “issue”, thus appearing to engage in a *Dysconscious* orientation.

*Endorsing language teaching practices.*

Like Allison, Cheryl appeared to approach her language teaching practice from a largely grammar-based, “academic” perspective. Data regarding Cheryl’s espoused teaching practices triangulate with the *Dysconscious* cluster, which indicated the lowest score with regard to *Standards-based* teaching practices ($M=4.96$, $SD=.54$) of all four clusters. Cheryl explained that most of her department had long since abandoned their textbooks because they were outdated. She created many of her own units based on textbook structure, and encouraged French to English translation in her practice of distributing vocabulary lists and grammar exercises. She expressed frustration that, after the demographic shift in the school population took place, students often did not “get” some of the content:
I was like, "Why can't we memorize these, you know, for regular verbs, why can't we memorize the endings of ‘ER’ verbs?" I am not even putting in ‘IRs’ and ‘Res’ at the same time, that's a different chapter! Why can't we do this, why can't we remember our pronouns, these are not things that used to be difficult? It's now that they are, and I am, you know, pulling my hair out.

Cheryl had not seemed to reflect upon her instructional practices as a potential source of disconnect. She also expressed her reluctance to speak in the target language, and asserted that none of her colleagues who taught “lower level” French or Spanish classes (ie. French 1 and Spanish 1) spoke in the target language either. Cheryl was frustrated by her perception that she was forced to teach French in a more “academic way”. She placed high value on beginning language learning at an early age, in an immersion setting, in a developmentally appropriate way. However, at her school, Cheryl said she was attempting to do lots of oral things and trying to get them to acquire language naturally, by not giving a vocabulary list, by teaching them things in context, although this is not always possible. They get vocabulary lists. They get obviously deductive grammar lessons where I explain how the passé composé is formed. Even though we do some deductive reasoning where you look at it and try to figure out what's happening, they are not learning language in a natural way.

This suggests that, although Cheryl was aware of ‘best’ language teaching practices, she felt a tension in her attempts or her ability to implement them in her instruction, whether because she perceived her students to be incapable of learning the content or because of the restrictions she perceived had been placed on her autonomy to implement her ideal teaching style and practices.
Making attributions about student enrollment.

Like Allison, Cheryl had “no idea” how students were enrolled in her French class. This was a source of concern for her, and something she had approached her colleagues in the department about on numerous occasions. Her colleagues echoed her sentiments:

We have this conversation as a department almost daily. We don't really know. In fact we actually went this year because I was particularly frustrated that with my French one classes I was struggling not only to get these kids to bring notebooks, to take notes, to do homework. I started pulling out the GPAs of the kids that were taking my classes that were not doing well and I was looking at kids who had a GPA of lower than 1.5. I had kids with GPAs of lower than 1.0. I asked my colleagues to do the same thing. We all looked at GPAs and we had really low GPAs. We are actually now at the end of the semester and we have real grades. We're not just guessing which kids are going to fail. We know which kids are going to fail. The end of this semester, what's basically today. Now we know. Tomorrow we will also have a department meeting and we are going to look at this and see where our GPA range was for kids that failed. I don't know looking at this stuff why necessarily you would put a kid in a World Language class if your GPA is lower than a 1.0 or if your GPA is a 1.3? This is not comfortable for me. I am not saying that those kids wouldn't necessarily benefit from a language course. I guess what I am saying is, in high school it's taught as an academic course.

She expressed that her department had decided to begin a conversation with the guidance department about the academic nature of language courses, and suggest that, “if the kid has a 1.1 or 1.2 or less, a world language class is going to be a really big struggle for them unless they are really motivated and it's something that they are really wanting to do”. Conversely, Cheryl spoke at length about how many students who failed other academic subjects did well in her French class. She was most concerned about those students who did poorly in all academic areas who also did poorly in her class:

What I suspect is and what I am trying to find data to analyze is I suspect that students who don't do well in their other classes are also not doing well in their foreign language classes. That is my belief. It's probably because they are not strong
readers, they don't have a strong vocabulary which they will get to learn, leads itself to problems where vocabulary acquisition and that sort of thing. They don't recognize any cognates because they don't have that vocabulary. That's my gut is that's why students don't do well in my class. Absenteeism is also a big issue, I guess. My gut is, is that kids don't do well in my class when they are also not doing well in their other classes.

At Cheryl’s school, approximately 48% of the students were enrolled in languages. When making sense of this data, she again referenced the “academic” nature of her content:

Because they are learning language in an academic way, I feel like I need students who are relatively strong academically. I would be more interested in like what percentage of kids who are...What percentage of kids who have a certain IQ are attempting language or what percentage of kids who have a certain GPA are taking language, more interested in that than I am about 50 percent of the whole school.

Data from Cheryl’s interview suggest that she felt restricted in her level of autonomy to change instructional practices to meet the needs of her students. She also implicitly recognized that many of her instructional practices may not have been working for all her students. However, she appeared unwilling to take responsibility for the assumptions she made about students in her class, and seemed to be approaching a trajectory of exclusion with respect to her student population. She seemed to attribute her students’ failures to low socioeconomic status, without critically evaluating the ways in which schools have functioned as mechanisms for marginalization of students of color. Although students of color at her school were actually equitably enrolled, Cheryl seemed frustrated by the perceived ‘quality’ of student that comprised her French classes. Data suggest that Cheryl held deficit views of students of color, and had low expectations for academic success. She concluded her interview by describing her desire for a further tracked language program:
I would very much like it if North Carolina would create some sort of, like, Honors French I, Honors French II, so that I could move my Is and IIs that are slower, at a slower pace and pare down the vocabulary lists and pare down the grammar, so that I can do more manipulative stuff, have a class that’s more basic, and then I can move faster with kids that are stronger.

Findings from this interview suggest that Cheryl seemed to view students’ socioeconomic status and perceived ability levels as educational issues, rather than the system that was already in place. Like Allison, Cheryl appeared to localize student interest, motivation, and success to what she perceived as innate student characteristics.

**The Conflicted Language Teachers: Beth and Sarah**

Beth and Sarah both seemed to epitomize the *Conflicted* orientation identified during survey data analysis in that each expressed desire to advocate for certain diverse student groups and make languages more broadly accessible. Beth’s school enrolled students of color in World Languages at an equitable rate in 2013-2014 and was a school that was approximately 38% non-White. Furthermore, 54% of their total student population was enrolled in World Language courses. Sarah’s school underenrolled African American students and was a school that was approximately 40% non-White. At Sarah’s school, 64% of the total school population was enrolled in World Language courses.

**Recognizing diversity dimensions in the classroom.**

In contrast to Allison and Cheryl, data suggests that both Beth and Sarah had critical awareness about the identities that their students brought to language classes. Beth was a Spanish teacher at a mid-sized high school, and was highly complimentary of her building principal, her administrators, and her school context. She identified as a White woman who
was married to a native Spanish speaker, and she taught both advanced honors Spanish courses and a Spanish for Native Speakers course. She described her typical class as: “All sorts of races and genders and economic status and capabilities. My lower level classes in the past are a little bit of everything. Now that this year I have got more upper level, I don’t have as many students with IEPS or 504 plans as I have had in the past.”

Beth expressed an ethic of caring about her students when she described a language department policy wherein each year, teachers followed their students as they move up in language study:

I think it’s a good idea for teachers to move up with their students. And just kind of continue with incentives and the caring that the teachers have for these students. That's all right, it doesn't matter which teacher you have for your class. Everybody's going to be taking care of the students to the best of their ability. We all genuinely have the nurturing spirit for these kids, it's just that we reach out to them in different ways, and if we can continue to maintain that relationship, it's just easier on the students.

Beth was also especially sympathetic for the students in her Spanish for Native Speakers class, who she said felt like “they don’t belong at the school”. She advocated often for her “Native Speakers”, and even collaborated with the school newspaper to have her students’ work published.

Like Beth, Sarah recognized a spectrum of diversity in her classroom, although her school did not enroll student groups of color equitably. Sarah self-identified as Jewish woman, and described some of her memories as an “Other” that she experienced in childhood and adolescence. She thought these experiences probably contributed to her identity as an inclusive teacher. She also completed a teacher preparation program that was grounded in social justice, and she believed that many students took her class because she was perceived as a teacher who cared for, and understood her students.
So, maybe, that’s part of the reason why a lot of kids take my class…is feeling like they have people that connect with them, issues that are really important to them. Things like what’s happening in Ferguson, and I don’t think people here even care…The rest of my department…I’m pretty sure none of them really understand what it’s like to be somebody who is not like everybody else.

Sarah also identified as an “Ally” of the LGBTQ population at her school. She completed Safe Space Training during her teaching preparation, and expressed regret that the school no longer had a functioning Gay-Straight Alliance, which had been disbanded because of a physical altercation between students. She thought her role as an ally “might also help kids that don’t want to take other classes. We still have coaches that call their students ‘faggots’…they get away with it, where I’m disgusted at that…but the teachers and the administrators don’t care”. By contrast, Sarah viewed her classroom as a safe context for students who identified as LGBT or Q. She displayed a “Safe Space” sign behind her desk, and had a zero-tolerance policy for homophobic slurs in her classroom. These data triangulate with cluster data in that teachers with a ‘Conflicted’ orientation were more likely than other teachers in the sample to view sexual orientation as relevant to teaching and learning, and more likely to view administrators, curriculum developers, and schools in general as responsible for addressing sexual orientation as a diversity dimension.

**Endorsing language teaching practices.**

In contrast to Allison and Cheryl, Beth adopted a mix of both traditional and standards-based teaching practices. For example, she often linked grades to perceived effort. She allowed students to test and quiz “makeups”, “retakes”, homework “makeups”, which contributed to her high student success rate in Spanish classes, but that:
There has always been the kids that are just going to fail for whatever reason whether it is personal, something going on at home, or they just don't understand it. I have had that every year, every quarter. That is just something I haven't been able to get rid of.

Data suggests that Beth viewed responsibility for student failure as external to her teaching practice, the curriculum, or her classroom. But, Beth also described language teaching practices that were standards-based. She valued integration of local community events and contemporary issues in the Hispanic community, and interdisciplinary collaboration as vital to her teaching. After data was analyzed, however, it was unclear to what extent Beth integrated these teaching practices into her both her Native Speakers course and her traditional Honors Spanish courses.

Also in contrast to Allison and Cheryl, Sarah embraced standards-based language teaching practices, such as interdisciplinary units, creating connections between and among student interests and course content, and encouraging students to draw connections between course content and current events. She explained, “Like, the part at the end of The Republic, where the rich people and the poor people are fighting. When we talk about the rich people, we are talking about the ‘one-percenters’, and who is the ’99 percent’?” Making connections are language practices are heavily emphasized in both the National Foreign Language Standards and the standards set forth by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, and Sarah seemed to have internalized pedagogies that supported these goals. Findings from interview data with Sarah and Beth regarding language teaching practices triangulate with cluster data, which indicated that teachers in the Conflicted cluster had the highest reported scores regarding Standards-based teaching ($M=5.27, SD=.35$).
As a Latin teacher, Sarah believed that her content was different from other areas of language study because there was no pressure to communicate orally in class. This, she said, was a benefit for students who were “shy…or nervous about speaking a Foreign Language” and also for students who had special needs. She held inclusive views about students with special needs, and stated, “sometimes I get a lot of kids on the spectrum for autism, and they actually do better with me than they would anywhere else because they can kind of be self-contained and do all the work and not really have to engage with things that frighten them…sometimes it [the social and interpersonal aspects of languages] is pushing comfort zones.” However, students in her class did close readings of texts, analysis of complex grammatical structures, and engaged in discussions of historical events that related to similar contemporary issues. Sarah viewed her Latin class as a site in which students could learn her content while grappling with societal issues such as socioeconomic differences and war through their analysis of texts.

Making attributions about student enrollment.

Unlike Allison and Cheryl, Beth and Sarah appeared to be aware of the structures in their schools that encouraged or discouraged student enrollment in languages. Beth attributed the equitable enrollment at her school to the work her language department had done to create a “bond” with guidance counselors to boost enrollment and so that they would not be seen as just another “elective”. This had specific effects on their program in that the “bond” resulted in the creation of the Native Speakers class. Members of the language department had also begun to visit area middle schools to recruit rising high school students.
But, her department did not engage in recruitment efforts targeted at certain student groups in the context of their efforts to expand:

We kind of leave that up to Guidance. We don't go into that particular part. This year, one of our school improvement team goals has been closing the achievement gap. The students that have been targeted for that are the African American and Hispanic populations. As far as this year is concerned, they are our target to reach out to. But it's more for their success, not necessarily our own enrollment.

Beth also acknowledged that there were not as many African American students in her upper level courses:

They don't seem to be as motivated to continue. We try to focus on the minorities in the school to try to keep them interested in the program. But it seems like they don't, when you ask them why they don't want to continue, it just seems like their answer is "Well, I have got my two years that the colleges need. I would rather take another business class" or something else in what they think their major is going to be in college, over a foreign language. Then we have the students that want to continue the program and continue onto AP classes. We have a little bit of both, but I would say that is the biggest difference.

However, data suggests that Beth failed to examine her own teaching and advocacy practices as they related to African American students; she did not consider that students may have opted out of continuation of her class because the content was not made relevant, the class may not have been engaging, or that her classroom may have actually not been inclusive.

Beth also attributed student enrollment to teacher recommendations: language teachers had to “sign off” on students’ registration cards each time they wanted to enroll in a next level of language course. Beth’s attributions about how students enroll in her course, and why students choose to continue to on to upper level language courses, suggest that Beth may have approached an advocacy orientation for some groups of students with whom she felt a connection (e.g. Native Speakers). However, these data suggest that Beth may take some
systemic marginalization practices as a given, and may not have critically examined her perceptions about African American student motivation and engagement or her teaching practices.

Like Beth, Sarah appeared to attribute student enrollment to specific practices at the school. She explained that most students in her Latin classes were college-bound, and that students enrolled largely via guidance counselors: “It’s not always true in Level One, but anybody who goes beyond Level One is definitely college bound…not just with Latin, but also with French…and Spanish.” She acknowledged the role of recruitment when she described the “curriculum fair” that took place each spring, where incoming freshmen had the opportunity to ask questions about languages in high school. Sarah also explained that she thought “kids did their own recruiting” in that some students sign up for classes based on word-of-mouth reports of teacher reputation or peers’ experiences.

Sarah spoke glowingly about the students in her Latin classes: “I have really, really good kids…These are honors kids from like, the top ten percent of the class. I usually have the valedictorian and salutatorian in my classrooms.” She also perceived a majority of her students to be highly motivated by grades and by a sense of competition with their peers. Conversely, she admitted that there were some students in her “last period” who may not have been passing classes other than her Latin classes: “They might not have passed, and as long as they are find with that, there is only so much I can do”. This suggests that Sarah drew a line with respect to advocacy and academic press for her students, and she may have viewed other teachers’ classrooms as ‘off-limits’.
Finally, when making sense of the enrollment data for her school, Sarah indicated that she had “never really picked apart the numbers”. Yet, she was unsurprised that African American students were underenrolled in language classes at her school, and made several attributions about why that may have been the case. The first attribution included speculation about how students are considered for languages:

I know we’re doing some kind of special academy thing where the administration picks what the students get. I wonder if this is one of the groups…I do know that they talked about African American males and how they’re under-performing at our school…not performing to standard in math and English tests. My supposition would be that if they’re not doing well in English, they’re never signed up for a foreign language, because generally speaking, the kids who get to sign up for the foreign languages are the kids who have passed English. I wonder if that has something to do with it, but I couldn’t tell you for certain or not.

When making sense of this line of thinking, she stated, exasperated:

It is beyond me what my administration is thinking at, any given time. I guess they're trying to help the kids out by getting them to pass the things they really need to pass high school. ‘A foreign language is just for college bound kids’. Maybe that. Although I think that sometimes, kids that might not do well anywhere else, I think the chance to try a foreign language, maybe that's their thing, and they'll finally be good at something. I don't know.

Sarah clearly believed in the power of language study and World Languages as sites of student success. However, her attributions about African American student enrollment suggest that, although she advocated for certain student groups in her classes, she seemed unaware of, or unwilling to exert, her own power, or agency, as part of the system. Her attributions about enrollment seemed to reflect the underlying tension between teacher and administration to which she repeatedly referred during the course of the interview. Findings suggest that Sarah may have felt empowered with her own students, but may have felt limited in her ability to affect change outside of her own classroom.
The Boundary Case: Martha

Martha, a native Spanish speaker and veteran Spanish teacher at a very large language magnet high school, appeared in some ways to epitomize the Aware, but not Advocates cluster identified with survey data analysis. However, data suggests that she may have been a boundary case in this cluster. Data from Phase I indicated that Martha’s school was approximately 60% non-White, and was the largest language magnet school in the district. In fact, Martha, and her colleagues in the department, were extremely concerned with the size of their language classes.

Recognizing diversity dimensions in the classroom.

Like Beth and Sarah, Martha seemed to recognize a spectrum of diversity in her classroom. When describing the ‘types’ of students that she taught, Martha segregated students into groups who were motivated to get their credit for college (“80%”) and students who were interested in continuing to upper level languages (“20”), and that “for the most part, I have Whites, African Americans, a few that are from Hispanic background but they’re not very fluent…and a few Asians.” Although Martha indicated that schools had a responsibility to address differing dimensions of student diversity, and she was keenly aware of the demographics of her classes, data suggests that she did not often consider the myriad cultures and identities that students brought to her class as relevant to teaching and learning. When focusing on “Culture” in her Spanish classroom, Martha appeared to focus on external culture of the target language. As a native Spanish speaker who had lived in many Spanish-
speaking places in the world, Martha felt she had many experiences to share with her students: “It’s very important because we not only teach the language, we teach the culture.”

**Endorsing language teaching practices.**

Unlike Beth and Sarah, Martha employed *traditional* language teaching practices in her high school classes although she previously taught at an immersion school and recognized the value of *standards-based*, content-based instruction in the target language:

> When I was teaching an immersion class, of course, they learned all the subjects in a different language and that's very good. Especially when I saw it in math, how it seemed like it was going to be very challenging for students who had learned math in Spanish to be able to transfer that into English. It's just amazing. They learned the concept. They learned to do the math. It wasn't hard for them to make the switch when they came to middle school or high school, and they have to do the math in English or their native language. It wasn't a hard switch. It was just absolutely very beneficial for them to have learned that skill in a different language.

In this way, Martha epitomized the *Aware* cluster of native speaker teachers who reported significantly greater espoused traditional language teaching practices (*M*=4.89, *SD*=.69). In fact, standardized *z*-scores in Figure 10 on the next page show that this group of teachers was over 1.5 standard deviations above the mean with respect to espoused traditional language teaching practices.
In her high school Spanish I and II classes, however, Martha largely taught in English. Her goal was to teach in the target language “about 90% of the time by the end of Spanish II”. This practice, according to National Standards (1999) and ACTFL (2015), is not congruent with broad goals of language instruction and communicative competency; now, ACTFL recommends a minimum of 90% of daily instruction in the target language in all levels of language study, especially in beginning courses. Data from Martha’s interview suggest that, although she was aware of student diversity and best practices in language teaching, she appeared unwilling to enact these beliefs or advocate for them.
Making attributions about student enrollment.

Although she was aware of students’ ethnoracial backgrounds and believed that African American students in her classes could learn, Martha appeared to essentialize students by perceived group, and made assumptions regarding students of color and sports. When making sense of the enrollment data at her school, Martha believed African American students were underenrolled in languages because:

They tend to be more interested in physical activities. They choose all the classes that would involve the things that interest them above a language. Sometimes, they feel like they won’t really have a lot of advantage from continuing to learn. It depends because the African American males that I have tend to be very motivated. They really do advance a lot in their language skills. I just think that it would be like their initial interest, just not even wanting to try it out.

She made similar stereotypical comments about Latino students:

It's a little bit the same situation. They are more interested in sports. They are more interested in physical activity. I can speak specifically about the Latin culture because I worked a lot with that community. Many times, it's not geared too much towards intellectual activities, but their parents, their heritage might be more in the handy work or skills that would bring immediate resources as opposed to a long term studying academically. Language wouldn't necessary be looked at as something that would bring a practical benefit immediately. That might be the influence, they might be looking at something, like mechanics, or it's something that could bring a benefit a little bit sooner than learning a language long term.

Martha drew upon her experience working with the Latino “community” to make these attributions. Although she was a native Spanish speaker, and a Mexican citizen, it is unclear to what extent she considered herself part of the community about which she was making attributions. Her attributions suggest essentialization and broad assumptions about all Latinos, and that she had also internalized the dominant discourse regarding tracking, or the notion that some students may be better suited for different courses of study. Like Allison
and Cheryl, Martha appeared to localize language enrollment and engagement to individual student factors rather than a system of marginalization and inclusion stemming from the legacy of racism and the effects of racialized hierarchies on the education system. Furthermore, her attribution of enrollment to student interest implied that, although she was aware that guidance counselors made recommendations to students who were on a college-prep track, what courses they chose were largely up to them, and that languages may not be interesting to these particular groups of students. When describing the students she had in her classes, she explained:

We have very good students and that's the other thing. As a general rule, the students who we have in the language department. Because it is a choice. It's not something that they're forced to take. For the most part, we have kids that are not looking to come in and make trouble. They are interested in learning. As far as behavior, we have a good population in the language department.

Although Martha did not explicitly state that she perceived students of color to be ‘troublemakers’, her comments appeared to imply that, were African American and Latino students to be equitably enrolled at school, the language classroom environment dynamic may shift and be more difficult to manage.

Finally, when I asked Martha about the overall enrollment numbers at her language magnet school (75% of all students enrolled) and any plans to expand, she expressed profound concerns about staffing, facilities, and class sizes. Her concerns suggest that the language department at her school was spread so thin that they were unprepared to accommodate any increase in student population:

I am honestly concerned because right now we don't really seem to have the space or the staff necessary for the students who are coming in the future. We are getting a lot of students from a couple of magnet school that have immersion programs. We really
don't have the staff. Just one teacher is teaching all the higher levels. Her class at the beginning of the semester was 60 kids enrolled. Like I said, we didn't have the room. I am concerned. As these kids are coming up, either they're going to have to drop the language or I don't know what's going to happen.

These comments are an interesting juxtaposition to a problem of access; instead, Martha suggested that perhaps the school had made languages available above and beyond the scope of their capacity. Martha also expressed frustration because her department, “did go to the magnet coordinator for our district…He did tell us clearly that even if it’s a magnet school, that doesn’t mean we would get anymore allocation for teachers.” Martha’s frustration suggests that her focus on advocating for her department and her colleagues was more immediate than considering what populations of students may be underenrolled in her language classroom.

**Summary of Findings**

Findings from Phase III of the study were elicited using both enrollment data results from Phase I, and cluster orientations derived from Phase II. Although data from each phase was analyzed independently, participants interviewed in Phase III appeared to represent the four belief orientations derived after survey data analysis. Broadly, three of the five language teachers interviewed appeared to be active preservers of status quo education, while two language teachers seemed to have espoused beliefs towards inclusivity and advocacy for some diverse student groups.
Major Findings, as Framed by Critical Race Theory

The purpose of this mixed methods study was to explore the extent to which middle and high school World Language classes in North Carolina function as sites of inclusion for historically marginalized students. When integrated and viewed from a Critical Race perspective, data sources and analysis techniques converged and triangulated to indicate that World Languages act as another agent of exclusion for students of color and appear to further replicate racial hierarchy and inequity in public schools. The following sections highlight how findings relate to central premises of Critical Race Theory as applied to educational contexts.

The Permanence of Racism

A central principle of CRT holds that racism is permanent in our society, and manifests in all major structures, including education (Bell, 1995), and that these “structures allocate the privileging of Whites and the subsequent Othering of people of color in all areas, including education” (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 27). Findings from enrollment data analysis, and survey and interview data analysis support this premise. In this study, analysis of enrollment patterns indicated that male students of color face barriers to enrollment in language courses at middle and high schools in North Carolina. While these findings are troubling, they are consistent with the literature to date that details broad discrepancies in the type of academic courses available to students of color nationwide (Department of Education Office of Civil Rights, as cited in Motoko, 2014), and the rate at which students of color are enrolled in courses that may be viewed as academically challenging or rigorous such as
World Languages (Hubbard, 1975; Wilberschied & Dassier, 1995). These enrollment patterns display the ways in which racialized mechanisms can serve to simultaneously privilege some groups while oppressing others.

Next, the belief orientations that teachers in this study appeared to exhibit highlight the permanence of racism (Bell, 1992) in the education system, and the ways in which racism and Whiteness as property (Harris, 1993) manifested at micro levels (e.g. teachers’ beliefs). Language teachers in the sample (n=22) appeared either unable or unwilling to acknowledge that students’ ethnoracial status continues to be a source of inequity in public education, which implicitly and explicitly contributes to the marginalization of students along these dimensions of diversity. Language teachers in the sample (n=71) also appeared to reject the salience of diversity dimensions in favor of a colorblind approach. Finally, native speaker language teachers in the sample (n=31), who may have lived and worked in other countries before teaching in the US, appeared to be particularly attuned to cultural pluralism and appeared to recognize a spectrum of diversity in their classroom, as indicated by their survey responses; yet their ambivalence towards advocacy for student groups who have been historically marginalized in public schools represents at best, a misunderstanding of the systems of privilege and oppression in American public schools, and at worst, a rejection of historical factors surrounding cultural pluralism and subsequent internalization of a White supremacist culture. As such, these teachers also appeared to contribute to marginalization.

Also, two of the three language teachers interviewed who taught at schools where students of color were underenrolled made assumptions about students of color and their interest in sports or computers as an explanation for underenrollment. Furthermore, given
that a majority of teachers in the sample, including native speakers, completed a traditional four-year college or university teacher preparation program and ostensibly engaged in some type of diversity coursework, findings regarding teachers’ belief orientations to diverse student groups also underscore the pervasiveness of racism in teacher education, and the extent to which living in a society engulfed by racist ‘smog’ (Tatum, 1997) contributes to belief systems about diverse students that remain intact during and after teacher preparation.

**Critique of Liberalism**

Critical Race scholars in education reject underlying assumptions of liberal ideology, including colorblindness, meritocracy, and objectivity (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). Findings from this study suggest that language teachers (n=71) appeared to embrace ‘colorblindness’, and to minimize the importance of diversity dimensions to teaching and learning. This approach to education “ignores the fact that inequity, inopportunity, and oppression are historical artifacts that will not easily be remedied by ignoring race” (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004, p. 29). This belief orientation is also problematic with regard to teachers’ abilities to build relationships with students and validate certain aspects of students’ identity by employing culturally relevant teaching practices (Gay, 2000). Furthermore, three of the five language teachers interviewed appeared to hold particular conceptions of student ability, motivation, and merit, and made attributions about both enrollment and success in language courses according to these conceptions. Interviews with language teachers revealed that they appeared to categorize students in their typical classes by perceptions about motivation and merit, and espoused the notion that students who
“wanted to learn” would ultimately be successful in language study. Implicitly, teachers appeared to espouse beliefs that there are students who do not want to learn, or who are not “motivated”, and thus, will not be successful. Teachers appeared to situate ability and motivation as local to the student herself, which absolves teacher or school responsibility for student learning, thus intrinsically supporting the myth of meritocracy (Baez, 2006), or the notion that if a student works hard enough, she will be successful. This liberal ideology neglects to account for the ways in which schools operate in a hegemonic system, and systematically privilege and oppress students according to a range of dimensions, including ethnoracial status (Bell, 1980; Delpit, 1995). This perspective also omits the importance of culturally relevant teaching and practices that are learner-center as integral to student engagement and motivation (Ladson-Billings, 1995).

**Intersectionality**

Critical Race Theorists recognize the intersectionality of multiple identities, and the ways in which one can experience multiple forms of oppression based on identities and contexts (Crenshaw, 1989). Findings from enrollment data analysis specifically highlight the intersectionality of students’ identities since results indicated that there were no significant differences in World Language enrollment for female students of color. This suggests that World Language enrollment policy marginalizes African American and Latino male students in particular ways, based on a combination of both ethnoracial and gender identity. In addition, only one language teacher of five interviewed referenced gender as a demographic descriptor when referring to typical students in her class. Specifically, she appeared to be
aware of a large number of male students enrolled in her middle school French class, and articulated her frustration with their (problematic) classroom behavior. However, she espoused a ‘colorblind’ attitude with reference to students’ race and ethnicity in her classes. This suggests that a combination of gender awareness with colorblindness may result in particular stereotypes and expectations of certain student groups.

**Interest Convergence**

The principle of interest convergence as applied to education (e.g. Zion & Blanchett, 2011) asserts that change to status quo policy and practice arises only when the interests of dominant groups (e.g. White students and stakeholders in education) intersect and converge with those of non-dominant groups (e.g. students and stakeholders of color in education). Bell (1980) asserts that gains for African Americans and other non-dominant groups that occur simultaneously with the interests of Whites are unlikely likely to have substantive impacts for people of color. Enrollment data analysis indicated that students of color in more diverse schools had access to more languages and more levels of languages, while students in predominately African American and Latino schools had fewer language choices and fewer opportunities to enroll in advanced courses. However, male students of color were less likely to be enrolled in language courses in diverse schools that had advanced course offerings. As such, the principle of interest convergence explains this variation in access for students of color in diverse schools as compared to opportunities in less diverse schools, while their White peers in all schools appear to enjoy more language offerings.
Integrated findings from this study indicate that World Language classes appear to serve as mechanisms for exclusion for historically marginalized students in public schools in North Carolina. In the following chapter, I discuss implications for World Language policy, teacher preparation, and professional development. I also present implications for my own practice.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

This study explored the extent to which World Language classrooms act as sites of inclusion for historically marginalized students in North Carolina. Three data collection and analysis techniques were employed in three phases to determine equitability in enrollment and to understand and create profiles of teachers’ orientations towards meeting the needs of diverse students. The following chapter is organized by a brief overview of these findings. I then address points of access to World Languages, and implications for policy and practice. Next, I present limitations of the current study and the contribution of the research to my own personal transformation. Finally, I present future directions based on findings from the current study.

Findings from this study indicated that there were statistically significant discrepancies in equitability of enrollment in World Language courses for African American and Latino male students, which appeared to indicate systematic exclusion of these student groups based on the intersection of gender and race. Findings from two-step hierarchical clustering, MANOVA, and interview data indicated that language teachers’ orientations towards diversity varied systematically: three clusters appeared to hold orientations that perpetuate status quo education for students of color and other historically marginalized student groups; and one cluster appeared to hold beliefs that were more inclusive, but many of the teachers in this group appeared to hold conflicting beliefs, specifically regarding sexual orientation and faith. This variation in access to courses and teachers who are prepared to meet the needs of diverse learners supports the notion that schools introduce mechanisms for inclusion of some privileged groups and marginalization of oppressed
groups (Illich, 1976) as a function of a capitalist system (Bowles & Gintis, 1976); reproduce cultural and societal norms and hierarchies (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990); and are sites of inequity in resources, access, and curricula (Banks, 1995; Kincheloe & Steinberg, 1997).

Furthermore, these findings indicate that there are multiple points of access in World Language study. For students of color, amelioration of enrollment discrepancies in middle schools and high schools may not guarantee an inclusive classroom, as indicated by analysis of practicing language teachers’ belief systems regarding diversity. A majority of language teachers in the sample appeared unprepared to meet the needs of historically marginalized groups of students, nor did some appear to consider themselves, their administrators, their curriculum developers, or their schools as sites of responsibility for including diverse students and topics in classrooms. Language teachers in the sample appeared to espouse belief systems as a function of teaching in a racialized education system and society (Tatum, 1997).

By sequentially analyzing data regarding actual student enrollment in language courses and teachers’ beliefs about student diversity and their language teaching practices, major findings emerged regarding the mechanisms by which certain student groups may become marginalized. These findings indicate that a majority of language teachers in the sample appeared to have internalized dominant discourses about students of color and espoused beliefs and teaching practices that perpetuate the exclusion of historically marginalized students. However, survey data revealed that some teachers appeared to demonstrate a greater propensity towards inclusivity of some student groups; and interview
data revealed that one teacher declared herself a “teacher for social justice”, and two teachers actively advocated for certain groups of students.

**Expanding access: World Languages for All**

As indicated in Figure 11 on the next page, findings from this study indicate that there are multiple points of access to World Language study that may be problematic depending on contextual factors. These points of access are displayed as a scale to illustrate the seemingly arbitrary nature of World Language enrollment as guided by students’ access to school resources and stakeholder perceptions about students. However, when viewed from a critical perspective, and given the permanence of racist practice and policy in society and dominant narratives regarding students of color, systematic exclusion of students of color and other non-dominant groups is inevitable. Findings from this study support this notion.
First, middle schools appear to operate as particular sites of inclusion or exclusion for students enrolling in language courses, since many operate on an exploratory model (NCDPI, 2013). That is, students who elect to enroll in languages often have an exploratory sequence during their 6th grade year (which may include a nine-week “wheel” sequence of one or two languages, depending on school offerings), and then may choose to continue on to earn one credit of the equivalent of a high school language course over the course of their 7th and 8th grade years (North Carolina State Board of Education, 2007). Due to this sequencing, if students do not elect to enroll in a language course as they begin their 7th grade year, they
will not have the opportunity to enroll in a language course for high school credit until high school. That there were some middle schools in the sample where no languages were offered compounds this problem of equitability in access. Furthermore, in districts where high schools operate on a block schedule (ie. four 90 minute classes, two semesters) students have the opportunity to complete high school language courses in levels 1 to Advanced Placement courses. However, at high schools that operate on a year-round schedule (ie. six-seven 50-60 minute classes), students who have not earned high school language credits in middle school are limited in their opportunity to reach level 5/AP courses at the high school level. As such, the type of middle schools and high schools that students attend appear to function as direct gateways to language study and to plans to pursue higher education in North Carolina.

Participants in the study also reported broader, school-level points of access. Three participants identified guidance departments, who enrolled students in language courses based on college preparation status or educational track. Since language education has long been part of a larger tracking and sorting mechanism (Osborn, 2000), findings from this study support the notion that language education is an elite subject that is viewed as an enrichment to an already rigorous course of study for students who plan to pursue higher education (Guilherme, 2002). It is unclear from this study how guidance counselors approach student enrollment; however, teachers in the sample attributed student enrollment primarily to guidance departments’ policies at their schools.

Also identified as a school-level point of access was school administration, who perhaps implicitly endorsed language study for some groups of students while explicitly
redirecting other groups of students to remedial reading and math courses and programs based on achievement, as measured by standardized tests. Two participants articulated the extent to which administrators could control language enrollment based on achievement data. Ironically, those students who were not performing at proficient levels on standardized tests appeared to be funneled away from language study and into remedial classes (one of which in the study was taught by a licensed French teacher who had received no instruction or professional development in literacy or math education), despite the broad research literature indicating that students who study a language have more robust linguistic skills and achieve higher overall.

Interview data revealed that a further point of access for student enrollment in language courses appeared to occur at the classroom level in the form of teacher recommendations. In order for students to advance to the next level of language study in some schools, teachers must ‘sign off’ on the student’s registration. This practice is inherently problematic, given the research on teachers’ implicit biases and the subjectivity of teacher perceptions about students of color. Since teachers (both White and of color) are more likely to lower expectations for students of color (e.g. Delpit, 1995), White students are more likely to be recommended for enrichment or gifted programs (e.g. Perry, Steele & Hilliard, 2004) and students of color are more likely to be recommended for special education services (e.g. Zion & Blanchett, 2003), a promotion practice based on teacher perception of student performance and ability likely results in further exclusion of historically marginalized groups.
These points of access are problematic in a multitude of ways: students of color in the current study were more likely to attend schools where less languages and less levels of languages were offered; and three of the five points of access articulated by teachers in the study (guidance counselors, administrator perceptions about student groups, and teacher recommendations) may be impacted by beliefs about students based on their diverse characteristics. For instance, Sarah articulated that administrators at her school had identified (and essentialized) African American students at her school as an ‘at-risk’ population who needed remediation in reading and math. As such, schedule time was not available for these students to enroll in a World Language class. This restriction of access has further implications for this group of students, as not only will they not have completed gateway requirements to attend a four year college or university in the UNC system in North Carolina, they also have not had the opportunity to experience the benefits that may come with language study.

This study substantiates other interdisciplinary research indicating that school simultaneously privilege and oppress student groups based on perceptions about race, and the intersectionality of race and gender. Because fewer languages were offered in schools with higher concentrations of students of color, and students of color in predominately White schools were less likely to be enrolled, this study reinforces claims that students of color experience a narrowed curriculum (Ladson-Billings, 1995). Thus, expanding access to language courses for all student groups who attend all school types at an equitable rate is a first mechanism by which advocates can position World Language classes as sites of inclusion.
Expanding understanding: Implications for World Language Teacher Preparation

The extant research on teachers’ beliefs situates teacher learning within the context of our own experiences and prior knowledge (Pajares, 1992). However, these belief systems develop in a society that is defined by inequity. Thus, many teachers are unaware of the privilege associated with certain aspects of identity (McIntosh, 1989), and may be unable to recognize how those privileges, and corresponding oppression, act as mechanisms for exclusion and marginalization in public education and society-at-large. In this study, language teachers in the sample reported that certain dimensions of diversity were not relevant to teaching and learning; yet, our students bring experiences as cultural, racialized, gendered beings in a patriarchal, White supremacist, heteronormative society. How do we reconcile this tension?

Since three of the four cluster orientations in this study appeared to perpetuate exclusion of historically marginalized students, findings support the prevailing perspective that language teachers do not consider the diversity that their own students bring to the classroom (Kubota, Austin, & Saito-Abbott, 2003; Osborn, 2000). Indeed, “Rarely do US foreign language professionals publicly wonder about the relationship of foreign language study, social identity, and access to resources, or even about the ability of individuals to profit from discursive diversity in general (Harré & Gillett, 1994, as cited in Kinginger, 2004, p. 222)”. Furthermore, these findings appear to validate claims that World Language teachers construct a particular definition of culture that is “neutral” and “sanitized” (Kubota, Austin, & Saito-Abbott, 2003, p. 14). Culture remains extraneous and inextricably linked to the target language; the culture in our classrooms is that of the teachers’ experiences with
target language culture and the target language culture about which students are to learn. Language teaching, as such, is often viewed as “apolitical” (Ortega, 1999, p. 38).

Despite efforts to support language teacher candidates in their understanding and integration of target cultures, they may be representative of the larger teaching population – that is, they need explicit instruction in cultural and linguistic diversity, multiculturalism, culturally relevant pedagogy, and teaching diverse populations. For White language teacher candidates, preparation should include work on interrogating whiteness, understanding of White Privilege, and developing critical language awareness (Osborn & Reagan, 1998). All teacher candidates, including native speakers who are on non-traditional licensure tracks, must develop an understanding of linguistic teaching as a socio-political activity that may reify social categories (Kubota, 2005). Language teacher candidates must also be prepared to discuss language rights (Skutnabb-Kangas, 2001) and linguistic variations with respect to power and dominant codes (Kubota, 2005), similar to the critical perspectives presented in Lisa Delpit’s (2005) *Language Learning and Diversity*, which question the origins of dominant English language structures and the power they bestow.

Teaching is an inherently political act, and teachers can employ critical pedagogies to analyze, critique, and affect change to the status quo (McLaren, 1995). Thus, language teacher preparation should include an exploration of interrogation of the complexities and hegemony of the target language and culture that will allow similar interrogation of one’s own native language and culture (Osborn, 2000). If World Language teachers are prepared to engage with students about issues such as racism (heteronormativity, sexism, etc.) as they exist in the target language culture(s), analysis can be further extended to critically examine a
student’s (and teacher’s) own culture and societal structure. In turn, this will prepare students to ‘cross borders’ in both literal and figurative senses, and create greater opportunities to experience both economic and social success (Giroux, 1992; Guilherme, 2002). This is a second mechanism by which advocates can position World Language classes as sites of inclusion.

**Expanding pedagogies: Implications for World Language Professional Development**

In this study, language teachers appeared to espouse a combination of both traditional and standards-based teaching practices. However, one cluster of teachers reported much higher agreement with traditional teaching practices, which include teaching from the textbook, teaching about the target language and culture in English, and a focus on grammar and linguistic structure at the expense of lessons to develop communicative competencies and critical thinking. These findings are consistent with the literature to date regarding language teachers’ beliefs about their practices, which indicates a shift towards more progressive teaching methodologies since the adoption of the National Standards, but which simultaneously rooted in traditional, technocratic teaching. These traditional teaching practices are antithetical to inclusive teaching practices in that they are teacher-centered, and mimic a ‘banking’ concept of education wherein the teacher is the expert and the students are empty receptacles to be filled with knowledge (Freire, 1970).

Although much language instruction must involve direct input from the teacher, lessons can be tailored to incorporate student interests, and to build on the prior experiences and knowledge that students bring to the language classroom. Even if a language teacher
does not identify as a teacher for social justice, or has not yet developed a critical
consciousness about the socio-political positioning of schools as mechanisms for privilege
and oppression, these culturally relevant practices have the potential, at minimum, to increase
student engagement and motivation in language classes. As such, language teachers should
be provided with the opportunity for meaningful professional development to explore ways
to tailor the curriculum of their target language and culture to integrate the language learner
and the multiple identities that language learners bring to the classroom.

**Limitations**

There were some limitations to this study. First, because language teachers who
participated in the survey were recruited via email and during the FLANC conference, the
‘type’ of teacher who volunteered to participate in the study may have been more policy-
oriented than the general language teaching population in North Carolina. The introduction
of an incentive for participating in the online survey may have helped to offset some of these
effects, however.

Next, findings from this study position practicing teachers, many of whom are veteran
teachers, as potentially unable to meet the needs of their students. While survey and
interview data revealed that a minority of teachers appeared more likely to espouse inclusive
beliefs and language teaching practices, it is likely that these teachers’ beliefs lie on a
continuum that is dynamic and context-dependent. Put another way, it is likely that some
teachers in the sample do advocate for their students in impactful and unique ways, although
they may not appear to view certain dimensions of diversity as relevant to teaching and learning.

Finally, it is important to consider findings from this study in context: that is, when viewed from a developmental perspective, teachers hold belief systems that are a function of the society in which we live and work. As such, it should be no surprise that teachers in the study appeared to espouse ‘colorblindness’, as this was a prevailing liberal ideology for much of the 20th century, and that teachers have internalized dominant discourses that are a function of structural, cultural, and aversive racism. It is also important to remember that teachers are capable of change and growth; as such, teachers in this study who appear to perpetuate status quo education now may experience specific encounters in the future that prompt a shift in their belief orientations towards student diversity and how they incorporate diversity dimensions in their classrooms.

**Personal Transformation**

As a mixed-methods project, this research was intended to add to the limited research about World Language teachers’ beliefs about teaching diverse students, and also to create space: I hoped to not only capture World Language teachers’ perceptions about their students, but to raise teachers’ critical awareness about access and diversity in World Language classrooms by asking them to reflect on enrollment data from their schools and to prompt them to explore their attributions about how and why students take their classes. As I analyzed this data, I also had the opportunity to continue to reflect on: 1) my own experiences as a White teacher whose formative teaching experience occurred in a public
high school of students of color; 2) how teachers’ belief systems are multi-faceted and
dynamic, and 3) the inherent sociopolitical power of teaching.

As a White high school teacher of students of color before pursuing doctoral studies, I
was already hyperaware of my position as a White woman, and the power that status granted
me in multiple contexts in education and beyond. As I conducted this research, and despite
my knowledge of the research on teachers’ beliefs, I was still surprised by the results from
survey data and by comments teachers made over the course of the interviews. This surprise
led me to recount the specific encounters I had experienced in my own life that prompted my
shift towards critical consciousness and antiracist education.

I also was reminded that beliefs, as part of larger systems, are fluid and may often
seem to compete. One participant, Cheryl, who identified as “gay”, specifically challenged
my conceptions of belief orientations in that she made especially harsh comments about the
students at her school, many of whom were of color and of low socioeconomic status. Her
interview reminded me that simply embodying a dimension of diversity that is non-normative
does not preclude critical consciousness. In other words, I had assumed that because Cheryl
was a lesbian, she was also ‘plugged in’ to social justice education and issues of race and
racism in public education and society.

Finally, while not included as a part of the dataset, teachers who completed the online
survey had an opportunity to reflect on the survey itself, and reading their reflections was
heartening. Many teachers wrote that the survey items had prompted them to think deeply
about their inclusivity and their language teaching practices. Also, during the course of the
interviews, two participants articulated that they hoped to advocate more for their students in
the future, given our conversations and their new understanding and reflection on enrollment patterns and practices at their specific school sites. The possibility of hope and interruption in these narratives reaffirmed my dedication to antiracist education in my work as both a researcher and a teacher educator.

**Future Directions**

Critical Race Theorists in education (e.g. Hilliard, Ladson-Billings, 1995; Milner, 2010, Zion & Blanchett, 2011) posit that the construct of interest convergence can be used as a tool to critique inequitable practices and identify avenues where meaningful change can occur, although the pervasiveness of racism threatens to subsume these changes (Bell, 1989). However, when applied to the context of language enrollment practices, interest convergence could, at minimum, open discourses about the extent to which languages are offered across Local Education Agencies and at which particular school sites. Moreover, given the wealth of research literature that details the cognitive and affective benefits of language study, stakeholders in education could position language classrooms as sites where the ‘achievement’ gap could be narrowed by first enrolling all students in language courses, and then identifying and employing teachers whose orientations towards diversity support student learning. In this way, all members of an educational community could benefit. Language teachers could position their work as critical educators and create opportunities for students to critique power structures across cultures and languages, including their own.

Future research should include identification of and case study research with language teachers who do position themselves as critical educators. This research could be
used to create an exemplary profile for language teacher education. Future research should also include work with students in language classes to explore the extent to which they perceive language study to be a culturally relevant pursuit, and how it may impact their sense of engagement and motivation. Finally, future research should include work specifically with students of color to explore perceptions about the position of language study as a site of inclusion.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A: COMPLETE DEMOGRAPHIC
INFORMATION OF PRACTICING TEACHERS IN THE SURVEY SAMPLE
## Appendix A: Self-reported Teacher Demographic Data

### Teacher Faith: Selected and Self-reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Faith</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atheist</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agnostic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Christian</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Jewish</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Muslim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buddhist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unitarian Universalist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>99.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *including non-practicing members, “no faith”, “my faith”, “n/a”, “open mind”, and “non practicing”

### Teacher Sexual Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Sexual Orientation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heterosexual</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homosexual</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bisexual</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not listed here</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Teacher Disability Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Disability Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>able-bodied</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabled</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not listed here</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Target Language</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin, Greek, other classical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Native Speaker Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-native speaker</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native speaker</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher Years of Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 years</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-10 years</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more than 10 years</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Mode of Teaching</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>face-to-face</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>97.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCVPS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional four-year university or college program</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensure/certificate program</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral/Alt entry program</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location of Teacher Preparation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NC public</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC private</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of state college/uni</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>online</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Area of Teaching Licensure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licensure</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign/World Languages</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>90.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B: SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ALL ITEMS IN MEASURE - TEACHERS’ SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MULTICULTURALISM AND DIVERSITY (TSR-MD) (N = 188)
**Appendix B**

*Summary of Descriptive Statistics for all items in Teachers’ Sense of Responsibility for Multiculturalism and Diversity (TSR-MD) (n = 188)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In general, race is relevant to me.</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ race will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of races are represented in my teaching. Race is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of races are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various races need to be represented in teaching only if students of those races and ethnicities are present in the classroom. In general, schools are responsible for addressing the differences among races.</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, economic status is relevant to me.</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ economic status will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of economic statuses are represented in my teaching. Economic status is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of economic statuses are represented in the content.</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic status is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of economic statuses are represented in the content.</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>-.85</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address economic statuses in their classrooms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address economic statuses in their classrooms.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various economic statuses need to be represented in teaching only if students of those economic statuses are present in the classroom.</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>-.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among economic statuses.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, gender is relevant to me.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of genders are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-.51</td>
<td>-.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of genders are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address genders in their classrooms.</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various genders need to be represented in teaching only if students of those genders are present in the classroom.</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among genders.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>-.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, faith is relevant to me.</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>-.65</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ faith will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of faiths are represented in my teaching.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of faiths are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address faith in their classrooms.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various faiths need to be represented in teaching only if students of those faiths are present in the classroom.</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among faiths.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, disability is relevant to me.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ disabilities will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of disabilities are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of disabilities are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SEM</td>
<td>T-statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disabilities in their classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various disabilities need to be represented in teaching only if students</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of those disabilities are present in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among abilities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, sexual orientation is relevant to me.</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ sexual orientation will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of sexual orientations</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring a variety of</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientations are represented in the content curricula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexual orientation in their classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various sexual orientations need to be represented in teaching only if</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>-.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students of those sexual orientations are present in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>among sexual orientations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general, culture is relevant to me.</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My students’ culture will play a role in my teaching practice.</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be my responsibility to ensure a variety of cultures are</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represented in my teaching practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>CI 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture is relevant to learning.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.57</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum developers should be</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible for ensuring a variety of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultures are represented in the content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators should be</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-1.11</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible for making sure teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>address culture in their classrooms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various cultures need to be</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>represented in teaching only if</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students of those cultures are present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: SUMMARY OF DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR ALL ITEMS IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE (N = 188)
### Summary of Descriptive Statistics for all items in Foreign Language Education Questionnaire (n = 188)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The major curricular focus of effective foreign language programs is on the adopted textbook and accompanying ancillaries.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.508</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ideal time to begin the study of a foreign language is in early elementary school.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>-1.986</td>
<td>5.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for interdisciplinary learning. (i.e., relating the content of the foreign language class with that of other school subjects).</td>
<td>5.20</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>-1.678</td>
<td>5.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language instruction incorporates authentic materials.</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>.690</td>
<td>-2.185</td>
<td>9.611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who have learned a language other than English somewhere other than in school benefit from taking courses in the language they have learned elsewhere.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.683</td>
<td>-.935</td>
<td>2.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The effective foreign language teacher uses the foreign language as the dominant language of instruction.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>-.864</td>
<td>1.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All students, regardless of future educational plans, can benefit from studying a foreign language.</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>-2.204</td>
<td>6.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In effective foreign language programs, nearly all of class time is devoted to learning the language system (i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and syntax).</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.338</td>
<td>-.236</td>
<td>-.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In effective foreign language instruction, some time is devoted to teaching students how to use specific communication strategies (e.g., circumlocution, approximation, gestures).</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>-.932</td>
<td>2.109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective foreign language programs include opportunities for students to access a variety of technologies.</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>-.778</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to explore topics of personal interest through the foreign language.

Effective language programs provide students at all levels of instruction with opportunities to use the target language for real communication, both in the school and beyond.

English is the dominant language of instruction in effective foreign language programs.

Effective instruction in the foreign language class is designed to promote the use of critical thinking.

Only college-bound students should enroll in foreign language classes.

Effective foreign language instruction is related to students’ real lives within the school, community, family, and peer group.

Effective foreign language teachers plan instruction on how to use specific learning strategies (e.g., previewing, skimming, inferring information.)

The ideal time to begin the study of a foreign language is in high school.

Effective foreign language instruction uses open-ended activities (e.g., portfolios, demonstrations, presentations, projects) to determine a portion of the students’ grade.

Effective instruction in culture leads to an understanding of the underlying values and beliefs of the target society (societies).

The primary focus of effective foreign language programs is on the development of vocabulary and knowledge of grammar.

The role of the effective foreign language teacher is to help students learn what is in the textbook.

The chapter tests that accompany the textbook provide an adequate means of assessment in effective foreign language programs.
Foreign language study is not for students who have difficulty with learning in general.

There is little or no benefit for students who have learned a language other than English somewhere other than in school to take courses in that language.

Effective foreign language instruction defines and assesses cultural learning objectives just as systematically as grammatical and lexical learning objectives.

The study of foreign languages enhances only certain professions.

The effective foreign language teacher creates opportunities for learning that relate foreign language instruction to that which the students already know.

The role of cultural instruction in effective foreign language programs is secondary to that of vocabulary and grammar.

Students who have learning difficulties can be successful foreign language learners.

The focus of assessment in effective foreign language programs is on students’ knowledge of vocabulary and grammar.

All students, regardless of career objectives, can benefit from studying a foreign language.
APPENDIX D: TEACHERS’ SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MULTICULTURALISM AND DIVERSITY SCALE (TSR-MD; KOZEL, 2007, 2009)
Appendix D: Teachers’ Sense of Responsibility for Multiculturalism and Diversity Scale (TSR-MD; Kozel, 2007)

DIRECTIONS: Teachers these days are asked to assume a variety of roles and responsibilities with the increasingly diverse population of students in NC. In the following survey, we ask you to share your perceptions of the scope of your roles and responsibilities as a World Language teacher. Please complete the survey by selecting the single response that best reflects your agreement or disagreement with each statement, keeping in mind that 1 and 6 should be used only when you feel extremely strongly about a particular statement. Your responses are completely anonymous.

Strongly Disagree Disagree Moderately Disagree Moderately Agree Agree Strongly Agree

1. In general, race is relevant to me.
2. My students’ race plays a role in my teaching.
3. It is my responsibility to ensure various races are represented in my teaching.
4. Race is relevant to learning.
5. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various races are represented in the content curricula.
6. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address race in their classrooms.
7. Various races need to be represented in teaching only if students of those races are present in the classroom.
8. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among races.
9. In general, economic class is relevant to me.

10. My students’ economic class plays a role in my teaching.

11. It is my responsibility to ensure various economic classes are represented in my teaching.

12. Economic class is relevant to learning.

13. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various economic classes are represented in the content curricula.

14. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address economic classes in their classrooms.

15. Various economic classes need to be represented in teaching only if students of those economic classes are present in the classroom.

16. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among economic classes.

17. In general, gender is relevant to me.

18. My students’ gender plays a role in my teaching.

19. It is my responsibility to ensure various genders are represented in my teaching.

20. Gender is relevant to learning.

21. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various genders are represented in the content curricula.

22. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address genders in their classrooms.
23. Various genders need to be represented in teaching only if students of those genders are present in the classroom.

24. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among genders.

25. In general, faith is relevant to me.

26. My students’ faith plays a role in my teaching.

27. It is my responsibility to ensure various faiths are represented in my teaching.

28. Faith is relevant to learning.

29. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various faiths are represented in the content curricula.

30. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address faith in their classrooms.

31. Various faiths need to be represented in teaching only if students of those faiths are present in the classroom.

32. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among faiths.

33. In general, disability is relevant to me.

34. My students’ disability plays a role in my teaching.

35. It is my responsibility to ensure various disabilities are represented in my teaching.

36. Disability is relevant to learning.

37. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various disabilities are represented in the content curricula.
38. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address disabilities in their classrooms.

39. Various disabilities need to be represented in teaching only if students of those disabilities are present in the classroom.

40. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among abilities.

41. In general, sexual orientation is relevant to me.

42. My students’ sexual orientation plays a role in my teaching.

43. It is my responsibility to ensure various sexual orientations are represented in my teaching.

44. Sexual orientation is relevant to learning.

45. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various sexual orientations are represented in the content curricula.

46. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address sexual orientation in their classrooms.

47. Various sexual orientations need to be represented in teaching only if students of those sexual orientations are present in the classroom.

48. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among sexual orientations.

49. In general, culture is relevant to me.

50. My students’ culture plays a role in my teaching.

51. It is my responsibility to ensure various cultures are represented in my teaching.
52. Culture is relevant to learning.

53. Curriculum developers should be responsible for ensuring various cultures are represented in the content curricula.

54. Administrators should be responsible for making sure teachers address culture in their classrooms.

55. Various races need to be represented in teaching only if students of those cultures are present in the classroom.

56. In general, schools should be responsible for addressing the differences among cultures.

In order to generate accurate profiles of teachers, it may help to know something about your personal identity. Please choose the following terms from the drop-down menu that best represent your identity.

Ethnoracial status:

Gender:

Economic status:

Faith:

Sexual orientation:

Disability status:

Area of teaching licensure:

French

Spanish

German
Japanese
Chinese
Italian
Arabic
Latin
Elementary Education
Middle Grades Language Arts/Social Studies
Middle Grades Math
Middle Grades Science
Secondary English
Secondary Social Studies
Secondary Math
Secondary Science
Other: ________________
APPENDIX E: FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION QUESTIONNAIRE (FLEQ; ALLEN, 2002)
Appendix E: Foreign Language Education Questionnaire (FLEQ; Allen, 2002)

The following items include a 5-point, Likert-type scale, and the possible responses are as follows:

Strongly Agree   Agree   Undecided   Disagree   Strongly Disagree

Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the statement. Respond according to what you believe, not necessarily what you actually do. There are no right or wrong answers.

1. The major curricular focus of effective foreign language programs is on the adopted textbook and accompanying ancillaries.

2. The ideal time to begin the study of a foreign language is in early elementary school.

3. The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for interdisciplinary learning. (i.e., relating the content of the foreign language class with that of other school subjects).

4. Effective foreign language instruction incorporates authentic materials.

5. Students who have learned a language other than English somewhere other than in school can benefit from taking courses in the language they have learned elsewhere.

6. The effective foreign language teacher uses the foreign language as the dominant language of instruction.

7. All students, regardless of future educational plans, can benefit from studying a foreign language.
8. In effective foreign language programs, nearly all of class time is devoted to learning the language system (i.e., pronunciation, vocabulary, grammar, spelling, and syntax).

9. In effective foreign language instruction, some time is devoted to teaching students how to use specific communication strategies (e.g., circumlocution, approximation, gestures).

10. Effective foreign language programs include opportunities for students to access a variety of technologies.

11. The effective foreign language teacher provides opportunities for students to explore topics of personal interest through the foreign language.

12. Effective language programs provide students at all levels of instruction with opportunities to use the target language for real communication, both in the school and beyond.

13. English is the dominant language of instruction in effective foreign language programs.

14. Effective instruction in the foreign language class is designed to promote the use of critical thinking.

15. Only college-bound students should enroll in foreign language classes.

16. Effective foreign language instruction is related to students’ real lives within the school, community, family, and peer group.

17. Effective foreign language teachers plan instruction on how to use specific learning strategies (e.g., previewing, skimming, inferring information.)

18. The ideal time to begin the study of a foreign language is in high school.
19. Effective foreign language instruction uses open-ended activities (e.g., portfolios, demonstrations, presentations, projects) to determine a portion of the students’ grade.

20. Effective instruction in culture leads to an understanding of the underlying values and beliefs of the target society (societies).

21. The primary focus of effective foreign language programs is on the development of vocabulary and knowledge of grammar.

22. The role of the effective foreign language teacher is to help students learn what is in the textbook.

23. The chapter tests that accompany the textbook provide an adequate means of assessment in effective foreign language programs.

24. Foreign language study is not for students who have difficulty with learning in general.

25. There is little or no benefit for students who have learned a language other than English somewhere other than in school to take courses in that language.

26. Effective foreign language instruction defines and assesses cultural learning objectives just as systematically as grammatical and lexical learning objectives.

27. The study of foreign languages enhances only certain professions.

28. The effective foreign language teacher creates opportunities for learning that relate foreign language instruction to that which the students already know.

29. The role of cultural instruction in effective foreign language programs is secondary to that of vocabulary and grammar.

30. Students who have learning difficulties can be successful foreign language learners.
31. The focus of assessment in effective foreign language programs is on students’ knowledge of vocabulary and grammar.

32. All students, regardless of career objectives, can benefit from studying a foreign language.

33. Please indicate the extent to which you are familiar with the Standards for Foreign Language Learning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all familiar</th>
<th>Somewhat familiar</th>
<th>Very familiar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Please take a moment to share with us your feelings and experiences as you reflected on these roles and responsibilities.

- We may be interested in contacting you to participate in a follow-up interview. If you are willing to be interviewed either by phone or in person, please provide your email.
APPENDIX F: TEACHER INTERVIEW PROTOCOLS
Profile of School
Spanish, French, German, Latin,
4 Languages total

Interview – Beth
Teaches Spanish 3, 4, SNS

The purpose of our interview today is to talk about the World Language program at SCHOOL. My interview with you is one of a series planned that will investigate teacher perceptions of World Languages in some of the large districts in the state. I will be interviewing teachers at various middle and high schools with different types of programs (e.g. IB, AP, etc.) The format of our interview today is semi-structured.

I will record our interview on my iPhone using an app, and also on my iPad, which is why we are on speakerphone today. I anticipate that our interview will take between 30 and 45 minutes, and no longer than 1 hour. I want to reassure you about confidentiality in this process as well. Our interview will be recorded and any identifying information will be removed to protect your identity and confidentiality. All data will be stored on my computer, which is password-protected. Can you confirm that you have read the informed consent form I emailed you and that you agree to proceed with participation in the interview?

Do you have any questions before we get started?

1. Tell me about your experiences as a student of World Languages (if applicable).
2. Tell me how you came to be a teacher at HIGH SCHOOL.
3. How long have you been teaching at HIGH SCHOOL? And in general? And can you give me a little bit of demographic information about yourself?
   a. Prompts about gender, ethnoracial status, nationality, immigrant status, native speaker status, highest degree obtained, pathway to licensure, sexual orientation, and disability status

4. At HIGH SCHOOL, you offer four languages, right? When you first began teaching at this school, what was your perception of the World Language program? How has that perception changed?

5. How important do you think World Languages are as a content area?

6. How important do you think they are at this school?

7. What types of students do you have in your Spanish classes?
   a. Prompts about ethno-racial status of students.
   b. Prompts about students who elect / enroll, and how they do so (e.g. plans to attend college/university, taking the class for elective credit, no room in schedule for other classes, do you recruit? etc.).

8. How successful are students usually in your class?

9. How motivated are students usually in your class?

10. Last year, demographic information indicates that, at HIGH SCHOOL, about 62% of students were White, 21% African American, 13% Latino, 1% Asian, 3% Multiple, etc., and a small group of students who are American Indian and Pacific Islander. From a percentage standpoint, it looks like most student groups were enrolled in World Languages at about the same rate as they comprised the school population. For example,
your school last year was 12.6% Latino, and Latino students comprised 12.9% of the World Language Student population. Female students were slightly overenrolled, and Male Asian students were slightly overenrolled compared to the rest of the student groups. How do you make sure that students are equitably enrolled in language courses at East Forsyth?

11. Only about 54% of the total school pop was enrolled in a language last year…to what do you attribute this number?
   a. Prompts about whether or not all students can benefit from WL study.

12. What do you think are the benefits of having WL programming in public schools?

13. What do you think are the costs of having WL programming in public schools?

14. Is there anything else you’d like me to know about the WL program?

Profile of Middle School

Spanish, French

2 Languages total

Interview – Allison

Teaches 6-7-8th grade French

6th grade exploratory; 7th/8th 2 year class =HS French 1

The purpose of our interview today is to talk about the World Language program at MIDDLE SCHOOL. My interview with you is one of a series planned that will investigate teacher perceptions of World Languages in some of the four largest districts in the state. I
will be interviewing teachers at various middle and high schools with different types of programs (e.g. IB, AP, etc.) The format of our interview today is semi-structured.

I will record our interview on my iPhone using an app, and also on my iPad, which is why we are on speakerphone today. I anticipate that our interview will take between 30 and 45 minutes, and no longer than 1 hour. I want to reassure you about confidentiality in this process as well. Our interview will be recorded and any identifying information will be removed to protect your identity and confidentiality. All data will be stored on my computer, which is password-protected. Can you confirm that you have read the informed consent form I emailed you and that you agree to proceed with participation in the interview?

Do you have any questions before we get started?

1. Tell me about your experiences as a student of World Languages (if applicable).

2. Tell me how you came to be a teacher at MIDDLE SCHOOL

3. How long have you been teaching at MIDDLE SCHOOL? And in general? And can you give me a little bit of demographic information about yourself?
   b. Prompts about gender, ethnoracial status, nationality, immigrant status, native speaker status, highest degree obtained, pathway to licensure, sexual orientation, and disability status

4. At MIDDLE SCHOOL, you offer 2 languages, right? When you first began teaching at this school, what was your perception of the World Language program? How has that perception changed?

5. How important do you think World Languages are as a content area?
6. How important do you think they are at this school?

7. What types of students do you have in your French classes?
   c. Prompts about ethno-racial status of students.
   d. Prompts about students who elect / enroll, and how they do so (e.g. plans to attend college/university, taking the class for elective credit, no room in schedule for other classes, do you recruit? etc.).

8. How successful are students usually in your class?

9. How motivated are students usually in your class?

10. Last year, demographic information indicates that, at MIDDLE SCHOOL, about 62% of students were White, 28% African American, 4% Hispanic/Latino, 1% Asian, 4% Multiple, , etc., and a small group of students who are American Indian. From a percentage standpoint, it looks like most student groups were enrolled in World Languages at about the same rate as they comprised the school population. For example, your school last year was 4% Latino, and Latino students comprised 4% of the World Language Student population. Female students were slightly overenrolled, and Male Asian students, were slightly overenrolled compared to the rest of the student groups. It looks like you had 15/137 Male African American students enrolled in languages – 4% underrepresentation. To what do you attribute this number?

11. Only about 15% of the total school pop was enrolled in a language last year…to what do you attribute this number?
   b. Prompts about whether or not all students can benefit from WL study.

12. What do you think are the benefits of having WL programming in public schools?
13. What do you think are the costs of having WL programming in public schools?

14. Is there anything else you’d like me to know about the WL program?

Profile of School

Spanish, French

NCVPS: Latin

(3 languages total)

Interview – Cheryl

Teaches Spanish

The purpose of our interview today is to talk about the World Language program at HIGH SCHOOL. My interview with you is one of a series planned that will investigate staff perceptions of World Languages in some of the large districts in the state. I will be interviewing teachers at various middle and high schools with different types of programs (e.g. IB, AP, etc.) The format of our interview today is semi-structured.

I will record our interview on my iPhone using an app, and also on my iPad, which is why we are on speakerphone today.

I anticipate that our interview will take between 30 and 45 minutes, and no longer than 1 hour.
I want to reassure you about confidentiality in this process as well. Our interview will be recorded and any identifying information will be removed to protect your identity and confidentiality. All data will be stored on my computer, which is password-protected. Can you confirm that you have read the informed consent form I emailed you and that you agree to proceed with participation in the interview?

Do you have any questions before we get started?

1. Tell me about your experiences as a student of World Languages (if applicable).

2. Tell me how you came to be a teacher at HIGH SCHOOL.

3. How long have you been teaching at HIGH SCHOOL? And in general? And can you give me a little bit of demographic information about yourself?
   c. Prompts about gender, ethnoracial status, nationality, immigrant status, native speaker status, highest degree obtained, pathway to licensure, sexual orientation, and disability status

4. When you first began teaching at HIGH SCHOOL, what was your perception of the World Language program? How has that perception changed?

5. How important do you think World Languages are as a content area?

6. How important do you think they are at HIGH SCHOOL?

7. What types of students do you have in your Spanish classes?
   a. Prompts about ethno-racial status of students.
   b. Prompts about students who elect / enroll, and how they do so (e.g. plans to attend
college/university, taking the class for elective credit, no room in schedule for other classes, do you recruit? etc.).

8. How successful are students usually in your class?

9. How motivated are students usually in your class?

10. Last year, demographic information indicates that, at HIGH SCHOOL, about 32% of students were White, 53% African American, 10% Latino, 1% Asian, 2% Multiple, etc., and a small group of students who are American Indian. From a percentage standpoint, it looks like all these groups are enrolled in World Languages at a pretty equitable rate as they comprise the school population. For example, your school is 53% African American and 58% of the World Language enrollment number is comprised of African American students, so that group of students, specifically female African American students actually looks overenrolled. Male African American and Latino students are slightly underenrolled. At your school, how do you make sure that access to language courses is equitable across student groups?

11. Last year, it looks like about 48% of the students at HIGH SCHOOL were enrolled in a language course. What do you think of these numbers? (Prompts about whether or not all students can benefit from WL.)

12. What do you think are the benefits of having WL programming in public schools?

13. What do you think are the costs of having WL programming in public schools?

14. Is there anything else you’d like me to know about the WL program?
Profile of High School

Spanish, French, German, Latin,

4 Languages total

NCVPS: Honors German 3

Interview – Sarah

Teaches Latin, levels 1-AP

The purpose of our interview today is to talk about the World Language program at HIGH SCHOOL. My interview with you is one of a series planned that will investigate teacher perceptions of World Languages in some of the four largest LEAs in the state. I will be interviewing teachers at various middle and high schools with different types of programs (e.g. IB, AP, etc.) The format of our interview today is semi-structured.

I will record our interview on my iPhone using an app, and also on my iPad, which is why we are on speakerphone today. I anticipate that our interview will take between 30 and 45 minutes, and no longer than 1 hour. I want to reassure you about confidentiality in this process as well. Our interview will be recorded and any identifying information will be removed to protect your identity and confidentiality. All data will be stored on my computer, which is password-protected. Can you confirm that you have read the informed consent form I emailed you and that you agree to proceed with participation in the interview?

Do you have any questions before we get started?

1. Tell me about your experiences as a student of World Languages (if applicable).

2. Tell me how you came to be a teacher at HIGH SCHOOL.
3. How long have you been teaching at HIGH SCHOOL? And in general? And can you give me a little bit of demographic information about yourself?
   
   d. Prompts about gender, ethnoracial status, nationality, immigrant status, native speaker status, highest degree obtained, pathway to licensure, sexual orientation, and disability status

4. At HIGH SCHOOL, you offer four languages, right? When you first began teaching at this school, what was your perception of the World Language program? How has that perception changed?

5. How important do you think World Languages are as a content area?

6. How important do you think they are at this school?

7. Why should kids take Latin?

8. What types of students do you have in your Latin classes?
   
   e. Prompts about ethno-racial status of students.

   f. Prompts about students who elect / enroll, and how they do so (e.g. plans to attend college/university, taking the class for elective credit, no room in schedule for other classes, do you recruit? etc.).

9. How successful are students usually in your class?

10. How motivated are students usually in your class?

11. Last year, demographic information indicates that, at HIGH SCHOOL, about 60% of students were White, 22% African American, 11% Latino, 2% Asian, 4% Multiple, etc., and a small group of students who are American Indian. From a percentage standpoint, it looks like some of these groups were enrolled in World Languages at about the same rate
as they comprise the school population. For example, your school last year was 11% Latino, and Latino students comprised 11% of the World Language Student population. However, some student groups look like they were overenrolled or underenrolled. For example, last year, 61% of the students at the school were White, and White students comprised 65% of the World Language student population. Your school last year was 22% African American and 18% of the World Language enrollment number was comprised of African American students. When you drill down further and look at the raw numbers, it looks like that last year, 102 African American male students were enrolled in World Languages out of 229 at the school. What do you think of these numbers? Prompts about whether or not all students can benefit from WL study.

12. What do you think are the benefits of having WL programming in public schools?

13. What do you think are the costs of having WL programming in public schools?

14. Is there anything else you’d like me to know about the WL program?

Profile of HIGH SCHOOL

Spanish, French, German, Japanese offered face-to-face

NCVPS: Latin, Mandarin Chinese, Russian, Arabic

(8 languages total)

Interview - Martha

Teaches Spanish 2 & 3
The purpose of our interview today is to talk about the World Language program at HIGH SCHOOL. My interview with you is one of a series planned that will investigate staff perceptions of World Languages in some of the four largest LEAs in the state. I will be interviewing teachers at various middle and high schools with different types of programs (e.g. IB, AP, etc.) The format of our interview today is semi-structured.

I will record our interview on my iPhone using an app, and also on my iPad, which is why we are on speakerphone today.

I anticipate that our interview will take between 30 and 45 minutes, and no longer than 1 hour.

I want to reassure you about confidentiality in this process as well. Our interview will be recorded and any identifying information will be removed to protect your identity and confidentiality. All data will be stored on my computer, which is password-protected. Can you confirm that you have read the informed consent form I emailed you and that you agree to proceed with participation in the interview?

Do you have any questions before we get started?

1. Tell me about your experiences as a student of World Languages (if applicable).
2. Tell me how you came to be a teacher at HIGH SCHOOL.
3. How long have you been teaching at HIGH SCHOOL? And in general? And can you give me a little bit of demographic information about yourself?
e. Prompts about gender, ethnoracial status, nationality, immigrant status, native speaker status, highest degree obtained, pathway to licensure, sexual orientation, and disability status

4. So, HIGH SCHOOL is a language magnet school for the district, right? When you first began teaching at this school, what was your perception of the World Language program? How has that perception changed?

5. How important do you think World Languages are as a content area?

6. How important do you think they are at this school?

7. What types of students do you have in your Spanish classes?
   a. Prompts about ethno-racial status of students.
   b. Prompts about students who elect / enroll, and how they do so (e.g. plans to attend college/university, taking the class for elective credit, no room in schedule for other classes, do you recruit? etc.).

8. How successful are students usually in your class?

9. How motivated are students usually in your class?

10. Last year, demographic information indicates that, at HIGH SCHOOL, about 40% of students were White, 28% African American, 3% Asian, 3% Multiple, 25% Latino, etc., and a small group of students who are American Indian. From a percentage standpoint, it looks like all these groups are enrolled in World Languages at about the same rate as they comprise the school population. For example, your school is 28% African American and 26% of the World Language enrollment number is comprised of African American students. However, when you look at the raw numbers, it looks like that last year, 197
African American male students were enrolled in World Languages out of 362 at the school. What do you think of these numbers? (Prompts about whether or not all students can benefit from WL study.)

11. What do you think are the benefits of having WL programming in public schools?

12. What do you think are the costs of having WL programming in public schools?

13. Is there anything else you’d like me to know about the WL program?