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ABSTRACT

The Black/White Achievement gap has been a persistent problem in education. Previous research attributed this gap to students' culture (Jenks & Phillips, 1998; Ogbu, 1995a,b) or teachers' expectancy (Rist, 1970). Post-colonial literature suggests that this research itself is oppressive, and that learning is negotiating the "spaces" between students and teachers (Ellsworth, 1997), creating a hybrid "mestiza" space (Anzaldúa, 1987). The openness of immersion to diversity, and its subsequent educational benefits for African-American students (Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999) conforms to this post-colonial perspective.

This mixed-methodology study examined both academic achievement and the experiences of Louisiana fourth grade students/teachers in both the regular education and the French immersion contexts. The quantitative phase compared these students' LEAP test scores. The qualitative phase was a cross-case comparison of four classrooms--an extreme class (90% of the school population in poverty) and a typical class (African-Americans of average academic achievement) in each context.

Quantitative findings indicated that while there was a bridging of the achievement gap between the LEAP math scores of African-American immersion students and those of white students in regular education, the gap remained amongst immersion students. In the qualitative phase, the regular education classroom was found to be a more fixed and assimilating context than immersion. Further, immersion students had higher collective self-esteem and a more positive view of schooling. Though Typical Immersion appeared to create a hybrid third space, the regular education context in which immersion programs were situated appeared to negatively influence these programs.
CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

This study was designed to compare the experiences of African-American Louisiana students in two different educational contexts: the French immersion classroom and the regular education classroom. It investigated the influence of these two different classroom contexts on African-American students' academic achievement and on their social self-constructions (See Definitions p. 28).

Standardized achievement tests were used to assess the students' academic achievement. Results were compared between African-American and white students and between French immersion students and regular education students. Then the interactions between ethnicity and context were measured to see if they significantly affected students' achievement (See Definitions, p. 28). Interviews and direct observation were used to gather data on the African-American students' perceptions of themselves and others, and these students' interactions with their teachers and their peers within two different contexts: (1) the regular education classroom context; and (2) the Louisiana French immersion classroom context.

Statement of the Problem

In 1981, white students whose parents had only a grade school education had higher SAT scores than blacks whose parents had graduate degrees. In 1995, nothing had changed (Thernstrom, S. & Thernstrom A., cited in Steele, 2000, p. 32)

For not only must the black man be black; he must be black in relation to the white man… Overnight the Negro has been given two frames of reference within which he has to place himself… The black man among his own… does not know at what moment his inferiority comes into being… And then the occasion arose when I had to meet the white man's eyes [original gender]. (Fanon, 1967, p.110)
The Achievement Gap

The above statements highlight social information that the schools and society impart and impose on African-American students and the effect that this information has on students' social self-constructions. The first quote stresses the "achievement gap" (See Definitions, p. 28) between African-American and white students and how that achievement gap inhibits African-American upward social mobility. The second quote suggests that the frame itself, the negative comparison of African-Americans to whites according to a white perspective or standard, creates notions of inferiority.

On the one hand, to ignore the "achievement gap" is to allow the educational system to fail African-American students and to contribute to social reproduction. Delpit (1995) discussed this issue and stated that "pretending that gatekeeping points don't exist is to ensure that many students will not pass through them" (p. 39). Hedges and Nowell (1998) have determined that there is still a significant gap in Black/White achievement, especially in the top 10% of achievement test score distribution. This distribution has not changed significantly since 1965. Johnson and Neal (1998) concluded that the only parity in annual wages between African-Americans and whites occurred when African-Americans were college educated. Yet, the Black/White achievement gap appears to be holding students back from a college education. Jencks and Phillips (1998) found that in 1992 only 13.3% of African-American students from the class of 1982 had college degrees compared to 30% of the white student body. When Jencks and Phillips examined white and African-American students' college graduation rates they revealed a 16.7 point disadvantage in college graduation rates for African-American students. However, when Jencks and Phillips (1998) went further and manipulated the same data, this time examining the graduation rates of
African-American students and white students who had equal test scores they found that the 16.7 disadvantage in college graduation rates had turned into a 5.9 point advantage.

The importance of eliminating the achievement gap is further brought to the forefront with the election of George W. Bush as our 43rd president. President Bush has promised to increase accountability, which in Louisiana and many other states entails the use of high-stakes tests (see Definitions p. 28). Students who cannot pass these tests are to be held back or even tracked into lower level courses. If the achievement gap cannot be closed, the racially unequal social stratification will become even more pronounced due to a disproportionate number of African-American students being retained or tracked into lower classes and thereby not qualifying for college admission.

Frames of Reference

On the other hand, African-American students entering the educational system encounter an interrelated problem; these students are framed by this previous research based on standardized achievement test scores. Previous literature on the "achievement gap," such as that discussed above, framed African-American students as "lacking" and in need of "remediation" while the educational system which allows African-American students to fall through the cracks is depicted as "the great equalizer" and the hope of the community. Fanon's (1967) quote underscores the apparent immutability of their fate. Castenell and Pinar (1995) cite Fanon's seminal work as having "grasped, perhaps most precisely" the "African-American presence in America" (p. 330). According to Fanon, they are seen as, and begin to see themselves as, inferior. Even when African-Americans do achieve--that is, when they fail to conform to this frame of reference--they are seen as an exception to the rule, as an anomaly to be studied (Fordham, 1988). Fanon questions imposed frames of
reference which are used to define "the black man," frames of reference such as achievement tests, (standard) English, and teachers' preconceived perceptions which label African-American children as inferior to white children.

Even education theories impose frames of reference by describing very fixed identities for African-American students; these students are framed as either the victims of an oppressive system or the source of their own failure. West (1993) discusses the loss of hope within the African-American community as a nihilism "that increasingly pervades the black community" (p. 22). I would argue that this nihilism is a consequence of an acquiescence to imposed frames of references. What the present study hypothesizes is that the static and fixed nature of frames of reference in the regular educational context results in student social self-constructions which reproduce the social stratification in American society. Further, this study hypothesizes that frames of reference are influenced by context and that changing the educational context of the classroom may result in altering students' frames of reference.

Background of the Study

Working from a post-colonial perspective, which according to Bhabha (1994) is a perspective "that enables the authentication of histories of exploitation and the evolution of strategies of resistance" (p. 6), I have endeavored to discern why African-American students are held down rather than uplifted by our educational system. Why is it that our educational system is not living up to its promise as the great equalizer? Instead, the system often seals the fate of African-American students, locking them into a vicious cycle of social stratification. This vicious cycle of social stratification has been discussed both within and outside the field of education. It is not a problem unique to African-Americans. Latinos in the United States, North Africans in France and many other colonized, minority societies all
suffer from the problem of social stratification. In addition all pass through a system of education which promises opportunity but fails to deliver on its promise. This background section will investigate how previous educational theorists and researchers have framed racial inequality in education. Researchers' explanations for racial inequality in educational achievement all have the underlying theme of "fixity" in the educational context.

An important feature of colonial discourse is its dependence on the concept of "fixity" in the ideological construction of otherness. Fixity, as the sign of culture/historical/racial differences in the discourse of colonialism, is a paradoxical mode of representation: it connotes rigidity and an unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition (Bhabha, 1994, p. 42).

As a teacher I find that Bhabha's description of "rigidity and unchanging order as well as disorder, degeneracy and daemonic repetition" is an apt description of schooling. As a theorist, I find that it is Bhabha's underscoring of the importance of fixity in the construction of otherness which appears to be an emerging theme both within the educational setting and within educational theory. Post-colonial theory and critical theory denigrate fixity and extol the virtues of negotiating boundaries or frames whether they are ethnic, linguistic and/or social. The following section gives a working definition of "frames of reference" and describes research and theories which fossilize the identities of students and teachers based on fixed frames of reference,

Frames of Reference in Educational Research and Theory

This section gives a working definition for frames of reference focusing on how this term is defined in educational research. Next, different theories in educational research are discussed with regards to how these theories view the educational environment, and how these views fix students' and teachers' identities.
Defining Frames

Galloway (1997) states that in understanding a culture, it is necessary to have a frame of reference. She believes that members of a culture all share the same frame of reference, that is, they share "their own perceptual apparatus for giving sense to and making sense of their world" (p. 258). This definition of a cultural frame of reference is very close to Bruner's (1999) culturalism, which relates to education.

Bruner defines the "macro" side of culture "as a system of values, rights, exchanges, obligations, opportunities, power," and the "micro" side of culture as "how the demands of a cultural system affect those who must operate within it… how individual human beings construct 'realities' and meanings and adapt them to the system" (p. 11-12). In order to understand another culture one must construct a new frame of reference within one's microculture in terms of the people who created that culture. This corresponds to Tyson's (1999) concept of students' social self-construction and the importance of context in students' construction of their identities.

In discussing the macro/micro-culture, Bruner (1999) emphasizes the importance of language in culture by providing a summary of the Whorf-Sapir hypothesis, saying that "thought is shaped by the language in which it is formulated and/or expressed" (p. 18). Yet, within this constraint, language is one of the few trap doors to a certain liberation. It is what Jakobson terms the "metalinguistic gift" (Jakobson, cited in Bruner, 1999, p. 19): the ability to examine our language and transcend its limits. Bruner believed that one of the functions of pedagogy was to cultivate this "metalinguistic gift" and thereby improve students' capacity for meaning making and constructing realities.
Bruner (1999) further defines frames of reference to be a reality which is constructed through interaction. This interaction takes place mainly through language, though it also takes place through gestures or by other means, and it relies on one's ability to understand the minds of others, what Bruner terms our "intersubjectivity" (p. 12). Bruner (1999) offers the idea that schools are instruments of the culture, a way to convey the macro-culture to the individual. Egéa-Kuehne (1996) discusses learning not via interaction within a single culture but through the study of otherness and multiple voices. "[I]n order for students to experience 'effective' learning, and to develop this crucial metalinguistic competence, they must not be prevented from encountering controversial expressions, even though (or perhaps because) those might challenge the beliefs and values most central to their socio-cultural context and construed self-image" (p. 158). The following literature described in the background of the study reviews research and theories which fix the identities of students and teachers based on frames of reference which reflect and reify this macro-culture.

Frames Which Fix Identities

In this section, I examine and analyze the fixed frames of reference in educational theory which serve to reify, reproduce or simply reflect the dominant context in education--the regular education classroom context (See Definitions, p. 28). Upon examining these insufficiencies, research supporting a more fluid, less fixed educational context will be discussed along with critical theory which supports this alternative classroom context.

Cultural Deficiency

The first frame of reference to be examined is the frame used by educational researchers who operate in a more positivistic, numbers-driven paradigm. This frame of
reference places the responsibility for the "achievement gap" on the shoulders of African-American students and their families. Bhabha described it in these terms:

The white man's eyes break up the black man's body and in that act of epistemic violence its own frame of reference is transgressed, its field of vision disturbed (Bhabha, 1994, p. 42).

The cultural deficiency perspective is the most epistemically violent frame given credence in educational theory. When discussing Herrnstein and Murray's controversial work in The bell curve (1994), Jencks and Phillips (1998) constructed the Heredity-Environment dichotomy by attributing the source of the Black/White achievement gap to either the students' "race," which Herrnstein and Murray believe, or to the culture in which the students were raised, which Jencks and Phillips support. The problem with this frame is that the responsibility for the students' lack of achievement is placed on the students, their families and their cultures, whereas the role of the schools is not questioned.

Sleeter (1993) discussed the cultural-deficiency perspective which frames "the main causes of their [minorities] difficulties" as "located in their homes and communities" (p. 160). She added, "White people usually seek to explain persistent racial inequality in a way that does not implicate white society" (p. 160). This is reflected in Jencks and Phillip's (1998) discussion of how schools do not contribute much to the Black/White achievement gap. They cited the fact that African-American students entering first grade who score at the 16th percentile in norm-referenced tests will be at the same percentile when they graduate from high school. Yet, Jencks and Phillips estimated that a white student who enters school in the same percentile (i.e., 16%) would end 12th grade at the 27th percentile. They conceded that this difference in achievement "could involve genes, home environment, school environment or other factors" (p.29).
The cultural deficiency frame is a frame many teachers use in their construction of students' identities. Teacher expectancy often reflects the frame of cultural deficiency. Rist (1970/2000) researched how teachers' expectancies of students were based on the students' family backgrounds rather than the students' actual work or achievements. These expectancies were formed even before the students entered the Kindergarten classroom and they continued to affect them well into the second grade, when the study ended.

Sleeter's (1993) observations and interviews with teachers who participated in a multicultural in-service revealed that many teachers believe in this frame of cultural deficiency. This results in a banking approach to education in which teachers try to fill up these empty "vessels." However, since these "culturally-deficient" children come to school so ill-prepared, there is little hope, in the teachers' minds, that they will ever catch up with the students who come to school with some previously acquired knowledge. Hence, the teachers do not feel responsible when these students fail. It is considered to be a "fait accompli" even before the students set foot in the classroom.

While some teachers and researchers consider minority students' home cultures to be deficient, others label these students' home cultures as different and undervalued. The next section discusses the cultural capital perspective and the related culturally relevant education perspective.

Cultural Capital

Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) described minority students and white girls as having a different cultural and linguistic capital from that of white males. According to their studies on French students in secondary school, white male students possess the cultural and linguistic capital needed to succeed. From this viewpoint, the culture of the minority and
female students is then seen as valuable, but not valued by the school system. Within this frame, researchers outline two different ways to approach the students' undervalued cultural and linguistic capital: accommodations, and culturally relevant teaching.

Sleeter (1993) described teachers who tried to get students to accommodate the valued culture. These teachers tried to bridge the gap between the students' actual cultural and linguistic capital on the one hand, and on the other hand, the cultural and linguistic capital the students need to succeed. While the teachers worked toward accommodation and reproached schools for not valuing minority students' culture, they never questioned the elite culture. The elite culture remained unchallenged and in power. The focus was on students accommodating the more valued cultural capital. This accommodation is reflected in transitional bilingual education programs, which claim to value both languages equally, but whose end goal is to funnel students into all-English classes. This socialization into the mainstream is assimilation. This frame of reference, like the cultural deficiency frame, again holds the students and their cultures responsible for their own failure within the school system.

Ladson-Billings (1994) and Ladson-Billings and Henry (1990) have a different perspective within the "cultural capital" frame. They espouse culturally relevant teaching, which values African-American students' cultural and linguistic capital. Culturally relevant teaching draws on students' experiences and roots while criticizing powerful Western ideologies and contrasting them with African ideologies.

Culturally relevant teaching has two hurdles to overcome. First, it requires in-depth knowledge of African-American ideologies and culture, an insider's perspective. Consider that, in the above-mentioned studies, the teachers who used culturally relevant teaching
practices were either African-American or lived and worked within the African-American community (Ladson-Billings, 1994; Ladson-Billings & Henry, 1990). However, in most classrooms the teachers are white and live and work within the white community. In order to ensure culturally relevant teaching practices in diverse classrooms, teachers would either have to have an in-depth knowledge of all minority cultures or different minorities would have to be segregated to ensure that teachers could study the specific culture on which their schools would be focused.

My core criticism of the culturally relevant perspective is that it is confined to the same fixed frames of reference as the cultural deficiency and the cultural capital perspectives. It has the minority culture on one side and the majority culture on the other. And while it critiques and contrasts the two cultures it sets them both up as stable and unchanging--the problem of fixity. Anzaldúa (1987) discussed "[t]he coming together of two self-consistent but habitually incompatible frames of reference" saying that it is "not enough to stand on the opposite riverbank shouting questions, challenging patriarchal, white conventions" (p. 78).

Fixity, once again, is the limitation of the next educational frame, reproduction. While cultural capital theory discusses the difficulty students have in accommodating the more-valued cultural frame of reference and while culturally relevant teaching perspective rebukes this accommodation, reproductive theory describes how the imposition of the more-valued cultural frame of reference results in lower level social stratification for students possessing a less-valued cultural frame of reference.
Reproduction

Reproduction is based on Marxist and neo-Marxist theory. It views the social and economic structures as determinants in the outcome of schooling. For Bowles and Gintis (1976), schools are used to fulfill the labor needs of an industrial society. Students from the lower classes are socialized in poorer school to be good laborers; and classes offered to these students teach them to be obedient, and disciplined. These poorer schools, according to MacLeod (1995), "lack the most basic resources: classrooms, desks…photocopying machines…and properly trained teachers (p. 264). Students from the upper class, on the other hand, are tracked into classes which encourage competition, independence and achievement. The social and economic forces envision schools as worker factories which process students in order to reproduce the current social hierarchy, keeping the powerful in power.

Reproduction is evident in a number of minority, underclass and/or colonized populations. Willis (1981) discussed the reproduction of social stratification in working class English boys. Drawing from Willis, Foley (1990) described this same reproduction in the "shit-kickers" and "vatos" (lower-class white and Latino) populations in a southern Texas town. Finally, MacLeod (1995) uncovers not only apparent reproductive behavior in his vivid description of the "Hallway Hangers" (low-income whites) and the "Brothers"(low-income African-Americans), but goes further by actually returning to the site of his initial ethnography and documenting the "despair" and the "dream deferred" eight years later.

Reproduction alone does not explain why some minorities succeed while others do not. Although social reproduction of the current social and economic system is represented as the end result of schooling in these studies, they describe much more than simple student
acquiescence to a dominant culture. They describe student agency. Foley (1990), Willis (1981) and MacLeod (1995) describe the educational system as reproductive, but they describe minority students as active, and resistant to this reproduction. The next section discusses this resistance.

Resistance

Resistance theorists such as Willis (1981), Foley (1990) and Ogbu (1995a, 1995b; Ogbu & Simons, 1998) shed light on the lacunae in reproduction theory by explaining social stratification as not only the outcome of a systematically oppressive system, but also the outcome of the reactions to the system on the part of oppressed students. Ogbu (1995a, 1995b; Ogbu & Simons, 1998) examined the differences between "involuntary minorities,"--i.e., African-American students and Latino students--who show a gap between their achievement and the achievement of white students, and "voluntary minorities," who do not present this achievement gap (See Definitions, p. 28).

Ogbu (1995a, 1995b, 1999; Ogbu & Simons, 1998) found that involuntary minorities, such as African-Americans, resist schooling and Standard English because they consider both as an imposition and a threat to their own culture. Fordham (1988), Ogbu (1995a, 1995b, 1999) and Ogbu and Simons (1998) all found that the community and school peers considered African-American students who were successful in school as "acting white." Furthermore, Steele (2000) contended that African-Americans see their identity as a currency which triggers white moral obligation. Steele (2000) believed that the Black/White achievement gap is due to a system "in which black identity becomes more important than black competence" (p. 38).
Ogbu (1995a, 1995b, 1999), Ogbu and Simons (1998), Fordham (1988) and Steele (2000) further indicated that African-American students perceive schooling to be assimilationist and therefore, due to a strong desire to retain their identity, they resist schooling. In essence they perceive schooling as a site within which they must choose between retaining their identity or "acting white." Resistance theory, like the other aforementioned theories, establishes fixed ideological constructions of identities in the classroom. They all establish two frames of reference--one which accepts the prestige cultural capital and one which resists that culture. While resistance theorists critique the educational system for being assimilationist and bring to light student agency, they also revert to the initial problem of considering the students and the students' culture as a contributing factor to their failure.

Summary

Cultural deficiency, cultural capital and reproduction theories all present fixed, static notions of the cultural frames of reference of minority and majority students. Although cultural relevancy and resistance theories offer minority students the possibility of a critique or a reaction to the majority frame of reference they still refer to fixed frames of reference (self/other) for the students. The next section explores critical theories which underline the importance and need for re-examining fixed frames of reference in order to construct the theoretical framework on which this study is based.

Theoretical Framework

The following section discusses literature which critically examines how students are framed in the educational setting and how this fossilizes the students' identities. This section also explores the importance of language in fixing student identities. Finally, French
immersion is offered as a response to this critical view of how students and their respective languages are treated within the educational context.

**Fixity and Assimilation**

Hooks (1989) discussed multiple voices and how "the insistence on finding one voice…fit all too neatly with the static notion of self and identity that was pervasive in university settings" (p. 11). It is this static notion of self and identity, the fixity, which is apparent in the mentioned educational theories discussed in the previous section. Within these frames, students are defined as being deficient, non-conforming, reproduced and/or resistant. Even a complimentary description, such as a "model minority" in educational discourse is still oppressive in its fixity. Lee (1996) discusses how the "model minority" description of Asians oppresses in two ways; it has been used as a hegemonic device to maintain white dominance and it "silence[s] the multiple voices of Asian Americans… creating a monolithic monotone" (p. 6).

This stone or wall analogy is reflected in a brick metaphor a colleague of mine once used when she was trying to account for unequal educational achievement among her students. She likened her higher achieving students to bricks and her lower achieving students to clay. They both began as the same material, but one was hardened, formed and ready to be built upon before reaching the classroom door while the other needed to become a brick before construction could begin. While I disagree with the implications of my colleague's metaphor, which reflects the cultural deficiency ideology, I believe that it offers insights into the problems this study addresses. The language and identities taught to students in the regular education context seem to mold them into bricks which either fit the
system--i.e., speaking Standard English or receiving high test scores--or are rejected by the system--i.e. they fail their tests or grade.

As a "white" teacher in a Southern school system, I have witnessed the prevalence of ideologies which fix African-American students' identities. Fanon (1967) spoke "of alienated (duped) blacks, and, on the other hand, of no less alienated (duping and duped) whites" (p. 29). Overall, theories of education appear to conform to Fanon's description of educators duping students and students being duped (reacting or conforming to the frame). But the theories do not address how educators are themselves duped by static notions of society, schools and students--a fixed worldview.

**Negotiating Fixed Borders**

According to Kumashiro (2000) learning does not occur in comfort but in conflicts with one's original worldview. It occurs by causing "upsets." Kumashiro cites Felman (1995) "teaching and learning really take place only through entering and working through crisis, since it is this process that moves a student to a different intellectual/emotional/political space" (cited in Kumashiro, 2000, p. 44). Static notions of students, schooling and teachers give the appearance of insurmountable problems. They lull teachers and researchers into believing that either they are doing all that can be done, or nothing more can be done. It is not through the ease of believing we are doing all we can, or through the ease of believing nothing can be done, that learning occurs. Rather it is through dis/ease that we learn--the dis/ease of realizing that something can be done, but that it would require us to redefine ourselves and our students.

The redefinition of selves and the rejection of fixed notions of students and teachers reveal another factor which contributes to mis/education. This problem is described by
Ellsworth (1997) as the "space between' the teacher/teaching and learner/learning for instance, who the teacher thinks the students are and who they actually are, or between what the teacher teaches and what the students learn" (cited in Kumashiro, 2000, p. 31). Ladson-Billings's (1994) study of exceptional teachers of African-American students found that successful teachers of African-American students involved themselves in their students' lives, diminishing the "space" between teachers and students. In order to empower both teachers and students in the classroom, the space between the two must be reduced.

Theories of cultural deficiency, cultural capital, reproduction and resistance all reify or accept as a fact that teachers and students have separate and separated frames of reference. This distance between the frames of reference allows teachers to wash their hands of any blame and place it elsewhere. The distance between, and fixity of, the frames provokes the opposition and resistance which minority students feel towards schooling. In order to overcome the dichotomies of teacher/student, oppressor/oppressed, insider/outsider those within the classroom context must negotiate the borders between these dual frames. Rather than being a site in which students and teachers reify and fix ideological constructions of their identities, the classroom must become a site of agency in which students and teachers redefine themselves--constructing their own "mestiza" or mixed hybrid consciousness which transcends duality (Anzaldúa, 1987). The "mestiza" consciousness is not a "balancing of opposing powers," it is a "new consciousness" or "third element which is greater than the sum of its severed parts" (Anzaldúa, 1987, p. 79-80).

**Student Social Self-construction**

Tyson (1999) examined how students create their own identities within the context of schooling. She hypothesized that students' social self-construction determines their
achievement. This social self-construction encompasses the cultural incompatibility explanations, the reproduction theories, and the resistance theories. Social self-construction is based on social perceptions, such as the communities in Ogbu's (1995a, 1995b, 1999) and Ogbu and Simons's (1998) studies, which perceived successful African-American students as "acting white." In addition, it is based on the expectancy effects of teachers and schools to which Rist (1970/2000) and Sleeter (1993) referred. However, the students' social self-construction is not simply "overdetermined from without" (Fanon, p. 116) because it allows for student agency. It is the students who are constructing their own identities within the given contexts.

While this theory acknowledges the power the students possess in constructing their own identities, it does not free the context from implication in the pattern of social stratification which comes out of regular education in the U.S. In regular education, students' social self-construction is influenced by the communities' resistance to school culture and language, the teachers' and school devaluation of the African-American students' cultures, and pre-established expectations for the students. Rather than following the same pattern as regular education, French immersion offers a third context--a third space--which is neither a dominant culture nor an oppositional, resistant culture. Because French immersion is different, it offers a space in which difference is valued; a space where students are encouraged to build and create a new voice, a new language. African-American students whose self-construction develops within a French immersion context do not appear to be following the same pattern, in terms of academic achievement, as their peers in regular education (Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999; Holobow, Genesee, Lambert, Gastright & Met, 1987).
One aspect of minority culture often cited as contributing to students' poor school performance is language.

Individuals who speak languages other than English, who speak patois as well as standard English, find it a necessary aspect of self-affirmation not to feel compelled to choose one voice over another, not to claim one as more authentic, but rather to construct social realities that celebrate, acknowledge, and affirm differences, variety (hooks, 1989, p. 12).

Ogbu's (1999) article on Ebonics revealed a connection between the African-American children's dialect beliefs, attitudes and behaviors in school with those of their parents. Ogbu discussed Ebonics as an oppositional dialect which functions as a boundary maintenance mechanism. The article described how parents and students, although they understood the importance of learning Standard English for school success, did not feel comfortable speaking Standard English. Standard English was also perceived as assimilationist and those who spoke it were seen as betraying or denying their blackness; they were said to be "speaking white."

Similarly, Schumann's acculturation theory (1976) contends that a detrimental language learning situation will occur if the target language group is dominant; if the language-learning group is large, cohesive and desires cultural preservation; and if these two groups have a negative attitude towards each other. Aguirre (2000) found that Puerto Ricans, like African-Americans, felt that English was important, but they resented it as being imposed on them and they considered English as a threat to their heritage. The fixity of Standard English in the American school system and the movement toward English-only serves to reify these linguistic borders.
Contrary to the (Standard) English-only context, French immersion offers a space in which differences are affirmed, in which one language is not more authentic than another, and in which teachers and students create a new identity of "immersion teachers and students." In addition, French immersion responds to critiques of regular education found in the reproduction, resistance, cultural deficiency and cultural capital theories of education because French immersion offers a "third space" outside the Standard English/Black English dichotomy in which teachers and students can redefine and negotiate the borders between them.

French Immersion: A Fresh Start?

Whereas Ogbu (1999) and Fordham (1988) discussed how speaking Standard English and succeeding in schools is considered "acting" or "speaking white," French immersion offers students a chance to achieve academically without going through the filter of Standard English. The African-American students and community in Ogbu's study saw school and Standard English as an imposition. Since in French immersion English is used for one half or less of the school day, perhaps it is not as dominant a force as it is in regular education. Additionally, since parents have the choice whether or not to place their children in a French immersion program and to take them out of the program, French immersion offers more options than the perceived imposition of compulsory schooling in Standard English.

In terms of cultural opposition to the school language, in a situation similar to that of Puerto Rican students in Aguirre (2000), French immersion offers African-American students an additive language, which is not perceived historically as an assimilationist language. In fact, for African-American students in Louisiana, French is often a heritage language of family and friends in their community. So, rather than taking away the language
of their culture, French immersion in Louisiana offers a culturally relevant second language to the students. Although this fact may take away from the generalizability of the findings of this study, it nonetheless reflects the reality in which the study is situated.

In terms of teachers' perceptions of cultural deficiency or accommodation, a pilot study (Haj-Broussard, 2002) and discussions with an immersion coordinator in Louisiana revealed that French immersion teachers do not refer to cultural deficiencies to explain success or failure in their classrooms (Boudreaux, 2001). Rather they look to establish a relationship with their students and it is this relationship which they feel will ensure student success. This is precisely the attitude described in Ladson-Billings's (1994) study of exceptional teachers of African-American students; it also refers back to Ellsworth's (1997) "space" which needs to be bridged between teachers and students (cited in Kumashiro, 2000).

It can be argued that French immersion teachers, like minorities in America, are outsiders themselves. As citizens of other nations or as Louisiana heritage language activists, French immersion teachers do not wish to be assimilated and they understand on a personal level the importance of other cultures and the dominance of the (standard)-English-white-American culture. According to the French attaché pédagogique in Louisiana many teachers ask to work or continue to work in Louisiana to participate in the revitalization of Louisiana French culture (Dubernet, 2001). This engagement in language revitalization may contribute to the immersion teachers' enthusiasm for teaching and it may affect the generalizability of the study. However, it points to a particular context, an opportunity which may be especially beneficial to the education of African-American students. Furthermore, it offers a context outside the traditional one of regular education, and we saw that the latter does not appear to serve African-American students as well as it should.
Early research in the French immersion context revealed that French immersion benefits African-American students (Holobow, Genesee & Lambert, 1991; Holobow, et al., 1987; Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999). Holobow et al. (1987) and Holobow et al. (1991) noted that in primary school, with only two or three years of French immersion, African-American students had higher oral French language scores than white students in French immersion. However, these students showed little or no difference in achievement scores from those of their non-immersion African-American peers. Cloud, Genesee and Hamayan (2000) discussed the importance of leaving students in the immersion program for a sustained period of time in order to reap the benefits of immersion.

Caldas and Boudreaux (1999) examined students after the four to six years of immersion education which Cloud, Genesee and Hamayan (2000) recommend. After examining the state standardized Louisiana Educational Achievement Program (LEAP) criterion referenced test (See Definitions, p. 28) math and reading scores of 1,941 of immersion and non-immersion third, fifth and seventh grade students in Louisiana, and controlling for student race, gender, school poverty level, and school grades, they found that as instructional time spent in French immersion increases so do both English and math scores. Moreover, they found that poor African-American immersion students benefited the most from French immersion.

Summary

The Black/White achievement gap has serious repercussions for the perpetuation of social stratification in the U.S. If this achievement gap is not addressed, the increased use of high-stakes testing will widen this gap and solidify racially unequal social stratification. The dominant teacher ideologies, which consider minority students as having cultural
deficiencies or needing to be assimilated into the mainstream, dominant culture (Sleeter, 1993), are ideologies which conform to a very static view of education. Similarly, educational theories which view education in terms of cultural capital, reproduction or resistance, fix students' and teachers' roles based on the frame of the regular education context.

Tyson (1999) and Kumashiro (2000) offer another perspective in which African-American students and their teachers reconstruct their identities and renegotiate the borders and spaces within the context of schooling. French immersion offers an alternative context to regular education. French immersion is founded on cultural and linguistic variety. It is a site where students and teachers can construct identities which do not reproduce the fixed results from which the regular education context seems unable to escape. Previous studies on French immersion have shown that minority students, specifically African-American students, receive additional academic benefits in a French immersion context. This study re-examines these academic benefits while hypothesizing that the interactions between, and perceptions of, students and teachers in the immersion classroom affect both student achievement and student social self-construction.

The Study

In this study, I observed African-American students', their peers' and their teachers' interactions and recorded African-American students' and their teachers' voiced perceptions in two different classroom contexts. In addition, I examined the frames which have been heretofore used to define African-American students, namely standardized tests, and investigated whether different classroom contexts resulted in different test scores. Using data gathered through direct observation, examination of school documents, questionnaires
and interviews, I analyzed how students and teachers interacted and perceived themselves and others in both the French immersion and the regular education contexts, and how these two different classroom contexts affected the academic achievement of African-American students.

1. The first phase of this study includes a quantitative comparison of immersion and non-immersion fourth grade students' LEAP scores. Using the fourth graders' third grade Iowa Test of Basic skills (ITBS) scores (See Definitions, p. 28) as a control, this phase investigated (1) whether there were differences in academic achievement between African-American students and white students, (2) whether there were differences in academic achievement between French immersion students and regular education students and (3) whether there was any interaction between these groups.

2. The second phase of this study includes a constant-comparative case study of emergent themes regarding immersion and non-immersion fourth grade students' and teachers' interactions and perceptions of self and other in both typical and extreme cases. Phase I was used to determine the typical case sampling, for which two schools were selected according to their African-American students' average achievement. For extreme case sampling, two schools were selected according to extreme sampling criteria of schools with over 90% poverty.

Significance of the Study

As Hollins (1989, in Ladson-Billings, 1994) noted, three types of programs have typically been used to try to close the achievement gap between African-American and white students: remediation/acceleration programs, re-socialization programs, and culturally relevant programs. Despite these programs, the achievement gap remains. Early studies in
French immersion relating to African-American students show language benefits but little academic benefits in primary school (Holobow et al., 1987; Holobow et al., 1991) and then overall academic benefits in late elementary school (Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999). However, apart from Caldas and Boudreaux (1999), Holobow et al. (1987), and Holobow et al. (1991), little research has been conducted on the effects French immersion has on the academic achievement of African-American students. This study sought to reexamine the achievement results, as indicated by the LEAP tests, of African-American students enrolled in fourth grade Louisiana French immersion programs.

Moreover, previous research results do not offer any conjecture as to why African-American students do better in a French immersion context. Tyson (1999) hypothesized a link between students' social self-construction and achievement, but due to the lack of difference between the contexts she studied she was not able to offer support for this hypothesis. A critical examination of current literature addressing the Black/White achievement gap revealed students, teachers and theorists with fixed notions of identity in the schools. These fixed notions appeared to separate and divide rather than unite. This study examined differences in the construction of identity in both the French immersion and the regular education classroom contexts by examining how African-American students, their peers and their teachers (1) perceive themselves, (2) perceive others and (3) interact within the school setting. Exploring factors which may contribute to African-American students' achievement and their construction of their own identity may provide regular education teachers and French immersion teachers greater insight into what affects African-American students' identities and achievement, both positively and negatively, in the classroom.
Situating Myself

As a French immersion teacher who has taught for her entire ten year career in Title I schools with an African-American student population of 40-99%, I have found that African-American students in French immersion are not only highly successful academically, but also that bilingualism offers an added boost to the children's self-esteem. Furthermore, in the past five years four French immersion schools with an African-American population of 90% or more have either been closed or have fought to keep their program open. Therefore my motivation for undertaking this study is two-fold.

First, I wanted to see the context in which I had taught from a different perspective, to see how it differs from regular education and perhaps how it can be improved. Secondly, I wanted to examine how African-American students experience the two programs and whether French immersion is enriching and beneficial to African-American students. While my professional experiences were my impetus for undertaking this study, I included a variety of checks and balances in my research methodology to minimize my potential bias in favor of immersion programs. These measures, used for minimizing observer/researcher bias, are discussed throughout the methods section (Chapter III) and included peer debriefing, teacher logs, the use of questionnaires, member checks and a study auditor.

The next section contains the research questions and hypotheses which guided my study. Following that is a list of definitions to facilitate reading the chapters.

Research Questions

The following hypotheses and questions guided this study:

Phase I—Differences in the African-American/White Achievement Gap

Null hypotheses:
Hypothesis 1
a) There is no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of white 4th grade students and the LEAP mathematics scores of African-American 4th grade students.
b) There is no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of white 4th grade students and the LEAP language scores of African-American 4th grade students.

Hypothesis 2
a) There is no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade French immersion students and the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade regular education students.
b) There is no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of 4th grade French immersion students and the LEAP language scores of 4th grade regular education students.

Hypothesis 3
a) There are no interactions between the main effects of classroom context and ethnicity on the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade students.
b) There are no interactions between the main effects of classroom context and ethnicity on the LEAP language scores of 4th grade students.

Phase II—Differences in African-American Students' Experiences

Questions:
1) Is there a difference between student/teacher interaction in the French immersion context and student/teacher interaction in the regular education context as measured by direct observation and as triangulated by "The Southwestern Cooperative
Educational Laboratory's Interaction Observation Schedule" (Liberty & Bemis, 1970) and the "Classroom Interaction Rating Form" (Knox, 1983)?

a. Does this difference increase if the students are African-American?

2) Is there a difference between student/student interaction in the French immersion context and student/student interaction in the regular education context as measured by direct observation and as triangulated by "The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory's Interaction Observation Schedule" (Liberty & Bemis, 1970)?

a. Does this difference increase if the students are African-American?

3) Is there a difference between how teachers perceive their teaching and their students in the French immersion context and how teachers perceive their teaching and their students in the regular education context as measured by direct observations, open-ended interviews, informal interviews and triangulated by the "Responsibility for Student Achievement Questionnaire" (Guskey, 1981)?

a. Does this difference increase if the students are African-American?

4) Is there a difference between how African-American students in the French immersion context perceive themselves, their teachers and their peers and how African-American students in the regular education context perceive themselves, their teachers and their peers as measured by open-ended interviews and triangulated by a revised interview version of Wright and Taylor's "Self and Collective Esteem Inventory" (1995) and Caldwell's (1998) revised "Collective Self-Esteem Scale?"

Definitions

- Achievement Gap
"African Americans currently score lower than European Americans on vocabulary, reading, and mathematics tests, as well as on tests that claim to measure scholastic aptitude and intelligence. This gap appears before the children enter kindergarten, and persists into adulthood. It has narrowed since 1970, but the typical American black still scores below 75 percent of American whites on most standardized tests" (Jencks & Phillips, 1998, p. 1).

- **Affiliation**

  To associate as a member of a group or to connect oneself with others. Affiliated members would work to help others in the group.

- **Classroom Context**

  This study puts more emphasis on the "classroom context" moreso than on the "school context." That is because in the "school context" the curriculum, the buildings, the administration, the required amount of time for instruction in each subject remained the same (except that the French immersion context included an added 30 minutes of French Language Arts taken from the time allotted to teaching English Language Arts). On the other hand, the classroom context, the teacher/student interactions, the classroom environment, the student/student interactions and the teachers' and students' perceptions differ enormously between French immersion and regular education.

- **Dual-track (two-way) Immersion**

  Dual-track immersion is similar to partial immersion in that two languages are used for instruction within the program (usually Spanish and English). This program entails having native speakers of both languages within the same classroom so that non-native speakers have native speaker resources besides the classroom teachers.
In the Louisiana French immersion context students receive instruction from a French immersion teacher or teachers and an English Language Arts teacher. This study focused on the French immersion portion of the students' schooling. During the French immersion segment of their schooling students were taught several disciplines (i.e., math, social studies, science and French language arts) using the French language. The teachers were native or near-native speakers of French, or at the very least, bilingual in English and French.

- **High-stakes Testing**

High-stakes testing is when the results of a single test have serious consequences for the students failing the test such as retention or mandatory attendance at summer school.

- **Involuntary Minority**

"Involuntary minorities are people who were originally brought into U.S. society more or less permanently against their will, through slavery, conquest, or colonization… Involuntary minorities develop an oppositional cultural frame of reference after their forced incorporation" (Ogbu, 1995, p. 203).

- **ITBS**

Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) is a norm-referenced nationally recognized test used statewide to assess the academic achievement of Louisiana 3rd graders.

- **LEAP Test**

Louisiana Educational Achievement Program (LEAP) test is a criterion-referenced high-stakes statewide testing program in Louisiana which is used to assess the academic achievement of Louisiana 4th, 8th and 10th graders and which determines whether 4th, 8th and 10th graders may continue to the next grade-level.

- **Regular Education Context**
It is the educational context found in most schools in which the students are taught all their subjects in Standard English.

- Remediation

Work, usually done one-on-one with the teacher and a student, towards correcting students or preventing them from doing things incorrectly.

- Social Self-construction

According to Tyson (1999), social self-construction is "the process of forming contextualized self-understandings based on a variety of social information that we receive about ourselves" (p. 32) such as through our perceptions of self and others and our interactions with others.

- Voluntary Minority

"Voluntary minorities are people who have moved to the U.S. more or less voluntarily because they believe that this move will result in more economic well-being, better overall opportunities and/or greater political freedom… Voluntary minorities bring with them cultural/language frames of reference that are different from, but not necessarily oppositional to, mainstream white American cultural/language frames of reference" (Ogbu, 1995, p. 202).

Organization of the Chapters

This chapter, Chapter I, introduced the problem, the background behind the problem and outlined the study. Chapter II reviews the literature regarding African-American students, their achievement, their teachers and their identities. After the Literature Review the methodology involved in this study is detailed in Chapter III. The subsequent chapters report on the findings: the quantitative findings in Chapter IV, the case studies of four classrooms in Chapter V and the cross-comparative findings in Chapter VI. Chapter VII
provides a summary and discussion of the study, pedagogical implications of the findings and recommendations for future studies.
CHAPTER 2:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This study investigated the influence of classroom context, specifically the French immersion context, on African-American students’ academic achievement and on their social self-construction. Hence, previous research was examined in terms of the Black/White Achievement Gap, how identity is constructed in the classroom and the effects of the French immersion context on students, particularly minority students. This chapter briefly reviews research on the "Black/White Achievement Gap," followed by an extensive review of literature discussing possible reasons for the gap. Next a review of studies on identity in the classroom and the importance of language in constructing identity follows. The final section reviews research on the context of immersion and its effects on minority students.

The Achievement Gap and Its Effects

Using a regression analysis, Trent (1998) examined the effect which the independent variables of race, age, sex, socio-economic status (SES) and school characteristics had on student achievement in the St. Louis school districts. Trent found that the "race effect" existed even after controlling for all other independent variables and prior test scores. In a separate analysis, Trent (1998) studied the effect of concentrated poverty on the achievement of the students tested. Both white and African-American students attending schools with a high poverty concentration showed depressed achievement. However, African-American students were more frequently concentrated in these high poverty schools.

Hedges and Nowell's (1998) research revealed that there was still a significant gap between African-American students' academic achievement and white students' academic achievement especially those in the top 10% of the achievement test score distribution. This
distribution had not changed significantly since 1965. The importance of closing this gap in
the top of the test score distribution was underscored in the Johnson and Neal's (1998) study.
It revealed that the only parity in annual wages between African-Americans and whites
occurred when African-Americans were college educated. Yet, the African-American/white
achievement gap appeared to be holding students back from a college education, because
college graduation appeared to be linked to higher test scores. Jencks and Phillips (1998)
found that in 1992 only 13.3% of African-American students from the class of '82 had
college degrees compared to 30% of the white student body. As stated in the introduction,
when Jencks and Phillips equalized the test scores, in essence eliminating the achievement
gap, they found that the 16.7 point disadvantage in college graduation rates for African-
Americans turned into a 5.9 point advantage. Even as researchers agree to the existence of
an achievement gap, there is much speculation as to why this gap exists and persists. The
following section analyzes research exploring possible causes for the achievement gap.

**Contributing Factors to the Achievement Gap**

The literature found which attempted to explain the achievement gap could be
classified into three different categories according to the identified reasons: family
background, teachers' expectations and perceptions of students, and the students' reaction to
their contexts. The following sections explore these three areas.

**Family Background**

Jencks and Phillips (1998) used family background to explain both the achievement
gap and to refute Herrnstein and Murray's (1994) "Bell Curve" argument. The Bell Curve
argument stated that socio-economic factors were not enough to explain the achievement gap
and that genetics were therefore in some way responsible for that gap. Before examining
Jencks and Phillips's study the repercussions of this kind of inquiry must be addressed. In both Herrnstein and Murray's study and the Jencks and Phillips's study, the authors frame their research in such a way that the African-American students themselves are seen as solely responsible for their own achievement gap. Factors such as context of the classroom, interactions with the teachers and other students, and the effects of language were not taken into account in these studies.

Jencks and Phillips's (1998) findings were based on previously collected data on five and six year old students using the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-revised. Although, Jencks and Phillips acknowledged that the limited-exposure to standardized English which African-American five and six year olds had might have affected their scores, they proposed nothing to counteract that effect. Instead they focused on refuting the argument that the achievement gap was due to genetic differences. They controlled for the mother's cognitive scores while they investigated parental education and parenting practices. They concluded that "middle class" parenting practices produced the highest test scores. However, as the next section describes, "middle class" parenting practices might have affected how teachers and other students perceived and interacted with African-American students. These perceptions and interactions might mitigate any apparent direct correlation between "middle class parenting practices" and achievement.

Teacher Expectations and Perceptions

Since the groundbreaking 1968 study of Rosenthal and Jacobson "Pygmalion in the classroom," high teacher expectations have been lauded as an important incentive to high student achievement. Meanwhile, low expectations are thought to result in low student achievement. Plewis (1997) acknowledged that concern over the low achievement of boys,
and the low achievement of African-Caribbean pupils prompted his study of six to seven year old students in England, which correlated teachers' assessments with standardized assessments of over 6000 students. The results of his study suggested that teachers' expectations might be too low for boys, ethnic minority pupils and pupils from less advantaged background. Plewis (1997) did not actually examine teachers and students in situ; however, he postulated that the teachers' perceptions of the students' behavior, rather than academic level, could explain these low expectations.

Studies on teacher expectancy done within the classroom offer a view of how teachers and students interact and perceive each other. Rist's (1970/2000) classic study of the effects of Kindergarten teacher expectations on students in an all-African-American elementary school revealed how the kindergarten teacher's decisions concerning the students' academic potential continued to affect these students in first and second grades. The teacher's decision about whether the students went to the "good table" or not was made only eight days into their Kindergarten school year. The decision to place students seemed to be based on four sources of information the teacher had regarding not academic but social, financial and familial information about the children. Families of students at the good table, Table One, had the highest income in the class, were more likely to come from two parent families, with better educated parents, and had fewer children in the family. Furthermore, Rist's (1970/2000) observations of the students revealed that the students at the good table, were better dressed, while the students at the lowest table were rarely dressed in clean clothes and sometimes smelled of urine. Rist (1970/2000) concluded that the teacher had set up a caste system in the classroom which reflected the class system of the larger society.
Rist observed that the teacher spent more time and interacted more often with students from Table One. When 18 of the 30 students advanced to first grade, the "readiness" materials they had completed over the course of the school year were used to place them in their first grade groups. As they moved up through the grades, the students did not start off Tabula Rasa. In fact, they rarely changed groups. Students progressed at pace with their group and were not allowed to work ahead, so there was little hope of upward mobility.

Furthermore, the students at the lowest table were perceived as lacking in the necessary behavioral skills and attitudes, so much so that in first grade the slow table was placed on the opposite side of the room from the other two tables. When Rist (1970/2000) questioned the second grade teacher about the values the separate groups held toward education, the teacher replied that she believed that the highest group considered education important and wanted to go to college. For the middle group (the Cardinals in second grade) the teacher was less sure about how they valued education and brought up the parents' culpability.

A lot of them [the Cardinals] have ambitions when they grow up. It's mostly the parents' fault that they are not at school more often (Rist 1970/2000, p. 289).

For the lowest group, the teacher did not attribute them any academic ambitions. In addition, the teacher used controlling behavior two to five times more often with the lowest group as with the highest group. Using research on authoritarian versus democratic teaching methods, Rist (1970/2000) outlined how this controlling atmosphere contributed to the poor achievement of the lowest group. According to Rist's, study underscored how schools

… strongly share in the complicity of maintaining the organizational perpetuation of poverty and unequal opportunity. This, of course, is in contrast to the formal doctrine of education in this country to ameliorate rather than aggravate the conditions of the poor (p. 298).
Besides underscoring schools' complicity in the reproduction of the social hierarchy, Rist's (1970/2000) interview with the second grade teacher in which she faulted the parents for the "slower" students' attendance revealed a cultural deficiency belief in which school success was dependent on external forces, forces other than instruction. Likewise, the kindergarten teacher's permanent placement of the students after only eight days of instruction pointed to this same belief that academic success was determined by something other than academic instruction. What Rist did not mention overtly, but was evident after his description of the teachers and students, was that the students whom the teacher had labeled "fast learners" seemed to come from the same socio-economic class and background as the teachers. In other words, the teachers had frames of reference similar to those of the students they viewed more positively; there was less "space" between these students and their teachers.

Like the teachers Rist described, Voltz's (1998) study of the attribution of student academic success reflected a cultural deficiency belief in schoolteachers and administrators. In a survey of 340 urban educators in 25 of the largest urban school districts in the U.S., Voltz (1998) asked 148 teachers and 142 principals what were the challenges evident in their schools and the extent to which they felt they could favorably influence those challenge areas. Of the 23 items, principals felt that they could favorably influence 48% of them, but teachers felt that they could influence only 30% of the 23 challenge areas.

The top three challenge areas, on which both teachers and principals agreed, had little to do with school. They included (1) students' lack of appropriate role models, (2) students' lack of stability in their homes, and (3) a lack of effective communication between the students' homes and their schools. Neither principals nor teachers felt that they could
influence either (1) or (2). In other words, the most problematic challenges according to the teachers and the principals surveyed, involved family issues. This is not unlike Rist's (1970/2000) finding that students' family backgrounds and social levels were seen by teachers to correspond to their students' academic capacity. In both studies, the teachers' influence was inconsequential, or seen as a lesser influence on academic achievement than the challenges that students face today. Rather than being an agent of change, schools merely reflected the social hierarchy.

Like Rist (1970/2000), Goldenburg (1992) studied teacher expectancy within the classroom. However, Goldenburg (1992) questioned the limits of influence which teacher expectations have on students' achievement. Goldenburg (1992) observed the transformation of two low SES Spanish-speaking students--Marta and Sylvia. Marta started slowly and initially had behavioral problems. These behavior problems were so disruptive in class that the teacher intervened even to the point of calling a conference with Marta's parents. The teacher began the year with low expectations for Marta, but by the end of the year Marta was a high achiever. On the other hand, Sylvia started off as what the teacher termed "whippy." She was quick to answer in oral discussions, well-behaved, and worked very carefully and slowly. Because Sylvia seemed to understand what was going on in class and because she was so well-behaved, the teacher did not intervene when Sylvia began not being able to finish her work. As a consequence, in spite of the teacher's high expectations for Sylvia, she finished the year below level, even though the last month of the year the teacher did intervene and Sylvia's work did improve.

Goldenburg (1992) used this case study to underscore the limits of the teacher expectancy effects. Furthermore, Goldenburg concluded that it was the teacher's
interventions--such as the teacher holding a conference with Marta's parents--and not the teacher's expectations which changed the students' behaviors. In the case of Sylvia, high expectations actually worked against her. The teacher's high expectations lulled her into a false sense of security in regards to Sylvia's progress. It is of interest to note that, when interacting with the teacher, Sylvia gave the appearance of comprehension. In the case of Marta, it was not the teacher's expectations for Marta's academic success which propelled the teacher into action, but rather the teacher's irritation with Marta's behavior.

In Rist's (1970/2000) study, the teachers dealt with discomfort between themselves and the students by avoiding students who had a different background and/or irritating behavior while interacting freely with students who came from the same background as they did. In Goldenburg's (1992) study, the teacher dealt with that discomfort by attempting to change the behavior of the student who irritated her. In both cases, it was the teachers' perceptions of, and interactions with, the students which determined whether the students received or did not receive their attention and help.

The importance of the space or differences between students' and teachers' frames of reference were seen in both Rist (1970/2000) and Goldenburg (1992). The teacher in the Goldenburg study (1992) focused her attention on reducing the space between herself and the student who was not doing well, but Rist's (1970/2000) teachers did nothing to reduce that space, and in fact used the distance between themselves and their students as a literal blueprint for their classes. They placed students who were like them in closer proximity and those who were less like them in the far corner of the classroom. In addition, in the Goldenburg study, the child who did not perform as well in the class was perceived by the
teacher as a good child, like the good children in the Rist study; however this perception was ill-founded and the child ended up not getting the attention and instruction she needed.

Reactions to the Context

While teacher expectancy studies documented how teachers' perceptions of, and interactions with, students affected their academic advancement, Ogbo (1995a, 1995b) and Ogbo and Simons (1998) used the cultural ecological theory of school performance to explore how African-American students' reactions to their context affected their academic achievement. They described two forces at work in hindering or encouraging minority students' achievement, the system and community forces. According to Ogbo and Simons (1998), the community forces worked out "collective solutions" to the discriminations of the system, what Ogbo and Simons termed "collective problems" (1998, p.158).

In a study by Ogbo and Simons (1998) examining the achievement of various minority groups around the world, Ogbo differentiated between two major minority status types and the different perceptions and responses to schooling which contributed to the minorities' academic achievement. The two types of minority status were voluntary (immigrant) minorities and involuntary (non-immigrant) minorities (See Definitions, p. 28). The status of voluntary or involuntary minorities was not based on race. Ogbo and Simons (1998) cited a number of examples of ethnic groups which would be involuntary in one nation yet voluntary in another. For example, African-Americans would generally be voluntary in France or Japan, but involuntary in the United States. According to Ogbo, it is

---

1 Ogbo and Simons co-authored the article, but Simons wrote the pedagogical implications while Ogbo explained his theory.
2 In this work Ogbo (1998) also defines refugee, migrant workers, undocumented workers and binationals, but his research focuses on voluntary and involuntary minorities.
history that is at issue, not race or ethnicity; a point which he accentuated using a quote from Colin Powell (1995).

My Black ancestors may have been dragged to Jamaica in chains, but they were not dragged to the United States. That is a far different emotional and psychological beginning than that of American Blacks, whose ancestors were brought here in chains (cited in Ogbu & Simons, 1998, p. 168).

In terms of schooling, it is each minority's historical vantage point, whether they are voluntary or involuntary minorities, which determines their perceptions and responses to schooling--their frame of reference. Voluntary minorities, like the settler societies which came before them, arrived in a country with a positive dual frame of reference. One frame of reference was based on their situation "back home" while the other one was based on their new situation in their country of immigration--for example, the United States. They saw their situation of discrimination as temporary and hoped to do better in the U.S. than they did "back home." They also trusted that education would bring them success and they saw the "white ways" of Standard English as additive, which is to say that they did not feel that their culture was threatened by learning "white ways."

Likewise, involuntary minorities have a dual frame of reference. However, they do not see their situation in the U.S. as better than "back home." Involuntary minorities' second frame of reference is that of the middle class white majority and they see their economic and social condition as inferior. They have a negative dual frame of reference. They do not believe that schooling and education necessarily lead to success, nor do they believe the "white ways" learned in school as an addition to their cultural knowledge. They see school culture and Standard English as an imposition and a threat to their identity.

In an earlier study, Ogbu (1995a) discussed differences in the creation of cultural frames of reference by voluntary and involuntary minorities. The cultural frame of reference
of voluntary minorities existed before they were introduced to the settler society. They see
the new dominant culture as something to be learned, as an obstacle to be overcome. Their
cultural frame of reference is not oppositional. Whereas for involuntary minorities, their
culture grew in response to being subordinated by the majority culture. This culture includes
attitudes which have been stigmatized by the dominant group. Involuntary minorities use
culture to define group status, which is to say who is a *bona fide* member of the group. The
use of the dominant group speech patterns, behavior or attitudes are all considered
disaffiliation from the group identity and are therefore to be avoided. Members who exhibit
these behaviors "act like the enemy." Fixity of identity in this case is in order to avoid
assimilation into the dominant culture.

Fordham (1988) explored how high-achieving students were stretched between the
collective ethos of the African-American community and the individualistic ethos in the
school context. The importance of this cohesiveness vs. individualism was an important
factor in the African-American experiences in the classroom, especially with regards to high-
achieving African-American students. Fordham (1988) analysed "the tensions high-
achieving Black students feel when they strive for academic success" (p. 54). Using
examples from interviews with a variety of African-American professionals, Fordham (1988)
found that African-American men described feelings negated by a society that wished to
make them raceless. While African-American women, by accepting "racelessness," lost a
sense of belonging or had little emotional attachment to the African-American community.
Fordham (1988) believes that "Black Americans who gain entry into predominantly White
institutions are likely not only to experience enormous stress and feelings of isolation and
ambivalence, but also to be viewed suspiciously… as 'un-Black people'" (p. 60).
Fordham interviewed and observed six high-achieving students, three males and three females, in a predominantly African-American (99%) D.C. high school. She found that the female students not only used racelessness as a means of social mobility, but they also internalized values and beliefs of the dominant system. Racelessness put social distance between them and their less successful peers. Male students were more conflicted; they did not want to be identified as different from their peers and as a consequence, they sometimes diminished their academic efforts or played the class clown.

Neither the female nor the male students believed they could be truly bi-cultural. This suggests that students had fixed notions of identity. The schools supported racelessness (which is actually the acceptance of the white value and belief system) and fixed notions of identity in many ways. The schools tracked "raceless" "winners" into the AP courses and the African-American "losers" into other courses. The teachers openly supported the concept of racelessness and the individualistic system which conflicted with the African-American community commitment to collective advancement.

Fordham (1988) concluded her study with the statement that "[i]t is imperative that Black Americans define explicitly their relationship to the larger society" (p. 82). She added that since the individualistic ethos of schooling continues to dominate, if "Black Americans are willing to have their children evince behaviors… that suggest a lack of connectedness to the larger Black community, then racelessness is a pragmatic strategy that more Black Americans should embrace" (p. 82).

While Fordham (1988) revealed how students relinquish their identity in order to succeed in school, Steele (2000) described how holding fast to one's identity resulted in failure at school. Steele used a Moral-Power model to explicate the achievement gap. In this
model, the African-American identity is seen as a currency with which one manipulates the majority. Steele believed that schooling was perceived as a subtractive process which threatens the African-American identity. According to him, since school was considered to assimilate--i.e., destroy--the African-American identity, and since identity is of higher value than competence, resistance to schooling was a natural by-product.

Similarly, Ogbu (1999) recounted how one parent complained that "the school is pulling away Black children and immigrant children from their mother tongues but [he] is glad that unlike the immigrants, Black children are resisting learning White proper English" (p. 176). This resistance resembled the resistance of students described by Willis (1981), Foley (1990) and MacLeod (1995)--a resistance which ultimately resulted in academic failure for the young English boys in Willis's "Learning to Labor," for the "shitkickers" and "vatos" in Foley's "Learning Capitalist Culture," and finally for the African-Americans in MacLeod's "Ain't no makin' it."

Ogbu (1994) found that in correlational studies "when black children and white children from a similar SES are compared, black children at every class level do less well than white children" (p. 283). Ogbu (1994) used racial stratification to explain why inequalities persist. Racial stratification in education consisted of both "white treatment of blacks in the educational domain and black responses to schooling" (p. 287). Ogbu (1994) contended that racial stratification could adversely affect African-American education through the perceptions and treatment of African-American students in the schools they attend. As literature on teacher expectancy and student resistance revealed that student and teacher interactions were often founded on fixed notions of identity, the following section explores teachers' and students' perceptions of race and identity in the classroom.
Race and Identity in the Classroom

This section focuses on teachers' and students' negotiation of race, racism and identity and how language is of particular importance in terms of identity in the classroom. The first sub-section examines how white teachers view themselves and "other." Next, minority students' social self-construction regarding race are reviewed and finally, the pivotal importance of language in terms of identity and with regards to African-American students in particular are examined.

Teachers and "Other"

Sleeter (1993) investigated how white teachers constructed race and discussed the implications of a "whitening" of the teacher force. She conducted a two-year staff development program for 30 volunteer teachers. The volunteers were from schools in which one third of the students were from a racial minority or from low-income families. The staff development consisted of nine all-day sessions the first year and five the second year. Throughout the two years, Sleeter (1993) conducted classroom observations and interviews with the teacher-volunteers. In the two school districts in which the volunteers taught, the cultural-deficiency perspective framed the majority of the problems facing students of color, and programs to help students of color were designed to remedy the students' deficits.

Two themes emerged regarding the teachers' conceptions of race, "color blindness," and "using culture to ease the process of assimilation." Teachers who purported being "color-blind" conceptualized racism as the unfair application of probably accurate stereotypes. Delpit (1995) discussed teachers' "color blindness," advising that teachers claiming to be color blind send a message that "there is something wrong with being black or brown, that it should not be noticed [original italics]" (p. 177). Delpit continued to describe
the effects of this "color blindness" and suggested "that if one does not see color, then one does not really see children. Children made 'invisible' in this manner become hard-pressed to see themselves worthy of notice" (Delpit, 1995, p.177). Within the undertone of cultural deficiency the other attitude held by white teachers was that of mutual cultural adaptation. Teachers considered it their responsibility to help students make up for gaps between their cultures and school culture (in other words the children were deficient).

Sleeter found that the majority of teachers saw race through the European ethnic experience or the "ethnicity theory." She used Omi and Winant's (1986) definition that ethnicity theory assigned blacks and other racial minority groups the roles which earlier generations of European immigrants had played in the great waves of the "Atlantic migration" of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (p. 20, cited in Sleeter, 1993, p. 160).

The problem with this ethnicity theory is that it overlooks the complicity of white institutions in subordinating others. Minorities are seen in the same light as earlier immigrants to the United States, like many of the white teachers' ancestors. Interviews with the teachers, conducted by Sleeter, indicated that for many of the participating teachers, racism was tantamount to irrational thinking which could be corrected with the introduction of rational thought. Yet, blazing the standard of rational thinking did not keep the white teachers from denying the complicity of white institutions in subordinating others. Nor did it help white teachers understand that for others, one's ethnic identity is not a choice (or a fashion--a set of earrings and a long skirt which one wears to festivals).

Sleeter (1993) believed that white teachers were unable to overcome racism because they had a vested interest in the status quo. As Lorde (1984) stated "For the master' tools will never dismantle the master's house" (p. 112). Sleeter (1993) underlined fixed notions of identity within the teacher rank and file. She suggested that more minorities needed to be
recruited to teach. While that is true, Rist's (1970/2000) study revealed that African-American teachers equally conformed to fixed notions of identity which favored white middle-class culture.

In the vein of Sleeter's (1993) examination of teachers' perceptions about race, Kailin (1999) investigated how white teachers perceived racism in their schools. Using an open-ended questionnaire, Kailin probed into the views of teachers in a school district which was considered to be very liberal. Kailin (1999) analyzed and coded responses to create three categories to which white teachers attributed racial problems. These categories were (1) the attribution of racial problems to African-Americans; (2) the attribution of racial problems to whites; (3) and the attribution of racial problems to institutional/cultural factors.

The most prevalent theme, which Kailin identified and which corresponded to Sleeter's (1993) findings, was the attribution of racial problems to African-Americans by 45.5% of the respondents. The conception that African-American students came from bad home environments, that education was not valued in their homes, or that African-American students received preferential treatment were all examples of how teachers attributed racial problems to African-Americans. In addition, Kailin identified some friction among African-American staff members, parents and students. White teachers were angry at being perceived as racists. Interestingly, in a questionnaire which specifically requested anonymity, the white teachers specified the African-American teachers' names when they spoke of racial antagonism; however, when African-American teachers' mentioned racist white teachers, they did not give any specific names. This pointed to a certain cohesiveness and desire to exclude others for those who share white teachers' culture or frame of reference.
While nearly 46% of the teachers participating in Kailin's (1999) study attributed racial problems to African-Americans, quite a few teachers did not. In fact, 40% of the participating teachers attributed racial problems to whites. Many teachers witnessed blatant racist language and unfair treatment of African-American students. However, while many teachers recognized the racism occurring in their schools, they did not take the responsibility of counteracting it. White teachers reported feeling powerless, embarrassed, and afraid to "rock the boat." As Kailin (1999) reported, "Hence we see another dimension of the persistence of racism: silence" (p. 742).

Sleeter (1993) revealed a tendency for teachers to establish a theory, be it the ethnicity theory or that of acculturation and being unable or unwilling to change that system. Kailin (1999) revealed a resistance to change, even with regards to systems of viewing differences which teachers understood to be unfair and racist. Both studies suggested that teachers operated within fixed frames of reference or borders with which teachers categorized their students and colleagues. Further, both studies highlighted an unwillingness by teachers to resist or even question those frames.

Henze, Lucas and Scott (1998) underlined the difficulty in trying to discuss identities and negotiate frames of reference within the educational context. These researchers observed 60 teachers during a staff development institute. The staff development began with four teacher panelists summarizing an article by Lisa Delpit (1988, reprinted in Delpit, 1995) titled "The silenced dialogue: Power and pedagogy in educating other people's children." Henze, Lucas and Scott (1998) investigated the extent to which the participants were able to discuss racism, power and white privilege, and what facilitated or impeded this discussion.
The title of the article, "Dancing with the Monster," foreshadowed the difficulties which were encountered in the hour and ten minute teacher discussion of racism and their own privilege.

During the discussion, one of the teachers, Juan, discussed the problems he had about not being heard. He spoke of a white male movement which he had confronted in his department and how "they got nervous and they weren't willing to admit to it" (p. 199). The valor of his experiences were nullified when a white woman (Judy) superimposed her conception of sexism on to Juan's description of oppression. Judy explained how she simply "got over it." She went on to say, "It's their problem. I do my job " (p. 200). Juan was silenced. Sleeter (1993) described how the teachers' belief in an ethnicity theory denies the complicity of white institutions in subordinating others. Likewise, Judy's "pick yourself up by the bootstraps" point of view denied the complicity of the white institution. White teachers in Sleeter's study (1993) described ethnicity as being a choice. This intense version of individualism is seen in Judy's description of the white males who oppressed Juan as stupid white people, just like there were stupid men who oppressed her as a woman.

Hence, the system which Juan perceived as the source of his oppression was nothing but a few "stupid" individuals. Following that logic, then the replacement of those stupid white males with more rational, liberal thinkers should solve the problem. Britzman, Santiago-Valles, Jimenez-Munoz, and Lamash (1993) described this same mentality in "Slips that show and tell." They described multicultural education as generally being preoccupied with "supplying students with 'accurate' and 'authentic' representations of particular cultures in the hope that such corrective gestures will automatize tolerant attitudes" (pp. 188-89). A multicultural education which believes that the void of ignorance merely needs to be filled with rationality and which believed the myth that "rationality leads to
sensitivity" (p. 195) was described by Britzman et al. as a failure. It overlooked the problem that ignorance or stupidity is not merely a void to be filled.

According to this enlightenment logic, learning is an orderly progression from ignorance to knowledge; ignorance is thus understood as an originary state, not as an effect of the knowledge one holds, and so typically, making space for ignorance is not an educational priority. (Britzman et al., 1993, p. 195)

Britzman et al. (1993) consider the commitment to rationality as being antithetical to multicultural education because it positions all participants as equal, "as if one could choose to be unencumbered by larger dynamics of domination and subordination" (p. 196). So, not only are there fixed notions of identity protected through silence, but the very notion that these identities could affect our understanding, perceptions and learning is denied.

In Britzman et al.'s (1993) description of two student teachers' multicultural lessons, the authors revealed how high school students, like the teachers described in Henze, Lucas and Scott (1998), either clung to, or denied, identity markers. In all cases there was a reluctance to complicate their tidy and familiar world. Kailin's (1999) beliefs about a "conspiracy of silence" equally pointed to a reluctance to "rock the boat" or to change a familiar world.

Students' Social Self-constructions

Dolby (2000) did not study white teachers or any teachers at all. Her study examined high school students in a South African high school. Yet, within her work, she cited an important issue which relates to Kailin's (1999) and Sleeter's (1993) critiques of white teachers. Dolby examined the changing of identity and the importance of a critical examination of differences. Dolby (1997) cited Burbules, "[t]olerance of difference, or for that matter celebrations of difference, are not the ultimate educational outcome we should be after; it is the critical re-examination of difference, the questioning of our own systems of

Dolby (2000) examined the transformation of students' identities when the context within which the students were learning was radically altered. In this case Dolby (2000) studied high school students' identities following the fall of apartheid. Citing Foucault's (1980) belief that difference is always constructed within, expresses and produces power (p. 902), Dolby revealed how identity and differences in identity reflected the surrounding power structure by describing the transformation of "coloured" students and their migration from peers of black South African students to peers of white South African students as the power shifted from white to black.

While the fall of apartheid was an obvious and irrefutable change in context, Tyson (1999) described how students created their identities in what should have been two distinctively different contexts, but ended up being similar contexts. Tyson (1999) described fourth grade student attitudes, behaviors and achievement in a private "all-Black by parental choice" school and an "all-Black through de facto segregation" school. Both schools touted a commitment to "Black children's self-esteem and their achievement," yet both schools "undermined those commitments by conveying messages of Black cultural deviance to students" (p. 242).

Tyson found evidence in both schools of the belief of cultural deficiency, the use of white students to represent standards of achievement, and students' opposition and disengagement from the classroom. Both schools showed evidence that difference was considered to be deviant; difference carried pejorative connotations. "Goodness" on the other hand seemed to be associated with "white middle class cultural styles" (p. 246). The cultures
of both schools resulted in what Tyson termed "repressive cultural socialization" (p. 248). The emphasis on discipline tended to punish students for expressing excitement about what they learned, what Tyson termed "ability shows" (p. 248). Tyson also found that students were confused by the positive messages of self-worth coupled with the messages regarding their deviance from the white norm. While some aspects of African-American culture and history were celebrated, the school attempted to extinguish Black vernacular language and some types of behavior.

Wright and Taylor (1995) examined the effects of three different contexts on Inuit, mixed heritage and white students' identities. The authors investigated the differential effects of early education in the heritage language versus early immersion in a second language (L2) programs--both English and French--on the child's self-categorization, personal, and collective self-esteem. Using group of pictures of Inuit, white, and the students' own pictures, Wright and Taylor had students classify themselves and the other children in the picture according to various positive and negative traits (happy, nice, not many friends). For self-categorization of ethnicity, the Inuit and the White children were fairly clear on this subject, especially at the end of the school year. The Inuits went from 92% categorizing themselves as Inuit in the Fall to 97% in the Spring. The Whites went from 93% in the Fall to 100% in the Spring. The mixed heritage students had a more interesting story going from 52% categorizing themselves as Inuit in the Fall to 39% in the Spring. These changes were not statistically significant.

In terms of personal self-esteem, overall the self-esteem of white and mixed heritage students was significantly higher than that of Inuit. However, in the heritage language program the Inuits showed significant improvement in self-esteem and the mixed heritage
students in the heritage language program showed approaching significant improvement in personal self-esteem. The Inuit and mixed heritage students in the L2 program both showed lower self-esteem but neither reduction was deemed significant.

For collective self-esteem, the white and mixed heritage students were significantly more likely to positively rate the white targets. White for white bias was greater in the spring. Inuit in the heritage language showed a bias for in-groups and those in the L2 showed a bias toward out-groups; but this bias was already present in the Fall, so it cannot be attributed to the program of study. Mixed heritage students were significantly more positive toward the white targets, but it was not stated whether there was a difference between heritage language and L2 programs. For collective self-esteem, as judged by friendship preferences, the white students seemed to show signs of ethnocentrism after Kindergarten. Although in the Fall 30% of their chosen friends were Inuit, by Spring only 10% of them were Inuit. The mixed heritage children also chose significantly more whites. Inuits showed no particular preference. This study brings to light both the positive and negative effects that different contexts can have on student identities. Furthermore, it underscores the importance of language in student identities.

The role that language plays in establishing identity, fixing borders and frames of reference, especially within the African-American community, is an area of scholarship on which the next section focuses.

Language and Identity

Ogbu (1995a) stated that the schools contributed to minorities' problem of identity with the school context by expecting minorities to give up their ethnic dialects or languages, and by assuming that they must give them up in order to learn Standard English. This
conflict between school and ethnic identity was referred to by DeVos (1980) as an "affective dilemma" (cited in Ogbu, 1995a). In his subsequent case study, Ogbu (1995b) found evidence of ambivalence in the involuntary minority community which stemmed from this school-identity dilemma.

Ogbu (1995b) studied two different communities, a Chinese-American community (voluntary minority) and an African-American community (involuntary minority), over a period of two years. The two year, two case study ethnography used participant observations, interviews, surveys and school documents to determine how these communities thought the U.S. education system worked and how they tried to gain access to education. Both communities perceived many similar hurdles to be overcome in getting an education. Both communities encountered cross-cultural misunderstandings such as no parental involvement for the Chinese Americans, and verbal dueling for the African-Americans. There were also language and communication barriers for both communities. Chinese Americans have a tonal rather than a stressed language while African-Americans have different meanings for English words and their theory of speaking--what is or is not good speech--is not legitimized in school. Ogbu (1995b) also found that both communities had different conceptual knowledge and learning styles, and both had been subjected to a cultural hegemony in the form of Jim Crow schools which tracked them on a level lower than that of white students.

The difference was found, not in the obstacles placed before them, but in how they interpreted these obstacles and the consequences of these interpretations on their ability to overcome them. Chinese Americans developed what Ogbu (1995b) termed an "alternation strategy" or what Gibson (1988) called "accommodation without assimilation" (cited in
Ogbu, 1995b). Chinese Americans believed that learning English would lead to success. English did not pose a threat to their own language or culture. They could alternate between the dual frames of reference without any detriment to either.

For the African-American community there was ambivalence with regard to Standard English. The parents discussed how they believed that their children needed and should learn Standard or "proper" English, yet in the community and in the home the use of Standard English was equated with "Acting White" and was considered a betrayal. Ogbu (1995b) stated that "involuntary minority students need programs to help them learn to approach the learning of school cultural practices and language as an additive process" (p. 293).

The importance of language in identity cannot be overemphasized. Indeed Ogbu (1995b) stated that most ethnographies explicitly discuss language differences. Another study by Ogbu (1999) considers the importance of language differences and identity in the African-American speech community. Ogbu (1999) defined a speech community as "a population that shares both a common language or linguistic codes and a common theory of speaking or cultural rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech acts" (p. 150).

In what appears to be the same previous ethnographic study as Ogbu (1995a, 1995b), Ogbu (1999) underlined the connections between students' dialect beliefs, attitudes and behaviors in school with those of their parents and communities. He did this by examining research on diglossia and bilingualism, particularly the research of Fishman (1967) and his four proposed diglossia relationships in a speech community. Ogbu (1999) defined the first three of these relationships. 1) Diglossia and bilingualism commonly originate from

---

3The ethnography also detailed a Mexican American community, but it was not included in this article.
colonization, conquest or enslavement; they are found in a speech community in which an oppressor imposes its language and communication patterns on a subordinate population. 2) Bilingualism without diglossia hypothetically occurred in a formally diglossia speech community in which the status of the two languages is questioned and there is no separate function for each language. 3) Diglossia without bilingualism occurs when formally separate speech communities are brought together by moving/redrawing political boundaries. In this relationship, the other group's language is not learned. Ogbu (1999) gave the example of Calabar, Nigeria, where he grew up and where a shift of borders caused several language groups to settle next to each other; yet members of these language groups did not learn any of the other immigrants' languages nor did the British learn any immigrant languages. However, Ogbu (1999) stated that the immigrants did learn and use English, so this situation appears to fit better in the bilingualism and diglossia relationship category. The last of Fishman's (1967) diglossia relationship categories is when a speech community in which neither bilingualism nor diglossia are found, 4) a monolingual community. This is a rare occurrence which happens only in isolated communities.

To add to Fishman's (1967) speech community types, Ogbu (1999) created a fifth type called diglossia, bilingualism and collective identity. He built this speech community type based on a two-year ethnography of an African-American speech community in California, which he called "Lafayette." Three researchers from within the community of Lafayette gathered data for the ethnography through of informal and formal interactions with the community and participant observations of community events such as religious services,

---

4 Diglossia is "the relationship between two dialects or two languages that are used for different purposes within a speech community" (Ogbu, 1999, p. 150).
informal gatherings, and meetings on special issues. The observations allowed the researchers to compare what was said to them in interviews to what people actually did.

What Ogbu (1999) found was that both African-American adults and children in the Lafayette speech community perceived a difference between white American "correct" or "proper" English and African-American "plain talkin'" or "slang." Both adults and children in the community were also aware of the higher status given to white English and they equated white English with Standard English. In addition to having different types of status, the two dialects had different functions. "Slang" English was for everyday use and was associated with comfort and feeling comfortable. Within the Lafayette speech community, people did not initiate communication in "proper" English and those who did were called "Oreos" because they talked like white people and were therefore considered as "white on the inside." "Proper" English was for outside the community or talking with outsiders. The researchers who worked as student aides in the school saw dialect-switching at school with standard English being used in the classroom and "slang" English in the hallways.

These observations underlined Ogbu's (1999) fifth diglossia relationship--that of diglossia, bilingualism and collective identity. Ogbu (1999) stated, "the language or dialect differences serve as boundary-maintenance mechanisms and provide the minorities with a sense or self-worth" (p. 155). Hence the use of Standard English with outsiders and "slang" English within the community.

Although the comfortable way to speak was using slang, both adults and children in the Lafayette community understood the problems caused by differences between "slang" and Standard English. The parents spoke of not understanding what teachers talked about, or believed that teachers thought they were ignorant because of the low status of their dialect.
While students spoke of the importance of speaking Standard English in order to get an education and a job, they saw African-American speakers of Standard English as thinking they were superior to other African-Americans. They interpreted speaking Standard English as "puttin' on," as an unnatural way to speak. Not only did the Lafayette community perceive Standard English as unnatural, they perceived it as a threat to their identity. The proof of which was found in family members who moved to predominantly white communities and whose children no longer spoke the "slang."

This belief of English as a threat to community identity is reflected in Aguirre's (2000) study of the perceptions of Puerto Rican college students toward a politically-charged, imposed dominant language, English, and a less politically-charged language (in that region) that students chose to take as an elective, namely French. Using questionnaires, Aguirre found that students preferred French and perceived themselves to be doing better after one or two semesters of French than after 12 years of obligatory English instruction. Aguirre believed that these perceptions were reinforced by the students' belief that English was assimilationist while French was perceived as an additive language.

The importance of language and classroom contexts in establishing identity has been reviewed as has the role of identity in teachers' and students' perceptions of themselves and others within the classroom. The next section reviews research on French immersion as a site in which students can learn academic material and redefine their identities within a context which differs from regular education.
French Immersion and Minorities

Research on immersion in general and French immersion in particular offers insight into how well at-risk minorities perform in immersion programs and what the context inside these programs is like. This section examines those two aspects of French immersion.

Achievement and Minorities

Foreign language study has been shown to foster the acquisition of basic skills (Garfinkel & Tabor, 1991; Johnson, Flores and Ellison, 1959; Masciantonio, 1977; Rafferty, 1986) and can even be used as an equally, if not more, effective means of teaching basic skills, as in the case of French immersion (Bruck, Lambert & Tucker, 1974; Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999; Holobow, Genesee, Lambert, Gastriight, & Met, 1987). This section examines literature which reports on the effect the immersion context has on immersion students, specifically on any additional benefits immersion may provide for minority students.

In general, immersion students' basic skills are very strong. Bruck, Lambert and Tucker (1974) studied the first French immersion program in Canada, the St. Lambert project, in its eighth year. No statistical analyses were done on the scores because the previous six years the analyses had shown that there was no detrimental effect on the students due to immersion, and both the control group and the immersion group had suffered from attrition to the point where statistical analyses would have been ineffective. The students were tested on English language skills, mathematical skills, French language skills and cognitive flexibility. In terms of basic skills, the study found that the English language skills of the immersion group were above grade level while the mathematical skills of the
immersion group were equal to the control group. The previous seven years of study had also found that immersion students did as well or better than the control group.

The question remained, does a foreign language immersion program improve the basic skills of minorities? Holobow, Genesee, Lambert, Gastright, and Met (1987) found that minority students achieved better linguistically in an immersion program than in a regular English program. Holobow et al. studied 73 kindergartners in an immersion program and 70 in the regular program in Cincinnati public schools. The students were matched based on pre-test scores, and it was found that in English language arts the students in both groups did as predicted based on their SES. After completion of the school year, it was discerned that the immersion students were on par with the regular education program students in terms of English language skills; however, the lower SES students made significant progress in French language arts. The immersion students made so much progress that the degree of progress could not be linked to SES. In other words, the effect of SES on progress in French language arts diminished. This, after only one year of immersion in a half-day kindergarten class. From data gathered the following year, Holobow, Genesee and Lambert (1991) did a follow-up study in which they controlled the testing more closely. They found that minorities did as well on verbal language arts in French; however, in written language arts, a Black/White achievement gap was perceived.

The notion that early language learning encourages students who are less likely to achieve is also found in Caldas and Boudreaux (1999). Their study, conducted in Louisiana, showed the benefits of foreign language instruction, specifically French immersion instruction, on the basic skills of minority students after four or more years in the program. Caldas and Boudreaux (1999) investigated the effects French immersion instruction had on
the basic skills of minority students and/or students from a high level of poverty school at
grades three, five and seven. They scrutinized various independent variables which could
have affected each group's (African-American or white; immersion or non-immersion) mean
score.

Caldas and Boudreaux (1999) discovered that Louisiana immersion students did
better than their non-immersion counterparts regardless of any independent variable. They
also discovered that the more time students spent in the French program the greater their
academic achievement, especially in English. Finally, Caldas and Boudreaux (1999) found
that "French immersion had a differential effect on academic achievement, returning
significantly greater dividends in schools with higher levels of poverty" (pp. 12-13). They
also found that African-American immersion students did better in high poverty schools than
African-American immersion students in low poverty schools.

In fact, in poor schools, immersion African-Americans’ mean score in English (88.1
%) was only one point lower than their white immersion counterparts (89.2%) while non-
immersion African-Americans (76.6%) had a more than six point differential from their
white counterparts (82.8%). When the students' math scores where examined in these same
poor schools, both the immersion African-American (90.1 %) and immersion white students
(90.9%) outscored their non-immersion African-American (75.8%) and white (80.8%)
counterparts. Although the immersion scores differed by less than a point, the difference
between African-American and white non-immersion students was five points. In fact, in
math, the overall average of immersion African-American students (90.4%) was higher than
immersion white (89.5%), non-immersion African-American (74.6%) and non-immersion
white students (82.3%). Thus, the achievement gap in math, which was evidenced in regular
education between African-American and white students, was not apparent in the French immersion context after four to eight years in the program.

These findings have a limited generalizability due to the small size of the sample. Out of 25 African-American immersion students 20 were in high poverty schools, leaving only five African-Americans in low poverty schools. Overall, the numbers of African-American students in dual language programs such as immersion is minimal (Lindholm-Leary, 2001). In addition, Caldas and Boudreaux drew both the regular education participants and the immersion participants from the same schools which limits the validity of the study due to the following threats to validity: experimental treatment diffusion, compensatory rivalry, and/or resentful demoralization.

Lindholm-Leary (2001) investigated the academic achievement of 4900 students in dual-track immersion programs (See Definitions, p. 28) mostly in California with one school in Alaska over a period of four to eight years. Rather than compare the students to non-immersion students, Lindholm-Leary determined whether or not students were below, on or above level in Academic language proficiency (L1 and L2) and content area achievement. With regards to African-American students, they scored "at level" in grades one and two but below level in grades three and five in L1 proficiency. In L2 proficiency African-American students scored below level at all grade levels. In mathematics, African-American students scored "at level" in grades one, three and six and below grade level in grades four and five, but five was slightly below.

As with Caldas and Boudreaux (1999), these findings have limited generalizability due to the size of the sample--only 3% of the 4900 participants were African-American. It is important to note that Lindholm-Leary, based on their findings from the study, determined
that African-American students benefit from dual-language immersion programs. They based this conclusion on the fact that most of the African-American students in the study came from a lower Socio-Economic level. In other words, they believed that these students would have scored below grade-level whether they were in immersion or not. Further, in terms of the language in the dual-track immersion context, as in Aguirre's study, the dominant language in the dual-track immersion classroom is Standard English, a language which the poorer African-American students may have perceived as assimilationist.

**Immersion Context**

Within the immersion context there are a myriad of influences bearing on students. One of the most evident is the teacher's interaction with the students. Teacher interaction is especially important at the primary level when students are unable, or just beginning, to communicate in the second language (L2). Tardiff (1994) compared kindergarten immersion and non-immersion teachers' discourses and found that immersion teachers frequently made use of pre-modified input and interacted more with the students. Immersion teachers also used context clues and paralinguistic elements three times as much as the regular education teachers. Thusly, Tardiff surmised, the immersion teacher was setting up "scaffolds" (Bruner, 1975, cited in Tardiff, 1994) to facilitate comprehension and achievement.

Likewise, Peregoy's (1991) study of interaction in a kindergarten two-way immersion classroom uncovered the various ways in which the immersion context was set up by the teacher to provide scaffolds (Bruner, 1978, cited in Peregoy, 1991). Using anecdotal notes collected on a bi-weekly basis over the course of the 1988-1989 school year, the author described scaffolds as coming from previous teacher-directed activities or from the native
speaker peer elements available in a two-way immersion setting. However, in the French immersion setting native speaker peers are rarely present in the classroom situation.

Tarone and Swain (1995) attributed the need for group membership to an interaction problem common in many upper elementary immersion classrooms, both Spanish and French immersion. This sociolinguistic study of immersion students revealed how this need to belong to a group affects the language in which students interact. The authors used various interviews with immersion students to explore why the older immersion students (third grade and up) tended not to use the second language (L2) in the classroom, particularly when conversing with one another. They hypothesized that a diglossic situation with a superordinate (formal) language, notably the L2, and a subordinate (vernacular) language occurs in the immersion classroom. They felt that the older students tended to mark their identity and socialize with their vernacular language, which happened to be their L1. Tarone and Spain (1995), in speaking with students, found that socialization was much more important to students than staying in L2 and looking like a "dweeb." In speaking with older immersion students, they found that the students wanted to learn the vernacular version of the L2, but it was not available to them in the classroom setting. Students in a Spanish immersion school frequently asked the teacher's aide how to say words such as "dork," "fresh," or "cool." Unlike the dual-track immersion program in which Standard English was the primary goal, in the Spanish and French immersion contexts it was vernacular English which was given an elevated place in the children's social interactions, albeit it was sometimes to the detriment of L2 usage.

This social detachment from the L2 was found in two-way (dual-track) Spanish/English immersion (See Definitions, p. 28). Lindholm-Leary (2001) distributed an attitudinal
questionnaire to 611 dual language education grades 3-8 students. Of particular interest is the fact that the poorer African-American students disassociated the most with the L2. They were the least likely to enjoy learning the language and the least likely to want to continue in the study of the L2. However, as with the immersion studies on African-American students, this study was limited by the sampling size. Only five percent of the 611 students were African-American. Furthermore, in the two-way dual track immersion setting the focus was on learning English, Standard English, and using the students as resources for their native language.

Valdés (1997) discussed the problem with intergroup relations in dual-track immersion schools, the main problem being the impact of the larger society's values on the teachers and students. For example, in the dual-track immersion setting, the minority children were expected to learn English, while the acquisition of a second language for the mainstream child was enthusiastically applauded. Valdés commented that children are generally keenly aware of this difference in attitudes toward their language acquisition (Valdés, 1997). So perhaps poorer African-Americans were equally aware of negative attitudes toward their non-standard language. In terms of language and power, the language minority was still seen as "the other" in the dual-track immersion. Valdés (1997) pointed out that the white middle-class standard is still the base against which all "others" are measured.

Summary

The above literature focused on the reasons that researchers gave for the achievement gap and the importance of identity construction--the way that teachers and students construct identities--within the classroom context; and the importance of language in constructing
identity. The final section examined the effects French immersion had on African-American students' achievement and the classroom context.

Whereas some researchers used statistical correlations to support hypotheses attributing the cause of the Black/White achievement gap to either family background or genetics (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994; Jencks & Phillips, 1998), other researchers investigated teachers and students within the classroom to determine the reasons why this gap persists (Rist, 1970/2000; Tyson, 1999).

Within the classroom, teachers were shown to devalue African-American types of behavior and language whilst holding white middle class behavior patterns and language as the standard (Rist, 1970/2000; Tyson, 1999). It also appeared that many teachers agreed with the concept that the achievement gap was due to factors outside the teacher's control (Kailin, 1999; Sleeter, 1993; Voltz, 1998). When questioned concerning racism in schools, teachers would either "blame the victim," attributed it to irrationality, or they fell into a "conspiracy of silence," not wanting to "rock the boat" (Britzman et al., 1993; Kailin, 1999; Henze, Lucas & Scott, 1998).

African-American students reacted to, opposed and disengaged from, this repressive school context (Ogbu, 1995a, 1995b, 1999; Tyson, 1999). They saw schooling as assimilationist and their choice as either giving up their identity to succeed--what Fordham (1986) termed "racelessness"--or as opposing and rejecting schooling altogether.

The importance of language in African-American culture cannot be overemphasized. According to Ogbu (1999) it is a premier marker which determines a bona fide member of the culture. Aguirre (2000) discussed the Puerto Rican culture which equally stressed the importance of language in guarding one's identity. The opposition to English as an
assimilationist language and the acceptance of French as an additive language could be a key in understanding the achievement of African-Americans in the French immersion setting.

The French immersion setting has been shown to have additional academic benefits for African-American students to the point of eliminating the achievement gap (Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999; Holobow et al., 1987; Holobow et al. 1991). The context of French immersion has been shown to scaffold children's understanding of both language and content. In addition, a diglossic effect occurred at the later elementary stages in which a vernacular English, not a Standard English and not the L2, became the dominant student language. This raised the prestige of "slang" English within the French immersion classroom. Though African-American students in dual-track immersion classes--in which Standard English was the prestige language--made linguistic gains, they did not appear to make academic gains due to their immersion experiences. Furthermore, African-American students enrolled in dual-language immersion were more likely to not enjoy immersion and to wish to leave the program (Lindholm-Leary, 2001).

The effects French immersion has on African-American students need to be examined more closely. Such few studies are not enough to establish the positive effects of the French immersion context on African-American students. In addition, the studies which have been done on academic achievement of African-American French immersion students have not sought to investigate what happens within the classroom context which could contribute to an improvement in achievement.
CHAPTER 3:  

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURE 

Research Design 

A sequential mixed model design, or what Creswell (1995, cited in Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998) termed the "two-phase design" was used for this study. The initial phase (Phase I) was a quantitative phase and entailed a quantitative causal-comparative examination of fourth graders' achievement in which the defined group is fourth graders in a French immersion context and the comparison group is fourth graders in a regular education context. Phase II was a qualitative phase which examined African-American students' and their teachers' experiences and perceptions of the class in both the French immersion and regular education contexts. This chapter describes the two phases of the study, provides details regarding how validity, reliability and trustworthiness were addressed throughout the study, and discusses the limitations of the study.

Phase I 

Phase I tested hypotheses regarding student achievement (1) based on ethnicity; (2) based on context (immersion or regular education); and (3) any interaction between ethnicity and context.

Sampling 

In Phase I of the study the comparison group was matched with the defined group using a number of procedures. The attributes of the defined group, the matching procedure used and the attributes of the comparison group are described in the following subsections.
French Immersion Schools Sampling Procedure

The entire population of fourth grade Louisiana French immersion classes was invited to participate in this study. In the 2000-2001 school year there were a total of 8 school systems and a total of 25 schools in Louisiana offering a French immersion program with 2069 students enrolled in the Louisiana French immersion programs. Each immersion school containing one or more fourth grade immersion classes and having at least one-fourth grade African-American student was invited to participate in this study.

While all the Louisiana school districts with French immersion programs agreed to participate in this study only ten of the thirteen immersion schools participated. Two of the schools which declined to participate had less than 4% minority students in the school population. The other school was a school with over 90% minority population and over 90% of the students having free or reduced lunch. This minority school, which once had a strong K-4 French immersion program, dismantled its program in the 2002-2003 school year. School personnel would not comment as to why the program had been closed.

The participating schools were categorized according to the school socio-economic status (SES, as determined by the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch), the percentage of minority students attending the school, and the school's School Performance Score (SPS). According to the Louisiana State Department of Education,

The school performance score is calculated for each school, based upon that school’s performance on four indicators. These School Performance Scores will range from 0 to beyond 100. A score of 100 indicates that a school has reached the 10-Year Goal; a score of 150 indicates the school has reached the 20-Year Goal. Each indicator will be given a weight as follows: 1) LEAP 21 Tests: 60%; 2) the Iowa Tests: 30%; 3) Student Attendance: 10% (K-6), 5% (7-12); 4) Dropout Rate: 5% (7-12). (Louisiana's school and district accountability system, 2001).
The information for the ten immersion schools is summarized in Table 3.1. It is important to note that the SPS of the immersion schools rated exceptionally high in comparison with the state average scores. The missing letters "B", "G" and "H" denote the three immersion schools which declined to participate in the study.

Table 3.1 Profile of Participating Louisiana Immersion Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>4th grade immersion students</th>
<th>% Free or reduced lunch</th>
<th>% Minority students</th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>School label</th>
<th>Regional education service center</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>123.3</td>
<td>School of Academic Distinction</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>104.1</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D¹</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>56.43</td>
<td>117.90</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E²</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>114.20</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>65.11</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>Academically Above Average</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I¹</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>83.49</td>
<td>46.14</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>Academically Below Average</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>Academically Below Average</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>108.00</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>94.41</td>
<td>96.03</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>Academically Above Average</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>60.72</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>Academically Above Average</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Averages</td>
<td>15.83</td>
<td>53.78</td>
<td>43.51</td>
<td>96.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Later excluded because the principal declined to send the final LEAP scores to the researcher.
² There are three immersion 4th grade classrooms at this school.
³ Later excluded because there were no African-American 4th grade immersion students in this school.
Regular Education Schools Sampling Procedure

Matching regular education schools were then selected based on the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch, the percentage of minority students, and the regular education school's proximity to the French immersion school. The percentage of students receiving free and reduced lunch and the percentage of minority students are both factors often considered when investigating African-American students and their school achievement (Jencks & Phillips, 1998; Trent, 1998). Close proximity to the immersion school was considered so that the matching schools came from similar regional populations and/or were under the jurisdiction of the same Louisiana regional education service centers as the immersion school population. The close proximity of the schools also ensured study feasibility by enabling the researcher to drive to both schools within the same school day. Close proximity was defined as being within the same regional education service center (Appendix A) and/or around an hour of driving time. This created a proportional stratified sample, drawing from a population similar to that of the French immersion schools. Below is a detailed description of the process by which the matching regular education schools were selected. The matching schools were subsequently designated as RA, RC, etc. to denote a regular education school which matched the immersion school A, C, etc. (See Table 3.2).

In Louisiana, in the 2000-2001 school year, there were 13 elementary Schools of Academic Distinction, 77 Schools of Academic Achievement, 344 Academically Above Average Schools, and 339 Academically Below Average schools. Matching schools were identified using the Louisiana Department of Education website which allows researchers to interact with school accountability data (School performance scores 1999-2000 category and data report, 2000).
Since there were so few schools of Academic Distinction, only the school performance score and distance from the school were considered in matching School A. Overall the Schools of Academic Distinction shared similar characteristics. Most of the schools (12 out of 13) had percentages of students receiving free or reduced lunch at or below 30%. Likewise, most of the schools (11 out of 13) had percentages of minority students at or below 30%. The regular education school matched to School A (School RA) was in closest proximity to the immersion School A (see Table 3.2).

Unlike School A, the other immersion schools matched more regular education schools in terms of their school performance scores, therefore the socio-economic level of the schools and the percentage of minority students attending the school were also considered in choosing a match. To find matching schools for the remaining immersion schools, the percentage of students receiving free or reduced lunch and the percentage minority students were rounded 5% higher and 5% lower to create a usable range for the Louisiana Department of Education interactive internet program. In other words, if a school had 38.6% students receiving free or reduced lunch then a range of 30% - 40% was established. If this range resulted in no schools or in no other schools in close proximity from which to choose then the range was increased by 5% in both directions until a matching school was found.

Some schools were easier to match than others. Immediate matches were found without having to extend the percentage range for the following schools: E with six matches, F with seven matches, I with 11 matches, L with eight matches and M with 19 matches. School C, D and K had no other matched schools until the range was extended by an additional 5% in both directions. School J initially had three matches but one of the
matching schools was nearly 200 miles away and the others did not have a fourth grade class. Once the range was extended by 5% in both directions for School J, seven matching schools were found. Among all the matching schools, the schools in closest proximity to the immersion schools were chosen in each case. This proximity was determined by entering the towns in which the schools were found into the program for driving directions on www.mapquest.com. If the initially selected regular education school declined to participate in the study, the next-closest matching school was then invited to participate. Second choice schools were chosen to match School D and School F, while School C was matched with a third choice school. The characteristics of the matching regular education schools are summarized in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Profile of Matching Regular Education Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Students in selected classroom</th>
<th>% Free or reduced lunch</th>
<th>% Minority students</th>
<th>SPS</th>
<th>School Label</th>
<th>Region and distance from immersion school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>37.54</td>
<td>132.3</td>
<td>School of Academic Distinction</td>
<td>IV Same city 0 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>IV Same city 0 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>39.42</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>II 80 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>21.52</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>V 23.7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RF</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>65.49</td>
<td>64.12</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>Academically Above Average</td>
<td>II 58.9 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>Academically Below Average</td>
<td>V 50.5 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RK</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>33.11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>School of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>VI 68.7 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.09</td>
<td>97.69</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>Academically Above Average</td>
<td>V Same city 0 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>61.59</td>
<td>47.06</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>Academically Above Average</td>
<td>IV 48.2 miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>18.33</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>44.03</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Matching Classroom Selection

Within each regular education school the closest matching classroom(s) to the French immersion classrooms were chosen based on the number of African-American students and students with free or reduced lunch. Immersion schools without African-American students in fourth grade were excluded from the study as well as their matching regular education school. School I was the only participating immersion school which had no African-Americans in the fourth grade. This was a surprising finding considering that School I had a minority population of over 40%, most of whom were African-American. Thus schools I and RI were excluded from the study.

During the classroom selection process it became evident that, despite having matched the schools so closely, the immersion classrooms did not match the regular education classrooms. In fact, in many cases we found that the immersion classrooms did not match the demographics of the school. School I, with a school population of 40% minority students and an immersion classroom with no minority students was a conspicuous example. With regards to the regular education classrooms there were even more differences, the most apparent being the size of the classrooms. Table 3.3 summarizes information about the percentage of minority students and whether students are on free or reduced lunch in order to compare immersion schools, immersion classrooms and regular education classrooms. As revealed in Table 3.3, the immersion classrooms were shown to have fewer minority students, fewer students on free or reduced lunch than both immersion schools and regular education classrooms. In addition French immersion classrooms had smaller average class sizes than the selected regular education classrooms.
Dependent Variable and Measures

The dependent variable of the quantitative phase of the study was the students' academic achievement. This achievement was measured using the fourth grade Louisiana Educational Achievement Program (LEAP) scores while the third grade Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores served as a covariate.

Table 3.3 Classroom Selection Comparison Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Immersion schools</th>
<th>Immersion classrooms</th>
<th>Regular education classrooms</th>
<th>Number of students in selected classroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%Free or reduced lunch</td>
<td>% Minority students</td>
<td>%Free or reduced lunch</td>
<td>% Minority students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>32.45</td>
<td>44.11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>33.39</td>
<td>56.43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 1</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 2</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E 3</td>
<td>31.36</td>
<td>22.03</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>65.11</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>69.34</td>
<td>34.22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>55.44</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>94.41</td>
<td>96.03</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>60.72</td>
<td>46.77</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ITBS is a norm-referenced nationally recognized test used statewide to assess the academic achievement of Louisiana 3rd graders. This test accounts for 30% of the Louisiana school performance score (SPS). A review of the ITBS (Brookhart, 1998) revealed that the validity is evident in the sound content development, by establishing strong correlation and intercorrelation with the Cognitive Abilities Test (CogAT) and correlation with future student grades and test performances. However, the ITBS authors did cite a study by Ansley
and Forsyth (1990) which showed that some problem-solving items tapped mostly computational skills and some tapped mostly reading skills. In terms of reliability, the ITBS is cited as having some of the highest levels of reliability in the testing industry. Most subtest reliabilities were in the .80s and .90s across forms K, L and M.

The LEAP test is a criterion-referenced test which is used statewide to assess the academic achievement of Louisiana fourth graders. In addition to accounting for 60% of a school's performance score, the LEAP test is a high stakes test which fourth graders must pass in order to advance to fifth grade. The test is composed of four parts: English, Math, Social Studies and Science. The students can reach five levels of achievement: advanced, proficient, basic, approaching basic and unsatisfactory. Students must reach an "approaching basic" level or higher in English and Math in order to advance to the fifth grade.

An operational field technical report on the LEAP test in 1999 examined the validity and reliability of two different forms of the fourth grade test (Mitzel & Borden, 2000). Although the two math forms diverged somewhat, Form 2 being apparently more difficult than Form 1, both forms were equated using simultaneous calibration techniques. In terms of validity, item analysis and content validity analysis were done. For the item analysis, the vast majority of the item total correlations for all forms of the math and English tests fell between .1 and .6 (with only four outliers out of 216 items, two of which were over .6). Item correlations falling near .25 - .75 are most desirable because they indicate that a student's performance on the item correlates positively with that student's performance on the test; a student doing well on the test will get that item correct and a student doing poorly on the test will miss the item. Of the 216 items, 195 items fell into this range.
In terms of content validity, the LEAP test was "designed to blueprints specifying the proportion or weight of the test in terms of score points that are devoted to any given content unit" (Mitzel & Borden, 2000, p. 4-1). All forms of the LEAP test were within these "Blueprint Specifications" indicating content validity, and no variation was seen between forms, indicating comparability between the forms.

In terms of reliability, both the Feldt-Raju stratified alpha estimates and the Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficient were in the very good (.80 or greater) to excellent (.85 or greater) range. For the writing assessment segment of the test, the item total correlation was within the .25 - .75 range but the reliability in terms of inter-rater reliability was not as high as the other items in the LEAP test. Depending on the form, 20% to 22% of the raters had only 0-5 point discrepancy between their ratings. Ratings which diverged by 6-10 points comprised 72% of the raters for both forms of the writing assessment. The other raters were off by more than 10 points. The authors underlined that "[I]f the tests are used for high-stakes decisions (e.g., grade promotions), poor levels of rater agreement contribute an additional source of error, which in turn affects test reliability" (Mitzel & Borden, 2000, p. 2-3). In general, there was excellent evidence for the reliability and validity of the fourth grade LEAP test.

**Data Collection Procedures**

Data was collected during the 2001-2002 school year using the current fourth graders ITBS scores from their previous third grade year, demographic data (SES and ethnicity) and their LEAP scores from the current school year. Authorizations were obtained from the school boards and principals (Appendices J & K). Permission from the Internal Review Board was also obtained (Appendix I). In this phase, the LEAP scores of French immersion
fourth grade classes were compared to the matching regular education student scores while controlling for the previous third grade ITBS scores.\(^4\)

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis for Phase I served two purposes. It served as a constructive replication of the Caldas and Boudreaux’s (1999) study, which found that French immersion was a strong predictor for academic achievement especially among African-American students. Furthermore, the initial data collected for Phase I served as the starting point for the qualitative analysis by providing the descriptive statistics of the students' ITBS achievement test scores which were used to identify two typical case schools. In addition, quantitative data provided information on the schools' SES which were used to identify two extreme case schools that is the two schools operating with students in extreme poverty.

To determine whether the differences in students’ LEAP test scores were significant or not an analysis of variance was needed. Although the regular education classrooms were matched with the immersion classrooms, there were still differences in the two student populations which could not be controlled, such as the fact that the immersion students were placed in the program based on parental choice. In order to minimize initial differences between the groups which could not be controlled through matching, an Analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was conducted in Phase I using a 2x2 design, with a covariate of the students' ITBS scores. The 2x2 design included the effects of (1) ethnicity (white or African-American) and (2) context (French immersion or regular education) on academic achievement. Using the covariate of the students' ITBS scores, the ANCOVA was used to

---

\(^4\) Originally, SES was to be included as a second covariate, but due to the high correlation between the SES and the ITBS score and extra "noise" created by using two covariates in the ANCOVA, the SES was excluded.
determine the main effects of context and ethnicity on academic achievement as well to ascertain whether there was any statistical interactions between context and ethnicity affecting academic achievement.

Validity and Reliability

Quantitative research has very well defined means of establishing rigorous controls over an experiment. They are concerned with validity and reliability and integrated into each stage of the experiment: design, sampling, measurement, implementation and analysis. In general, quantitative research follows Kerlinger’s (1986) MAXMINCON principle. The three components of this principle are MAXimize the experimental variance by providing experimental conditions as different as possible; MINimize the error variance from factors such as unreliable testing measures; and CONtrol for extraneous variables (cited in Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998, p. 31).

Internal Validity

Internal validity is the CON in the MAXMINCON principle. It "is the extent to which extraneous variables have been controlled by the researcher, so that any observed effect can be attributed solely to the treatment" (Gall, Borg & Gall, 1996, p. 467). Internal validity is concerned with controlling as many extraneous variables as possible in an attempt to minimize the risks of any alternative explanation, so that the researcher’s inferences are the only possible explanation for relationships or causal linkages between variables and events (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Threats to internal validity are listed below. The methods this study used for control are listed in bullets beneath the threat (Gall et al, 1996, p. 466-473; Isaac & Michael, 1997, p. 66-68):

1. **History**: events occurring besides the experimental treatment.
• To control for the threat of history the experimental group must be similar in all respects but the independent variable. The immersion group was matched to the regular education group in terms of socio-economic status, percentage of minority students, and regional area.

2. **Maturation**: physical or psychological changes in participants.

   • To control for the threat of maturation a control group of regular education African-American students who had no exposure to French immersion was used.

3. **Testing**: students may become test-wise.

   • To control for the threat of testing two different but correlated tests were used.

4. **Instrumentation**: changes in measuring instrument, especially likely in observational measurements.

   • Since the test was given according to state standards this threat could not be controlled by the researcher. However, the uniform standards used by the state in testing students did offer a degree of control to instrumentation for Phase I.

5. **Statistical regression**: tendency for extreme scores to retest closer to the mean.

   • This threat is a limitation of this study.

6. **Differential selection**: when using a control group, effect may be confounded by differential selection of participants.

   • Because random sampling could not be used, this is a limitation to the study. However, the threat of differential selection could be offset by Phase I of the
study in which the of variances in students' LEAP test scores are controlled based on the students' ITBS scores.

7. **Experimental attrition**: participants drop out.
   - This is a limitation of the study. Participants whose data was missing were excluded from the study.

8. **Selection-maturation, selection-history, etc**: effect of the treatment confounded by other factors or interaction of other factors.
   - Because immersion students were self-selected (or selected by their parents) to be in the program, it was possible that some other factors besides the immersion/non-immersion context and the variables on which the students were matched (SES, ethnicity and regional location) could have influenced their achievement test scores (i.e., motivation, parental support in academic achievement). This is a limitation of this study.

9. **Experimental treatment diffusion**: control groups (or parents of control participants) may seek to access a treatment perceived as desirable. Control teachers may borrow ideas from experimental teachers and use them in their classes.
   - Since the immersion programs were not in the same schools as the regular education programs there was minimal contact between control and experimental groups. In addition, the parents in the regular education programs could not seek access to the immersion schools because students could not enter the programs after the second grade.
10. **Compensatory rivalry by the control group or the John Henry effect**: students in the control group perceive a competition with experimental group and perform beyond their usual level.

- Since the immersion programs were not in the same schools as the regular education programs there was minimal or no contact between control and experimental groups.

11. **Resentful demoralization of the control group**: students in the control group perceive that a desirable treatment is being withheld from them.

- Since the immersion programs were not in the same schools as the regular education programs there was minimal or no contact between control and experimental groups.

**External Validity**

While internal validity looks at the inferences made by the researcher about what happened in the experiment and why, external validity examines "the extent to which the findings of an experiment can be applied to individuals and settings beyond those that were studied" (Gall et al., 1996, p. 473). Bracht and Glass (1968) divide external validity into two categories, population validity and ecological validity (cited in Gall et al., 1996, p. 474).

Population validity deals with generalizing findings from the studied sample to a specified, larger group, a population. Bracht and Glass recognize two sorts of population validity:

1. **The extent to which one can generalize from the sample to a defined population**: findings can only be generalized to the population from which the sample was drawn.
That means findings can be generalized safely to the accessible population but it is
risky to generalize to the target population.

• Because of the specific context of French immersion in Louisiana, the
generalizability of the study findings to populations in any other context is
severely limited. However, the findings could be generalized to the accessible
population of the study--all the French immersion programs in Louisiana. In
addition, the findings could provide suggestions and a source of emulation for
other programs and research studies.

2. The extent to which personological variables interact with treatment effects:
generalizability of findings may be affected by personological traits.

• The use of previous student achievement as a control for phase I helped control
for personological variables which would affect achievement test scores.

Besides population validity Bracht and Glass (1968) defined ten other factors which
affect external validity (cited in Gall et al., 1996, p. 475). These factors are classified as
threats to the ecological validity of a study. The ecological validity concerns how well the
findings from one researcher-controlled, environmental condition can be generalized to a
different environmental condition. Treatment effects which can only be obtained in
controlled environment are said to have low ecological-validity. The ten factors are:

1. Explicit description of the treatment: explicit description of the treatment is needed so
   that other researchers can reproduce the study.

   • The use of a qualitative phase in the study which described in detail the context of
     French immersion in Louisiana helped contribute to the control for this threat.
2. **Multiple treatment interference**: If participants are exposed to treatments A, B, and C the findings cannot be generalized to a situation in which only treatment A occurs.

   - Again, the explicit description of the French immersion and regular education contexts enabled the researcher to note any other treatments (e.g., computer lab, science lab, scheduling, etc.) which could have created a multiple treatment interference. Since the study was conducted in situ it was not possible to control for this threat and consequently it should be considered a possible limitation to the study.

3. **Hawthorne effect**: When participants are aware of being in an experiment, or are aware of the hypothesis, or are receiving special attention, this factor rather than the treatment may cause a change in their behavior. Findings from studies in which the Hawthorne effect occurs are not generalizable to situations in which researchers and others involved in the study are not present.

   - Since the participants were aware of being in an experiment this factor rather than the treatment (different contexts) might have caused a change in their behavior. However, in terms of special attention to African-American students, this attention was minimized by also including a group of white students to participate in the interviews.

4. **Novelty and disruption effect**: The novelty of a treatment may be effective because it is different, but that novelty wears off. Conversely, a treatment may be initially ineffective because it disrupts the normal routine of a class but may later, with continued use, prove to be effective. Initial treatments are therefore not generalizable to a condition of continued use.
• This was not an initial treatment. Both the regular education program participants and the immersion program participants had been in their respective contexts for 4 to 5 school years.

5. **Experimenter effect:** The treatment may be effective or ineffective due to the individual who administers the test. Findings from these studies cannot be generalized to situations in which someone else administers the treatment or test.

• The standardized tests were administered by the teachers, and followed uniform state procedures and the directions of the testing companies.

6. **Pretest sensitization:** The pretest may interact with the experimental treatment and affect research results. If this is the case generalizations cannot be made to situations in which no pretest is administered.

• The ITBS test was given a year prior to the LEAP test. It was given at the end of each school year just before summer vacation. All tests were administered each year during the same week statewide.

7. **Posttest sensitization:** If the posttest is a learning experience it can have a similar effect as pretest sensitization.

• It is possible that the high-stakes posttest interacted with instruction in the two contexts. The pressure to ensure that students pass the test and the need to "cover" the entire curriculum this criterion-referenced test includes no doubt affected instruction. However, all classes were under the same pressure.

8. **Interaction of history and treatment effect:** It could be argued that findings should not be generalized past the time in which they occurred. Later, a reproduction of the same study, in the same place, with the same participants may have different results.
• Phase I was a constructive replication of the Caldas and Boudreaux's (1999) study done three years earlier which could, to a certain extent, control for this threat.

9. Measurement of dependent variable: The treatment may only prove superior on a specific measurement instrument such as multiple-choice tests. Generalizations are then limited to situations in which the measure is a multiple-choice test.

• The qualitative phase (Phase II) examined the students in other contexts such as classroom activities and discussions. This phase provided a more global view of the effects of the two contexts on students.

10. Interaction of time of measurement and treatment effects: A posttest administered at different points in time after a treatment may result in different findings.

• The tests given followed the state guidelines and schedules and were strictly controlled by the state and the testing companies.

A certain number of factors should be taken into consideration in quantitative research. Snow (1974) believed that experimental designs are often "systematic designs" which are so controlled and artificial that they are not generalizable to the real-life classroom (cited in Gall et al, 1996, p. 478). Therefore, in educational experimental research, he advocated a more representative design which would reflect the natural environment of the learner. This study was done on-site within the classrooms. Another problem in quantitative research is experimenter bias; Rosenthal (1976) highlighted this problem (cited in Gall et al., 1996, p. 480). Experimenter bias is an extraneous variable and a serious threat to internal validity. In order to avoid experimenter bias Gall, Borg and Gall (1996) suggested that the researcher not work directly with the study, but rather have naïve experimenters work with study participants. However, Barber (1973) found that having experimenters other than the
investigator administering the treatment engendered problems of implementation or treatment fidelity (cited in Gall et al, 1996, p. 481). This study did not entail the use of experimenters other than the researcher. However, the researcher did not administer the standardized tests. In addition, peer debriefers, teacher’s logs, and questionnaires were used to guide the study and to include multiple perspectives for interpretation.

Phase II

Phase II used qualitative methods to examine African-American students' and their teachers' experiences and perceptions of the class in both the French immersion and the regular education context in both typical and extreme case samples.

Sampling

For the qualitative phase of this study, Phase II, both a typical case sampling and an extreme case sampling were used to select two fourth grade immersion classrooms and two fourth grade regular education classrooms. Typical case sampling allowed for a general view of each context and of African-American students' experiences in each context, French immersion and regular education. Extreme case sampling allowed for a view of African-Americans' experiences not only within each context, French immersion and regular education, but also within an environment which is considered an "at-risk" environment.

For the typical case sampling, univariate statistics from Phase I were used to select the classrooms. The mean ITBS scores for the African-American students were calculated for each context (French immersion and regular education). The participating Typical Case French Immersion Classroom consisted of the French immersion class whose African-American students’ averaged ITBS scores were closest to the mean for all participating African-American immersion students. Similarly, the participating Typical Case Regular
Education Classroom consisted of the regular education class whose African-American students’ averaged ITBS scores were closest to the mean for all participating African-American regular education students. The extreme case classrooms were French immersion and regular education classrooms in which at least 90% of the students received free or reduced lunch; in other words the extreme cases were the schools with a high concentration of poverty (See Table 3.4)

Table 3.4 Summary of Cases Selected for Phase II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>French immersion</th>
<th>Regular education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Case</td>
<td>Aria Elementary</td>
<td>Blue Willow Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Case</td>
<td>Comeaux Elementary</td>
<td>Dautrive Elementary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within each classroom four African-American children, two boys and two girls--one higher achieving and one lower achieving for their respective genders--were selected based on their ITBS test scores. This allowed for the study of difference in the experiences of the higher and lower achieving African-American girls and boys. In order to ensure the viability of the study and to guard against attrition, only classrooms with at least six African-American students (3 boys and 3 girls) were included in the case study. To further ensure that African-American students did not feel singled-out, when possible, four white participants (two boys, two girls, one high, one low-achieving according to their ITBS test scores) were also interviewed. The teachers of the four participant classrooms were also invited to participate in the study.

Data Collection Overview

Utilizing data collected during Phase I, four 4th grade classrooms--two typical cases and two extreme cases--were selected for direct observation. Assent, consent and
authorization forms were obtained from the administrators, teachers and students (Appendices J, K & L). The researcher conducted a revised Wright and Taylor (1995) collective self-esteem interview (Appendix B) as well as initial in-depth, open-ended interviews with the four selected African-American students (see sampling) in each selected class and with four additional white students in the typical case classes. In addition, an open-ended interview and informal interviews were conducted with the teachers of each classroom (Appendices C & D).

The classrooms were then observed six to nine times over a period of three months from January 2002 through March 2002. At the end of the observation period, brief, open-ended follow-up teacher interviews were conducted (Appendix E). In all four classes, the French immersion and regular education teachers were asked to fill out Guskey’s (1981) "The responsibility for students' achievement questionnaire" (Appendix G) while the participating students were asked to fill out the Caldwell’s (1998) revised "Collective Self-Esteem Scale" (Appendix H). In addition, as a member-check, an individual classroom case-study report was given to the participating teachers for their reactions and comments which were then integrated into the final case study. Table 3.5 summarizes the timeline for data collection.

**Qualitative Data Collection Procedures**

Qualitative data collection procedures involved observation, interviews, questionnaires and other documents. The following section provides an account of the instruments and procedures used to gather the data needed for Phase II. Interviews in all school were conducted following the third week of observations.
### Table 3.5 Timeline for Data Collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline:</th>
<th>Procedures:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September - October 2001</td>
<td>Authorization was obtained from the Internal Review Board and authorization forms were sent out to all selected parish school boards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2001</td>
<td>Authorization was obtained from participating parish school boards. School principals were sent authorization forms. Demographic and ITBS data collection began.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2001</td>
<td>All demographic and ITBS data was collected. Phase II typical and extreme case schools were selected. Authorization was obtained from selected case study schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| January 2001       | January 11: First observations of extreme case classrooms--Class A and B  
January 15: 2\textsuperscript{nd} observation Class A (Extreme Immersion Classroom)  
January 16: 2\textsuperscript{nd} observation Class B (Extreme Regular Education Classroom)  
January 23: 3\textsuperscript{rd} observation Class A (Extreme Immersion Classroom)  
January 25: 3\textsuperscript{rd} observation Class B (Extreme Regular Education Classroom)  
January 28: 4\textsuperscript{th} observation Class A (Extreme Immersion Classroom)  
January 30: 4\textsuperscript{th} observation Class B (Extreme Regular Education Classroom) |
| February 2001      | February 1: Quick observation Class B (Extreme Regular Education Classroom)  
February 1: 1\textsuperscript{st} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
February 4: 2\textsuperscript{nd} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
February 6: 5\textsuperscript{th} observation Class B (Extreme Regular Education Classroom)  
February 8: 5\textsuperscript{th} observation Class A (Extreme Immersion Classroom)  
February 13: 6\textsuperscript{th} observation Class B (Extreme Regular Education Classroom)  
February 15: 1\textsuperscript{st} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom)  
February 18: 3\textsuperscript{rd} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
February 19: 6\textsuperscript{th} observation Class A (Extreme Immersion Classroom)  
February 20: 2\textsuperscript{nd} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom)  
February 22: 4\textsuperscript{th} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
February 25: 3\textsuperscript{rd} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom)  
February 27: 5\textsuperscript{th} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom) |
| March 2001         | March 5: 4\textsuperscript{th} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom)  
March 6: 5\textsuperscript{th} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom)  
March 7: 6\textsuperscript{th} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
March 8: 7\textsuperscript{th} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
March 13: 8\textsuperscript{th} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
March 18: 6\textsuperscript{th} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom)  
March 18: 9\textsuperscript{th} observation Class C (Typical Immersion Classroom)  
March 20: 7\textsuperscript{th} observation Class D (Typical Regular Education Classroom) |
| April-May 2001     | Type up field notes and interview transcripts. Create case studies for each classroom.                                                                                                                     |
Observation Procedures

The qualitative observation procedures closely followed the procedures used in Tyson (1999) since the participants were the same age and ethnicity, and Tyson was also examining interactions and perceptions of the students within two varied contexts. Classrooms were observed a total of 28 times, from six to nine observations per school, over a period of ten weeks. All the observations, with the exception of one quick observation in Class B, the Extreme Regular Education Class, were half-day observations lasting around three to four hours for a total of approximately 100 contact hours. Students and teachers followed their normal daily routines and activities during these observations. In order to get a more global view of the classroom interactions and to be able to watch these interactions unfold I endeavored, like Tyson (1999), to be a "complete observer" (Junkers, 1960), rather than a participant observer. However, as Tyson noted, when children are involved this is next to impossible. Thus my status as observer fluctuated between complete observer and "researcher participant." According to Gans (1982) a "researcher participant" is one "who participates in a social situation but is personally only partially involved, so that he can function as a researcher [original gender]" (cited in Merriam, 1988, p. 93).

As suggested by Taylor and Bogdan (1984), I described the setting, people and activities attempting to note direct quotations or at least the substance of what people said. In the wide margin (again a suggestion of Taylor and Bogdan) of my running records I equally noted my own observer comments regarding my feelings, reactions and initial interpretations of what was occurring in the classroom. Following Tyson’s (1999) approach, my descriptions focused on classroom interactions, body language, tone of voice and attitudes at the time and in the context in which they occur. The running records, which were
no doubt incomplete due to the tremendous amount of information that I encountered, were reviewed immediately following my observations, supplemented with my headnotes and typed into fieldnotes.\(^5\) In addition, a contact summary document (Miles & Huberman, 1994) was used to summarize salient points found in each field contact as well as point to areas the research still needed to address (Appendix F). Finally, a daily researcher journal kept track of personal notes regarding my reactions to the field notes, the summary documents, and the research in general.

Drawing again from Taylor and Bogdan (1984) the direct observations shifted from a "wide angle" lens which focused on a global description of classroom events, to a "narrow angle" lens which focused on patterns of interaction with the four participating African-American students. The "wide angle" lens not only ensured that overall classroom interactions were recorded but also ensured that the study was not perceived as focusing only on certain students. Teachers’ attitudes and interactions in general and with the selected students in particular were also included.

**Observation Instruments**

Both the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (Bemis & Liberty, 1970) and the Classroom Interaction Rating Form (Knox et al., 1972) were used to triangulate the findings of direct observations (Appendices M & N).

The Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (Bemis & Liberty, 1970) or SCIOS is an instrument which uses a category system to record teacher and student behaviors within 16-minute intervals. These categories were later grouped into eight teacher behaviors and seven student behaviors based on SCIOS

---

\(^5\) For a more detailed description of this process see Sanjek (1990), Vocabulary of Fieldnotes.
factors which were defined by a factorial analysis done during the development of the instrument (Bemis, 1969). Reliability of this measure was established by the researcher using Cronbach's Alpha on the SPSS statistical program which averaged all possible split half reliabilities. The reliability for the SCIOS was established at .6654. Its construct validity was assessed by the researcher over the course of this study, as the SCIOS had the capability to differentiate between immersion and regular education students and teachers in four separate factors (See Table 3.6).

Table 3.6 Differentiated SCIOS Scores for Construct Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Dominance</th>
<th>Teacher Permissiveness</th>
<th>Student Disruptive</th>
<th>Student Hyperactive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Immersion (EXI)</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>11.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Immersion (TI)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Regular Education (EXRE)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typical Regular Education (TRE)</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Classroom Interaction Rating Form (Knox et al., 1972) was used as an easily understandable observation scale. Although there is little information concerning the validity of this measure a precedent for using the Classroom Interaction Rating Form was set when it was used by the Columbia University Center of Adult Education in order to study adult basic education programs using both formative and summative evaluations. Reliability of this measure was established by the researcher using Cronbach's Alpha on the SPSS statistical program which averaged all possible split half reliabilities. The reliability for the Classroom Interaction Rating Form (Knox et al., 1972) was established at .7467.
Interviews

Interviews for this study consisted of one structured student interview (Wright & Taylor, 1995) and two open-ended interviews with some possible follow-up questions, one for the teacher and one for the selected students. The open-ended interviews were based on questions asked by Tyson (1999) when she interviewed African-American grade school students and their teachers. The interviewees for the two student interviews were selected, as stated in the sampling section of Phase II, based on high/low achieving students’ ITBS test scores. All interviews were audio-taped and transcribed.

The structured student interview was a revised version of the Wright and Taylor (1995) measure of personal and collective self-esteem, which was in turn inspired by the early black and white doll studies of Clark and Clark (1939). To avoid the perception that appearances and ethnicity can be used to determine what people are like, this interview asked the students about themselves and their classmates, rather than using dolls or pictures of varying ethnicities (for interview guide see Appendix B). This interview was used to examine students' perceptions of ethnicity in the typical case classes. However in the extreme case classes, since all but one of the students were African-American, the measure was used to examine students' perceptions of gender.

The children decided whether they fit into a category and then chose five classmates who they though fitted in this same category. The positive categories included children who are nice, smart, happy, good-at-many-things, have-lots-of-friends, like-to-go-to-school. The negative categories were those whom other children did not like and those who were not so good at school. For personal self-esteem, each positive attribute a child chose for himself or herself resulted in a score of +1 while each negative attribute resulted a score of -1 (scores
ranged from –2 to 6). For collective self-esteem, the scoring was similar except that each in-
group member's name (based on the students' parents self-classification in their cumulative 
folder) gave 1 point for positive and –1 for negative (with 5 selected students in each 
category, the scores range from –10 to 30). The final classification the children did was to 
choose five children who were their best friends (0 for no in-group choices to 5 for all in-
group choices). There were students who did not choose the requested five students and 
others who mentioned more than five students; because of this the students' number of 
responses did not always add up to 40.

Pilot data were collected from 10 students in order to develop this interview (Haj-
Broussard, 2001). Pilot student interviews helped redefine questions which were not clearly 
understood by the students. The construct validity of the interview was determined by the 
researcher through convergent validity using a correlational approach using Spearman's rho 
on the SPSS statistical program with Caldwell’s (1998) revised version of the "Collective 
self-esteem scale" (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). No correlation was found in terms of the 
Wright and Taylor (1995) interview with regards to gender. However, with regards to 
ethnicity the Wright and Taylor interview correlated significantly to the Caldwell Collective 
Self-esteem Total Score in terms of positive in-groups and out-groups with both having a 
correlation coefficient of .712. In addition, the Write and Taylor negative in-groups and out-
groups correlated significantly with the Caldwell Total School Score with correlation 
coefficients of .733 for the negative in-groups and .768 for the negative out groups.

The open-ended interviews were semi-structured interviews revised from Tyson’s 
(1999) study of student self-construction in elementary age African-American students. To 
verify the comprehensibility of the questions, the initial interviews were piloted in December
2001 on two volunteer immersion students, two regular education teachers, and two immersion teachers who did not participate in this study. The open-ended interviews consisted of an initial interview and a brief follow-up teacher interview. The open-ended interviews asked the students and teachers about how they perceived themselves and others in the classroom. The direct observations, on-going analysis, and informal interviews were used to devise the follow-up questions and to direct observations. (For interview guides see Appendices C-E)

**Documents and Questionnaires**

Documents used in this phase of the study, include a voluntary teacher log, contact summary sheets (Miles and Huberman, 1994) and the students’ ITBS achievement test scores. Questionnaires included the "Responsibility for students' achievement" (RSA) questionnaire (Guskey, 1981, Appendix G), and Caldwell’s (1998) revised version of Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) "Collective self-esteem scale" (CES) (Appendix H).

The voluntary teacher logs were prepared at the request of the researcher to allow for a more in-depth view of the teachers’ perceptions and to afford another perspective on classroom observations. Since the logs were done at the researcher’s request there is little doubt as to the authenticity or "verification" of these documents (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Contact summary sheets describing salient points and themes which emerged over the course of the study were filled out by the researcher after each day of observations and interviews. In addition, contact summary sheets were filled out by peer debriefers after classroom observations. The use of the other document source, the ITBS achievement test scores, was previously discussed in the sampling section of this phase.
The questionnaires, RSA and CES, were used to triangulate the researcher-collected data and analyses. While using both interviews and direct observation offered a means of triangulation within the case study, both methods were vulnerable to researcher-caused errors such as loaded interview questions or a pro-immersion biased point of view. These questionnaires measured teacher attitudes, student self-esteem and student collective self-esteem. Although no measure is without bias, these questionnaires did offer another perspective on student and teacher attitudes and perceptions. The emerging themes regarding student and teacher attitudes and perceptions from the observations and interviews of Phase II were compared to the following measures.

The teachers' perceptions of responsibility for their students' successes or failures were measured using "The responsibility for students' achievement" (RSA) questionnaire (Guskey, 1981; Appendix G). In terms of reliability, the RSA questionnaire had a high consistency of teacher responses even after a four-month interval. Test-retest correlations were all significant with the total R (responsibility) score as .739 for, the R+ (responsibility for successes) score of .718, and .784 for the R- score (responsibility for failures). The reliability indices for each of the two subscales, self-responsibility for +/- classroom events, were calculated by Guskey using the unequal length Spearman Brown, the Guttman split-half and the alpha coefficient. These indices were as follows: self-responsibility for the positive classroom events had indices of .760 for the Spearman Brown, .754 for the Guttman split-half, and .791 using the alpha coefficient. For self-responsibility for negative classroom events, the indices were .899, .885 and .881 respectively. Intercorrelation between the two subscales was low, providing further evidence that the two subscales measure different orientations. This low intercorrelation led Guskey (1981) to caution against using only the
total R scores to avoid camouflaging important differences. Descriptive statistics showed that the obtained means exceeded those which would be expected by chance. Finally, factor analysis revealed that two common factor models accounted for 60% of variance, and that distinctions between the R+ and the R- scores were evident.

Caldwell (1998) proposed that collective self-esteem was a more salient aspect for members of more collectivistic cultures such as African-Americans. As a measure of student collective self-esteem, Caldwell (1998) revised Luhtanen and Crocker's (1992) collective self-esteem scale to assess collective self-esteem in young children based on ethnic group membership, family membership, and school membership (Appendix H). This revised scale was used both to correlate to the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview and to triangulate with the open-ended interviews and direct observations. Because the scale entailed defining and framing the students’ ethnic groups this scale was not used until observation and other interviews were completed. Preliminary analyses by Caldwell showed acceptable internal consistency. Cronbach’s alpha coefficients ranged from .83 to .86 on the three versions (ethnic group, family and school) of the Collective Self-Esteem Scale (CSES). Correlations between the CSES and a scale of individual self-concept (the Piers-Harris Self-Concept Scale) found that the three versions of the CSES were moderately correlated (.53 for scholastic, .51 for familial, and .43 for ethnic) with the Piers-Harris scale.

**Data Analysis**

Data analysis began with data collection. Bogdan and Bilken (1982) discussed the importance of during-study analysis. For analysis during the study, contact summary sheets were used (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These forms summarized the salient points of an observation or interview and the initial themes or patterns the researcher perceived. These
contact summary sheets were also used for peer debriefing at the "during-study" analysis phase. Three different peer debriefers, all graduate students in education, created contact summary sheets based on classroom observations and interview transcripts. These contact summary sheets were compared to the researcher’s contact summary sheets to minimize researcher bias from directing the study and the emerging themes. A sample contact summary sheet is presented in Appendix O.

At the end of the observation period, when all the data had been collected, the interview transcripts, observation field notes, documents and contact summary sheets were compiled to form a case study database (Yin, 1984). This case study database was organized chronologically by classroom. At this point, as recommended by Goetz and Lecompte (1984), the research proposal was reviewed in order to ensure that the research questions were addressed in the final report. After reviewing the research proposal, as suggested by Merriam (1988), the case study data base was read as a whole, "virtually holding a conversation with the data," taking notes on the most striking, important aspects and keeping a "separate running list of major ideas that cut across much of the data" (p. 131). Themes and patterns which emerged during the pilot study were added to this list (Haj-Broussard, 2002).

This data were unitized. According to Lincoln and Guba (1985) a unit must be relevant to the study, and "the smallest piece of information about something that can stand by itself" (p. 345). The units were coded and categorized both situationally (who? what? when? and where?) and according to the major ideas, themes and patterns in the aforementioned running list using the N*dist Vivo qualitative data analysis program. Although this method has the appearance of using a priori categories to sort a case study data
base, it is not a question of using "borrowed categories" (p. 37), which Glaser and Strass (1967) critique, but rather using categories which have emerged from the pilot study and the holistic reading of the case study data base. Because of time limitations, with the end of the school year drawing near, it was at this point that the case study reports were created for the teachers. The teachers' responses to the case study reports were then added to the case study database.

At this stage new themes were developed by using a comparative technique described by Lincoln and Guba (1985, pp. 347-348) in which the researcher began with the first coded unit and placed it in a yet to be named category, then looked at subsequent units to determine if it was essentially similar to the first or if it needed a separate category. This process was continued with the other units determining if the data needed a new category, if they fit in a provisionally established category, or if the unit was irrelevant to the developing set (units for the miscellaneous pile).

Once categories stopped emerging and started merging to the point of having six to eight categories, then the categories properties were noted, and a covering rule was devised. The salience of these categories was based on their "internal homogeneity" or how they fit together, and on their "external heterogeneity" or how they differed or stood out from other categories (Guba, 1978). To determine if the categories were complete there needed to be "a minimum of unassigned data items as well as relative freedom from ambiguity in classification" (Lincoln & Guba, 1981, p. 96). In addition, Merriam (1988) stated that independent investigators must agree that the categories make sense in light of the data. Thus peer debriefers were also involved at this stage of the data analysis.
The development of hypotheses occurred by examining links between the categories and the category properties in an on-going fashion on multiple levels, both within and between classrooms (Merriam, 1988). First, hypotheses were developed by examining students' and teachers' interactions and perceptions within each individual classroom using the individual case study reports which were written for each classroom and sent out to the participating teachers for a member-check. Next, the hypotheses were compared within each program, either French immersion or regular education. The third level of analysis compared hypotheses of students' and teachers' interactions and perceptions across programs, comparing French immersion to regular education. Plausible understandings concerning the hypotheses were tested as well as alternative hypotheses by examining how, or if, themes emerged based on the alternative hypotheses. Finally, a cross-case analysis of the emergent themes and hypotheses was conducted and reported.

**Trustworthiness**

Qualitative research entails a variety of methods to maximize trustworthiness. Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed four criteria for building trustworthiness in a qualitative study. These criteria were supposed to be alternatives to the four quantitative criteria, but many researchers now feel that they correspond to the criteria for quantitative research (Isaac & Michael, 1997; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Each criterion responds to a different question. The following questions are adapted from Lincoln and Guba (1985) by Isaac & Michael (1997, p. 221). Credibility corresponds to internal validity in quantitative research and asks the question "Will the methodology and its conduct produce findings that are believable and convincing?" Transferability corresponds to external validity and asks "To what other textually similar setting can these findings apply?" Dependability corresponds to
reliability and asks, "Within reasonable limits, are the findings consistent with other similar studies?" And finally confirmability corresponds to objectivity and asks "Are both the process and the product of the data collection and analysis auditable by an outside party?"

Credibility

Lincoln and Guba (1985) described techniques for verifying each criterion. The techniques to verify credibility and how they are evident in the study are listed below.

1) Looking into the integrity of the observations encompasses assuring prolonged engagement to minimize errors and assuring persistent observation to be able to distinguish the significant from the superfluous.

   • This study was done over a period of three months with at least weekly half-day observations. The students and teachers were observed in all their daily activities from class time to recess to lunch at various times throughout the school week.

2) Triangulation is used to corroborate findings using different sources, methods and investigators. Patton (1990) listed four different kinds of triangulation.

   a) Methods triangulation reconciles data collected by quantitative methods to data collected using qualitative methods.

      • This study used both quantitative and qualitative methods. In addition, closed-ended questionnaires were used to triangulate with the themes which emerged from the interviews and observations.

   b) Triangulation of qualitative data sources involves "comparing and cross-checking the consistency of information derived at different times and by different means within qualitative methods." (Patton, 1990, p. 467).
• This study compared the perspectives of observation data, interview data, and teachers’ logs on classroom events.

c) The third type of triangulation is analyst or investigator triangulation. This entails using multiple observers or analysts in order to reduce the potential for bias inherent in a single observer or analyst’s perspective. The catchall phrase for this method of triangulation could be "multiple-perspectives."

• Teachers’ logs and peer debriefers were used to allow for "multiple-perspectives" within the study.

d) The fourth method of triangulation previously mentioned by Eisenhart and Howe (1992) is theory triangulation. Theory triangulation requires looking at the same data from multiple theoretical perspectives. These multiple theoretical perspectives serve to highlight "how findings are affected by different assumptions and fundamental premises" (cited in Patton, 1990, p. 470).

• The theories examined in the theoretical framework of the study were used as alternative explanations to interpret the generated hypotheses.

3) In peer debriefing a disinterested outside party plays the devil’s advocate.

• See triangulation 2c. Peer debriefers were used during data collections to minimize bias in the direction of the study and during analysis to ensure that the themes that emerged corresponded to the case study data.

4) Negative case analysis is a process of revising a hypothesis until it fits the observed reality.

• The hypotheses were examined both within and across the classrooms and programs. Hypotheses were revised until they fit the multiple levels of analysis.
5) Finally, in member checks, considered the most crucial of the five techniques in establishing credibility, the participants themselves test the authenticity of the data.

- Individual classroom case-study reports were given to participant teachers for a member-check.

Transferability, Dependability, and Confirmability

The other three criteria are more succinctly definable. Transferability analyzes the original study and its context, searching for any other setting where this conclusion is possible. Because this study is based on the idea that context heavily influences students and because the Louisiana French immersion students are located in a very specific context, it is acknowledged that the transferability of the findings in an immersion setting are very limited. However, the findings could be used in the construction of future Louisiana French immersion programs. The findings regarding the regular education contexts would be equally embedded in a specific context and of limited generalizability, however, these findings could be used by teachers who teach in a similar environment.

Dependability, or whether or not a repeat of the study would lead to the same conclusions, can be verified using two techniques. The first is triangulation, wherein the investigator comes at the problem from different angles to see if its findings hold up. The second technique is to invite an outside auditor to examine the processes and products for integrity and accuracy. Both of these techniques have already been addressed in the credibility section above.

The final criterion, confirmability, is the most ambitious and demanding. It requires that the investigator conduct a full-scale audit following the entire sequence of events from beginning to end while checking, reconstructing and assessing the audit trail of data as well
as the overall audit process. This assures that sound decisions were made and that there was accuracy in recording the data. To ensure confirmability, a dated research journal, the case study database and the contact summary forms were used to create a chronological audit trail.

Summary

This study consisted of two phases. Phase I was a quantitative causal-comparative study. The defined group of fourth grade French immersion classes were matched with the comparison group of fourth grade regular education classes based on school performance scores, school and classroom minority student percentages, school and classroom free and reduced lunch percentages and proximity of the regular education school to the immersion school. Because matching is an inexact process, an ANCOVA (Analysis of Covariance) was conducted using the students’ third grade ITBS scores as covariates. The ANCOVA was used to determine the main effects of context and ethnicity on LEAP test scores as well as the statistical interactions between context and ethnicity on the LEAP test scores.

Once all the participating classrooms for Phase I were selected, Phase II began based on the initial data collected. Both a typical case sampling and an extreme case sampling were drawn for Phase II (Table 3.4). Typical case classrooms had African-American students whose mean ITBS scores were the closest to the overall mean score for African-American students in their respective contexts. Extreme case classrooms had students with the lowest SES.

Once the classrooms were selected, they were observed over a three-month period from January 2001 to March 2001. Observations were both global and focused. Global observations noted the student-teacher interactions and student-student interactions while
focused observations noted the interactions with both teachers and peers of two high-achieving African-American students (a boy and a girl) and two low-achieving African-American students (a boy and a girl) in each participating classroom. In addition, these students, four white peers and the teachers in each classroom were interviewed both formally and informally and asked to fill out questionnaires. Additionally, teachers were asked to write down their observations in a teacher’s journal.

A case study database was compiled consisting of the observational fieldnotes, interview transcripts, documents, questionnaires, as well as the researcher's and peer debriefers’ contact summary sheets. The database was unitized and emerging themes were developed. Hypotheses linking these themes were developed on multiple levels:

1) Within each classroom. From this analysis, individual classroom case studies were developed.

2) Within each program. Finding themes which emerged within all the French immersion classrooms or within all the regular education classrooms.

3) Across programs. Comparing and contrasting French immersion themes and hypotheses to regular education themes and hypotheses.

After examining the themes and hypotheses on all the above-mentioned levels, the final cross-case analysis report was written.

Limitations

The present study is sensitive to potential limitations:

In Terms of Internal Validity:

1. **Statistical regression**: Since the immersion group was not a randomly selected group the tendency for extreme scores to retest closer to the mean could be a limitation.
2. **Differential selection**: Since the French immersion students were not only not randomly selected but they were placed in a program by their parents, any statistical effect found might be compounded by differential selection of participants. This is a serious potential threat to the validity of this study.
   
   a. The French immersion participants were self-selected (they chose or their parents chose for them to be in the immersion program).
   
   b. Students experiencing academic difficulties were sometimes withdrawn from the immersion program as per their parents' request.

3. **Experimental attrition**: Attrition has always been a problem in French immersion and participants’ dropping out of the program is a serious potential threat. For the quantitative measures, the missing participant data was excluded.

4. **Selection-maturation, selection-history, etc.**: Because French immersion students were self-selected (or selected by their parents) to be in the immersion program it was possible that some other factors besides the immersion/non-immersion context and the variables on which the students were matches--SES, ethnicity and regional location--could be influencing their achievement test scores. This is a potential limitation of this study.

**In Terms of External Validity:**

1. **Multiple treatment interference**: While the explicit description of the French immersion and regular education contexts enabled the researcher to note any other treatments (e.g., computer lab, science lab, scheduling differences, etc.) which could create a multiple treatment interference, the naturalistic context of the study made it impossible to control for this threat and it should therefore be considered a possible limitation to the study.
2. **Hawthorne effect**: Since the participants were aware of being in an experiment this factor rather than the treatment might have caused a change in their behavior. However, in terms of special attention to African-American students, this attention was minimized by also including a group of white students to participate in the interviews. Findings from studies in which the Hawthorne effect occurs are not generalizable to situations in which researchers and others involved in the study are not present.

3. **Experimenter bias**: This study did not entail the use of experimenters other than the researcher. However, the researcher did not administer the standardized tests and peer debriefers, teacher logs, questionnaires, member checks and a study auditor were used both to guide the study and to include multiple perspectives for interpretation.

4. **Interaction of time of measurement and treatment effects**: The tests given followed the state guidelines and schedules and were strictly controlled by the state and the testing companies. Therefore, this threat should be considered a potential limitation of the study.

**Other Limitations to the Study’s Generalizability:**

1. **The French heritage language context of Louisiana**: Most of the other French immersion programs in the U.S. consider French to be a foreign language, but in Louisiana, French is a heritage language for many African-American and white immersion students.

2. **The limited population of fourth grade French immersion classroom**: There were only 13 fourth grade French immersion programs. Two schools declined to participate in the study; one program was dissolved and another program was excluded from the study because no African-American students were enrolled in their fourth grade immersion classroom, leaving no possibility of control for attrition.
3. **The lower percentage of minority students in French immersion**: Although this lowered percentage is common for French immersion schools it reduces the generalizability as to non-immersion classrooms.
CHAPTER 4:
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

This study was a two-phased mixed model design, which investigated the impact of the French immersion context on 4th grade African-American students. In addition, teachers' perceptions and interactions in general and with regards to African-American students in particular were examined. The quantitative phase, Phase I, of this study investigated the impact of context and ethnicity on 4th grade students' LEAP test scores. This chapter first gives a descriptive analysis of the participants, dependant variable, independent variables and covariate. After the descriptive analysis, the inferential hypotheses and results regarding the inferential analysis are given, followed by a summary of the quantitative results.

Descriptive Analysis

The following section describes the demographics of the participants and provides descriptive statistics concerning the independent variables, dependant variable and covariate.

Demographic Information

A total of 347 students participated in Phase I. Of these students 163 were in the French immersion context and 184 were in the regular education context. The following three tables (Tables 4.1, 4.2 & 4.3) summarize information on the SES and the ethnicity of the participants according to the context in which they were schooled. While the number of students who pay full lunch prices and the number of white students were equivalent in both classroom contexts, the regular education setting had nearly 30 more students on free lunch (See Table 4.1).
Table 4.1 Socio-economic Status of Participating Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free</th>
<th>Reduced</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Immersion (FI)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education (RE)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of ethnicity, there were over 20 more African-American students in the regular education classes than in the immersion classes while the other ethnicities were balanced (See Table 4.2). This was after one immersion class was excluded from the study because it had no African-American students despite the school having a 40% African-American population.

Table 4.2 Ethnicity of Participating Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Immersion (FI)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education (RE)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 provides a more detailed profile of the students within each context with regards to ethnicity and SES.

Table 4.3 Ethnicity and SES Profiles of Participating Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free Lunch</th>
<th>Reduced lunch</th>
<th>Full lunch</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FI: White</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI: African-American</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI: Other minorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE: White</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE: African-American</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE: Other minorities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FI: French Immersion
**RE: Regular Education

The majority of white students in both contexts were in the higher SES category and paid full price for their lunches while the majority of African-American students in both
contexts were in the lower SES category and were on either free or reduced lunch programs.

**Descriptive Statistics**

The obtained mean scores and standard deviations for students in French immersion and regular education are summarized in Table 4.4. These are the means before they were adjusted using the ITBS as a covariate. In addition, the scores are broken down for the African-American students and the white students as per context. All the mean scores for French immersion students were higher than those of the students in their peer groups on both the ITBS and the LEAP test, with the exception of the white French immersion students' ITBS language score which is precisely the same as the white regular education students' ITBS language score. As shown by the large standard deviations in the LEAP scores there was much more variance between the LEAP scores within each peer group than there was between the ITBS scores within each peer group.

**Table 4.4 Obtained Mean ITBS and LEAP Scores of Participating Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ITBS Math</th>
<th>ITBS Lang</th>
<th>LEAP Math</th>
<th>LEAP Lang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Immersion</td>
<td>203.9</td>
<td>210.5</td>
<td>364.7</td>
<td>361.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 17.9</td>
<td>sd 18.7</td>
<td>sd 46.7</td>
<td>sd 45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAA</td>
<td>192.15</td>
<td>206.59</td>
<td>335.37</td>
<td>340.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 18.8</td>
<td>sd 19.88</td>
<td>sd 45.73</td>
<td>sd 42.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>207.62</td>
<td>211.87</td>
<td>373.24</td>
<td>368.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 15.99</td>
<td>sd 18.25</td>
<td>sd 42.75</td>
<td>sd 45.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAA</td>
<td>187.1</td>
<td>195.06</td>
<td>317.00</td>
<td>317.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 18.8</td>
<td>sd 20.52</td>
<td>sd 38.78</td>
<td>sd 42.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REW</td>
<td>194.88</td>
<td>211.87</td>
<td>343.31</td>
<td>348.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sd 21.38</td>
<td>sd 18.24</td>
<td>sd 47.07</td>
<td>sd 53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FI: French Immersion  ***AA: African-American
**RE: Regular Education  ****W: White

The correlations results between the dependent variables (LEAP scores), the covariates (ITBS scores) and the independent variables (ethnicity and classroom context)
are summarized in Table 4.5. Strong and statistically significant correlations were found between the covariates (ITBS scores) and the dependent variables (the LEAP scores) in and across the math and language subject tests with correlation coefficients ranging from .58 to .74. In addition, there were significant correlations between the two independent variables (ethnicity and classroom context) respectively and the two dependent variables respectively (the LEAP scores) with correlation coefficients ranging from -.23 to .33. Similarly, the covariates (ITBS scores) correlated significantly across the board, however, the correlation between the ITBS language score and ethnicity, while statistically significant was relatively small (.12). There was no significant correlation between ethnicity and classroom context.

Table 4.5 Correlations Between all the Variables and the Covariate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ITBS Lang</th>
<th>LEAP Lang</th>
<th>ITBS Math</th>
<th>LEAP Math</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Classroom Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ITBS Lang</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.65302**</td>
<td>.65959**</td>
<td>.58225**</td>
<td>.11922*</td>
<td>-.31743**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP Lang</td>
<td>.65302**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.65229**</td>
<td>.72944**</td>
<td>.29546**</td>
<td>-.23163**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBS Math</td>
<td>.65959**</td>
<td>.65229**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.73486**</td>
<td>.27669**</td>
<td>-.22807**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP Math</td>
<td>.58225**</td>
<td>.72944**</td>
<td>.73486**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.32507**</td>
<td>-.30199**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>.11922*</td>
<td>.29546**</td>
<td>.27669**</td>
<td>.32507**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.09633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom Context</td>
<td>-.31743**</td>
<td>-.23163**</td>
<td>-.228077**</td>
<td>-.30199**</td>
<td>-.09633</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
** <.0001

(Ethnicity coded as 1=African-American, 2=White; Classroom Context coded as 1=French immersion and 2= regular education)

Inferential Analysis

This next section details the hypotheses, assumptions and results of the ANCOVA which was used to reveal whether there were significant differences in academic achievement (1) between African-American and white students, (2) between French immersion and regular education students, and (3) whether there were significant differences due to any interaction between ethnicity and context.
Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were investigated regarding the impact of context and ethnicity on 4th grade students' LEAP test scores.

Hypothesis 1

a) There is no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of white 4th grade students and the LEAP mathematics scores of African-American 4th grade students.

b) There is no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of white 4th grade students and the LEAP language scores of African-American 4th grade students.

Hypothesis 2

a) There is no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade French immersion students and the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade regular education students.

b) There is no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of 4th grade French immersion students and the LEAP language scores of 4th grade regular education students.

Hypothesis 3

a) There is no interaction between the main effects of classroom context and ethnicity on the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade students.

b) There is no interaction between the main effects of classroom context and ethnicity on the LEAP language scores of 4th grade students.
Running the ANCOVA

An analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) was used to analyze the main effect of two independent variables (context and ethnicity) and one covariate, ITBS scores, on the LEAP scores. Two data sets, one with the mathematics scores on both the ITBS and LEAP and the other with the language scores on both the ITBS and LEAP were created for the participating students. Initially, the results of all participating students--African-American, white and other minorities--were analyzed. However, due to the small number of non-African-American minorities (13 students out of 347) and since their results were not essential to test the hypotheses, the results of these students were excluded.

ANCOVAs were performed on the newly revised data sets to analyze the main effect of the two independent variables (context and ethnicity) and one covariate (ITBS scores) on the LEAP scores, in both math and language. The ITBS math scores were used as a covariate with regards to the LEAP math scores while the ITBS language scores were used as a covariate with regards to the LEAP language scores. It was not possible to perform a MANCOVA to test the overall effects of the independent variables (context and ethnicity) and the covariates (ITBS scores) on the dependent variables (LEAP scores), since the covariates were different, ITBS mathematics and ITBS language.

Assumptions

Before utilizing the ANCOVA, a number of assumptions were tested. Since the covariate (the ITBS) was a reliable and valid measure, it had a low measurement error. Covariates should have a linear relationship with the dependent variables. Linear regressions performed by the researcher using the SAS statistical program indicated that both the ITBS math and the ITBS language had a significant linear relationship with their
equivalent LEAP subject test scores. Finally, the assumptions of homogeneity and normal distribution of residuals was addressed. Both box and quantile-by-quantile (QQ) plots were performed on the residuals of the ANCOVA model. The QQ plots indicated that the residuals were normally distributed for both the mathematics and language results (See Appendix Q and R). The box plots also followed the assumptions of homogeneity and normal distribution of residuals for both the mathematics and language results (See Figure S and T). Once these assumptions were addressed the students' scores were analyzed. The following section continues with the presentation of the overall results of the ANCOVA.

**ANCOVA Results**

Overall, the main effect of ethnicity was significant for both the LEAP mathematics scores (11.37) and the LEAP language scores (6.76). The main effect of classroom context was only significant for the LEAP mathematics scores (6.34). The combined effects of ethnicity and classroom context were not shown to significantly affect either one of the LEAP test scores. The following table summarizes the overall results of the ANCOVA. A detailed analysis of the results for each hypothesis follows.

Table 4.6 ANCOVA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LEAP Language Scores</th>
<th>LEAP Mathematics Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted df</td>
<td>Adjusted MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9778.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom context (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4070.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3636.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>272784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within (Residuals)</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1447.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>1447.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05  
**<.0001
Hypothesis 1.a: Math

a) There is no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of white 4th grade students and the LEAP mathematics scores of African-American 4th grade students.

The adjusted mean LEAP math score of African-American students was 338.80. The adjusted mean score of the white students was 352.33 (Table 4.7). The difference between the two means (13.5275) is significant with white students having the higher mean score. This indicates that for math scores the null Hypothesis 1.a should be rejected since the LEAP math scores of African-American students are significantly lower than the LEAP math scores of white students.

Table 4.7 Test of Significance for the Effects of Ethnicity on LEAP Math Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>338.80</td>
<td>3.3156</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>102.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>352.33</td>
<td>2.1414</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>164.53**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between ethnicities</td>
<td>13.5275</td>
<td>4.0121</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
**<.0001

Hypothesis 1.b: Language

b) There is no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of white 4th grade students and the LEAP language scores of African-American 4th grade students.

The adjusted mean LEAP language score of African-American students was 332.78. The adjusted mean LEAP score of the white students was 356.52 (Table 4.8). The difference between the two means, 23.7364, is significant with white students having the higher mean score. This indicates that for language scores the null Hypothesis 1.b
should be rejected since the LEAP language scores of African-American students are significantly lower than the LEAP language scores of white students.

Table 4.8 Test of Significance for the Effects of Ethnicity on LEAP Language scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>332.78</td>
<td>3.7365</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>89.06**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>356.52</td>
<td>2.4423</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>145.98**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between ethnicities</td>
<td>23.7364</td>
<td>4.4737</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>3.42**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** < .0001

The results of the math ANCOVA and the language ANCOVA bear out that there is a significant difference between the mean LEAP score of white 4th grade students and the mean LEAP score of African-American 4th grade students; thus it appears that white students do score significantly higher than African-American students on both the mathematics and the language sections of their LEAP tests.

Hypothesis 2.a: Math

a) There is no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade French immersion students and the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade regular education students.

The adjusted mean math score of students in the immersion context was 350.54. The adjusted mean math score of students in the regular education program was 340.59 (Table 4.9). The difference between the two means, 9.9424, is a significant difference with French immersion students having the higher mean score. These results indicate that the LEAP math scores of immersion students are significantly higher than the LEAP math scores of regular education students thereby rejecting the null hypothesis 2.a.
Table 4.9 Test of Significance for the Effects of Context on LEAP Math Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Immersion</td>
<td>350.54</td>
<td>2.9254</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>119.82 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>340.59</td>
<td>2.6028</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>130.86 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between classroom contexts</td>
<td>9.9424</td>
<td>3.9502</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
** <.0001

Hypothesis 2.b: Language

b) There is no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of 4th grade French immersion students and the LEAP language scores of 4th grade regular education students.

The adjusted mean language score of students in the immersion context was 345.89. The adjusted mean language score of students in the regular education program was 343.41 (Table 4.10). The difference between the two means is 2.4849 with French immersion having the higher mean score. However, this difference is not significant. Therefore, the null Hypothesis 2.b cannot be rejected since it states that there would be no significant difference between the LEAP language scores of immersion students and the LEAP language scores of regular education students and no significant difference was found.

Table 4.10 Test of Significance for the Effects of Context on LEAP Language Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
<th>Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>French Immersion</td>
<td>345.89</td>
<td>3.4163</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>101.25 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>343.41</td>
<td>2.9978</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>114.55 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between classroom contexts</td>
<td>2.4849</td>
<td>4.6345</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** <.0001

The results of the math ANCOVA indicate that the null Hypothesis 2a can be rejected in terms of classroom context affecting mathematics test scores since there is a significant main effect for context on LEAP math scores. However in terms of the LEAP language
test scores the null Hypothesis 2b cannot be rejected since classroom context, French immersion or regular education, had no significant main effect on the LEAP language scores of 4th grade students.

**Hypothesis 3.a: Math**

a) There is no interaction between the main effects of classroom context and ethnicity on the LEAP mathematics scores of 4th grade students.

This analysis found significant main effects for the covariate (ITBS math) and for both independent variables (classroom context and ethnicity). However, the interaction between classroom context and ethnicity was not found to have a significant main effect on the mean LEAP math scores indicating that the null Hypothesis 3.a could not be rejected. These results are summarized in table 4.11.

**Table 4.11 Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects (LEAP math scores)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Num df</th>
<th>Den df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>6.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>11.37*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context * Ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBSM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>289.97**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
**<.0001

**Hypothesis 3.b: Language**

b) There is no interaction between the main effects of classroom context and ethnicity on the LEAP language scores of 4th grade students.

The LEAP language analysis was parallel to the LEAP math analysis. This analysis found significant main effects for the covariate (ITBS language) and for only one of the two independent variables (ethnicity). In terms of language, neither the classroom context, nor the interaction of classroom context and ethnicity, were found to
have a significant main effect on the LEAP language scores. This indicates that the null Hypothesis 3.b cannot be rejected. These results are reported in table 4.12.

Table 4.12 Type 3 Tests of Fixed Effects (LEAP language scores)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Num df</th>
<th>Den df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>28.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context * Ethnicity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITBSL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>217.11**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**<.001

The results indicate that neither null Hypothesis 3.a nor null Hypothesis 3.b can be rejected since no significant interaction was found between ethnicity and context in terms of LEAP mathematics scores or LEAP language scores. That is to say that overall the combination of context and ethnicity, such as African-Americans in the French immersion context, did not significantly affect the students' LEAP scores.

Focus on African-American Students

As shown in tables 4.11 and 4.12, there were no significant interactions overall between context and ethnicity on either the LEAP math or the LEAP language scores. Because this study focuses on African-American students in the two classroom contexts, the following section examines the effects of context on these students in particular.

Table 4.13 summarizes the obtained scores and adjusted scores of the four student groups which were compared.

The adjusted mathematics scores of each of the four groups where compared to the mathematics scores of the other groups to determine if there were any specific significant differences. While the white regular education students (347.54) have significantly higher math scores than the African-American regular education students (333.65), the African-American immersion students' math scores (343.95) are not
Table 4.13 Obtained and Adjusted LEAP Mean Scores of Participating Students (Across Contexts)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obtained LEAP Math</th>
<th>Obtained LEAP Lang</th>
<th>Adjusted LEAP Math</th>
<th>Adjusted LEAP Lang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIAA</td>
<td>335.37 sd 45.73</td>
<td>340.32 sd 42.22</td>
<td>343.95 error: 5.04</td>
<td>335.53 error: 5.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW</td>
<td>373.24 sd 42.75</td>
<td>368.99 sd 45.59</td>
<td>357.12 error: 3.13</td>
<td>356.25 error: 3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAA</td>
<td>317 sd 38.78</td>
<td>317.48 sd 42.42</td>
<td>333.65 error: 4.19</td>
<td>330.03 error: 4.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REW</td>
<td>343.31 sd 47.07</td>
<td>348.99 sd 53.7</td>
<td>347.54 error: 3.01</td>
<td>356.78 error: 3.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*FI: French Immersion  ***AA: African-American
**RE: Regular Education  ****W: White

significantly different from either regular education group--their mean score falls between the white and African-American regular education students' mean scores. The only students whose test scores show a significant difference from all other contexts and ethnicities are the white French immersion students who had the highest math scores of all the groups (357.12). These results are summarized in Table 4.13 and 4.14.

Table 4.14 Test of Significance for the Effects of Context and Ethnicity on LEAP Math Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIAA * FIW</td>
<td>-13.669</td>
<td>6.0118</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAA * REAA</td>
<td>10.3030</td>
<td>6.4809</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAA * REW</td>
<td>-3.5850</td>
<td>5.8463</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW * REAA</td>
<td>23.4699</td>
<td>5.4058</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.34**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW * REW</td>
<td>9.5819</td>
<td>4.3911</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAA * REW</td>
<td>-13.888</td>
<td>5.1116</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>2.72*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
**<.0001

The significant differences in the adjusted language mean scores of African-American students were compared with other student groups. Overall, the African-American students in both classroom contexts combined have significantly lower scores (FI 335.53; RE 330.03) than the white students, whose scores are virtually the same across contexts (FI 356.25; RE 356.78). While the language scores of the African-
American immersion students are higher than the African-American regular education students this difference is not significant (Table 4.15).

Table 4.15 Test of Significance for the Effects of Context and Ethnicity on LEAP Language Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIAA * FIW</td>
<td>-20.7221</td>
<td>6.7498</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-3.07*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAA * REAA</td>
<td>5.4992</td>
<td>7.5465</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIAA * REW</td>
<td>-21.2514</td>
<td>6.7897</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-3.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW * REAA</td>
<td>26.2213</td>
<td>6.0733</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>4.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIW * REW</td>
<td>-0.5293</td>
<td>5.0683</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REAA * REW</td>
<td>-26.7506</td>
<td>5.8435</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>-4.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* <.05
**<.0001

Summary of Quantitative Findings

African-American students overall had scores significantly lower than those of white students on the LEAP test in both mathematics and language in their respective classroom contexts. Additionally, French immersion students overall scored higher than regular education students in both mathematics and language on the LEAP test in their respective ethnicities. However, the difference between the scores was only significant for the mathematics LEAP scores and not for the language LEAP scores. Furthermore, there was no significant main effect of the interaction between classroom context and ethnicity on LEAP scores in either mathematics or language.

When focusing on the effect of the interaction of being African-American in the French immersion context, data revealed that in mathematics there was no significant difference between the LEAP math scores of African-American French immersion students and those of white students in regular education. Although this may indicate an improvement or a bridging of the achievement gap, it is balanced by the fact that there was also no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of African-American students in French immersion and the LEAP mathematics scores African-
American students in regular education. The African-American French immersion students' math scores fell between the math scores of the white students in regular education and the math scores of African-American students in regular education. Only the white French immersion students scored significantly higher than all the other groups in mathematics. In terms of language LEAP scores only ethnicity had a main effect on these scores. In both contexts, the white students had virtually the same mean score and these scores were significantly higher than those of the African-American students in both contexts. The African-American students in French immersion had higher scores than the African-American students in regular education, but the scores were not significantly higher.

While the context of French immersion did bridge the achievement gap in mathematics between white regular education students and African-American French immersion students, this gap remained between the White and African-American French immersion students in both subjects and between White and African-American students in language, regardless of classroom context. Nonetheless, French immersion students had scores that were equal to or higher than their non-immersion peers.
CHAPTER 5:
THE CASE STUDIES

This study is a two-phase mixed model design, which investigated the impact of the French immersion context on the experiences of fourth grade African-American students. This chapter reports the individual case studies for the four participant classrooms from Phase II, the qualitative phase. Phase II examined the interactions and perceptions of African-American students and their teachers' interactions and perceptions both in general and with regards to African-American students in particular. Data were collected using observations, interviews (Wright & Taylor, 1995; Tyson, 2001), and questionnaires (Gusky, 1983; Caldwell, 1999). The case study reports were initially given to the teachers for a member check. Once the teachers had responded to these reports, their responses as well as the students' perceptions were incorporated into the final case study reports.

The reports on each case study follow the same pattern: a general overview of the context in terms of the environment and the interactions which occurred in the classrooms; an introduction to the teachers followed by a more focused examination of each teacher's interactions with their students and their perceptions; and finally the perceptions of each participating student. In the two final case study reports, the typical case studies, the introduction to the teacher and the teacher's interactions with their students are incorporated into the general overview of the context since there was only one participating teacher in each of the reports. In all of the indented quotes citations are given indicating the source of the data whether it be fieldnotes (FN), interview (INT), or contact summaries (CS). After the source abbreviation for the fieldnotes the location and visit number are given, so A1 would be my first visit to Aria elementary followed by the date of the visit.
Case Study A: Aria Elementary--The Extreme Immersion (EXI) Class

General Overview of the Context

School Environment at Aria Elementary

Aria elementary was a majority African-American school with over 90% of the students on free or reduced lunch. According to Sean\(^1\), one of the three school custodians, many of the furnishings in the front hallway as well as the display shelves and the large aquarium were purchased with funds raised by the parents and the community. Plants and pictures of students receiving honors covered the freshly painted walls and a piano sat on the constantly buffed floored. Overall, the school was well decorated, well maintained, clean and well supported by the community. There was no library at the school. Instead, books were housed in certain classrooms and a master list was created to determine where each book was housed.

The principal, Mrs. D, a dynamic African-American woman, while proud of French immersion, was not afraid to ask for a certain amount of autonomy in terms of classroom discipline from her teachers.

Mrs. D made a school-wide announcement telling the teachers that they have to "skin your own skunk". Going on to explain that she can't do her job and their jobs (FN, A1, January 10, 2002).

The administration also emphasized the LEAP test with frequent announcements concerning the test and with a poster size copy of the check received for the state for improving their school performance score. At one point, the principal made an announcement concerning how attendance was figured into the overall school accountability score. She told the teachers that they needed to stop sending attendance forms "so early to the front." She went on to say that "every point counts" and how the students needed to practice their study skills because that was a

---

\(^1\) All names used for participating schools, teachers and students are pseudonyms.
part of the LEAP test they should be able to answer easily. She underlined how the students should not overlook "the minor things" (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

The influence of the outside world on the school was evidenced during my third observation after a knock on the door interrupted Madame Maurice's class. P.E. coaches entered the class and instructed the students to leave their jackets and bags in the classroom and to go and line up in the hall for a metal detection sweep. Two coaches went through the students' jacket pockets and bags while another coach scanned the students in the hallway with the metal detector wand. Later, I asked a passing student how long those searches had been going on and she responded that they had been going on since "that school." I asked if she meant Columbine (where two boys shot and killed a number of students and teachers) and she nodded "yes" (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

Class Environment at Aria Elementary

The fourth grade immersion class at Aria elementary consisted of three French immersion teachers: a science/math teacher, a social studies teacher, and a French language arts teacher. The students were shuffled between three different classrooms. Students socialized and played around at each transition from classroom to classroom, so it was often difficult for the teachers to keep control of the class during these transitions and to get the students on-task in order to begin instruction.

Students move to M. Kaiga's class. They come in noisely. Jerry is throwing papers in the trash ("2 points" I say under my breath … that was a bad idea: he begins throwing in everything in sight).

M. Kaiga: Nous avons un test vendredi. (We have a test Friday.)…

Brianca moves to the back of the class (her table from last week).

M. Kaiga: Silence et prenez vos cahiers de science sociaux. Brianca. Jerry. (Be quiet and take out your social studies notebooks.)

Jerry points to show that he has the right book out. Drew gets up to sharpen his pencil. It makes a lot of noise, but doesn't work. Drew balls up a piece of paper and throws it in the trash (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).
In addition, to get to M. Kaiga's classroom the students had to move was across campus.

Overall, this was not an easy class to teach. The P.E. coaches, both African-American women, said the following concerning the class.

One coach, talks about this group being the "hardest to warm to." The other coach adds "like nightmare on elm street" and she continues by saying "there is just no breaking them" (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

French was not the dominant language in the Aria immersion program. Although teachers mainly taught in French, the students for the most part used English (non-standard) nearly-exclusively both in academic and social situations. Teacher reminders to speak in French were largely ignored except for specific translation requests. In addition, English announcements and English teachers often interrupted French immersion instruction. This pervasiveness of English in French immersion was further expanded by administrative, parental and student anxiety concerning the LEAP standardized tests. The immersion parents apparently, based on teacher interviews, had voiced concerns to both the teachers and the administration over the effect that teaching content in French and then taking the LEAP test in English would have on the students' test scores. The fall out of this Test Anxiety was that all content books were now in English (Math, Science and Social Studies) and the power structures within the student/teacher interactions were reversed: the students had the power to control instruction by citing their parents' test anxiety. M. Kaiga articulated the problem very well in his open-ended interview.

… many of the parents don't understand that "why would you like to teach the children in French whereas they have to take the test in English." Some parents still don't get it but, most of the students who are in fourth grade immersion classes they are really good children classes [sic], they can do it. … the problem is the parents, they worry, are worried about it (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).
Madame Maurice was equally vexed by the pressure of using English to ensure success on the LEAP tests in the immersion classroom. She said that some of the weakness the students had in French might be due to the requirement that immersion teachers send home homework in English and the need to translate into English to ensure the students know the information when they see it on the LEAP. She did not want to teach fourth grade next year.

**Student/teacher Interaction at Aria Elementary**

For student/teacher interaction, students, particularly girls, capitalized on this test anxiety and played what I dubbed "The non-comprehension, need-it-for-the-LEAP trump card".

M. Kaiga is still trying to get the students to understand.
M. Kaiga: Gandhi voulait. Gandhi wanted liberté?
Girls in front (Rashona, Tamara, Falîna) (smiling): What you mean? What you mean liberté?
M. Kaiga: He wanted liberty (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

During every observation, the students would feign misunderstanding (often turning and smiling at their classmates) and demand to be told the information in English. If the teacher resisted the student would mention how they needed this information for the LEAP and the teacher would then relent and give them the information in English.

Rashona says that she doesn't understand and that the test will be in English.
M. Kaiga says the test will be "en français vendredi". (in French Friday)
Rashona says no "the LEAP test will be in English" and she doesn't understand (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

This imposed use of English to ensure students' comprehension; I termed the English "language safety net." This English "language safety net" caused the students to never have to rely on their French language skills to understand.

M. Kaiga begins to read the French phrases and asks students to explain. But the students' French is not good enough or they are feigning non-comprehension and M. Kaiga ends up translating. When M. Kaiga asks them if they understand they are trying to translate into English (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).
Although the teachers tried to encourage French in their classrooms they never dropped what I termed the French "language safety-net." That is to say, rather than encouraging the students to extend their own discourse in a broken and inexact French, teachers used their own well-developed French to extend the students' discourse. What would, in earlier French immersion grades, be considered a "scaffold" to support their French language development; in a fourth grade French immersion class became a "crutch."

Rashona asks what something is. Brianca starts to explain, but Madame Maurice takes over and answers Rashona's question. Brianca keeps explaining only quietly (to herself) (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

This French "language safety-net" often stemmed from the teachers' desire to help the students. Teachers would infer the students' French answers and then finish their statements. Although this demonstrated to the students that the teachers understood what they were saying, it also resulted in the students only producing very simple utterances or no utterances at all. Further, it did not allow them the chance to engage in extended discourse.

Falina: Ecrire…(Write..)
M. Kaiga: Ecrivez la titre et puis la vocabulaire (You write the title and then the vocabulary) (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

This lack of French and over-reliance on English may explain the students' lack of basic classroom vocabulary and simple pronunciation errors.

Tamara gives example: "Mon pencil est sur la table." (My pencil is on the table) After the teachers' corrections and Falina's correct use of "crayon," Rashona repeats [the same error] in her phrase: "Mon pencil est sur Madame Aussi corrects her: Mon crayon Madame Aussi finishes her sentence (la table) Rashona quietly says "la table" (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

The over-reliance on English and the lack of vocabulary in French due to this over-reliance undoubtedly contributed to the students' disinterest in using French in the classroom.
Across the classrooms, I observed that students who aggressively worked to interact with the teachers (calling out answers or questions) received more of the teachers' attentions. These aggressive students were all girls, in particular Tamara, Rashona and Falina, the higher achieving African-American girls. These girls affirmed the old adage, "it's the squeaky wheel that gets the grease." They yelled out answers, questions and unsolicited extensions on the topic at hand. They were very engaged and excited about learning, however in this excitement they tended to speak exclusively in English (non-standard).

Kyla, Rashona, Tamara and Brianca have their hands raised
Kyla responds in English and French. Falina corrects Kyla. Tamara tries to correct Kyla but she is wrong.
Rashona: They have deux paralelle et un intersection.

In addition, they ensured that no one else in the class needed to rely on the French language skills because as the teachers spoke in French, these higher achieving girls often translated into English for the class.

Madame Maurice says they will use a white sheet.
Rashona translates white to English.
Madame Maurice says they will do M. Gallon et ses enfants.
Kyla translates: Mr. Gallon and his kids. (FN, A6, February 19, 2002).

One particular girl, Rashona, was quite aggressive in making sure that she was spoken to and spoke only in English.


In M. Kaiga's and Madame Maurice's classes the girls were in the front and center of the class and they dominated. The girls were the students who answered and asked the most questions, thus they received most of their teachers' attention.

M. Kaiga asks the questions about the test and Tamara, Brianca, Sheila, Falina, answer… Mr. Kaiga tries to reclaim the class after the interruption by another
teacher. He calls on Keesha, Tamara (again) and Kyla to answer the remaining questions [All girls!] (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

The girls are calling out answers. Rashona explains in English.
Madame Maurice: Regardez "H".
Madame Maurice asks them if H has parallel and perpendicular lines.
Tamara: Two vertical lines
Rashona: Looks like an "I" (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

The boys were seated in the periphery. They moved about the class during the lesson and they were more than likely to be disengaged, disruptive or engaged in a delaying tactic such as sharpening their pencils on a broken pencil sharpener or getting up to throw away paper. During one class session, Drew, the lower achieving African-American boy, swung between the desks on the way back from the pencil sharpener and wrote on the back of his chair with his pencil while Kevin and Jerry threw wadded papers into the trash in the back of the classroom (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

In informal discussions, Madame Maurice and M. Kaiga mentioned that it was the boys' disruptiveness, particularly three boys, whom they did not name, who tried to give "funny answers" or to make the class laugh, which forced the teachers to move the boys to the margins. Both Madame Maurice and M. Kaiga explained that they often changed the classroom seating arrangement but would be forced to isolate disruptive boys, until they "calmed down" and stopped disturbing the class. M. Kaiga in response to the initial case study report said that "most of the difficulties/challenges are created by boys." He discussed how the boys forgot materials or did not do homework, while the girls remembered these things. As such the boys were marginalized both within the classroom discourse and within the physical space of the classrooms. Two interactions contributed to the boys' marginalization, 1) the students who yelled out and were already engaged got the teachers' attentions, namely the girls

Brianca and Deon have their hands up.
Sheila yells out questions about spelling.
M. Kaiga responds.
M. Kaiga goes to help Brianca.
Sheila talks out her answer.
M. Kaiga: That's "correcte." Ta réponse est correcte (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

and 2) even when the teachers did call on the boys, the boys often gave the wrong answers, because they had been disengaged and were not following classroom instruction. The teacher then skipped to a girl, who knew the correct answer.

Deon keeps talking out saying "I know the answer" "I know the answer". When is called on he is wrong (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

In this way, the teachers end up engaging the students who were already engaged and understanding the materials, the girls.

The boys' disruptiveness and disengagements had disciplinary as well as academic consequences. While punished as much as the girls, the boys' disruptive behaviors were often ignored while the girls less overt offenses were corrected in order to keep them on task.

Tamara talks out a question.
Drew bangs his pencil
Madame Maurice scolds Sheila.
Drew keeps banging (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

This wide gender gap in the Aria immersion class was bridged only occasionally by, Shae, the higher-achieving African-American boy. Although very engaged and eager to answer questions, Shae was not as aggressive as the girls in getting the teachers' attentions.

Student/student Interaction at Aria Elementary

Overall the student/student interactions seemed very familial, like siblings. They often socialized and this socialization was either in non-Standard English or it was silent socialization achieved through looks, gestures (such as winks when students would delay instruction) and mouthing words to each other.
Falina comments (Buying time?): I thought Great Britain had and "I" in it (she turns and winks to Sheila) (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

There was also social interaction with languages, both French and English. This interaction involved word play and jokes using Franglais.

Madame Maurice: Quand je parle tu te tais.
Sheila: I wasn't parlaying
Students laugh (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

Once when I was asked to walk three boys to their next class (they had to stay late in M. Kaiga's class because they had been playing around instead of finishing their test), they began to sing a rap song in English that they had created together in first grade French immersion.

The students, often the girls and Shae, helped one another across genders and achievement levels.

Shae is talking to Kyla about the instruction.
He counts to 4 in an attempt to show he made questions (FN, A6, February 19, 2002).

Sheila throws a pencil to Rashona who gives it to Dylan (FN, A6, February 19, 2002).

Charlotte is working and helps Jerry and Tamara find the right page (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

This was especially true when the teachers misunderstood the needs of a student or a question raised by a student. When the teachers' responses were insufficient another child would step in to help his/her classmate.

Brianca: Qu'est-ce que c'est le numéro cinq?…
… M. Kaiga begins to explain both the question and response to Brianca, but she is not understanding. After a few minutes of discussion, Sheila gives her book to Brianca to copy. Brianca asks Sheila about a word and she helps (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

As much as students helped each other, they corrected, teased, fought with and tattled on each other (hence the aforementioned sibling comparison).
Jerry tries to sharpen his pencil on the pencil sharpener that is very noisy and the one that didn't work last week.

Shae: It don't work. Dingo (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

The ability to both understand intuitively and be able to get under their fellow classmates' skin suggested a very close-knit community within this immersion class. Shae, the higher achieving African-American boy, articulated this feeling of community in his interviews.

Shae: We been in, all of us been in the class for like through first grade.
Researcher: So you've been like long time friends. Who are your best friends?
Shae: I think everybody.
Researcher: Everybody in the class? (Shae nods) (INT, Shae, January 28, 2002)

Shae: We all like family (W&T INT, January 24, 2002)

Yet, within this close-knit community there still existed a gender gap. For the most part the boys interacted with the boys and the girls interacted with the girls, except Shae, the higher-achieving African-American boy, who interacted and fought with the girls.

Shae is demonstrating the task to Sheila (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

Shae and Rashona are exchanging words.
Madame Maurice is scolding and having students translate what she says.
Teacher scolds Shae and Rashona in English.
Rashona continues talking under her breath (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

The dominance of the girls in student interactions, as in student/teacher interactions was evident. Certain girls--the higher-achieving more dominant girls--scolded the boys for playing, corrected the boys' French and insinuated that they were smarter than the boys.

Shae and Kevin who stay behind didn't get part A
Tamara: Part A is easy, but I'm not gonna tell you.
Shae: But you said you would (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

Tamara: Number one easy. I have to say all them easy.
Shae: I didn't start.
Drew is singing a rap song. It ain't my first. Yo mama got.
Tamara: Y'all better do your test. Y'all gonna get it.
Shae: What?!
Tamara: You heard! (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).
Kimberly Teachers at Aria Elementary

Madame Maurice: The Math and Science Teacher

Introduction to Madame Maurice

Madame Maurice was a tall elegant Black woman from Niger. She had been teacher for 13 years, ten in Niger and three in the United States at Aria elementary. She had the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree with teaching certification. Overall, Madame Maurice was very optimistic about her class. She discussed the students' marked improvement in behavior. "At the beginning, we had to teach them a lot of things, like, walking in line. Most of it was behavior problems at the beginning of the school year. Now it's much better." When questioned concerning how well she thought "things were going with the class" this year, she discussed her optimism concerning the LEAP results. "I don't think there's anything bad. I think they're doing good, and I'm positive about the outcome of the test. Positive, I mean, optimistic."

Teacher/student Interactions in Madame Maurice's Class

In addition to the student/teacher interactions described in the preceding section, there were specific student/teacher interactions specific to Madame Maurice's class. This section describes those additional interactions.

Madame Maurice always began her class with a review of previous concepts or of homework.

Madame Maurice: Ça fait moins de 90 degrees. Là c'est plus de 90 degrees. Ce n'est pas perpendiculaire. (That's less than 90 degrees and there it is more. It's not perpendicular.)

9:33 Madame Maurice: Alors, on n'a pas oublié la leçon d'hier. (So, we didn't forget yesterday's lesson) (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).
Madame Maurice corrected her students not by supplying them with the correct answers but merely by questioning the students about their incorrect answer and having the students correct their own mistakes.

Madame Maurice writes an "F" on the board.
Madame Maurice: Combien de lignes paralelle? (How many parallel lines?)
Charlotte: Un (one)
Madame Maurice: Est-ce qu'un peut avoir seulement 1 ligne paralelle? (Can one have only one parallel line?) (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

Madame Maurice further extended students discourse by delaying her speech and letting the students finish her thoughts for her.

Madame Maurice: Paralelle, Perpediculair ou Intersection?
Jerry: Intersection.
Madame Maurice: Pourquoi? Les lignes… (Why? The lines…)
Jerry: Croise (cross) (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

While she occasionally asked students to repeat what she said the way that she said it--to improve their pronunciation--she additionally ensured that the students comprehended the vocabulary and the concepts behind the vocabulary.

Madame Maurice: Repète Drew.
Drew: Verticale.
Madame Maurice: Tu sais ce que c'est? Avec tes bras montre moi horizontale (Do you know what that is? With your arms show me horizontal).

She scaffolded comprehension in her classroom by providing students with concrete, hands-on activities such as, having the students use their arms to demonstrate geometrical concepts like angles and intersecting lines, having the students show mapping skills by creating and following direction on a map they drew on the chalkboard and through the use of manipulatives such as paper dots for electrons during the science lesson.

A common student/teacher interaction found in Madame Maurice's classroom entailed the following sequence: the teacher asked questions; students answered them (sometimes in
French and sometimes in English); then Madame Maurice corrected the students' language (sometimes simply by repeating what the students had said in a more complete manner) and/or Madame Maurice asked the students to extend the content in their answers.

On the board Madame Maurice draws two parallel lines.
Class: Paralelle (parallel)
Madame Maurice: Pourquoi? (Why?)
Jerry: Lines that never intersect.
Madame Maurice: Jamais never jamais
Jerry: Never
Madame Maurice: Repète.
Jerry: Jamais
Madame Maurice: Deux lignes ne se touchent jamais. Dylan, Kevin, fais comme ça (The two lines never touch. Dylan, Kevin do like this). She makes her arms into parallel lines. She gets various students to do that also (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

Madame Maurice encouraged student/student interaction in her classroom by having the students work in groups and pairs. However, in one science group activity relating to protons and electrons, jobs were not provided for each member of the group and confusion arose. Students who were not given a task either began to socialize, became disruptive or disengaged from their group in order to create their own manipulatives. In an informal discussion of this activity, Madame Maurice said the students knew their jobs, but the students who were given the papers or the electrons were the only ones who appeared to engage in the activity.

Madame Maurice tried to insist on the use of French in her classroom, nevertheless, the students responded to her questions in either a very English Franglais (with just some key words in French) or, when they got excited, simply in English. Other students, like Rashona, were very insistent on the use of English in the classroom.

Madame Maurice continues with her lesson. Kyla, Rashona and Tamara are engaged but they keep blurting out answers in English.
Madame Maurice: Kyla trop d'anglais (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).
Madame Maurice used some of the English the students brought into her classroom to compare the French language to the students' English language. When discussing a question on the LEAP practice test with Skyla, Madame Maurice described a French word they had studied saying "It's not that different from English." In her interview she considered the positives of studying French saying "there are a lot of words in math and science that have their sources in French, so the French make them understand better where the words come from."

Madame Maurice occasionally switched to English when she was disciplining the students to ensure that they did not feign non-comprehension as an excuse for not behaving or simply because she wanted the students to understand her frustration.

Madame Maurice: One more thing I told you that you could work with "a" partner. T'as entendu Sheila? (You heard Sheila?) This time I said it in English (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

Madame Maurice used the parents and warnings of calls to the parents to help discipline her students.

Madame Maurice: Charlotte et Sheila je parle à vos parents ce soir (I'm talking to your parents tonight).
Sheila starts to argue with her.

However, Madame Maurice also mentioned the lack of parental support. In an informal conversation she mentioned one parent, the mother of Drew, the lower-achieving African-American boy. Madame Maurice explained how Drew's mom withdrew her parental support because of her child's low ITBS scores. Drew's mom used Drew's ITBS scores as proof that "he can't do it." Madame Maurice could not understand her fatalistic attitude.

Madame Maurice's own interactions with the students equally undermined her disciplinary policies. She warned students of a disciplinary action (for example failing a test if they talked during the test), but she would not follow through on her threat.
T: J'ai dit plusieurs fois "silence." C'est l'heure de s'assoir. (I told you many times "silence." It is time to sit). But she doesn't punish the talkers. Jerry bangs on his desk (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

Furthermore, what Madame Maurice perceived as punishment was perceived as a reward by the students.

Madame Maurice gives Brianca, Jerry and Kevin their own test booklets "parce que vous parlez trop" (Because you talk too much).
Kevin (bragging): I'm by myself (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

With regard to the apparent gender gap at Aria elementary, Madame Maurice would try to question the boys in an effort to reengage them in the class. However, she did not keep the boys engaged and the boys soon returned to their disengaged behaviors. One of the reasons, perhaps the main reason the boys were not called on, was because Madame Maurice often did not call on students but instead allowed the girls to yell out questions and answers. Regardless of the girls' engagement in class, there was a gender gap with regards to the teacher's attention. At times, Madame Maurice did not acknowledge the boys' questions or answers, but did respond to the same question and/or response when the girls made them.

Shae asks about "Newton."
No response.
Falina: What does "Newton" mean?
Madame Maurice: Newton, ça montre le travaille (Newton shows the work).
Falina looks back at Shae (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

In that same vein, the girls were scolded for speaking in French or being off-task but the boys, although often punished, had to go to extremes such as fighting or banging on their desks to get the teacher's attention.

Drew bangs his pencil
Madame Maurice scolds Sheila.
Drew keeps banging
Tamara asks a question in French but is scolded because she does not raise her hand.
Drew and Jerry are banging their pencils (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).
Madame Maurice's Perceptions

Madame Maurice held herself up to very high standards. She commented on how she was not doing as well as she could and discussed some of her suggestions for improving education in the Aria elementary French immersion program.

Madame Maurice: We really need to have, like, some material, more material, things like books, workbooks, more.
Researcher: Anything else?
Madame Maurice: Um, maybe like computer software…videos (INT, Maurice, January 17, 2002).

However in informal interviews Madame Maurice was adamant that the immersion program needed a less disjointed schedule for the students. She also discussed the difficulty of teaching only science and math rather than all the subjects, because one must "concentrate on content not language." She believed a better schedule would enable the teachers to concentrate more on the French language and would allow them to integrate content in a holistic fashion instead of always rushing to cover content. Additionally, there was an underlying feeling, due to the imposed schedule, that the administration wanted to ensure that immersion was not different from the English classes or even that French immersion was not as important. This secondary status was brought to light during one of my observations. The English teacher entered the classroom and told the students that she was watching them while Madame Maurice did something. I began to map out the classroom. Madame Maurice came in to explain to me that she would be right back, but the other teacher had asked her (during her math class) to run some copies for her. She commented that it was math time and she was obviously distraught. I offered to run the copies and I had Brianca do the class map while I ran down and made copies (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).
According to her responses on the teacher questionnaire, Madame Maurice took much of the responsibility for the positive occurrences in her classroom but even more so she took responsibility for the negative occurrences. When interviewed about who was responsible for the students learning Madame Maurice responded, "I can say, let's say 25% from the students, 75% from the teacher." In fact five times during the formal interview Madame Maurice alluded to her responsibility for her students' success. This pro-active stance on her students' education could explain why Drew's mom's fatalism bewildered her.

Madame Maurice held equally high standards for her students. She believed that they were capable of working at a much higher level but they were made to be lazy. They were not forced adapt to challenges.

Madame Maurice: If they have, to me, they have like, some, too many facilities that makes them a little bit lazy. Like using calculators in math and that's what I'm dealing with here lately. Make them think by themselves, work by themselves instead of using all these tools (INT, Maurice, January 17, 2002).

In informal conversations, Madame Maurice explained how the students did not speak enough French, not because they could not but because they were "canaille" (a sort of cute sneaky). Furthermore, she believed the students' constant demands for translations was a controlling tactic. The researcher shared this perception before discussing the issue with the teacher and had previously termed this interaction the "non-comprehension-need-it-for-the LEAP trump card."

While Madame Maurice attributed the students not meeting her expectations to their laziness, she considered her perception of the students' lack of respect to be a cultural mismatch. In informal discussions, Madame Maurice discussed the cultural shock the Africans experienced in the U.S.--she was not sure how it was for the Europeans. According to her, in Africa, students respected their elders whereas in the U.S. teachers had to "lutter" (fight) for students' respect (FN, A1, January 11, 2002).
Culture was a dominant theme in the interview with Madame Maurice. She referred to culture over 20 times throughout the interview. She discussed cultural differences, cultural exchange/sharing and the importance of language in achieving cultural sharing and understanding. Some of the cultural references she referred to in her interview included:

- This class is one that contains cultural differences and differences in the way we have to handle administrative paperwork.
- I wanted to come and teach in Louisiana because I've been, myself, a French student whom French wasn't the first language. So, I wanted to share my own experience, and see how others react to a new language.
- I like different teaching strategies and I learned to face different cultural acts and behavior (INT, Maurice, January 17, 2002).

Although Madame Maurice considered culture and cultural exchange to be vitally important, she did not consider French to be a heritage language for most of the students. She believed that only 5% of the students had speakers of French in their families whereas 62% of the students reported that they had speakers of French in their family.

Overall, Madame Maurice was optimistic about her class. She did not feel that she had any "problem children" and considered all her students to be very intelligent. She believed not only that instruction was important for academic success, but also that education should challenge children and that these challenges deepen and enrich students' experiences.

The students who don't always come to me when they don't understand. Some try to, I don't know comment on dit, se dépasser, try to do, like, more than what they know. They always trying some new challenges [sic]. Sometimes they even try to challenge me. These are the students that I like the best (INT, Maurice, January 17, 2002).

Further she believed that if students were successful, "it's because they've been enjoying the lesson." She believed that learning a second language was both an enjoyable experience and a culturally enriching one.
Like if they're learning in their own language or in another language, maybe it's a little bit slower, but it's not their maternal language, but I think it's richer. It brings them more (INT, Maurice, January 17, 2002).

Likewise, Madame Maurice felt her central mission as a teacher was "to find any kind of strategy so all students will be successful, not just in school, but in their life." She considered the LEAP test as an evaluation of her work not of the students.

"It's important to me because it makes me, it's an evaluation of myself. I can see if I'm really doing teaching good, or if they're learning something with me" (INT, Maurice, January 17, 2002).

M. Kaiga: The Social Studies Teacher

Introduction to M. Kaiga

M. Kaiga was a slender Black man of medium height. He was in his forties, but he appeared younger. Originally from Mali, M. Kaiga had the equivalent of a Bachelor's degree. Although, he had been teaching French as a second language at Aria elementary for four years, this was his first year in the French immersion program. He was brought into the immersion program well into the first six-week period, because the principal had asked him to take the French immersion position in order to save the program. The school had not found a permanent third grade math and fourth grade social studies teacher, so, students were dropping out of the program. M. Kaiga went to a few in-service training sessions to learn how the parish taught content and then began teaching third and fourth grade immersion. M. Kaiga had a very structured, traditional class consisting of reviews, lectures, vocabulary lists, tests and question/answer sessions.

M. Kaiga explains where India is but the map is a small map on the wall in the corner of the room.
M. Kaiga: Tout le monde vois? (Everyone can see?)
Some students move up to see.
M. Kaiga: OK. Maintenant le vocabulaire. Qu'est-ce que c'est "L'empire brittanique". M. Kaiga tells them it is "Grand Bretagne" and then translates it to
Great Britain. Students are writing the vocabulary and the definitions on the board (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

The poverty at the school was evident in the very noisy, old heater and the students' lack of materials. Students loaned each other material such as when Charlotte passed Drew a paper to write on. M. Kaiga sometimes supplied needed materials, such as notebooks and pencils.

As a social studies teacher in an all-African-American school and as a citizen from a once colonized country, M. Kaiga's content reflected his concerns for justice and freedom. He often referred to the students' own place, as southern African-American students in America, in the worldwide struggle for freedom. He also compared what African-Americans did in America with struggles for freedom elsewhere in the world such as India. M. Kaiga's topics included Rosa Parks and the Montgomery bus boycott, Martin Luther King, Gandhi, and the concepts of "liberty," "segregation," and "independence." It must be noted that observations took place between Martin Luther King Jr.'s birthday and during February, which is Black history month.

M. Kaiga carried forth that ideal of justice in his teaching. There was an incident in which a girl incorrectly answered a question and a boy teased her for making a mistake.

M. Kaiga asks where India is.
Charlotte: British.
Kevin: Coo coo (and laughs).
M. Maiga then asks Keith where India is. Keith looks in his book but doesn't answer. M. Kaiga then explained the answer to them both and also explained why it was not right to tease (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

In terms of discipline within the classroom, M. Kaiga was shocked in terms of the childrens' discipline problems and especially their disrespect towards adults, which he said did not happen in his country. However, his actions in class did not ameliorate the situation. While he made his disciplinary warnings in English, so that the student could not say that they did not understand, he often did not follow through with those threats. Once M. Kaiga told the students in English
that they would get an F if they talked and he would personally walk them to the office, however, when the girls began talking he instead responded to them and did not punish them. In the teacher interview, M. Kaiga revealed that he relied more on parental involvement to maintain discipline in his classroom.

And another thing that I usually do is to call the parents and most of the time if the parents are involved there is no problem (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

Teacher/student Interactions in M. Kaiga's Class

During in-class discussions, as discussed previously, M. Kaiga usually called on the girls. The girls were usually the most eager to volunteer information.

Falina Kayla and Tamara have their hands up.
Brianca and Charlotte raise their hands when M. Kaiga asks where India is (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

A typical interaction had M. Kaiga calling on the girls, the girls would respond in French (very simple utterances) or English, then M. Kaiga would repeat what they said in a more precise French and/or add on some extended content information.

M. Kaiga: Qu'est-ce que c'est le boycott? (What is a boycott?)
Sheila: Les gens ne sont pas d'accord avec une compagnie (People do not agree with a company).
M. Kaiga repeats what she says and adds something about not buying products (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

M. Kaiga usually called on the boys for managerial or disciplinary reasons. This was undoubtedly due to their disengagement during lectures and discussions.

Drew gets up to sharpen his pencil again.
M. Kaiga: Drew assis-toi (Drew, sit down).
Drew does not sit down he continues to sharpen the same pencil he has sharpened three times (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

He rarely called on the boys to give answers and the few times he did the boys usually responded incorrectly to the questions.
M. Kaiga: Rapidement on va revisé. Qui était MLK? Matt. (Quickly we are going to review. Who was MLK? Matt.)
Matt does not respond.
M. Kaiga: MLK était… repète… MLK était un leader des droits civiques. (MLK was… repeat… MLK was a civil rights leader)
Matt repeats (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

In general if any students answered incorrectly, M. Kaiga skipped to another student, answered the question himself or stayed on the student until that student figured out the correct answer. When Skyla gave an incorrect answer to places in which there slavery existed (her initial response had been India). M. Kaiga told her where she was wrong and then tried to push her further. While he accepted her revised answer, he skipped to Tamara for a more complete and correct answer (FN, A3, January 24, 2002).

M. Kaiga used English as a "language safety net" to reassure students that what they thought they were learning they were indeed learning. However, in social studies, his translations often did not help the students, because they did not have the vocabulary in English. This was especially true when M. Kaiga referred to world geography.

M. Kaiga: Gandhi wanted India to become independent of Great Britain.

M. Kaiga's Perceptions

M. Kaiga's perceptions were permeated with the cultural differences and similarities between him and his students and between the U.S. and his country.

When I first came here they told me OK your school is the majority African-American students that's what they told me. So this was a big surprise for me. First I was expecting to have uh white children in my class... I discovered that we have some things in common that are related to culture. Uh uh and also some people speak French. A kind of French which is different from what I studied at school, but it's French I can talk with them and uh communicate and this is also amazing … for us the United States there is no other language just English (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

Researcher: Do you find this that the girls are more motivated and the…
M. Kaiga: More motivated and very very and more intelligent I would say, the girls here…I come from a system where it is the opposite. Boys in my system, where I am from, my country, are more interested in going to school, in learning. Girls no. (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

He often mentioned the central importance of learning language for success in life and in understanding one's own cultures.

It [linguistics] was really fun you learn a lot about yourself and culture and also the..uh..the other cultures. Thanks to linguistics I can write my own language, which is not French, my… uh… my, if you want, my first language, the language I was speaking in my family (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

He mentioned the difficulty of teaching a language other than English in an intensively English environment.

Because they hear French only in a classroom setting. Outside … Everywhere they do to be [sic] everything is English (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

Added to this, M. Kaiga explained how the pressure of the LEAP test and the parental worries about the test were intensified because the test was in English, but the content was being taught in French. This was mentioned in the overview of the context. Although M. Kaiga was optimistic about the students' outcomes on the test, his interactions with the students, namely his reliance on translation seemed to reflect those parental misgivings. When he would teach, he translated the questions that he asked into English. When students answered, they either gave one-word answers in French on which M. Kaiga elaborated or they responded in English.

M. Kaiga was very exigent in terms of what he expected from his students and he frequently mentioned the need for hard work and student autonomy.

OK I think the greatest challenge affecting the students in this particular school is to uh faut bien faire faut percever… try to do… (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

I would describe the best students as someone who is really interested (pause) in learning the language, in the class and someone who is always trying, who is not afraid of making mistakes or errors (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).
Overall, M. Kaiga did not feel the students had met these expectations. He felt that the students got away with a lot in his class and that they could be lazy.

We expect them to express to hold a conversation a very elementary conversation in French. Most of them do not try. I'm not saying they don't but I think they don't try. If you tell them uh "Comment t'allez-vous" they say "what, what did you say?" (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

Although he held his students up to high expectations, which they did not meet, M. Kaiga felt that ultimately he was responsible for the class outcomes, especially any negative outcomes in his classroom. The teacher responsibility questionnaire underlined this sentiment. While he owned his responsibility, M. Kaiga believed that the teacher, administration and parents should work as a team to ensure students' successes.

I think it should be, in my opinion, we should be a team: the teacher, the parents and the administration. ... We are all responsible. In case of failure the first person we see is the teacher. "Oh it's him or its her." But I think it should be a teamwork really (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

In terms of academic success, namely the LEAP test, M. Kaiga was perplexed.

When they introduced me to immersion they told me that OK the children will have to take the LEAP the ITBS. Especially the LEAP if they fail it they may have to stay in fourth grade, but the ITBS. I really don't know why the reasons for those tests. I know that in my system of education testing is very very important, but it's not at every grade level. Sometimes it.ah sometimes its' really. Its' really I not saying its unfair, but it may be unfair. A child may fail the test, he or she I'm going to give you an example.[gives example of A student who failed] ...Maybe the computer didn't read the right answer, I don't know, or the student was not in the that day. Because many of the students if you look at the background where they come from this can also affect their uh in French we say "rendements" (scores) (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

This concern over the fairness of the LEAP test underlined the most salient theme expressed by M. Kaiga, that is, his profound belief that education was to ensure a successful life for the students. He punctuated the point that a success in life entailed respect, justice and understanding of oneself and others.
I would like to make… uh … what you call in France… to make a… a person… to help them become a person. Person with a capital P in the beginning. Which means someone who respect himself or herself, respect for other. Someone who stands for justice. Someone who stands for equality. All the life skill, the social skills that we talk about. It's not just someone who..ah… he has a bunch of money… no. I like for students to be proud of him or herself in his or her adult life. … I would like them to be grateful to be thankful to me… because I have taught them the right thing (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

His felt that learning other languages was crucial to this success, because he felt that learning other languages led to cultural exchange and a deep understanding of one's own culture and language.

Our teacher used to tells us… if you speak one language you are one person, if you speak two languages you are two people, if you speak three you are three people… this, this this so… I would like the way he explained, he used to explain us, how important languages were, still are, I would say (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

Further, his interactions and dependence on the students' parents as well as his awareness that he was teaching a heritage language also underlined his goal of education for respect, justice and understanding of oneself and others.

Researcher: A lot of the students have grandparents [who speak French] ?
M. Kaiga: Yeah grandparents who speak French. A lot of uh a lot parents … uh let's say grandparents… and there is a grand parent even now that's all she can talk. She talks pure French better than English (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002).

Madame Aussi: The French Language Arts Teacher

Introduction to Madame Aussi

Madame Aussi was a small Black woman with an infectious smile. She had been brought into the program mid-way through the year, in December, to replace M. Kaiga who moved from French as a second language to the immersion classroom. Madame Aussi, like Madame Maurice was also from Niger. In fact, they had been in the same university and it was Madame Maurice who recommended Madame Aussi to the principal Mrs. D. Because Madame Aussi felt much
more comfortable speaking in French, interviews with Madame Aussi were conducted in French. In general Madame Aussi did not seem to be at ease teaching. Her lessons to the French immersion students seemed more like French as a second language-elementary class (FLES) than a French language arts for immersion class. In fact, in informal discussions Madame Aussi said that she was under the impression that she was supposed to teach only FLES. She further stated that no curriculums were provided to her in either FLES or French immersion language arts. The vocabulary and content of the classes were very rudimentary (under, over, in, cows, sheep and classroom objects). This was no doubt due to her inexperience in having never worked in French immersion. Yes despite her working with very simple vocabulary and concepts the students still responded in Franglais choosing to use English rather than the simple French vocabulary. This reinforced Madame Aussi's belief that the students needed repetition in order to formulate sentences in French. Madame Aussi was pleased with her instructional style and genuinely felt she was meeting the needs of the students. The only problem she found with teaching her students was "pour les faire taire" (to get them to be quiet).

Teacher/student Interactions in Madame Aussi's Class

Madame Aussi's class work contained more form than content; chorus, repetition and drill were often used in her class. In one class the students took turns doing the same activity in which they repeated simple animal names for nearly the entire 30-minute class.

Madame Aussi: C'est quoi? (What's that?)
Class: The cow.
Madame Aussi: Repetez (Repeat)
Class: La vache.
Madame Aussi: Repetez.
Class: La vache.
Madame Aussi: Tamara?
Tamara: La vache.
Madame Aussi: Shae.
Shae: La vache.
Madame Aussi: Merci tres bien. Il reste un seule (thank you, very good. There is only one left.)
Someone: Chevre (goat)
Madame Aussi: Taisez-vous! (Be quiet)
As she passes students repeat
La chevre, la chevre, la chevre, la chevre
She makes Charlotte repeat three times because her pronunciation is slightly off (FN, A2, January 15, 2002).

It must be added that I was able to visit Madame Aussi’s class only four times and she stated for her member check that her lessons extend over the entire week so a visit once a week did not reflect the reality of a lesson. Madame Aussi had a hard time disciplining her class. The students were mean to each other and they got into fights which required the intervention of the principal or the vice-principal on three of my first four visits to the school. When Madame Aussi scolded the students it did not seem to ameliorate the situation.

Teacher scolds Shae and Rashona in English.
Rashona continues talking under her breath.
Shae: Stop giving her attitude!
Rashona: Shut up!
Shae: You shut up!
Jerry: Shut up. Shut up (FN, A4, January 28, 2002)!

Madame Aussi corrected the students' errors by modeling (repeating the correct form) after the students repeated whatever form they were drilling. The students did not self-correct nor did they learn from the corrections given to others.

Tamara again: Mon pencil est sur la table (My pencil is on the table).
Madame Aussi: Mon crayon (My pencil).
[about five minutes later]…
Rashona: Mon pencil est sur…
Madame Aussi: Mon crayon (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

In addition, the use of repetition in Madame Aussi ’s lessons did not appear to correct some of the students' rudimentary pronunciation errors such as the word "chaise" which nearly all the students continually pronounced with an English /ch/ rather than a French /sh/. Even with
Madame Aussi’s constant modeling of the correct form, the students continued to use the English /ch/ rather than the French /sh/.

Despite these shortfalls the possibilities for the French language arts class were brought to light in one of Madame Aussi’s lesson. In this lesson, she gave the students a chance to create their own phrases, their own language rather than simply repeating pre-fabricated phrases. The effect was immediate and powerful. The students, including some usually very disengaged boys, became engaged, motivated and eager to respond in complete French sentences.

Kevin: Ma main est sur…
Deon: Mon sac est…
Falina: Mon crayon est à cote moi
Madame Aussi: A cote de moi.
Tamara's turn. Sheila's turn. (Students all engaged)…

As students are lining up Deon walks up to Madame Aussi and tells her the phrase that he has been raising his hand to try and say (FN, A4, January 28, 2002).

I did not observe this amount student engagement and eagerness to use their French before or afterwards at the school. As other classroom interactions, both Madame Aussi and the students mentioned enjoyable songs and games that Madame Aussi used to teach French. However, I only observed one game, a counting game during which the two boys ended up getting into a fight for which the vice-principal was summoned to the class. There was also only one song observed, but the students did not get a chance to learn the song because Madame Aussi ran out of time. However, the unobserved songs and games that were mentioned did seem to interest the students. In his interview Shae discussed them.

Shae: She's [Madame Aussi] fun, she plays games with us, and she teaches French as we playing games, she teaches us French in the games and we learn a lot of words (INT, Shae, January 28, 2002).
Madame Aussi's Perceptions

Madame Aussi spoke of feeling like an outsider both within the classroom and within the school. She described her recent arrival in the states and the visa process that she had to undergo to work in the United States as a fatiguing and expensive. Her lack of English fluency and her lack of funds may have contributed to her feelings of being overwhelmed. In her words, she was still suffering from that traumatic experience, "J' en souffre encore même maintenant," (I still suffer from it even now).

Madame Aussi believed that students had a variety of "styles d'apprentissage" (learning styles): "en m'écouter"(by listening to me), "quand il voient"(when they see) et "pour certaines il joindre l'écoute à l'aide visual"(for some they join listening with visual aid). She said she tried to use all three when she teachers. The biggest challenge for students she found was to "apprendre, étudier et écouter" (learn, study and listen). Furthermore, in speaking of her best students she identified their qualities as "meilleurs élèvent c'est d'abord celui qui m'écoute qui reste tranquille en classe et qui pose des questions quand on comprend pas" (for her the best students listened, were calm and asked questions when they did not understand).

Madame Aussi took responsibility for positive occurrences in her classroom but not the negative occurrences. When asked the reasons for students not doing well she responded "si c'est un majorité dans la class, je me dit que c'est moi, c'est peut-être ma méthode" (if a majority of the students were not doing well she took responsibility for that saying it could be her methodology), however, " si c'est une minorité je me dis qu'ils ne fassent pas attention, ils n'écouterent pas, parce que généralement c'est les cas qui arrivent" (if only a few students were not doing well it was because they were not paying attention, they weren't listening and that that was generally the case).
She believed there were two types of students: motivated students who were interested and do well and disruptive students who were not interested and do not do well. She did not understand why the older students, who were supposed to "être la bonne example" (be a good example), were "le plus turbulant" (misbehaved the most). She divides up the immersion class into those who are "perterbateur" (disruptive) and those who "veulent vraiment apprendre" (really want to learn). For the "perterbateur" she said they "taquinent" (tease), "veulent pas apprendre" (do not want to learn).

She referred to discipline problems as the responsibility of the regular education teacher, as due to the lack of parental involvement and as an administrative failure to strike fear, perhaps better translated as demand respect, from the students. When asked who was responsible for the students, Madame Aussi divided the responsibility between the teacher, the parents and the administration (however, because of her responses concerning discipline problems it was not sure whether she was speaking of herself or the regular education teacher when she said "the teacher"). Madame Aussi did not elaborate on this in her member check. Nonetheless, she felt that the parents and teachers needed to "responsabiliser les enfants" (make students responsible).

Overall, Madame Aussi was optimistic about the students' outcomes and the challenges and benefits that cultural exchange would bring to the students. Madame Aussi believed that language or dialect "peut affecter pour une debut" (can at first affect) students' learning, before the students "s'habituent" (adapt) and then "ça passe"(it passes). Madame Aussi did not mention French as a heritage language for the students. In terms of her goals as a teacher, she said it was "donner ce que je connais moi-même à ces enfants" (to transfer her knowledge to the students) and she felt that the LEAP test (which had to be explained to her during the interview) was important to ensure that students had a solid "base" so that they could pass the test.
Shae: The Higher Achieving African-American Boy

Shae's Perceptions of Self and School

Shae was a higher-achieving African-American young man, according to his ITBS scores. He was nine and a half years old, slender, light-skinned and wore glasses. He was one of the few boys who was often engaged in the classroom instruction. Shae had high grades and he kept track of his G.P.A. to the decimal.

Researcher: How are your grades so far this year?
Shae: Um, they're good, cause I made a 3.143.
Researcher: That's good, you know your GPA. That's good.
Shae: And I mean, I don't know. And I made Honor Roll (INT, Shae, January 28, 2002).

He had a very positive view of learning and during his interview he constantly referred to how learning and high grades were stressed at home where Shae said "my mom talks to me about how I'm doing in school and if, like, I'm getting good grades and stuff like that." He did not feel that learning came easily to him, nor did he feel that grades said anything about him. He referred to his subjects as being "sometimes hard and sometimes easy." Shae preferred the subjects taught in English--spelling, reading, language arts--while his least favorite subject, science, was a subject taught in French. When he was asked if he had any problems at school he focused on his lack of understanding of school content.

Researcher: And have you ever had any trouble or problems in school?
Shae: Yes.
Researcher: Could you tell me about them?
Shae: Well, a lot of times, there were some things that I didn't know.
Researcher: And what did you do about it?
Shae: I asked the teacher (INT, Shae, January 28, 2002).

Further, he believed the teacher looked on him as a child whose grades were "kinda low" when he had some of the best grades of any boy in the class. Contrarily, he stated during this same
interview that he liked "getting good grades". Another contradiction that appeared in his interview when compared to observational field notes was when he said that teachers perceived him as a child who "talks a lot." With all the disruptive boys in this class, it would be hard to perceive quiet Shae as a child who "talks a lot." None of the teachers perceived him that way either. This feeling of being negatively viewed by others was evident in Shae's responses on the Caldwell (1999) collective self-esteem questionnaire. According to the questionnaire, Shae, more so than any other student in the class, felt that others negatively perceived his school. Further Shae felt that others also negatively perceived his ethnic group. While his confidence in his schoolwork and behavior appeared to be artificially low, his self-esteem, according to the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview, was not. Shae placed himself in all but one of the positive categories and none of the negative ones. Furthermore, his misapprehensions about the difficulty of his schoolwork also proved to be true. Shae was one of the few students in the class to fail his math LEAP test. Everyone was surprised, except perhaps Shae himself.

Shae's Perceptions of His Peers

Shae described his friends as follows: "my friends, they good to me, we play a lot and we don't get into arguments that much, and we got things we got somethings that's our favorite things we like to do, some sports and all kinds of stuff. And we like football." In asking the characteristics of those who were not friends he answered that question quickly and succinctly, "Girls." According to Shae the girls were "mean," and "they always rolling their eyes at the people. You can't even say hi." This contradicted what Shae said in his Wright and Taylor interview about all the students being best friends. Shae only mentioned one boy as a friend. Within the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview it was found that Shae attributed more positive attributes to the girls and more negative attributes to the boys. So, while he might have felt
negatively about the girls, he perceived them as having more positive attributes such as being
happier, nicer and smarter. Shae perceived the boys as being worse at school and not having
many friends. The margin for the positive was much larger than the margin for negative
attributes. The girls were mentioned for 20 positive attributes while the boys were only
mentioned for 10. For negative attributes the boys were mentioned for six while the girls were
mentioned for four.

Shea's Perceptions of His Teachers

Shae showed an overall satisfaction with his current French immersion teachers. Shae
used various characteristics to positively describe his teachers. He described Mme. Maurice by
saying,"she's, like, a good teacher for us, and as she's helping us with science and math, she
giving us French, too." M. Kaiga was "nice. He could be fun sometimes, and he's helpful when
you don't understand something in your work." Finally Shae described Mme. Aussi as, "fun, she
plays games with us, and she teaches French as we playing games, she teaches us French in the
games and we learn a lot of words."

Shae did not mention any of his teachers treating any other student differently. However,
he did say that each teacher's treatment of students was different from other teachers because,
"they treat different cause they not the same person." He believed that his teachers treated
different behaviors differently, namely that when "we don't pay attention," Shae explained, "can
make them turn around" that is to say become meaner. The only teacher that he said he did not
like was a previous French immersion teacher, not one of his current teachers. There appeared to
be a cultural clash with this former immersion teacher. According to Shae, "if you had your
shoes off, she'd take them and she'd throw them outside."
Shae's Perceptions of Language

Shae stated that he did not notice many differences in how language was spoken between home and school. He did not mention that his immersion teachers spoke a different language. Shae said that the content of what his teachers and parents said were different. His teachers "talk to me about my schoolwork, and um, well now they talk to us about LEAP and they trying to help us to pass" while his mom "talks to me about how I'm doing in school and if, like, I'm getting good grades and stuff like that." When discussing how his friends talked he again focused on the difference in the content saying that "we don't talk about school when we at home, but when we at school, we would talk about our work and stuff." In terms of French as a heritage language, Shae did not know of any heritage language speakers in his family.

Falina: The Higher Achieving African-American Girl

Falina's Perceptions of Self and School

According to her ITBS scores, Falina was a higher-achieving African-American young lady. She was ten years old, slender, light-skinned and wore glasses. As with the other higher-achieving girls in the class, Falina was engaged in the classroom instruction. She was not as aggressive as some of the other girls though. She had high grades," first six weeks, 4.0, second, 3.87, and this six weeks I made 3.87," but stated that they were higher in earlier years, "only one time I made a 3.857, all the others, 4.0." and that the schoolwork was harder this year. Falina preferred subjects in which she got good grades, but her favorite class, math, she enjoyed because she liked to "deal with numbers." According to Falina, getting good grades meant that "that I'm smart, I'm learning stuff." Further, she believed her content teachers thought positively of her. She thought Madame Maurice would say, "I'm really smart, cause I always make A's in her class." In the case of M. Kaiga she thought that he would say that she "acts up", but she
"makes good grades;" giving the impression that she felt that good grades neutralized bad behavior. In Madame Aussi's class, for which did not receive a grade, she said "I'm good, up in her class." In terms of how she viewed herself, according to the Wright and Taylor interview Falina attributed all the positive attributes and none of the negative attributes to herself. This positive self-esteem, according to the Caldwell collective self-esteem questionnaire, was not due to her identity being defined by either her school and or by her ethnic group.

Falina's Perceptions of Her Peers

Falina considered all the students in the class as her friends. When questioned about if any of the students in her class were not her friends Falina stated, "no, they all my friends. They all nice." She simply stipulated that she did not "hang" with all of them. When asked twice to elaborate on the difference between the friends that she "hangs" with and the friends that she did not "hang" with Falina simply responded," I don't know." According to her responses on the Wright and Taylor interview, Falina had a much higher estimation of the girls in her class. She attributed positive attributes 25 times to girls in her class and only 5 times to boys. Similarly, she attributed negative attributes to the boys seven times and to the girls only three times. Further, Falina only mentioned girls when asked to name her friends.

Falina's Perceptions of Her Teachers

Falina had never had a teacher she did not like. When asked about what she thought of her teachers and their treatment of her, Falina said, "all of my teachers treat me good, and they be fair to me. They just want the best for me to learn." She did however, notice differences between the teachers. Even though she had nodded her head when asked if the teachers treated the students the same, Falina found that Madame Aussi treated some students differently. Saying, "sometimes she could be mean and if you really be bad and stuff." As for the other French
immersion teachers Falina was very positive. She liked Madame Maurice because she "is funny cause she make the lesson really good. She explains good and stuff." She also described M. Kaiga as "a nice teacher." When asked how she thought that her teachers could improve Falina was concerned for her fellow students. She believed that teachers needed to "ask to them if they really understand and, like, give them a question that's out of the book and if he don't answer right, explain to him again until he understands." It is interesting to note that Falina used the masculine pronoun considering the problems the boys had in engaging with the activities.

Falina's Perceptions of Language

Falina stated that she did notice differences in how language was spoken between home and school. She said that her friends,"Um, they, like, try to be book over here since it's school and everybody over here and at home since nobody's from over here, they just different." When asked how different she elaborated that the way they talk at her home was "nicer." Falina acknowledged that her language was different at home than at school. However, she refused to elaborate on how it was different saying that it was "private." She did say that at home her mother would tell her "'do it right now' and she'll [Madame Maurice] explain why she wants you to do it." Falina said that her parents both knew other languages, her mother had taken French classes and her father was Filipino so he knew some Spanish and that his daddy was Italian. In terms of French as a heritage language, Falina's grandmother spoke French.

Drew: The Lower Achieving African-American Boy

Drew's Perceptions of Self and School

According to his ITBS scores, Drew was a lower-achieving African-American young man. However, it must be noted that unlike Shae, the higher-achieving boy at Aria Elementary, Drew passed both the language and math LEAP tests. He was nine years old of medium height
with an athletic build. Drew was constantly disengaged or disruptive during classroom instruction. He felt that his grades, which described as "A's, B's, and C's on my papers," were worse this year and that "the subject's harder" in fourth grade. As Drew explained, "I can't make no more four points like I used to." He did not believe that grades said anything about him. Although he was constantly disengaged and disruptive during class he said that he enjoyed learning. He further said that he liked subjects like social studies with M. Kaiga in which "we do, like, kinda sorta fun stuff. And we read and we take a test." When asked what kind of "fun stuff" he did he explained, "Well, when we taking a test, we may take our little social studies book, and if we don't get nothing, he let us look in our book and find the answers." Apparently, classes were more fun for Drew with no test pressure. Drew believed that school was hard except for spelling and social studies. When questioned about his disinterest in class he stated, "I wanna be smart. Sometimes, the other children, they take my answers and I don't have nothing else to say." When asked how teachers could improve how they taught Drew did not answer until I was ending the interview when he blurted out frustratedly,

Like when a teacher's going to call on somebody, the class be, 'ooh, ooh, ooh, here! Ms. Hunter, Madame Maurice!' They be raising their hands for the answer, and like Madame would be calling on somebody else other than me, and they get the answer that I was going to get teachers always called on the students who were going "ooh, ooh, ooh, here!" (INT, Drew, January 28, 2002).

Drew wanted to be called on and there were times in the beginning of a class when he would raise his hand, once. If, or rather when, he would not get called on, he would then disengage. Drew's definition of smart appeared to mean students who answered questions in school. Drew's understanding about the importance of school to his future was impressive. He spoke of his grades and needing to improve them, especially math, because he wanted to play professional football, because, "I have to know math to do that." Drew believed that his teachers perceived
him as "kinda good, kinda bad and a little bit of a hard worker." Contrary to Drew's perception, Drew was mentioned by name by all the teachers when they spoke of bad behavior, disrespect and laziness. According to the Wright and Taylor interview Drew attributed all the positive attributes to himself and the only negative attribute he said he had involved having difficulty with schoolwork. Like Falina, Drew's responses on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire showed that he did not feel that his school or his ethnic identity played a big role in forming his identity. Like Shae, Drew perceived that others negatively perceived his ethnic group.

**Drew's Perceptions of His Peers**

Drew spoke of his friends as "some kind" and "some mean". He did not know how to describe those who were not his friends. He just took the interviewers suggestion that they just "liked different things." As mentioned earlier, Drew believed that other students in the class were smart, but he felt that they stole his answers. In reference to problems in school, Drew related how some students tried to pick fights with him.

Drew: Uh, sometimes people like to fight me.
Researcher: Why do they like to fight you?
Drew: Because, I don't know why. They just come pick, and when they steal from my candy when I have some and sometimes when they have candy, they give me, but they never give me (INT, Drew, January 28, 2002).

Drew did not mention anyone from his class and since candy was eaten at recess when other students were around, it was not necessarily his immersion peers who picked fights with him. Drew was the only participant at Aria Elementary who found that boys had more positive attributes--by a wide margin 11 positive for the girls and 19 positive for the boys--and fewer negative attribute--a close margin five negative attributes for the girls and four for the boys.
Drew's Perceptions of His Teachers

Drew believed that teachers' treatment of students was dependant on the students' behavior, "when we nice to them, they be nice to us and when we bad to them, they bad to us." Additionally, he elaborated, "whatever you do, they're gonna do back." Drew kept changing his mind about who was his favorite teacher. At different time in the interview he mentioned each immersion teacher as his favorite. Yet he was critical of all the teachers for calling on other students when he had his hand up. When asked how could teachers do a better job he replied "help me" and then reiterated that teachers called on the noisy, smart students and not him.

Drew's Perceptions of Language

Drew's knowledge of language and register differences was impressive and stems from his experience with his family's heritage language. Drew had three grandmas and a grandpa who spoke French, but that was not all. One grandmother spoke Creole French, another grandmother spoke Standard French and a grandmother spoke Cajun French. Not only could Drew differentiate between these two heritage dialects but he also differentiated between the standard French that was spoken at school.

I have three grandmothers that teach different kind of French: Cajun, Creole and my grandmother talks the same kind of French like, uh, like every French teacher around in school! (INT, Drew, January 28, 2002).

When asked the difference between the different French dialects Drew replied, "because Cajun is different from the regular French that they speak right now and Creole is different from both of them." In addition, Drew was able to differentiate between the language he and his friends used at both home and school. He said that the way they talk in school was "nice" and at home was "bad" because, "Cause the school's supposed to be a nice school that, and you don't curse at school or nothing. And at home, they just have bad people around, that you say bad words."
Charlotte: The Lower Achieving African-American Girl

Charlotte's Perceptions of Self and School

Charlotte was a lower achieving, according to ITBS scores, African-American young lady. She was nine years old with a short, medium sized frame and very dark skin. Charlotte was usually engaged or tried to engage in the classroom instruction, but sometime she used classroom time to get homework done. She was a very helpful child. She often helped other students who could not see or had missed copying notes. She often helped Madame Maurice distribute materials for activities. Charlotte said that at school she learned "how to add, subtract, multiply, read, learn French, write and spell." She enjoyed learning those things and thought they were "easy." She reported that her grades had improved since first, second and third grade saying, "when I was in, like, in the first, I was used to making 1.0 and in second, I used to make two points and now I'm making three points." When asked what her grades say about her, Charlotte stated, "[t]hey say I can learn". She gave her own hard work credit for her improved grades explaining the higher grades were "because I study more, I listen more and I learn more." Charlotte was nervous about the LEAP. Unfortunately, her apprehension proved to well placed. Charlotte did not pass the math portion of the LEAP. Charlotte's favorite subject was French, "because you learn different days that are English." She believed her teacher, Madame Maurice would say, "[s]he's nice, she helpful, she kind, she listens a lot, and she friendly." According to the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview, Charlotte saw herself in a positive light. She attributed all the positive attributes to herself and the only negative attribute she attributed to herself dealt with her difficulty with schoolwork. Charlotte's collective self-esteem in terms of school, family and ethnic group, as measured by Caldwell (1999), was the highest score possible in all areas.
Charlotte's Perceptions of Her Peers

Charlotte considered her friends to be "nice, kind, helpful, and friendly." Those peers who she did not consider to be friends she described as "not helpful, kinda friendly, kinda nice and kinda mean." Charlotte, like Falina, the other female participant, gave positive attributes overwhelmingly to girls (25 girls and 5 boys) and negative attributes mostly to boys (7 boys and 3 girls). Charlotte listed only girls as her friends.

Charlotte's Perceptions of Her Teachers

Charlotte preferred teachers who were helpful. Her positive commentaries on her teachers varied. Madame Maurice was described as "helpful and nice and kind." M. Kaiga, her favorite teacher, was "fun, he nice and he funny" (a similar description as the one Falina gave of Madame Maurice, her favorite teacher). Madame Aussi was described as being, "friendly, nice, kind, helpful and happy." A Charlotte's general description of all her teachers was, "they helpful a lot, they friendly, and they like to help us." Charlotte said that she did not perceive that any teacher gave any differential treatment to the students. When asked how she thinks that her teachers could improve Charlotte comments reflected Falina's and Drew's worries about students who were having trouble understanding.

Let the, if the students don't understand, they could let one of the students explain it, and if they still don't get it, let the teacher explain it to them (INT, Charlotte, January 28, 2002).

Charlotte's Perceptions of Language

Charlotte did not notice differences in how language was spoken between home and school.

Researcher: Is there any difference, go back to your friends, between how your friends talk to you here at school and how your friends talk to you, say, if you're at your house?
Charlotte: No.
Researcher: No. They talk the same?
Charlotte: Same (INT, Charlotte, January 28, 2002).

Researcher: And is there any difference between how your teachers talk to you at school?
Charlotte: No (INT, Charlotte, January 28, 2002).

In terms of French as a heritage language, Charlotte did not know of any heritage language speakers in her family.

Researcher: Does anyone in your family speak a language besides English?
Charlotte: Not that I know of.

Aria elementary had a definite imbalance in the student/teacher power structure wherein the students had control of the classroom. Parent and administrative test anxiety over the LEAP test and the teachers' inexperience in the face of this test anxiety supported this imbalance of power. The African-American participating students had a positive view of schooling and their teachers. They interacted as siblings in class in that they were both helpful and antagonistic to one another.

Case Study B: Blue Willow Elementary--The Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) Classroom

General Overview of the Context

School Environment at Blue Willow Elementary

Blue Willow Elementary was a neighborhood school in the truest sense with a mostly local African-American population, faculty and administration. All the participating teachers were from the same area as the school. Blue Willow Elementary was located off the highway and over the (literal and proverbial) railroad tracks to an obviously impoverished neighborhood. My first visit to the school revealed the close community ties which the school had. I observed what appeared to be parents and grandparents walking the students to school. They said "hello" to me but I drew curious glances. I was immediately recognized as an outsider. At one point, a
car was stopped in the middle of the street to chat with a passerby. Nobody pulled up behind the
car (most of the parents were walking). An older man shuffled to the school with a child, stayed
inside awhile and then shuffled out. A man who was standing in the road chatting with the
stopped car asks the older man as he was crossing the street, "Y'Alright Mr. Doiron?" (FN, B1,
January 11, 2002).

The school was welcoming, neat and clean, but impoverished. Inside the main entrance
the hallway was lined with various sized plastic (resin) patio chairs. These chairs were backed
up against a concrete block wall that had paint peeling off of it. The school decorations
displayed school and community pride. Across from the chairs were pictures of previous and the
current principals, all Black men. There were also certificates from the state board of education
extolling the school's achievement (SPS score) and the school's scholastic growth (FN, B1,
January 11, 2002). Later in observations, the school accountability decorations would include a
poster size replication of a check for over $6,000 that the school received for their accountability
results. The librarian (and the participating social studies teacher), Mrs. Lebrun, was proud of
the five new computers that the school acquired for their Accelerated Reader program, a program
which encourages students to read by giving them points for each book read. Announcements on
the intercom reminded teachers and students of the importance of scoring well on the
standardized ITBS and LEAP tests. The following was the first announcement I heard in the
school.

The principal talks to the fourth grade about repeating a grade and the need to
pass the LEAP. "This is your ticket to the fifth grade." The principal gives the
dates of the test and explains how teacher will explain how to take tests. And
stressed the need to work with the students individually (FN, B1, January 11,
2002).
Although, the pride in the school and the commitment to the community were apparent in the school, the condition and material state of the school belied this positive upbeat attitude. The roof, which was under repair, was stained from previous leaks and leaked even more each time it rained, to the point of ceiling tiles falling down on a teacher. The noise and falling debris from the roof work distracted the teachers and students at a very crucial time--the month before the LEAP and ITBS tests. The work on the roof made everything rattle. Light shone through the rain stained tiles. The teachers' lounge had debris falling down from what looked like an asbestos covered ceiling. On my fifth observation of the school I arrived and found that the students were crammed together in the middle of the classroom. There were leaks all over the classroom. The teacher, Mrs. Porte, was in the back of the class trying to clean off her class library; all of her books were soaked. I volunteered to clean them off so she could begin teaching.

Further observation around the school found that the coke machine leaked onto the floor and had damaged the tiles in the hallway and the books in the library were mostly older books that were tattered and musty. The question that came to my mind, having visited other schools in the parish which were in much better condition, was why did the parish allow this school to become so dilapidated? Furthermore, why did they not fix the school over the holidays or over the summer rather than waiting until right before the LEAP and ITBS tests to begin their work? In her response to the member check, Mrs. Lebrun replied that the school had been told their insurance would not cover this work during the holidays.

Despite this physical environment the administration and faculty seemed upbeat, focused and very friendly. Students also were very active in the school and friendly. For example, there
were over 100 students who participated in the school science fair. The school rewarded this participation by mentioning each participant by name.

Announcements: Science fair placements are announced. 1-10 and overall winners. "All of you are winners. We didn't have the money to give prizes to everybody" Ms. Sonnier announces all the participants (over 100). The announcements seem to take forever (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Community ties were especially apparent during the month of February, when the school honored Black history month. During this month the halls and bulletin boards were decorated with pictures of Martin Luther King Jr., Rosa Parks and Fredrick Douglass. Pride in African-American heritage, in the community and in their accomplishments was the most palpable theme in this school. Students were eager to participate in the school's Black History program.

Mrs. Porte comes in for volunteers: I need 2 people (all heads go up) Mrs. Porte: Y'all don't even know what I want…I need 2 people to jump off the bridge for me. (All hands up…laughing) Mrs. Porte gives the criteria of the person she needs: not shy or sing song and with attitude to say something for the Black history program. Joanna: Mrs. Porte I speak loud and I'm black and I'm proud. (Teresa and Raylyn raise their hand and say they too are loud) Mrs. Porte gives Teresa and Said the tasks (FN, B6, February 13, 2002).

Class Environment at Blue Willow Elementary

Since both fourth grade classrooms were equal in terms of demographics (percentage minority and free or reduced lunch) and ITBS scores, the participating classroom was included in this study based on the principal's request. The class was a very well behaved class and the principal often praised this class for their good behavior in the hallways. Why the principal did not want me to observe the other class became apparent on the second visit to the school.

Another student comes and asks Mrs. Porte to come because Mr. Chenille's homeroom class is "cutting flips" (Mr. Chenille had to leave the room). Students look back at me when Mrs. Porte leaves. Half of the class stops working to wait for the drama to unfold (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).
Class Blue Willow had three content teachers: Mrs. Porte, the English language arts teacher and the homeroom teacher; Mr. Chenille, the math/science teacher; and Mrs. Lebrun, the social studies teacher. Student movement was minimized when transitioning from one teacher to another by having the social studies teacher come into the room while the students remained in the same place and by having the students change from their language arts classroom to their science/math classroom during the lunch and recess breaks.

Student/teacher Interaction at Blue Willow Elementary

Student/teacher interaction varied widely in the three classes depending on the teacher. For this reason, the student/teacher interactions are given individually for each teacher rather than creating an overall summary of observed student/teacher interactions.

Student/student Interaction at Blue Willow Elementary

In all three teachers' classes verbal socialization was discouraged.

Mr. Chenille scolds Antonio for talking. Said smiles at Jude after he goes back to his desk (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Raylyn and Heather are whispering.
Mrs. Porte: What's the whispering about (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Raylyn, Donovan and another student are talking
Mrs. Lebrun: Donovan can you just stop (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Because most of the observations were in whole group where verbal socialization was frowned upon, most of the student/student interaction observed in whole group was silent socialization. The silent socialization involved looks, gestures and mouthing words to other students.

(Mr. Chenille's class)
Joanna is wording something to Teresa. Robert is moving his shoulders back and forth like a dance.
Nigeria is staring at the door (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Roquette passes note to Teresa
Mrs. Lebrun: Tonight on TV Land Special find a little know Black History fact (FN, B4.5, February 1, 2002).

(Mrs. Porte's class)
Said flips off someone (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

The socialization was usually gender specific with girls talking to girls and boys talking to boys. However, the students who appeared to be higher achieving, those who were often correct when then answered questions in class and who needed very little, if any, teacher remediation, socialized across genders.

(Mr. Chenille's class)
Students begin talking while a group of students are working out problems on the board. Antonio is taking to Sasha. Donovan to Roquette. Nigeria is playing with her hands (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

This was especially true for Teresa and Robert who socialized often together.

Robert and Teresa are talking and looking at her [Teresa's] notebook (FN, B4.5, February 1, 2002).

In addition, Donovan, the higher achieving African-American boy socialized often with girls regardless of their achievement level.

Raylyn and Donovan are talking. Roquette hands Donovan a pencil. Donovan and Roquette are talking (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Occasionally the student/student interaction demonstrated there was friction in the class. However, teasing or laughing at other students was not considered acceptable by Mrs. Porte or Mr. Chenille and always resulted in punishment such as losing recess, being made to kneel ("put on their knees") or at the very least scoldings.

One student missed 9 and the whole class goes, "Ahh!" Mrs. Porte scolds them. Telling them that she already told them not to do that (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

Mr. Chenille gives 3 problems students start to work them out. Some students are incorrect, other kids laugh. Mr. Chenille scolds them for laughing (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).
Mrs. Lebrun did not seem to be aware of the teasing in her classroom and the students were more frequently able to get away with teasing.

Raylyn and Donovan are talking. Mrs. Lebrun scolds Raylyn and Donovan laughs. Mrs. Lebrun tells the students that they must pass Social Studies and Science on the LEAP this year. Before they didn't need to pass now they must. LEAP (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Robert: Said say she was cute
Said and Robert argue
Mrs. Lebrun asks how much Rosa Parks paid to the court (FN, B4.5, February 1, 2002).

There were also instances where the higher students in the class corrected the other students, but it was not their job to correct in the classroom.

Another student is describing something in the class.
Donovan corrects her.
Mrs. Porte puts Donovan on his knees (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

The students/student interactions were particularly apparent during one observed group art activity in Mrs. Porte's class that carried over into Mrs. Lebrun's class in this activity the students were making Mardi Gras posters and masks with beads, glitter and glue. It was during this activity that the community dialect became clearly apparent.

The students start calling out Mrs. Porte's name to get her attention.
Mrs. Porte: Mrs. Porte is gone.
Robert: Where she at? Who are you?
Mrs. Porte: I dunno cuz y'all not raising your hands (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Raylyn takes the marker and traces for Hermina.
Raylyn: That's tight man. That's better than mine.
Raylyn: (To Joanna) My sister, you just took it outta my hand.
Raylyn looks mad.
Joanna: I didn't say you were jerking it. I was askin' (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

The students' helping one another was pronounced during this art activity.

Teresa is on one knee helping a student trace their masks. She rubs her eye. She sits back in her seat to trace her own mardi gras mask.
Mrs. Porte: What's wrong? Your eyes burning? Antonio reaches over and takes twist (curley Q) of hair out of her eyes (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

The students worked together to overcome a problem, one which Mrs. Porte often had to overcome, the problem of lacking materials. Only a few students had brought materials (glue, glitter sticks) with which to decorate their masks. At first this caused a problem and the students were guarding their materials and bartering to get favors in exchange for borrowing materials.

    Robert: Whatcha gonna do for me? Whatcha gonna do for me? Whatcha gonna do for me? (he owns the gluesticks that everyone in his group wants)
    Mrs. Porte: I'm about to tell you what Mrs. Porte will do for you (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Mrs. Porte, frustrated with trying to figure out whose materials were whose, tells them, "They're only a dollar. You need to buy your own." She also tells them, "If you didn't buy it, you can't use it at all." Rather than submit to that, the students figured out a way to share without the loud bartering and bickering. However, one boy, Dusty, the lower-achieving participating boy, who had been working individually with Mrs. Porte during much of the group activity was excluded from the groups. When he started working on his own he did not have the materials he needed so he asked others for material.

    Dusty comes up and asks students to borrow scissors. He is refused. Dusty goes and looks at Teresa, Antonio and Roquette who are working on a poster. He puts his fingers in Teresa's face. She tells him to stop and he yells : I ain't doin' nothin' (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Mrs. Porte had him return to his seat and began helping him individually again.
Teachers at Blue Willow Elementary

Mrs. Porte: The Language Arts Teacher

Introduction to Mrs. Porte

Mrs. Porte was the participating language arts teacher and the homeroom teacher. She was a pretty young African-American woman in her twenties. While she still needed one test to be certified, she did have her bachelor's degree in education. This was Mrs. Porte's first year teaching fourth grade. She began teaching this class in November. Prior to that she taught English language arts at the secondary level at two different area high schools. Mrs. Porte was the only regular education teacher who did not need me to define French immersion. She had a daughter who had been in another area French immersion program, in a majority white school. Mrs. Porte did not say why she had taken her daughter out of immersion. Mrs. Porte had a very quiet and teacher-controlled classroom. She was both strict and kind while her class was obedient and hard-working. The classroom decorations, or what was left of them after the rain damage, included instructional posters, managerial posters and the students' own work.

Mrs. Porte was very adept at resolving problems that occured due to the school's poverty. When the rain began to leak onto the students' heads she placed their desks in a zigzag pattern so that all the students remained dry and she used the trashcan and other receptacles to catch the rain while a student was sent to get the janitor and the class continued working. The continuously leaking roof was frustrating Mrs. Porte.

Mrs. Porte talks to me about how she can handle the discipline "but this is too much" (referring to leaks). She says, "they are never this bad." I agree that it is bad and we discuss how the ceiling looks like asbestos (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).
When the students were found to have the wrong page in the LEAP test practice booklets, Mrs. Porte resolved that problem by writing out the entire page on the board, but again there was frustration at the perceived deficiencies at the school.

    Mrs. Porte: If we had our copy machine working I could just get copies but we don't so I'll just write it on the board (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Mrs. Porte began each lesson with games or other creative activities which activated the students' background knowledge. In one describing activity, Mrs. Porte had each student close their eyes and describe an object while the class guessed what object was.

    Joanna describes something black (Mrs. Porte's purse). She says it is where you put your jacket.  
    Mrs. Porte: We don't know where we put our jackets.  
    Class begins to tell her, but she stops them and reiterates (underlining that she wants Joanna to do more)  
    Mrs. Porte: We don't know where we put our jackets.  
    Joanna tells them it is her purse (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

After the fun activity, Mrs. Porte transitioned into some type of a writing activity.

    Students say they want to go next but Mrs. Porte is running out of time. The class figures out together who will take their turn for the next class.  
    Mrs. Porte: Let's start writing.  
    She says that they have practiced describing in the activity and now they can describe when they write (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

During this activity Mrs. Porte circulated among the students, offering help and making sure that students were on-task.

    Student responds and she tells him he is close. She reminds students of beginning, middle and end. "Your writing a story, a little story: Don't worry about the words, don't count the words." Mrs. Porte does not tell, she asks students. She doesn't give answers; she helps students find the answers. She is constantly reminding them about what they need to keep in mind and what they need to do (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

In informal discussions Mrs. Porte mentioned that she did many writing activities because she felt the students needed more practice writing to help them on the LEAP. Mrs. Porte set very
high behavioral and academic standards which the students were expected to meet. In addition, there were a number of classroom routines established by Mrs. Porte for both classroom management and academic work. There seemed to be a community or sub-culture within her classroom; it was a very family-like atmosphere. Within this close-knit atmosphere, outsiders stood out. The Title I aide who came into the classroom seemed to disturb its rhythm when she interrupted instruction and commented to the children about their behavior.

Aide whacks a child on the back who begins to talk (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Teresa gets up and shows the Aide what Said is talking about.
Aide: Why you gotta go up there?
Mrs. Porte: I think Teresa just needed to move (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

The class seemed to function better when it was just Mrs. Porte and her students—and they did seem like "her students," despite the class having other teachers.

Teacher/student Interaction in Mrs. Porte's Class

The most prevalent interaction in the class was as follows: students raised their hands, Mrs. Porte called on them, students asked their questions and Mrs. Porte responded. There were also times when students simply called out their questions or tried to walk up to Mrs. Porte to ask their questions. In those cases, Mrs. Porte responded but she first scolded the students for not following the classroom routine.

Teresa gets up and walks toward Mrs. Porte's desk.
Mrs. Porte: I don't know who's coming to my desk. I don't know they're just not following the rules.
Teresa goes back and raises her hand.
Mrs. Porte: Teresa.
Teresa asks to sharpen a pencil (FN, B6, February 13, 2002).

When Mrs. Porte punished the students, and the punishment used school-wide was placing students on their knees, she still included the students in instructional discussions.

Warren: MMMM.
Mrs. Porte: Who's making that noise?
Said points to Warren.
Mrs. Porte: Get on your knees Warren.
Even though Warren is punished Mrs. Porte lets him participate (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

Mrs. Porte did not want the students socializing or distracted when they were doing whole group work. She often scolded the students or warned them that they would be punished, but she did this in a light and humorous way, as if to say, "Now, I know you know better."

Jomela is in the wrong area. Tiffany tells Mrs. Porte. Jomela says something about sleep walking. Mrs. Porte says she is "about to wake her up." (FN, B5, February 6, 2002)

Mrs. Porte also developed a system of non-verbal behavioral cues in the classroom in which she could simply snap her fingers or stomp her foot and the students knew that she was criticizing their behavior.

A student tries to answer before Nigeria has finished describing and Mrs. Porte stomps her foot and gives that wide-eyed tilted head look of "not now!" (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Mrs. Porte also controlled the students' behavior by warning them that she would talk with their family if the inappropriate behavior did not stop.

Robert: Oh man.
Mrs. Porte: But move away from Robert.
Robert: What I do?
Mrs. Porte tells Robert if he "sucks his teeth" she will call his "Mama" (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

When Mrs. Porte corrected or criticized the students' work, it did not end there. She then helped them to improve their work. Mrs. Porte often asked the student to go further in their work; she pushed them to extend their thinking by giving suggestions, by asking questions about whatever task they were working on and by getting students excited about learning.

Raylyn begins describing the trashcan and the students laughed. Mrs. Porte scolds them.
Mrs. Porte: Keep going. What side they throw it in? What else do they throw in it?
Raylyn: Trash.
Mrs. Porte: Where's the open space, top or bottom?
Raylyn: The top of it round.
Mrs. Porte: All done?
Raylyn nods (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

She ensured that students corrected their own work by asking them questions until the students perceived their own error.

Mrs. Porte goes over to Teresa. She asks her questions about fiction. "What is in fiction?" She keeps questioning until Teresa understands. She scolds another student for looking outside instead of working, then she goes back to helping Teresa to make sure she got it (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Furthermore, when students had problems Mrs. Porte checked with the whole group to see if anyone else had the same problem or could answer the students' questions.

Robert has a question about the word "dialogue."
He can read it but he does not remember. Mrs. Porte asks the class. The class says something about talking (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

She did this both to make sure that all the students understood, but also to troubleshoot the students' strategies. She had unsuccessful students compare their learning strategies to that of successful students, again trying to get the students to figure out, on their own, what they were doing that was not working.

Teresa asks what is "friction?"
Robert: I know.
Mrs. Porte: How many times you read it Robert?
Robert: Two times (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Mrs. Porte was very fair in that she made sure that all the students had a turn in participating in class activities and discussions. During one observation she accidentally called on a student twice, but then she corrected herself (FN, B2, January 16, 2002). She also did not single out any students. If a number of students were talking, she would scold them as a group.
She encouraged politeness by ensuring that all the sneezes were met with "bless you's" and all the kind acts were rewarded with "thank you's." She showed concern for her students by being aware of who had sore eyes, who was getting frustrated with their work and who was not feeling well. Nor was she afraid to tell the students what she thought of their work. If she thought a student was not doing what he/she was capable of doing she would tell them that she thought they were being "lazy," however she allowed the students to prove her wrong.

Mrs. Porte: (to Teresa) Don't be lazy today.
Teresa: I'm not.
Mrs. Porte: Don't talk back.
Aide walks away after critiquing Teresa. Mrs. Porte stays and helps Teresa find the words she needs. Teresa comes up with something (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Students were not afraid to ask questions in her class, but they knew they were not supposed to simply yell out the questions.

Teresa asks for a chance (her name is on the board and she is punished)
Mrs. Porte: Why should I give you a chance? You don't give me one.
Teresa: But, it's hard not to talk.
Mrs. Porte: It's finished if you continue talking you'll get back on your knees.
Teresa keeps arguing.
Mrs. Porte: You want me to call Mrs. (incomprehensible) and Coach Hayes.

Mrs. Porte's Perceptions

Mrs. Porte perceived it as her central mission to meet the students' needs both in terms of "social skills" and in academics.

Mrs. Porte: My central mission as a teacher?… I have many, let's see… I really want to just touch as many lives as I can, and what I mean by that is, I want to instill in them the social skills they need and the, as well as the academic (INT, Porte, January 25, 2002).

She perceived parents as critical to and responsible for their children's success in school.

Researcher: Who is responsible for students learning?
Mrs. Porte: Parents for one, the students, and then the teachers. First we need those parents to push them and those students must understand that, ok, I'm going to school. I'm not going just for lunchtime. I'm going there to learn, to get an education. And once they have that attitude, that positive attitude, it makes the teacher's job easier (INT, Porte, January 25, 2002).

She was concerned that the students' home dialect or slang would have a negative affect on the students' learning.

It affects their learning because, for instance, with the writing assignment that I gave, many of them were writing the way they speak. Um, the grammar wasn't correct, which is typical for most of them. But it's the way their, I think it's their home life maybe. Some of them. I know they try to use the slang, I guess. Some of them forget that that stays outside of the classroom and they forget and they bring it into the classroom. So it affects their learning in that way. Sometimes they don't know how to differ between the two. They don't know how to separate it (INT, Porte, January 25, 2002).

However, in the follow-up interview 19 days later, Mrs. Porte appeared to have changed her mind about the students' ability to differentiate between languages, when asked if the student's home dialect would affect their LEAP scores, she replied, "at first I did, but the more I work with them. I don't think it really will, because they can differentiate between the two."

When students did not use "correct grammar." in the classroom, Mrs. Porte asked the students what they said that was not in Standard English, what was not "right," and the students either identified their error or another student pointed it out to them.

Mrs. Porte: Listen carefully and stop laughing
Donovan: I ain't laughing
Mrs. Porte: I ain't laughing?
Donovan: I'm not (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

At the end of the year, Mrs. Porte expressed pride in her students LEAP scores. The perception that the students' home environment and home language negatively affect the students was reflected in Mrs. Porte's teacher questionnaire. According to her responses on the questionnaire, Mrs. Porte took less responsibility for negative outcomes in her classroom, which
in open interviews she stated was caused by the students' home environment and language. In contrast, Mrs. Porte took more responsibility for the positive outcomes of her class.

Mrs. Porte was keenly aware of the disparate treatment of her students, African American students. In an informal discussion she discussed her concern regarding the desegregation of my school district and the differential treatment of African-American students in that desegregation. We discussed together how white parents seemed to know how to work the system. We further discussed how the burden of desegregation, in both her and my parish (both of which were under desegregation rulings) always fell on the African-American students who were moved and whose schools were closed. After our discussion Mrs. Porte asked about my race. I told her I was white.

Overall, Mrs. Porte believed that her students were hard-working and always tried (which she felt was a very important quality). She believed that her students perceived her as strict but with some good qualities.

They'll say that I'm mean (laughs), umm they love that I don't give homework, because I try to get it most of it done in during class time… and they don't like the fact that I don't let them listen to music, because their previous teacher did, but I don't do that. They have to earn that or win it and sometimes they don't deserve that (INT, Porte, January 25, 2002).

Mr. Chenille: The Mathematics and Science Teacher

Introduction to Mr. Chenille

Mr. Chenille was the mathematics and science teacher. He was a soft-spoken, always well dressed and coiffed, slightly overweight light-skinned African-American man. He had taught for over 26 years, 14 years at Blue Willow elementary. His classroom was decorated with instructional and managerial posters and papers. Mr. Chenille was an engaged teacher who was involved in extra-curricular activities such as the science fair and was proud of his students'
work. On the first day of observations, Mr. Chenille reported that he had taught all the science fair participants the scientific method in fourth grade science. The outline for the method was on each project. He further requested that I listen to his students talk about their projects when I came to observe. He related how he expected his students not only to do their project, but also to be able to discuss them. Mr. Chenille did not seem at ease with having a visitor in his classroom, in fact, contact summaries from the first visit to his class indicate that I felt like he was "putting on a show." His uneasiness with visitors did not stop him from putting me to work.

Mr. Chenille wants me to question the students but I don't want to alienate them. No one is paying attention but me.

1:10-1:25  
I go around and ask students about their projects. Students are working on a division worksheet as I go around (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

His work with the science fair and within his classroom followed a very structured approach to learning. First, Mr. Chenille said they would have a question answering session and would go over a few problems on the board telling students that they needed to raise their hands if there was a question. The students were usually very quiet. Then, he would hand them a paper with short hand for a number of division problems (over a 100 problems such as 45/7 representing 45 divided by 7). He told the students to raise their hands if they had a problem, but students rarely asked questions. Mr. Chenille would then begin working with groups of students at the board while the other students separated into groups but then worked individually on the problem sheets.

Mr. Chenille's teacher's log was as structured as his instruction. He stated his objectives for the day and then gave the percentages to which he successfully achieved those objectives.

Mr. Chenille's Teacher's Log January 16, 2002
Today's Objectives:
Multiply a 1 and 2 digits number by a 1-digit number. Also with multiplication word problems.
The following teaching techniques were used:
   a. Small Group Discussion
   b. Questions and Answers Session
   c. Supervised Study

Ninety-nine percent of the objectives was accomplished

In the science fair that Mr. Chenille organized (discussed previously), each child who did a project had to follow the same format and use the same vocabulary when discussing their project—Title, purpose, hypothesis, sources, conclusion. However, when his students tried to describe their work it was apparent that many of them knew the form but did not understand the function.

Some of their hypotheses don't match their experiments but they have the jargon down (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

I go around and ask students about their projects. Students are working on a division worksheet as I go around. The students' knowledge of experiments seems superficial (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

Due to the researcher's time constraints and other obligations that Mr. Chenille had (science fair obligations, doctor's appointments), Mr. Chenille's science class was only observed one time. This report was based primarily on his math lessons, which were observed five times (once a week over a period of five weeks).

Teacher/student Interaction in Mr. Chenille's Class

Mr. Chenille hurried students in after the transition from Mrs. Porte's class. His lesson for math followed the same basic structure each time and covered the same objective, teaching the algorithm for long division for four weeks (for the last observation Mr. Chenille changed his objective to teaching the algorithm for multiplication). Mr. Chenille followed the same routine each day. First he began with a whole group question and answer session followed by him putting problems on the board and calling on different students to answer different stages of the algorithm. Then he put some more problems on the board and called groups of students up to
each work on individual problems while the other students broke up into their pre-established groups and worked on their drill sheet packet--for division they used the same packet for five weeks and a similar one for multiplication.

Mr. Chenille says they are going to review multiplication. Goes step by step. He asks Micky, James, Heather, Said (who gets the wrong answer). Mr. Chenille lets Robert answer. It's the same drill. The same learning routine (FN, B6, February 13, 2002).

Throughout the algorithms he reminded students about the vocabulary used to describe each stage.

The class works out the problem and Mr. Chenille makes sure they know the vocabulary for division.
Mr. Chenille: Quotient is the answer (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Raylyn: sum 364
Mr. Chenille: Our product is 364 (FN, B6, February 13, 2002).

Although, Mr. Chenille was insistent on the correct mathematical and scientific terms, he otherwise allowed the student to use their home dialect. The students' dialect was very apparent during my second observation of his class when the students were presenting their science fair projects to me. Mr. Chenille did not comment on or correct the students' language.

In informal interviews, Mr. Chenille explained that he focused on long division because it was a weak point for the students and he wanted to ensure that they got it right on the LEAP. However, like the science fair project, it seemed like the students could follow the procedures, but they had only a superficial understanding of what they were doing. Despite the continual group and individual practice and the one-on-one remediation, when students worked out problems individually on board they often came up with the wrong answer.

Mr. Chenille: Antonio I wanna see what you got, since you got all that energy. Mr. Chenille needs to help all three of the students at the board again. The students don't understand (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).
Yet, during whole-group question and answer sessions, the students were eager to answer.

Kids in unison do the problem.
Mr. Chenille: Someone else give me another problem. We'll do a few more then I'll have someone come up to make sure they understand.
Students yell answers in unison (almost like a chorus) (FN, B6, February 13, 2002).

If a student answered incorrectly, Mr. Chenille rarely skipped over students or had another student answer when students worked problems incorrectly. Instead he worked with the child until the student was able to find the correct answer. Furthermore, he insisted that students help one another. On my fourth observation of his class, Mr. Chenille was busy remediating Dusty, the lower achieving African-American boy, so he told Said to help the another student who was having trouble with the algorithm. This forced student help of one another was at times given begrudgingly.

Antonio: I need help Taylor.
Taylor gets mad (FN, B6, February 13, 2002).

Antonio whispers looking for help. Annette, who he is asking for help looks upset (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

During the times when Mr. Chenille was engaged with helping students work on the board, or when other students were presenting something such as their science fair project to the class, the other students disengaged,

Student stumbles on her presentation and the other students begin to fidget and make noises. Students' heads are down or in their hands. They are playing with pencils (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

became non-apologetically disruptive,

Mr. Chenille scolding Robert. He calls another group to the board to do work. Robert is talking to his group. They are all laughing. Mr. Chenille swings by and they all begin working. Mr. Chenille scolds Robert.
Robert: What I do?
Robert is laughing when Mr. Chenille leaves (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).
Joanna is wording something to Teresa. Robert is moving his shoulders back and forth like a dance. Nigeria is staring at the door (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

In addition, students were constantly trying to leave the room.

Annette complains that she has a headache. Mr. Chenille sends her to Mrs. Reece (secretary) (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Donovan: Mr. Chenille can I use the bathroom?
Mr. Chenille calls Donovan to him and says he should go for recess and he thinks he is just pulling wool over his eyes (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Mr. Chenille tried to juggle keeping the students on-task in their groups and working individually with students who needed help. As shown above, the corrections of disruptive behavior were sometimes met with resistance. Group workers who wanted to play sometimes mocked or laughed at Mr. Chenille when he returned to work with the students at the board. The students also complained about doing drill work "all the time" (either using a worksheet or the math book provided by the parish). This antagonism between the students and Mr. Chenille will be discussed further in the students' perceptions of their teachers.

Mr. Chenille's Perceptions

Mr. Chenille was from the community. He perceived himself as caring, humorous and as someone who pushed the students to achieve.

I don't know, I expect a whole lot of things from 'em as far as their, uh, work is concerned. You know, uh, I have a lot of humor with 'em sometimes. You know, I'm concerned about their welfare…You know I love to get 'em involved, you know, into, uh, many activities (INT, Chenille, January 25, 2002).

He believed that the students' background and home environment were factors that challenged the students' success.

Researcher: And how do they view things?
Mr. Chenille: Ok, they, uh, home train them.
Researcher: Mm-hmm.
Mr. Chenille: Uh, bad vibes from the parents as far as education is concerned. You know, they live in that sort of world. They figure you know, you don't have to have an education. The call in from the street, the, the things that happen in a given situation they figure, "hey, well, hey if my parents did this, I can do… They making it. Why do I need an education for that? I can do it, too, and survive." You know, that's one of my concerns (INT, Chenille, January 25, 2002).

Further he felt that the students' dialect affected their learning, communication and future success.

Mr. Chenille: Yes, it does.
Researcher: How?
Mr. Chenille: As far as communicating is concerned, and uh, you know, the business world.
Researcher: So how does it affect the business world?
Mr. Chenille: Ok, if you can't communicate or get your ideas over, it's, I mean you can't accomplish your goals (INT, Chenille, January 25, 2002).

Yet, when asked if the students' language would affect the students LEAP scores, Mr. Chenille said, "I don't think so."

Mr. Chenille did not believe that his teacher training adequately prepared him for all the challenges of education.

Mr. Chenille: To, uh, I say about maybe 60% of it.
Researcher: Why is 60%?
Mr. Chenille: Ok, because we had many, uh, I mean, encounter many situations that they, uh, didn't prepare us for (laughs). You know, dealing with, uh, you know the parents, the public, you know, uh, certain children behavior… (INT, Chenille, January 25, 2002).

The focus on the social challenges that his students encountered permeated Mr. Chenille's interview. When asked how he knew which social challenges the students faced, he spoke of the students' honesty with regards to relating their negative home life environment.

The kids are all honest, whether it's involving, uh, illegal drugs in the home or their parents let them do whatever they wanna do, or latch-key kids, or you know I can go on and on.
Researcher: But they'll tell you?
Mr. Chenille: Oh, you know, they honest. The kids goin' come out and tell you
(INT, Chenille, January 25, 2002)

While, he stated that "[t]eachers, parents, and then the child themselves" were responsible for the children's learning, his teacher responsibility questionnaire indicated that he took more responsibility for successes than for failures. Furthermore, his focus on the students' challenging home environment suggests that he may attribute the negative outcomes in his classroom to the students' home environments.

Mrs. Lebrun: The Social Studies Teacher

Introduction to Mrs. Lebrun

Mrs. Lebrun was a shorter, older African-American woman with white hair. She taught using traditional teaching materials and methods. She used the social studies book, worksheets, and discussions. The help she offered students who were working on worksheets was not content help as much as spelling help. Being the librarian, she occasionally read trade books that related to the subject at hand. For example, she read a book about Rosa Parks to discuss Black history. However, her lesson plans were not well defined. She often discussed her future plans for the class and the importance of the LEAP test. In fact one class consisted of only a discussion of the upcoming LEAP and the future plans for the class.

Mrs. Lebrun: From now until LEAP we will be practicing on maps and you have to pass Social Studies this year. After LEAP we will follow the text-book closely. In preparation for LEAP I will remind you that you must always … (She is lecturing about LEAP but it does not seem like she has a lesson plan)… (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Because Mrs. Lebrun was not in her own classroom, she sometimes found that Mrs. Porte was in the middle of an activity or that her activity was a replication of one of Mrs. Porte's activities. For a Black history activity, the students told Mrs. Lebrun that they were doing the same thing
for Mrs. Porte. Mrs. Lebrun told the students that they were making a "bookmark" for Mrs. Porte, but they were doing a "sign" for her (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

Time was not used efficiently in Mrs. Lebrun's classroom. The transition from Mrs. Porte to Mrs. Lebrun was not smooth (often because the students were engaged in Mrs. Porte's activities). Mrs. Lebrun often let them continue working on their English work as they listened distractedly to her discussions. Time was wasted in class by doing things such as looking for books or webpages on the subject to be studied.

Mrs. Lebrun comes in. The students keep working on their posters. Dusty has a hand fan that he is playing with. Mrs. Lebrun tells the students that they can continue working and that any communication you do, "Do it in sign language. Imagine you don't have the ability to speak."

Students whisper while Mrs. Lebrun looks for a book (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Mrs. Lebrun has been searching the Internet for a Mardi Gras site. She reads from a site that she found as her lesson (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Instruction usually ended early leaving time for the students to either clean, socialize or again discuss the LEAP.

Mrs. Lebrun: Clean your desks and get ready for French. (There is still 7 minutes before French) (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

**Teacher/student Interactions in Mrs. Lebrun's Class**

The discussion of content in Mrs. Lebrun's class was not structured. During class discussions the students were allowed to call out answers.

Mrs. Lebrun talks about a political map. Mrs. Lebrun: What kind of map would show products of Louisiana?

Students yelling out products of Louisiana (FN, B4, January 1, 2002).

During reading or worksheet activities, the students were disengaged and socialized.

Ms. Labry passes out a worksheet and reads the students a quick story about MLK. She is walking around helping students...She continues to scold the students that they talked about this yesterday and she made clear to them what
they were doing. She staples MLK pictures on the board. She stops students from discussing the paper. Students are restless. The boys are especially restless (FN, B2, January 16, 2002).

She often digressed from the original subject but she did that because she referred to her own experiences, allowed students to add their experiences and referred to popular culture such as blockbuster films that most of the students had seen.

Mrs. Lebrun starts to reminisce about her vacation in Buford, South Carolina. She has the students find it on the map. And she asks and answers questions about Forrest Gump being from there. Robert is dancing and doing dialogue from the movie. Mrs. Lebrun: Buford is right on the Atlantic Teresa: I went to Atlantic, I mean Atlanta (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

While students disengaged from the more traditional lectures, they were almost all engaged when Mrs. Lebrun began talking about her experiences during a rural Mardi Gras, her experiences in the segregated south, and Mrs. Lebrun's vacations to places that they looked up on maps. It almost seemed like the students were trying to get Mrs. Lebrun off the subject so they could discuss her experiences.

When Mrs. Lebrun questioned the students and they answered incorrectly, she skipped to another student for the correct answer.


The students showed an impressive knowledge of both Black history and the cultural history of their city.

Mrs. Lebrun: Remember the collage we didn't do to well. Each person will have a construction sheet of paper. Y'all know Martin Luther King, Harriet Tubman Teresa: Rosa Parks (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).
Mrs. Lebrun: Ask your parents. Who is the first African-American Mayor of our city?
A few students: John Vaillant (FN, B3, January 25, 2002).

The boys had shown a special interest in the anecdote, read from a trade book.

When she talks about Rosa Parks picking up a brick to defend herself from a white boy, the kids act up (especially the boys) (FN, B4.5, February 1, 2002).

Mrs. Lebrun seemed to relate to the students in a grandmotherly fashion. When she came in the students went to her and showed her their work so that they could get her approval. She often talked to the students in a familial tone during discussions. Once, Mrs. Lebrun put her hands on a Donovan's head and gently tipped it back to look up at her. She asked him if that was the way he was supposed to act. He smiled and said, "No ma'am." However, in those wasted minutes in the class, when the lesson was over or had yet to begin, both the students and Mrs. Lebrun interacted differently. When there was no discussion going on, the students all socialized. Mrs. Lebrun, in an effort to quiet the class, scolded and punished some students but not others.

Raylyn, Donovan and another student are talking.
Mrs. Lebrun: Donovan can you just stop.
Robert is making his head go out like a chicken with his neck. He is also playing with his pencil. Teresa is asking about Eric somebody.
Teresa and Nigeria are singing: "I want candy." (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Once when Mrs. Lebrun allowed them to continue doing the group work which they had started in Mrs. Porte's class, Mrs. Lebrun told the most disruptive boys in each group that they were in charge and that there was to be no talking only sign language. The sign language that the boys used when Mrs. Lebrun turned around was hardly what she had been talking about.

Mrs. Lebrun is yelling at the students. Robert says "We speaking sign language" and flips her the bird (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).
By the end of the class, these boys were on their knees next to the board. In addition, in the noisy chaotic classroom times, misunderstandings occurred. For example, Raylyn, the lower achieving African-American girl, was placed on her knees even though she had just been asking another group if they wanted to use her Mardi Gras beads for their poster.

Raylyn goes by Donovan and Heather to see if they need a bead. She then goes to Nigeria, Sasha and Hermina to see if they need a bead.

Mrs. Lebrun: Raylyn turn around and get on your knees.

Raylyn is sulking on her knees with her back against the wall (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

There was so much going on that it was hard to understand why Mrs. Lebrun chose to punish some students but not others.

Mrs. Lebrun's Perceptions

Mrs. Lebrun perceived parents as the source of successes and failures in school today.

Uh, you know, you find that parents are not involved as the child get older, the parent don't be quite as involved, say like my kindergarten class. But then you do have parents in Ms. Porsche class that's very, very, very, uh, involved… You know, anytime there's something that they think is not right, or if something is right, you'll get a little comment from 'em. So that's good. So I think parent input is very important. And I see a difference in the classes when you have more parent involve… I guess as I think about it, that's one of the most important thing in all the class… anytime you had a real good class, you really had parents involved with you (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).

Mrs. Lebrun was very focused on the positive aspects of her school and in her member check she commented that my case study report did not mention enough of the positive things going on in the school.

We have, very, all of our, the faculty has changed a lot. I think, um, it's about, it's just a few of us that's been here, maybe one or two that's been here maybe a year before me and I'm the next person that, you know, the longest. But, um, so we've gotten young, younger teachers coming in, but everyone is very dedicated and I think we get along well as a faculty, so I've had a good experience here. Parents are cooperative, and the kids are normal (laughs) (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).
This focus on the positive occurrences corresponded to her responses on the teacher questionnaire which revealed that Mrs. Lebrun took more responsibility for positive occurrences in her classroom and less responsibility for problems in the classroom. When she discussed negative occurrences in her classroom such as discipline problems, she related how these obstacles were overcome.

You know, if you have a child that, uh, you just don't gel with, you have to recognize it and make a big effort to be fair with that child. Cause it's easy to, uh, (laughs) if there's one you like, it's easy to be nice, it's easy to do a lot of nice things. So if you have a challenging one, you have to really try to recognize it early so that you can be fair (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).

Mrs. Lebrun believed in community and to that end she described in informal discussions how she was participating in research done by a local HBCU directed toward community service which taught parenting skills to at-risk students' parents. Mrs. Lebrun was keenly aware of African-American struggles in education and she worried how the students' home environments would affect their success not just academically, but in life.

Researcher: And what do you see is the greatest challenge affecting young students today?
Mrs. Lebrun: Mmm… I don't, they're so many things out there. I think, um, the, uh, you know we have, elementary you don't have experience it, but then once they get older, they're a huge drop-out rate, you know. And I guess it's our area, and so I think it's probably drug-related, you know. A lot of it is drug-related, so that's a big challenge (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).

Mrs. Lebrun believed that students needed hands-on lessons which she redefined as "Being able to experience it, you know?" She also believed that students needed to work at their own pace, especially with regard to the LEAP test.

You know and, uh, and you know, and I think one of my big concerns… it would hurt them more than if they would go on, because they probably will open up, you know, like a flower, maybe another year and be just fantastic students, you know. So… And that's why I don't like the idea that this test determine so much (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).
Moreover, Mrs. Lebrun worried about the fairness of the test especially with regards to how her students' unique dialect and culture would affect how they understood the test.

[I]f you don't word it exactly the way they think it should be, then they seem to be lost, so it could affect it, you know. But if we would have an opportunity to, if, it would be fine if we could, like, rephrase the question (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).

She was equally concerned about the LEAP because of the pressure it put on the students, but she was fairly confident in the outcome of the test.

I always feel that it's kind of hard, that it put a lot of pressure, especially on the student, because I think a kid learn a lot sometime and they're ready to go on to the next grade, but if you got the LEAP test who is determining over the biggest percentage of whether they're going to go on or not, then that's a lot of pressure. And they go, when they start taking the test, they feel like they under so much pressure, I feel sometime they don't so as well, because we kind of scared 'em. (laughs). They oughtta do well (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).

She felt that students needed to be motivated, to follow directions and especially to have good parents in order to succeed.

My primary goal is motivating, uh, motivating. Uh, I think if… uh, I always feel like if a child is motivated to learn, then they can, they will learn.

(Describing her best class) they followed directions well, and the parents was very involved… seem like because the parents was involved a lot, that the kids, you know, you didn't have any behavior problems with them, so I think the home environment plays a big part (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).

Finally, she thought the students might have mixed perceptions of her.

(Laughs) I don't know. I don't, I, I don't know. Uh, probably more on the motherly side, you know. Basically, I think I have a pretty good relationship with them, but, uh, I don't know. I don't think they would say I was mean, but then they might would consider that also (INT, Lebrun, January 30, 2002).
Donavon: The Higher Achieving African-American Boy

Donavon's Perceptions of Self and School

According to his ITBS test scores; Donavon was a higher achieving African-American young man. He was nine years old, of medium build and medium height. He was not initially chosen as the higher achieving boy in the class. There were two other boys who were higher achievers. One declined to be in the study and the other had not taken the ITBS (on which student participant selection was based). Donavon had high grades and he kept track of his G.P.A. to the decimal, "3.74." However, Donavon did not rely on school for his identity. In fact, Donavon's responses to the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire revealed that he did not consider school, family or ethnicity as key to his identity. Moreover, school was scored as less important than family and ethnicity. Perhaps Donavon's disassociation with school was related to how Donavon felt others saw his school. The Caldwell questionnaire revealed that Donavon felt others did not positively perceive his school, family or ethnicity. When I asked him if his grades said anything about him, Donavon shrugged his shoulders. Although he may not have seen school as pertinent to his identity, Donavon enjoyed learning and thought that it was easy. His grades had improved in fourth grade, according to Donovan, "cuz it's the easiest grade." He later attributed his better grades to his increased knowledge, "cuz I know more than I used to." Donavon said that reading was his favorite subject--although the first time he was asked his favorite subject, Mrs. Porte, his reading teacher, walked into the room. He laughed when I suggested that might be why he chose that subject. Later, I questioned him again and he reaffirmed his preference for reading and said he liked it "cuz I like to read." His distaste for math was not about preference but about skill. Donavon stated that math was "too hard
sometimes, but I do it." He had not had any problems in school. When questioned as to how he thought his teacher, Mrs. Porte perceived him, Donovan was on the whole positive.

Donovan: A good student.
Researcher: A good student? Anything else she would say to me?
Donovan: I don't know.
Researcher: Well, what does she...how do you stick out in her mind?
Donovan: Alright.
Researcher: Alright? Ok. What about your work?
Donovan: I do good.
Researcher: You do good work? And your behavior?
Donovan: Good.
Researcher: Good. And how you get along with other kids?
Donovan: Alright (INT, Donovan, February 8, 2002)

Donovan's positive self-esteem was reflected in his responses on the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview in which he attributed all the positive and none of the negative traits to himself.

**Donovan's Perceptions of His Peers**

Donovan considered his friends to be "kind" and "good." Students who he did not consider to be friends were students who were "bad" and who "don't listen." Although these students were not his friends he stated that he felt "alright" about them. Donovan had both boys and girls as friends. This was evident in his frequent choice of Heather as a partner and as a best friend. While he attributed negative traits to both boys and girls, Donovan overwhelmingly attributed positive traits to the girls (25 of 30 possible).

**Donovan's Perceptions of His Teachers**

For Donovan, Mrs. Porte was not only his favorite teacher this year, she was also very much a part of his home life. She was his "momma's best friend" and they had been friends since "the first day they were born." Donovan's mother and Mrs. Porte were born on the same day. In addition to his close ties to Mrs. Porte, Donovan discussed other attributes that Mrs. Porte had such as helping students when they needed help, treating everyone the same and as Donovan put
Donavon thought that she was "alright" but sometimes "she mean." Mr. Chenille, however, received an overwhelmingly negative review. Donavon said that Mr. Chenille was mean, that he "give too much homework" and that "he keep whipping you." When questioned further about the "whippings," Donavon said, "cuz somebody else be talking on the side of me, he [Mr. Chenille] be getting me up. He don't ever whip girls, he just whip all the boys."

Donavon said that Mr. Chenille treated them all the same (notwithstanding the gendered whippings) but he treated them "bad." Despite, his negative view of Mrs. Lebrun and Mr. Chenille, Donavon stated that he had never had a teacher that he did not like. There appeared to be a contradiction in that statement.

*Donavon's Perceptions of Language*

Donavon stated that he did not notice differences in how language was spoken between his teachers and parents; however, he did notice a difference in the home/school languages of his peers. The difference according to Donavon was that they (he and his peers) cursed at home, but not at school "cuz we too small, and we not supposed to do that at school." In terms of French as a heritage language, Donavon said his grandparents speak "Indian" and French. He also said he had an "auntie" who spoke either French or Spanish, when questioned further he said she spoke Spanish.

*Teresa: The Higher Achieving African-American Girl*

*Teresa's Perceptions of Self and School*

According to her ITBS scores, Teresa was a higher achieving African-American girl. She was ten years old and of average height with a solid build. Teresa was very engaged in the

---

2 The parish in which this case study took place allows students to be paddled by their teachers.
classroom instruction. Teresa said she learned, "division, multiplication, how to read, things that happen, like, long time ago, French, and learn how to play like basketball, kickball, and baseball." She thought learning these subjects was "easy" and said that she had always been on honor roll. Teresa's favorite subject was math, but did not like learning it this year and she offered some constructive criticism on how the teaching of math could be improved.

Teresa: Well, my subject is math, but I don't like the way Mr. Chenille teach it. 
Researcher: How do you like it to be taught?
Teresa: Ma'am?
Researcher: How do you like it to be taught?
Teresa: To be taught?
Researcher: How, like, what would math have to be like so you to like it.
Teresa: Like when they give us problems on the board and we have to go answer it, instead of writing. And different things everyday (INT, Teresa, February 1, 2002).

Teresa had high grades, 4.0, and she felt that grades said, "That you smart and a good student." Further, she had plans to continue her education. When she was asked what she looked forward to in school she said "getting out of fifth grade, and getting out of college." She could not decide on whether or not she wanted to be a basketball player or an actress. Teresa believed that Mrs. Porte had a very positive view of her and would describe her as:

Teresa: A good student.
Researcher: Anything else?
Teresa: That she cares about other students, with their work, and kind. I like her (INT, Teresa, February 1, 2002).

Teresa's responses on the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview reflected her positive self-esteem. The only positive trait which Teresa did not attribute to herself was "someone who likes school." This could be due to her negative perceptions of certain teachers, which are discussed in more detail below. While Teresa may not like school, her responses on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire revealed that Teresa considered both her ethnic and school membership as
Teresa considered her friends to be playful, helpful and smart. Another qualification to be her friend was that her friends "come in whenever you need them." Teresa explained what she meant by that. "Like, if you wanna talk to someone about something you can always tell them and they don't bring it round or nothin'." For non-friends she mentioned one girl, Heather, another very high-achieving girl with whom Teresa was very competitive. There was an out of school component to this conflict. Teresa elaborated that she and Heather got into fights and that Heather told her mother "the wrong thing." According to Teresa "she [Heather] don't like me because her mother don't like me." Despite her conflicts with this one girl, Heather, Teresa, in her Wright and Taylor (1995) interview, attributed most of the positive traits to the girls (22 of 30 possible). Negative traits and the designation as a "friend" were equally attributed to both boys and girls.

Teresa's Perceptions of Her Teachers

Like Donavon, Teresa gave very high marks to Mrs. Porte. Teresa thought Mrs. Porte was nice, helpful and "you could talk to her about anything." When describing how Mrs. Porte treated her, Teresa said, "She treat me like, not like a queen… but she treat me the same way she treat everybody else. She like, fair." Mrs. Porte was her favorite fourth grade teacher because of non-academic reasons. Besides being nice, Mrs. Porte was her favorite fourth grade teacher because she was "like not really old, but she like, she like have a daughter and stuff… and she know how we feel." Teresa felt that both Mrs. Porte and Mrs. Lebrun (an older teacher) "care about us." Teresa liked Mrs. Lebrun for academic reasons, because "[s]he like, if you're having
a test or something, she'll like tell you, like, what page to go on to find the answer." There were
two teachers that Teresa did not care for: her French teacher, who she said had "favorites,"
namely Heather--Teresa's competition--and Mr. Chenille. As stated above, Teresa did not agree
with Mr. Chenille's methodology. She even challenged Mr. Chenille's long division algorithm.

The class is doing division problems together on the board.
Teresa says she does it different. Mr. Chenille has her show how.
She does it wrong. He says he knows why and tells her:
Mr. Chenille: We have to do simple division the right way. The way
Teresa was doing it was not the right process (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Her slight miscalculation allowed Mr. Chenille to prove that there was only one way to do the
problems. Further, Teresa perceived that Mr. Chenille mistreated her and the rest of the class.
She tried to describe the treatment, "he treat us, like, not really slaves, but he treat us like, 'do this
and do that.' He treat us bad." She believed that Mr. Chenille was mean and that he acted
differently when people come in to observe the class. Twice during formal interviews she
reiterated this change in Mr. Chenille's demeanor. When asked if her teachers help whenever she
needs help Teresa said that both Mrs. Porte and Mrs. Lebrun did, but that Mr. Chenille only
helped sometimes and that sometimes "when a teacher come in he said 'when you need help, I'm
going help y'all'." Moreover, when Teresa was asked how teachers could be better she gave the
following suggestion to Mr. Chenille, "stop making us write a lot and being mean to us, and
when other people come in, stop being nice to them to show off." Later in an informal interview
Teresa and some of the other girls in the class asked me to come back to class because Mr.
Chenille was nicer when I was in the classroom. Other suggestions that Teresa gave for her
teachers to improve how they taught were her suggestion to the French teacher to "to stop
picking our her favorites and do more, like, to make French better" and her suggestion in general
was "play lotsa games."
**Teresa’s Perceptions of Language**

When asked if she noticed in differences in how language was spoken between home and school by herself, her peers and between her teachers and parents, Teresa answered, "no ma'am" each time. She did not notice any differences in how language was spoken in the two contexts. In terms of French as a heritage language, Teresa responded that she did have a French heritage language speaker in her family.

Researcher: Ok. Does anyone in your family speak a different language besides English, like your grandmas, your grandpas?
Teresa: Well, my grandpa, he speaks English and French.
Researcher: Anyone else?
Teresa: No ma'am (INT, Teresa, February 1, 2002).

**Dusty: The Lower Achieving African-American Boy**

**Dusty’s Perceptions of Self and School**

According to Dusty's ITBS scores he was a lower achieving African-American young man. He was ten years old and of medium height with an athletic build. Dusty, while not disengaged during classroom instruction, did disengage during individual work. He often said that he could not do it or he simply daydreamed and did not get the work done.

Dusty is daydreaming and putting his finger in his mouth (FN, B4, January 30, 2002).

Mrs. Porte asks Dusty to continue with the cutting [the mask]
Dusty: I dunno…
Mrs. Porte: Stop saying I don't know and try.
Mrs. Porte puts a hole in the eye to start the cut and hands it to Dusty.
Mrs. Porte: Stop saying I don't know and try. Here Dusty.
Dusty cuts out the eye (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

He was not usually disruptive, but, of all the boys in the class, he appeared to be the least accepted. Sometimes he would be disruptive if other students rejected or were mean to him.

Dusty comes up and asks students to borrow scissors. He is refused.
Dusty goes at looks and Teresa, Mario and Roquette who are working on a poster. He puts his fingers in Teresa's face. She tells him to stop and he yells: I ain't doin' nothin' (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Dusty said that in school "I learn how to read, learn how to spell, learn how to do division." He felt that school was "easy" and he preferred spelling because he "could do it good." He said his GPA was 3.7. He felt that his grades were better this year "cause I'm learning more this year." He believed that grades simply said, "How you doin'" in school (INT, Dustin, February 6, 2002).

Dusty wanted to be a basketball player and he thought he would do well in fifth grade. He thought Mrs. Porte had a positive perception of him but that positive perception was tempered in terms of behavior. When asked what she would say about his behavior, he replied that it was "kinda good."

Although in the open interview Dusty discussed how school was easy in his Wright and Taylor (1995) interview he listed himself as not good at school. He also attributed the other negative trait to himself, "students who other students don't like." Dusty's responses on the Wright and Taylor interviewed appeared to be contradictory. Dusty attributed all the positive and all the negative traits to himself. That means that he said that he was both "smart" and "not good at school." He also said that "he had many friends", but that he was a "student that the other students don't like." This left the impression of a life outside of school. His response of what he looked forward to in the coming year, "My favorite, recess!" also indicated that his focus was not academic but elsewhere. Dusty's responses on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire pointed to this reality outside of scholastic life, listing school as least important to his identity. Dusty further indicated that his ethnicity was more important to his identity than school or family. Like Teresa and Donavon, Dusty did not perceive that others viewed his school positively. However, he did feel that his family and ethnic group were perceived positively by others.
Dusty's Perceptions of His Peers

Dusty spoke of both his friends and non-friends as "they nice," "and they kind" and "they good." He did not differentiate between friends and students who were not his friends. However, the importance of gender was underlined by Dusty's responses on the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview concerning his peers. In the Wright and Taylor interview it appeared that Dusty lived in an African-American boy's world. Of the 30 positive traits 26 were attributed to boys and all the negative traits were attributed to boys. Further, Dusty only listed African-American boys as friends.

Dusty's Perceptions of His Teachers

Dusty considered Mrs. Porte to be his teacher. When asked to describe his teachers (plural), Dusty said, "She nice," referring to Mrs. Porte. He considered all his teachers to be nice, to treat him "good," and to treat everyone the same. However, he preferred Mrs. Porte because she was the "nicest" and because "she let us play games sometimes when we be good."

In addition, when asked to elaborate on the improvement of his grades this year, Dusty attributed his improvement to Mrs. Porte.

Dusty: Cause I'm learning more this year.
Researcher: And why do you think you're learning more this year than the other years?
Dusty: Cause my teacher teaching me more.
Researcher: Who do you mean, by your teacher?
Dusty: She teaching me lots.
Researcher: Who is, Ms. Porte?
Dusty: Yes ma'am (INT, Dustin, February 6, 2002).

To improve his teachers, to make them better teachers Dusty suggested:

Dusty: Teach me a lot.
Researcher: But how would we do that?
Dusty: You learn more (INT, Dustin, February 6, 2002).
Dusty's Perceptions of Language

When asked if he noticed differences in how language was spoken between home and school by himself, his peers and between his teachers and parents, Dusty, like Teresa, answered, "no ma'am" each time. Dusty utilized this same response, "no ma'am," when asked if anyone in his family was a French heritage speakers.

Raylyn: The Lower Achieving African-American Girl

Raylyn's Perceptions of Self and School

According to her ITBS scores, Raylyn was a lower achieving African-American young lady. She was nine years old and still taller and bigger than most of the students in the class. Raylyn was usually engaged in classroom instruction, but she was also the social instigator. She tended to dominate discussions when the students worked in groups. She used her non-standard English whenever she spoke and it seemed to underlie her social dominance.

Raylyn: I need some scissors girls, some scissors. Girl, no I ain't poking no eyes (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Raylyn was always keenly aware of my observation of her and even though I tried to make it look as if I were just scanning the classroom whenever my eyes would fall on her, her eyes would greet mine.

When I come in Raylyn asks who I was looking at. She noticed that I was observing her. I tell her the whole class (FN, B5, February 6, 2002).

Moreover, Raylyn was very nervous during the interviews. She fidgeted and played with her fingers and although I tried to put her at ease she rarely spoke, she mostly communicated by gestures. In fact, there were over 54 times when I asked her questions or probes and she gave no verbal response. Often I had to ask a probe in order to get a non-verbal response. When asking about how her teachers treated her, Raylyn would not speak until I turned the tape recorder off.
Once I did that she talked more freely. This awareness and apprehension of the outsider's perspective was reflected in Raylyn's response on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire. While Raylyn indicated that her school, family and ethnic group were important in shaping her identity, she felt that others did not positively perceive her school, family or ethnic group.

When I asked Raylyn what she learned in school she said, "I learn about books." She felt that her schoolwork was easy and she preferred math because "it's not hard." Direct observations found that she was very engaged in math class. She did not like social studies because the questions were "hard" and "cause it's long." Overall, she believed that her grades were good and she had been on honor roll "when they had it up [when honor roll was posted on the wall that year]." She mentioned looking forward to staying on honor roll in the fifth grade. She would not respond to the problems in school question. She believed that Mrs. Porte perceived her as nice, kind and caring. In her Wright and Taylor (1995) interview Raylyn attributed no negative traits to herself and nearly all the positive traits to herself. The only positive trait she did not attribute to herself was the trait of "those students who are nice."

Raylyn's Perceptions of Her Peers

When asked to describe her friends Raylyn had an extensive list of descriptors.

Researcher: What are your friends like?
Raylyn: They like to color. They like to play games.
Researcher: And how would you describe them?
Raylyn: Kind.
Researcher: They're kind? Any other words?
Raylyn: Caring.
Researcher: Caring.
Raylyn: Nice (INT, Raylyn, January 30, 2002).

Those peers who she did not consider to be friends she described as "mean" and students who "talk about people." Yet, Raylyn said she would still like to hang out with those non-friends because "they don't have any one fun to play with." Like Teresa and Donavon, Raylyn attributed
more of the positive traits to girls, but nearly 1/3 of her positive choices were attributed to boys. Negative attributes were nearly evenly attributed to boys and girls. Raylyn was the only participating student who counted the Hispanic girl, Carrie, as a friend (both Raylyn and Teresa said that Carrie was a nice, happy student who the other students did not like).

Raylyn's Perceptions of Her Teachers

Raylyn as with the other students, showed a preference for Mrs. Porte. Raylyn preferred Mrs. Porte because, as she put it, "You can play in her class." When asked what her teachers were like and how they made her feel, Raylyn said of Mrs. Porte:

Raylyn: She nice.
Researcher: Anything else you could say about her?
Raylyn: She don't give out a lot of homework.
Researcher: Anything else?
Raylyn: (no verbal response)
Researcher: No. And how do you feel about her? Do you like her? Are you kind of scared or you happy or…
Raylyn: Happy (INT, Raylyn, January 30, 2002).

While Mrs. Lebrun and Mr. Chenille were not as popular, Raylyn did find something positive to say about them both. Mrs. Lebrun was "hard-working" but she made Raylyn feel "mad." Mr. Chenille was described as "kinda mean but he lets us be in groups." The interview was conducted over two days and during the first interview day Raylyn said Mr. Chenille made her feel "good." However, on the second interview when asked about Mr. Chenille she shook her head to indicate she did not like him, but she would not speak.

Raylyn considered that all her teachers treated everyone the same way. Yet, according to Raylyn, Mrs. Porte and Mr. Chenille always helped her when she needed help, but Mrs. Lebrun did not always help her "[n]ot all the time" when she needed help. While she felt that Mrs. Lebrun was a "hardworking" teacher, Raylyn felt that Mrs. Lebrun treated her "bad." She would not elaborate on that until I turned the tape recorder off. Likewise, when asked how Mr. Chenille
treated her Raylyn was non-responsive. When I turned off the tape recorder Raylyn discussed an incident that had happened that day and to which I tried to get her to respond to on tape, but she would not. The incident involved her trying to share Mardi Grad beads with a neighboring group and when she got up to deliver the beads, Mrs. Lebrun put her at the front of the class on her knees. She was mad "cuz she's always fussing when somebody not doing nobody wrong" and she said that this kind of thing happens mostly in Mrs. Lebrun's class. Raylyn said nothing about Mr. Chenille. When asked how she thinks that her teachers could improve Raylyn said simply "help us when we need help."

Raylyn's Perceptions of Language

Raylyn shook her head "no" when asked if she noticed differences in how language was spoken between home and school. In terms of French as a heritage language, Raylyn shook her head "no" when asked if she knew of any heritage language speakers in her family.

Student/teacher interactions at Blue Willow elementary varied according to whom the teacher was. Mrs. Porte's class was positive, nurturing and strict. Mr. Chenille's class was repetitive, structured and strict and Mrs. Lebrun's class was chaotic. The students socialized less in the strict environments with student/student interaction being controlled by the teachers. Student/teacher antagonism was high between the African-American participant students and Mr. Chenille and Mrs. Lebrun. Mrs. Porte was an exceptional teacher.

Case Study C: Comeaux Elementary--The Typical Immersion (TI) Class

General Overview of the Context

School Environment at Comeaux Elementary

Comeaux elementary where I had previously taught and where my sister still taught as a fourth grade regular education elementary teacher, was a Title I school with a student population
that was around 60% minority students and 70% of students on free or reduced lunch. The school was considered as both an "above average" school and at the same time a "school in decline" according to the state's accountability plan. This year a District Assessment Team (DAT) of experts from the local university came to observe the school to offer criticisms and suggestions for reversing the dropping standardized test scores at the school. Comeaux elementary was a clean, well-maintained school. The roof did leak in the library and a few of the classes when there was a hard rain, but the school board was scheduled to fix the leak in the summer following this school year. Nearly one-half of the classes at Comeaux elementary were given in temporary buildings. All seven of the fourth grade classes, nearly half the third grade classes and all but one of the first grade classes were in temporary buildings. In addition, resource, music and art classes were in temporary buildings.

The French immersion program was expansive at this school with nine French immersion classrooms in grades K-4. Out of the student population of around 700 students about 120 of them were enrolled in immersion classes. All the French immersion teachers at Comeaux elementary were responsible for teaching math, science, social studies, French language arts and art. The immersion program began at the school in 1996 and it had been adding a class each year until last year when Madame Mauriac, the participating teacher, was hired to create the fourth grade French immersion program at the school.

There was tension between the immersion and non-immersion fourth grade teachers. All the fourth grade teachers were undergoing District Assessment Team (DAT) observations and often discussed how nervous they were in the teachers' lounge. The pressure of the LEAP, while not emphasized by school announcements, was apparent in the teachers' informal discourse.
Many teachers felt "under the gun" and like they were shouldering most of the blame for poor test scores. The teachers were trying to work together to do review sessions and remediation.

Madame Mauriac allowed Ms. Price to take some of her classtime because students needed to practice LEAP social studies. However, she did not want to take French time away from her students for what fourth grade teachers termed a "BLITZ" a study session wherein each fourth grade teacher (except the immersion teacher) took a subject and crammed with the students. For math, Madame Mauriac said the "BLITZ" was "OK" but for the rest (reading/writing) it was a waste which she did not believe would help her students. Furthermore, she complained that on the Wednesday of the BLITZ week, the other teachers gave the students a long recess, taking even more time away from French (FN, C6, March 7, 2002). There were also other issues such as disciplinary duty (punished students went to a teacher for recess) in which Madame Mauriac's philosophy conflicted with the other fourth grade teachers' ideas.

**Class Environment at Comeaux Elementary**

Madame Mauriac was the homeroom teacher for the fourth grade French immersion class. She began her class at 7:55 am and taught until 9:00 am. Then Ms. Price, Madame Mauriac's team teacher (the one who teaches English language arts to the French immersion students), took over the class and taught for around an hour and a half with interruptions from music and P.E. At 11:00, Madame Mauriac got her class back until the end of the school day. The students in this class were readers. They had chapter books (on or above fourth grade level such as James and Giant Peach, Harry Potter, and the Borrowers) at nearly every desk. In addition, many students had French books at their desk. Both the French immersion and the English language arts teachers allowed the students to read throughout the school day.
Both the English and the French immersion teacher were pleased with their good relationship. They both felt that they worked well together. Madame Mauriac described how good the continuity with Ms. Price's class was (FN, C2, February 4, 2002). However, there was a teacher power struggle that occurred in the classroom in terms of time. The LEAP test brought this struggle to the forefront because the teachers were trying to prepare their students for their particular subjects on the LEAP, but they both kept running out of time. Furthermore, the LEAP interrupted French instruction more so than English instruction because the preparation material, which all teachers were required to use, was in English. This added a burden to the English teacher who tried to help Madame Mauriac by going over the English material with the students.

Madame Mauriac has Thalia read.
Thalia asks: En français? (In French?)
Madame Mauriac: Non
Thalia reads LEAP booklet in English.
Madame Mauriac tells her to slow down she can't understand.
Thalia reads more slowly (FN, C5, February 27, 2002).

The LEAP pressure was palpable and gave rise to the English teacher losing her temper and snapping at Madame Mauriac and the researcher when she was really just upset about having to take time, time that she did not have, to teach social studies LEAP materials.

Ms. Price loses it. She tells Madame Mauriac and me that if we think she is doing something wrong why don't we just do it ourselves. She says this is not her responsibility and when we look at her as though we don't understand (because we don't) she says that she saw us looking at each other. I tell her that maybe it's the pressure and that she should take a break. Ms. Price agrees and leaves. Madame Mauriac is in shock and leaves the room in tears. I take over the class (FN, C6, March 7, 2002).

Teacher/student Interaction at Comeaux Elementary

The students in the class always seemed to be on the verge of losing control, like a tinder box. Holding the class on-task always appeared to be a tenuous task, especially during the
French immersion time when the students were given more freedom. Madame Mauriac often had the students working in groups and pairs.

Madame Mauriac says the "Première chose" (First thing) they need to do is find a partner. Breen and Shaniqua get up as soon as she says this and Madame Mauriac scolds them. Madame Mauriac lets Mindy move. Madame Mauriac helps students find partners. Madame Mauriac suggest to Thalia to go with Cory. Thalia draws in a breath and looks shocked. Seth suggests himself to go with Cory (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

This encouraged interaction, but it also encouraged disruptive behavior. Madame Mauriac controlled this disruptive behavior by moving closer to the disruptive students, by scolding them or in severe cases by threatening to call the students' parents.

Breen tries to get Arty's attention to look at something. Madame Mauriac asks him if he has finished and walks toward him. Madame Mauriac scolds him (FN, C9, March 18, 2002).

Madame Mauriac: Laisse ton sac et bouge ton pince! Madame Mauriac scolds and tells him to listen to what is told to him. Monica tells on Breen. Madame Mauriac says she is calling his mom tonight. They discuss Breen says she'll be here Friday (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Madame Mauriac used concrete activities that integrated the content subject matter, other subjects (math in science or social studies) and French language arts.

Madame Mauriac: C'est un catastrophe le poème. C'est un catastrophe votre organization (It's a catastrophe this poem. It's a catastrophe your organization). She asks how many students don't have their poem. Madame Mauriac: Classe, 6 sur 17 (6 out of 17) 11:15 Madame Mauriac then asks the class what the percentage of students who forgot their poem is. Ruby says 15 (because there are only 15 students present today). Madame Mauriac changes : 6 sur 15 (6 out of 15) Cienna: Neuf qui ont (Nine that have it) (FN, C5, February 27, 2002).
She even utilized one of the students' names during science class to illustrate how the French language works in families and how words could be understood based on these word families.

Inspired by the poem, Madame Mauriac talks about the word family for Clara (a student in the class) and asks the students if they see another word to go in Clara's word family. Clara knows the word in her family is "la clarté."

Madame Mauriac says Clara's family get bigger (FN, C5, February 27, 2002).

She constantly asked students to extend their answers by asking them how or why things happen.

Madame Mauriac asks why there are rainbows: Pourquoi? (Why?)
Breen: Après il pleut le soleil. (After it rains sun)
Cory: La lumière (light).
Seth explains (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

In addition, both Madame Mauriac and the students frequently referred to previous lessons and classes when discussing the topic at hand.

Madame Mauriac talks about how Danielle mixed all the colors and asks what color she got.
Danielle: gris (gray) (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Further Madame Mauriac engaged students by giving them extensive projects such as finding pen pals in France to whom they wrote regularly and many science and social studies projects in which the students had to work together and with resources to find answers autonomously.

On the wall are letters from a class in France (their pen pals). There is a picture of their penpal class also. Madame Mauriac showed me earlier a letter Seth had written to his penpal. It was impressive (FN, C1, February 1, 2002).

Within the classroom Madame Mauriac encouraged her students to speak French about non-academic subjects by having a list of phrases that student might use in social situations such as "tu m'agace" (you bother me). She also had students engage in discussions about what they do outside of school.

Madame Mauriac discussing the SuperBowl with Breen.
Arty says in "New Orleans."
Clara joins in the conversation.
Cory: Je suis allé "to the parade" de Scott. (I went)
Madame Mauriac: A la parade.
Deanna says she went to the "skating rink."
Breen: Avec qui, avec qui? Avec black boy (With whom?)
(laughs with Thalia also)
Rebecca talks about Hockey.
Madame Mauriac: Qui a gagné? (Who won?)
Thalia has her hand up.
Thalia: Dimanche, je suis allée… went to a parade.
The students and Madame Mauriac begin a question and answer session about
that week-end.
Madame Mauriac: Tu en a des colliers? (Did you get some beads?) (FN, C2,
February 4, 2002).

In addition, Madame Mauriac allowed the students to play games when they finished their work
that let them discuss whatever they liked (however, these game-time discussions were not always
in French).

Madame Mauriac: OK Maintenant (Now).
Arty: Jouer (Play).
Madame Mauriac: On va jouer. Parce que tu joues ne veux pas dire qu'on faire la
foire. Allons. (We play. Because you play doesn't mean you're at the fair. Let's
go). The students get up and play different games.
Madame Mauriac: Tout le monde, quand on parle on parle en quoi? (Everyone,
what do we speak?)
Class: Français (French).

Madame Mauriac tried to joke with her students, but the jokes (which were very funny) went
over the students' heads. Perhaps she told jokes to lighten her own mood.

When Breen arrives at the bridge[on the floor map grid], the Madame Mauriac
smiles and says "Ne te jette pas du pont!" (Don't jump!) None of the students get
the joke (FN, C7, March 8, 2002).

Students were not afraid to ask questions or interrupt Madame Mauriac when they did not
understand the content or the language. They even walked up to Madame Mauriac during
individual work to demand one-on-one help. Madame Mauriac verified student comprehension
by questioning the students. To enable them to comprehend the content she was very good at
explaining using concrete examples.
Madame Mauriac has a grid laid out on the floor with tape and different pictures of places in a city. There are directional phrases that the students can use to give other students directions (FN, C7, March 8, 2002).

However, when the students did not understand procedures, the directions, Madame Mauriac became discombobulated; she could not always comprehend what exactly it was that the students did not understand. She would then re-explain the procedures and end up losing her tentative control of the class.

Madame Mauriac tells class to do it "tout seule"
Danielle says she can't [she doesn't understand].
Crystal gets up for a newspaper.
Seth and Melissa says it's not a problem.
Breen talks to Cory and Arty and laughs loudly.
Madame Mauriac explains the task to Danielle over Breen's loud laughing (FN, C9, March 18, 2002).

When questioning or calling on students Madame Mauriac tended to call on the boys for higher level, content questions, while the girls were called on more often to read passages and questions. At one point, Madame Mauriac called on the boys 14 times to answer questions while the girls were only called on to read the paper (FN, C2, February 4, 2002). Much of this difference was due to the two gifted boys, one white and one African-American, and their dominance of classroom interaction. In addition, when Madame Mauriac called on some of the girls they would tell her that they raised their hands to read, not to answer, the question. One African-American girl who volunteered content information and demanded higher-level content questions was an obvious exception to the gender pattern of student/teacher interaction in the classroom.

Melissa asks if the underground railroad was a tunnel (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Madame Mauriac asks students if they have the money to buy just 3 colors which ones do you buy? (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).
Melissa and Seth: Rouge, bleu et jaune (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).
At first, I perceived the girls in the class to be more disengaged than the boys. Although the girls were very interested in socializing during class time, they did their work quietly while they socialized. The girls' relative calm was initially perceived as disengagement when it was contrasted against the storm, which was the boys' disruptive engagement in the class. The boys were engaged in the class discussion but at least one of them became confrontational with the teacher and/or other students in nearly every discussion.

Breen and Madame Mauriac argue about putting something under his paper (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

She [Madame Mauriac] tells the class to pick up their books because they are "sacré." Seth argues that they aren't secret. Madame Mauriac and class explain to him that "sacré" means sacred not secret (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

While there were perceived gender differences in student selection to answer questions or read, there did not appear to be any ethnic differences in who was called on for instructional tasks. However, in terms of discipline, the African-American students were disciplined and quieted more often than the white students. When Madame Mauriac did punish and scold students she often met with resistance from the African-American students and sometimes her punishments were disregarded altogether.

Madame Mauriac has Cienna [the lower achieving African-American girl] explain to her why she is moving her clothespin. Breen cuts in scolding facetiously: De ne pas bouger comme un "wild animal." Madame Mauriac explains to Cienna why Cienna will be moving her clothespin and says said Arty's [the lower achieving white boy] will be moved also. Cienna smirks but she does not get up and move her clothespin. Cienna, Melissa and Nqush eye each other. I do not see anyone's clothespin move (after all that) (FN, C5, February 27, 2002).

Differential treatment of students based on ethnicity was observed during one particular lesson on American History in which the teacher assigned pairs of students various events to illustrate and which the class then placed on a time-line that was constructed over the
blackboard. Many of the events assigned on this particular day had to do with slavery and the emancipation of slaves. For this lesson Madame Mauriac assigned African-American themed illustrations to white students—who told her they did not want to do them—rather than to African-American students—who wanted to illustrate those topics.

Danielle reads about the first slave and Madame Mauriac asks if Danielle can draw the topic. She says no. Kole [lower achieving African-American boy] volunteers. Madame Mauriac chooses Arty and Danielle (2 white students) (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Madame Mauriac: Cory va illustrer "separate but equal" (again a white student) (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Later, when the students were working on biographies of historical figures the very disruptive African-American boy, Breen, became upset. He complained that all the African-American figures that they had studied (he mentioned Martin Luther King Jr. and Rosa Parks) had been taken.

Madame Mauriac asks Breen.
Breen in French says other took their characters too fast so he's not going to choose.
Madame Mauriac asks why he can't.
Breen: Pas dans 1900 (FN, C4, February 22, 2002).

The very disruptive white boy, Arty, laughingly suggested that he study "Evangeline" or the "Klu Klux Klan [sic]," while the teacher told him to look up a figure in a reference book.

**Student/student Interaction at Comeaux Elementary**

The above exchange between the disruptive and frustrated African-American boy and the disruptive white boy provides insight into the confrontational nature of many of the student/student exchanges in the classroom. One issue that was immediately apparent with the above conflict was that Madame Mauriac must not have understood how Arty mentioning the
Klan was a grave offense. She did nothing to diffuse that situation. In other words, her lack of the students' cultural knowledge contributed to the conflict in the classroom.

What was interesting about the student interaction in Class Comeaux was that some of the teasing as well as other social interactions often occurred in French.

Kole, Shaniqua and Melissa [all African-American students] socialize and call each other names in French during lunch (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Madame Mauriac asks who doesn't have a drawing.
Kole: Clara
Clara: J'ai a pris Kole! (I have one Kole!)
She is getting the paper to draw on in the back of the room.
Kole: Don't holler à moi girl! (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Students used French amongst themselves when they were in class talking to the teacher, socializing with one another, or even when talking to the class guinea pig (who was named after a guinea pig in a French storybook). That is not to say that the students never spoke in English, they often did. Nor is it to say that the students' French would have been completely understandable outside of the context of immersion, it would not have been. The students often spoke in Franglais, switching between French and English and "Frenchicizing" English words--'speaking immersion' as Lyster (1987) termed it.

Madame Mauriac talks to Mindy.
Arty: Tu es deaf. (You are deaf.)
Mindy: J'ai pas deaf you footballer (FN, C1, February 1, 2002).

Students were even able to create phrases communally. Each student saying a word needed to complete the sentence.

Madame Mauriac: Qui decide?
Breen: Gouvernement.
Kole: Branche legislative.
Melissa: Fais des lois.
Madame Mauriac: Senat.
Arty: Representants (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).
Within class there were two levels of communication, the teacher/student communication and the student community from which the teacher was excluded. As the teacher taught there was a lot of social interaction occurring. This interaction was subtler for the girls and included passing notes and silent socialization in which the students used eye contact, gestures and mouthed words to each other (it was hard to tell if they were mouthing words in English or in French, but the notes were in English).

Cienna is reading a note and Thalia is explaining what the note is saying. The note is about clothes and what size they are (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

The interaction between the boys was more overt and often disruptive to the class.

Arty tries to give a behavior coupon to Kole.
Arty pokes Kole.
Kole pokes back and says "arrête"
They start poking and kicking each other.
Madame Mauriac is talking about other senses that are evident in the poem.
Kole and Arty are throwing things (FN, C5, February 27, 2002).

Ethnicity, gender or both usually segregated the interactions between students. Socialization during instruction did not appear to affect the students' participation in instruction. The students appeared to be multi-tasking and they were able to keep up with the lesson or whatever activity was going on and still socialize. This observation was reiterated by the peer observer at Comeaux Elementary.

Even though some students seem constantly off-task, they do manage to follow the activity and keep up with that work (CS, Peer, March 18, 2002).

In fact, sometimes the entire class worked as a community to socialize. As Madame Mauriac focused her attention on helping one student, the other students passed gels pens or notes across the classroom. I termed this cooperative work to socialize "community socialization."
Shaniqua, Cienna and Thalia are communicating and passing notes behind Madame Mauriac (who is standing behind the first row of students because of the overhead projector). Ellie gives a note from them to Kole (all in first row) (FN, C7, March 8, 2002).

Breen and Shaniqua look like they are doing another pen exchange through Cory and Arty. As Melissa and Madame Mauriac interact it is clear that the glitter pens are the star of the class and not Madame Mauriac. (FN, C7, March 8, 2002).

During the pen exchange there did not appear to be any ethnic or gender differences just a community effort to let everyone use colorful pens. Another example of community socialization occurred during individual work, when all the African-American students, boys and girls, in the front row spontaneously began singing the same song.

Kole and Seth singing with Cienna and Shaniqua.
Mindy shakes shoulders to dance.
Arty starts yelling (FN, C9, March 18, 2002).

During this time the teacher was again helping a student in the back of the classroom.

The Immersion Teacher at Comeaux Elementary: Madame Mauriac

Introduction to Madame Mauriac

Madame Mauriac was a tall slender French woman with fly-away, curly, short brown hair. She had been teaching for 24 years, two of which were at Comeaux elementary as the fourth grade French immersion teacher. Before that she taught English as a Second Language (ESL) to adults and middle school students on four different continents. She was in her forties and planning on retiring after this year. She had had been trained in France and had the equivalent of a bachelor's degree.

Madame Mauriac's Perceptions

Madame Mauriac was a very cerebral teacher. When questioned about her training she emphasized the importance of pedagogical theory.
I had the chance to be in a Freinet class, you know the great pedagogue. The teacher there was really experienced and she used to do very interesting things with the children. It was not a traditional class... The theoretical part of it [training], I think was the most important part of it for me... but I really like that experience with the Freinet methods. It is based on free expression (INT, Mauriac, February 4, 2002).

She had an adventurous spirit and she came to Louisiana, "partly by chance and the desire to live in an English-speaking country." Before that she taught over twenty years,

In Morocco I started there teaching French to teenagers then I taught in France for awhile, ten years, South America as an English teacher in a French school and West Africa for three years in a French school and back to France to or three years and then I came here (INT, Mauriac, February 4, 2002).

Madame Mauriac stated that she was "not at all" adequately trained for her current assignment, "I used to teach English as a foreign language in middle school, at the middle school and here I'm teaching French." Because of her inexperience with immersion, coupled with her responsibility to create the fourth grade program from scratch at the school, Madame Mauriac discussed the difficulties of her job.

I found it tough at the beginning, real tough because I was starting the immersion program in fourth grade and I had nothing. I didn't even know what I was going to teach when I started and that made things difficult. The group that I started with was also a very difficult group... but uh finally we adapted (INT, Mauriac, February 4, 2002)

Madame Mauriac believed that students "learn best by doing things" and that "they absorb the language through, well, situations." According to Madame Mauriac, there were two great challenges for her students. The first she described as "having them speak French most of the time. They tend to socialize and use English in my classroom." The other challenge was "having them become autonomous. At that level, a few of them, but some of them are nearly bilingual and they could become autonomous very quickly with the help of reading." When asked if language/dialect affected the students' learning, Madame Mauriac replied without
hesitation, "not at all." Moreover, she believed "they learn even more I think, by using French." When asked how, she elaborated, "because they become more aware of the language themselves and they become able to transpose. It makes them think of the language."

Overall, Madame Mauriac considers this year's French immersion fourth grade class to have all the characteristics of her best students, "children eager to learn, interesting [sic] of looking for things, making research, active." In addition, she believes Seth, the higher achieving African-American boy, to be the "best student" she has taught saying he is "interested in everything, he can talk about any subject, he is always got the right answer, may be what he is lacking is the ability to work in pairs or in groups… he is curious." She found that this year's class was "a good class" but that they "they don't have as much less potential as the children I had last year, but they have a better attitude towards learning and they are better trained. They pay attention and they are learning." Additionally, she found that her class, like most American students, was "too talkative." With regards to interrelations between herself and the students, she states "we get on well." She discussed using the "discipline plans" and "rewards" to help deal with discipline problems and "calling someone else to intercede." But she interjected that "difficult kids have their good moments too."

Madame Mauriac did not have any academic concerns about the students per se, but she did mention concern over the home life situations of the students. Specifically, she mentioned some of the students "don't get enough care or attention at home, this is evident, there is even one who comes without breakfast in the morning. So there is concern, maybe with what's going to happen to them." The only child who she felt was having problems academically was a white girl with a learning disability, however, Madame Mauriac believed that the girl "she's surprising, sometimes succeeds in doing things so she may do well on the test." As for the significance of
the LEAP test, Madame Mauriac found "none at all" and stated that the LEAP test was simply a "frein [brake]…it slows you down" and that it was "preventing you from teaching the way you would like to teach." Further, she felt that the LEAP test was "not inappropriate to their age."

When Madame Mauriac discussed why a child would not do well, she divided the responsibility between herself and the child. The child may have "lack of attention, difficulties in concentrating or maybe the setting is not adapted to them. These are children that need to move and need to do more things with their hands, manipulate; or work individually, need individual teaching." For students who do well, she credits their "social cultural background." When asked directly who was responsible for a student's learning she responded "both teachers and parents." However, it seems the parental responsibility of providing materials "books what they need when it's time for them to be able to use that material" was secondary, merely a leg up, while the primary responsibility for a child's success or failure in school she took firmly upon her shoulders. The teacher was there to "hook" them and to "help them organize themselves."

As a teacher Madame Mauriac believed her central mission was "making the kids like to learn." Her greatest challenge as a teacher was "giving each individual what he or she needs. Sometimes we're not aware of what he or she needs; what kind of teaching was appropriate for each individual." When asked how she believed the students perceive her she said "some as kind, others as mean" (because of homework given or behavior problems) on the whole she hopes they think of her as "fair."
Seth: The Higher Achieving African-American Boy

Seth's Perceptions of Self and School

Seth was a higher-achieving African-American young man, according to his ITBS scores. He was also the only African-American student in the class who was in the gifted program. He was 10 years old, of above average height with a medium build. Seth was very disruptive but engaged in the class; he was not afraid to disagree with the teacher or correct other students.

Madame Mauriac: Une cause for the civil war (it was one reason).
Seth: C'est toutes les causes (it was all the reasons).
Madame Mauriac: C'était une des causes (it was one of the reasons) (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Madame Mauriac says she doesn't understand English. The class says she does. She says that it is not polite to speak English since she doesn't speak English well. Seth asks if a person were Chinese would it be impolite not to speak Chinese. Madame Mauriac says it polite to speak French to her. Seth says she "just made that up" (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Madame Mauriac asks … What is wrong next?
Ellie answers: Chapeau (nickname for accent circumflex).
Seth corrects Ellie: Accent circonflexe (both are correct Seth is more precise) (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Seth often was frustrated with his classmates and often he and the other gifted boy, the white high-achieving boy, dominated classroom discussions.

Madame Mauriac asks "Quelle siècle?" (What century?)
Danielle: 1700 chose.
Madame Mauriac: Quelle siècle?
Danielle keeps repeating the year.
Seth yells "Quelle siècle?!!"
Madame Mauriac explains difference between "siècle et années." (century and year) (FN, C4, February 22, 2002).
When Seth was not dominating classroom discourse he was either completely withdrawn from it (reading a book or working on a project during instruction) or he was disruptive (banging his fists on the desk).

Seth is still banging…
Madame Mauriac asks what a revolution is
Cory: Un grand changement
Some students think it is the civil war.
Seth correctly volunteers in French that is was the war with England and then continues banging (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

His behavior never seemed to bother Madame Mauriac who saw him as one of her "best students."

When questioned about what he learned in school, Seth mentioned "pre-algebra" and the "right endings on words." He said that sometimes he enjoys learning except when he was "upset with the teacher." However, he did go on to say when he was "in a good mood," he did not care about school. He likes math, "because, I think it's rather easy and I'm good at it." While he felt that social studies was "boring." Seth's grades had gone down in fourth grade because, "the grade (fourth) is harder and studying methods." In terms of his grades, Seth believed that they showed, "I'm creative, and I'm intelligent." He believed that Madame Mauriac's description of him would be, "he is very intelligent, and he talks a lot, and he's creative with his writing. And he can have a bad attitude sometimes." Madame Mauriac did mention his intelligence, his creativity and his excellent writing skills, but none of the negative characteristics. Seth was questioned at to why he had a "bad attitude,"

Seth: Because I'm aggravated at the teacher.
Researcher: What does she do to aggravate you?
Seth: Make me lose my temper (INT, Seth, March 13, 2002).

This 'bad attitude' was reflected in Seth's responses on the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview. In his responses concerning himself Seth did not consider himself to be a student who
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was "happy" or who "likes school." Furthermore, on the Caldwell (1999) collective self-esteem questionnaire, Seth was ambiguous concerning his own membership in the school. His answers on how school affected his own identity indicated that he felt that school was not important to his identity unlike family and ethnicity, which he indicated greatly affected his identity.

When Seth grows up he wanted to be a professional ball player. What he was looking forward to school next year was, "playing in the band, playing basketball, and running track. And yes I do feel like I'm gonna do good in that." He was not sure if he would stay in the immersion program or if he would transfer to the gifted self-contained school next year.

**Seth's Perceptions of His Peers**

Seth believed that his friends were "nice" and said "we don't argue very much." Those students Seth did not consider his friends he said that "most of the time they aggravate me," but that depends on his mood. Seth went on to say that he talks with more respect at school because at home his sister, "doesn't, like, go tell," but at school "it depends on who you're talking to." Of the five friends that Seth listed in his Wright and Taylor (1995), four of them were African-American. However, in terms of the positive and negative traits that he attributed to his peers, Seth attributed positive traits more so to the white students (17 of 30) and negative traits more so to the African-American students (6 of 10). The numbers were close though in terms of ethnicity. Likewise, in terms of negative traits attributed to each gender, Seth distributed them equally, five of ten for each gender. The largest difference was found in Seth's choices for positive attributes according to gender. Seth attributed positive traits mostly to girls (25 of the total 30 choices). The girls that Seth selected for "happy," "nice" and "liking school" were mostly white girls whereas the girls that Seth selected for "smart," "good at many things" and "having lots of friends" were mostly African-American girls. Moreover, out of the five choices
for those his considered his friends, Seth named three girls and only two boys. The girls that Seth selected as his friends were all African-American girls.

**Seth's Perceptions of His Teacher**

Seth felt that Madame Mauriac gave more chances than his parents who he believed were "firmer." He described Madame Mauriac as a teacher "who lets a lot of stuff slide" and as nice. However, he went on to say, "she can get aggravating." He seemed to be aggravated a lot. He did feel that Madame Mauriac gave help to him whenever he needed it and that she treated everyone the same way. Concerning how he believed that Madame Mauriac could improve her teaching, Seth said that teachers should teach students to play games to "make it a little more interesting." He said that that way, "we'll wanna play games and learn something out of it."

**Seth's Perceptions of Language**

When discussing differences in how his teacher, peers and parents talk, Seth focused on behavior rather than speech. As stated above, he felt that Madame Mauriac gave more chances and that his parents were "firmer." Further he believed that he could not trust his peers at school while he could talk to his sister because she "doesn't like go tell." When questioned about heritage language speakers, Seth responded:

Researcher: Okay. Does anyone in your family speak a language besides English? You said your mother's studying Spanish? Anyone else?
Seth: Not really.
Researcher: Not really? Just a little, or no?
Seth: My grandmother, I mean, my aunt.
Researcher: You said your aunt? And what does she speak a little?
Seth: French (INT, Seth, March 13, 2002).
Deanna: The Higher Achieving African-American Girl

Deanna's Perceptions of Self and School

Deanna was a large higher-achieving African-American girl. She was 10 years old and, like Kole and Cienna whose descriptions follow, had transferred to Comeaux elementary from the de facto segregated school because that school did not have enough students to continue the program past the second grade. She was taller than all her classmates save her friend Thalia from whom she was nearly inseparable. Deanna and Thalia worked hard together during project work and quietly followed along in class while socializing silently during teacher-led discussions.

I ask Thalia and Deanna what they are doing.
Thalia: Un poem de Victor Hugo. On dois dessiner. (A poem by Victor Hugo. We have to draw [it].) Thalia says she is going to present the poem somewhere (FN, C1, February 1, 2002)

When Deanna was separated from Thalia, at one point in the observation her desk was placed at the rear of the class, she still socialized with other students, mostly African-American students.

Monica, Melissa, Deanna and Ruby talk as Madame passes (FN, C3, February 18, 2002)

Kole makes noise the teacher calls on him.
He says: Deanna a mentioné quelque chose
Deanna talks about a couples "danse." (the class laughs)
Breen: Ça c'est "true." (It's true.)
Madame Maurice: On arrête... Elle n'est pas menteuse. (Stop. She is not a liar.)
Kole : Elle est menteur (She is a liar)(FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Deanna, when asked what she learned in school, mentioned all her academic subjects, "science, spelling, math, social studies, reading." Though she "sometimes" liked what she learned in school, but she felt that learning those subjects was "hard." Her favorite subject was spelling, because "it's just fun." Whereas she did not like science exclaiming "it's boring." Deanna's
grades were A's and B's in fourth grade, although she mentioned that they were dropping this year. She explained how she used to be on principal's list and how this year she was "just honor roll." The subject that she was dropping in the most was reading. Deanna explained the drop by saying, "I just don't read enough."

Deanna did not think that her grades said anything about her. She believed that she would do "great" in the fifth grade and looked forward "to play an instrument" (band starts in fifth grade). Deanna wanted to be a dancer when she grows up. She felt that Madame Mauriac would say that she "does great in school just like the rest of her students" and that she was a "real good student." Deanna's responses on the personal self-esteem portions of the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview indicated that she had a very high self-esteem attributing all but one of the positive traits to herself and none of the negative traits. However, she did respond that she was not one of the students who she considered to have "many friends." Based on her open interview responses to questions about friends and non-friends, which are discussed in the next section, this could have more to do with the fact that she was selective about who she considered her friend and less that she felt other students did not like her.

**Deanna's Perceptions of Her Peers**

Deanna had specific criteria both for her friends and those who she did not consider to be her friends.

Deanna: Some of my friends in the class are mean and nice… they I uhh… count on them… that's what I have problems with
Researcher: Like what?
Deanna: Like when I'm feeling down or bad
Researcher: What about the one's that aren't your friends what are they like?
Deanna: They make feel the people bad inside
Researcher: How do they do that?
Deanna: By teasing them (INT, Deanna, March 7, 2002).
She mentioned in particular one boy, Breen, who was quite disruptive in class and who she considered to be her only problem at school. In her responses to the Wright and Taylor interview, Deanna only mentioned African-American girls as her friends. Overall, Deanna mentioned African-Americans more often than whites in her responses on the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview--19 of the 30 choices for positive traits were African-Americans and seven of the 10 choices for negative traits were also African-Americans. However, as with her choice of friends, Deanna's choices reflected a positive view of African-American girls. Of the 19 African-American students chosen as having positive traits 14 of them were African-American girls. Of the seven African-American students chosen as having negative traits four were boys. Deanna's responses reflected not only a positive view of African-American girls but of girls in general. Of the 30 choices for positive traits, 25 were girls. For negative traits, Deanna spread her ten choices equally between boys and girls.

**Deanna's Perceptions of Her Teacher**

Deanna described her teacher succinctly, "She's fun." She responded affirmatively to inquiries at to whether her teacher was "nice to you," whether she "treats everyone the same way," and whether she "helps you whenever you need help." Her favorite teacher was Madame Case, who was her K-2\textsuperscript{nd} teacher at her old school. She liked Madame Case because she was "fun" and "made us do somethings." Fun was important to Deanna, in fact, her only critique of her teacher was "when Madame takes long talking." She appreciated an active and amusing, rather than a passive and boring, education.

**Deanna's Perceptions of Language**

The difference between how Deanna and her friends spoke at home and how they spoke at school, was that at home, "We gossip." Likewise, she believed her non-friend peers "they like
say curse words" when they were away from school. Deanna believed that students gossiped and cursed more away from school because the students would "get in trouble" utilizing these communication at school. However, Deanna did not notice any differences between the way her parents' and her teacher's language. Nor did she think that she changed the way she talked away from school. When asked if she had any heritage language speakers/speakers of other languages in her family, Deanna hesitated:

Researcher: Is there anyone in your family that speaks a language besides English?
Deanna: No…
Researcher: There's no one who speaks French?
Deanna: Oh!
Researcher: Who speaks French?
Deanna: My grandma
Researcher: Anyone else?
Deanna shakes head no (INT, Deanna, March 7, 2002).

Kole: The Lower Achieving African-American Boy

Kole's Perceptions of Self and School

Kole, like Seth, was of above average height but his build was more slender than Seth so he seemed even taller. Kole was nine years old. Like Deanna and Cienna, Kole transferred to Comeaux elementary after the second grade. He was a vivacious student who was eager to participate, but he had a short fuse and felt easily slighted.

Kole: Man I can't even get a "papier" without y'all talkin'!
Kole is angry (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Madame Mauriac has Kole move clothespin.
He says "so" and she makes him lower his clothespin again (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

Kole often spoke in French and played with the language. His favorite expression was "C'est Wac" (It's wac) when he thought something was not as it should be.

Madame Mauriac scolds Kole and Breen again.
Kole: C'est wac.
I help them get the dictionary and find conjugation.
Kole: Mais madame n'a pas answered (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Kole's spoken French was impressive; he rarely resorted to English because he had to.

Madame Mauriac comes to talk to me about the problem of English. She mentions Kole's wonderful French (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

When naming those subjects that he studied in school, Kole listed his major subjects, "math, social studies, science, English, reading." He enjoys learning because he believed "I will need it [learning those things] when I get older." Kole's favorite subject was math with the exception of "the dividing part." He did not like reading because "they have question that you have to find, that you have to go back and look in the story." Kole's grades consisted of C's and B's but he did get a D in one subject, but he forgot which one. His grades were lower now than before. He mentioned how, "in first, second, and third, I got A's," but "it gets harder." Kole did not feel that his grades said anything about him. Although he preferred math as a school subject, he also referred to math when asked about problems that he had at school, Kole explained that he had problems, "[i]n math, when I was first beginning." Kole felt his teacher would say "He writes good. He's a good student. But most of the time, he's not, not all the time." I asked Kole to elaborate on that statement.

Researcher: So not all the time? You're not a good student all the time? How are you not a good student?
Kole: When I didn't do stuff, it gets blamed on me.
Researcher: Why do you think that is?
Kole: Probably because the actions that I do, that I make.
Researcher: What kind of actions?
Kole: Like I get angry (INT, Kole, March 7, 2002).

Kole's responses concerning his problems in math and getting blamed or being angry at school were reiterated in his Wright and Taylor (1995) responses. The positive traits that Kole did not attribute to himself were "smart" and "liking school." In addition, the negative trait that Kole did
attribute to himself was that of a student who needs more help with his schoolwork. When he gets older, Kole said he wants to be a probation officer or a lawyer but not a cop because it was "too dangerous."

**Kole's Perceptions of His Peers**

Kole described his friends as "funny, playful..." and "sometimes but not all the time happy." Kole portrayed those whom he did not consider to be his friends, as peers who antagonize and provoke him. He described how non-friends would provoke him by saying things like "Aw, you can't hit me" in order to try to get him to "do something." Kole believed that even when he did not do "stuff," he would still get blamed. This belief reflected a sentiment, that others negatively perceived him regardless of his actions. This same reflection emerged in his responses on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire. According to his responses, Kole did not believe that other people had a positive view of his family or his ethnicity. Regardless of Kole's perception that others had a negative view of his own in-groups (family and ethnicity), Kole selected peers within his ethnicity and gender in-groups for positive traits. Kole attributed positive traits, by a slight margin, to more African-Americans than white students (16 of the 30 possible selections). Likewise, he attributed more of the negative traits to white students (5 of 8 possible selections). Kole only named three students as "those students who other students don't like as much." Two of the students were white and all three of his choices were girls. This revealed Kole's gendered selections for negative traits. Of the eight possible selections, seven of the students to which Kole attributed negative traits were girls. However, in terms of positive attributes Kole also selected more girls than boys (16 of 30) though the margin was close. In all his selection of girls, for both negative and positive traits, Kole selected white girls more than African-American girls (9 of 16 for the positive traits and 5 of 7 for the negative traits).
Kole's Perceptions of His Teachers

To improve education Kole utilized examples to demonstrate what he wanted.

Kole: They have some teachers that make us want to learn, like, they do action, like Ms. Price.
Researcher: What do they do?
Kole: Like, she does things, like, she did a cheerleading thing, with some pom-poms, for the LEAP test, and she told Ruby to help her (INT, Kole, March 7, 2002).

Though she did no cheerleading, overall, Kole reported that Madame Mauriac,

Kole: [S]he likes to do exciting things. She does a lot of activities with us.”
Researcher: Anything else? How does she treat you?
Kole: Good.
Researcher: She's nice to you?
Kole: She's nice to everybody (INT, Kole, March 7, 2002).

In fact Madame Mauriac was Kole's favorite teacher because (harkening back to the antagonistic relationship between Madame Mauriac and the English fourth grade teachers),

Because she, like, when people talk about how she talks French and how she do things, then she tells us just to let it slide and stuff. And we did our play about the dancing, they was talking about it, and she said just don't talk to them or look at them (INT, Kole, March 7, 2002).

This "let it slide attitude" was also underlined and appreciated by Seth, the higher achieving African-American boy.

Kole's Perceptions of Language

Kole described how his and his peer's language differed outside of the school setting,

"Say like, they'd say to me, and I'd say 'What's up?'" The difference he notices between his parents' and his teacher's language depended on what they tell him to do, "chores" at home and "things" at school. In terms of family members speaking a heritage language, Kole spoke of his grandmother.

Researcher: Does anyone in your family speak a language besides English?
Kole: My grandma, she speaks French.
Researcher: Do you get to speak with her?
Kole: Sometimes.
Researcher: She likes that?
Kole nods his head (INT, Kole, March 7, 2002).

Cienna: The Lower Achieving African-American Girl

Cienna's Perceptions of Self and School

Cienna, the lower achieving African-American girl, was 10 years old and of average height but she was so slender that it made her seem slight. Cienna, like Kole and Deanna, had transferred to Comeaux elementary from the de facto segregated school.

Cienna loved to socialize. She found inventive ways and times to socialize with the African-American girls around her during whole class activities.

Cienna shows copied pictures to Shaniqua.
Cienna words something to Shaniqua as Madame Mauriac works with her (FN, C2, February 4, 2002).

When the work was individualized she often did not do her assignments in class, instead she let others do her work, did work for other classes or socialized.

Cienna is working with Thalia.
Thalia: That's your paper.
Thalia gives the answer and Cienna copies (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Cienna is working on her spelling words (FN, C3, February 18, 2002).

Cienna said that at school she learned "different languages" and "different things to do" which she enjoyed learning and which she felt were "easy" to learn. Her favorite subject was math, "Cuz I think math's an easier subject." Cienna did not like science "because it feels hard." Her grades so far this year, she described as "great… A's and B's." According to Cienna, these "great" grades have not changed from earlier grades. Cienna was on honor roll twice and principal's list once. She did not know if her grades said something about her, but her Caldwell (1999) questionnaire indicated that school was more important to her identity than either
ethnicity or family. While her responses on the open interview indicated that she was pleased with her academic work, Cienna did not list herself among the students that she considered "smart" in her class and she did list herself as a student who was "not as good at schoolwork."

Cienna had not had any problems at school. She believed that she would do "great" in fifth grade. When asked what she was looking forward to in the fifth grade, Cienna demonstrated how proactive she was about comprehending what was said to her.

Researcher: What are you looking forward to?
Cienna: Umm…
Researcher: You don't know?
Cienna: What you mean "looking forward?"
Researcher: What are you looking forward… what do you want to do in fifth grade or what you are excited about getting to fifth grade to do… what's in fifth grade that you like?
Cienna: Different music teacher (INT, Cienna, March 13, 2002).

When she grows up Cienna wants to play basketball. Cienna perceived that her teacher would describe her as "Ummm… bright… exciting, nice and uhh… that's it" (very similar to Cienna's description of her friends, Madame Mauriac and Madame Case).

Cienna's Perceptions of Her Peers

Cienna's friends, according to her description, were "funny and silly and uhh nice, happy and excited." She felt sad for her classmates who she did not consider her friends because "they don't have any friends to play with," even though she described those non-friends as "nice and playful." While Cienna might not have felt that her ethnic group was important to her identity, her responses on both the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire and to the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview indicated that she had a very positive view of her ethnic group. In fact, Cienna focused on African-American students more than any of the other three selected participants at Comeaux Elementary. In her choices for positive traits, 21 of her 30 choices were for African-American students. In her choices for negative traits, seven of the ten choices were for African-American
students and all eight of the friends that she mentioned were African-American. On the subject of gender, Cienna's responses, like Deanna's, reflected a positive view of girls in general. Cienna attributed positive traits to girls in 23 of 30 possible selections while only attributing negative traits to girls four of ten possible times. Cienna did have two African-American boys who she considered her friends.

Cienna's Perceptions of Her Teacher

Cienna described her teacher, Madame Mauriac, as "[n]ice, fun ummm and she's exciting." Further, Cienna said Madame Mauriac treated her "nice," helped her whenever she needed help and treated everyone the same way. Her favorite teacher, like Deanna, was Madame Case, her K-2nd teacher, who Cienna described as "exciting" and as someone who "played lots of games with mathematics stuff, science and different subject things." As with Deanna's wish for "fun" in the classroom, Cienna was very interested in ensuring that her education was "exciting" and her advice to teachers was "Ummm plan exciting things with our subjects and different things and have fun."

Cienna's Perceptions of Language

Cienna did not notice any differences in the way her peers, teacher and parents talk. She did however notice that at school she speaks in French and at home she speaks in English. But that was not always the case.

Cienna: Because umm….I talk in English and at school I talk in French…
Researcher: And why do you do that?
Cienna: Because no one in my family speaks French. My grandmother used to , but she die
Researcher: Your grandma used to but she died. Anyone else
Cienna: My uncle
Researcher: Does he still speak it or
Cienna: He speak Creole and my other uncle to talk.
Researcher: Your other uncle can talk it? Which one Creole, Cajun?
Cienna: Creole (INT, Cienna, March 13, 2002).
Comeaux Elementary was a more student-controlled classroom with student actively engaging in their own education. Student/teacher interaction was often a negotiation with students and the teacher debating pedagogical and disciplinary methods. The students had even worked out a system in which they could socialize without interfering with their instruction. The African-American students were more focused on other African-American students in the class.

Case Study D: Dautrive Elementary--The Typical Regular Education (TRE) Class

General Overview of the Context

School Environment at Dautrive Elementary

Dautrive elementary was situated in a rural area of Louisiana and was decorated with large tires that were painted in bright colors and on which students could play. The following were my first impressions and encounter with Dautrive elementary.

The school is in a serene area with some very old live oaks and some 10-15 year old trees. The school is set next to a trailer park and a well-kept cemetery with freshly painted white graves. The office is a busy but very little room. Teachers come in and work around me, asking me to put things away because I am in the way. A student throws up. I'm led through the cafeteria (which smells like fish since it is Friday and it is Lent) to the brick fourth grade wing… There is bright equipment and soccer goals although, one of the goals is broken (FN, D1, February 15, 2002).

The faculty gets along well with each other and they were friendly to visitors. They were a close-knit faculty and during lunch breaks they discussed evening enrichment courses that some of them took together. In addition someone always had a joke or scathing, but insightful commentary to make in the teachers' lounge or the classroom. There seemed to be a general frustration with parents who were not supportive of who did not take responsibility for their child's education. There were also two incidents which stood out as evidence of this negative attitude. One occurred when I was checking out of the school.
There was a woman on the phone who was speaking to a parent who was trying to explain why his or her child could not make it to after school tutoring. The woman explained to the parent that was for his or her child's own good and the parent kept her on the phone apparently asking about busing services or a way to get the child to and from tutoring. The woman pulled the phone away from her ear, letting the parent talk but not listening and then put the phone back to her head to say "Sorry." Once she hung up the phone she said in a frustrated voice, "Get a job, get a life, get a car" (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).

The second incident was a quote taped to the wall in the teachers' lounge, which said, "It is easier to build a child than to fix an adult." Underneath the quote was hand-written, "Tell the parents!!"

Most of the faculty, administration and student body were white. It was a school in which minorities were a minority.

Class Environment at Dautrive Elementary

The classroom was very small for the number and size of the fourth grade students. However, it was well equipped both by the school--two computers, a television, a VCR and a sink--and by the teacher--a microwave and a refrigerator. The desks in the classroom were all new, but they were college size desks. The desks were too big for many of the students and for the size of the classroom, yet too small to fit all the students' books and supplies. Mrs. Trahan, the participating teacher, often complained about the lack of space. Students constantly fidgeted in an effort to get comfortable and the students getting or dropping their books and supplies often interrupted class time. Mrs. Trahan tried to remedy the pencil dropping with an addition to the desks.

Macy is taping something. She is taping a Mardi Gras cup to her desk to put her pencils in it (I see later all the students have Mardi Gras cups taped to their desks) (FN, D3, February 25, 2002).

Class time was highly structured. Mrs. Trahan used her classroom books and teacher's guide in most of her activities--what I termed "by the book" instruction. Mrs. Trahan had a schedule and she always appeared to be on the listed subject at the listed time. At math time the
students switched to their math books, workbooks and notebooks. The same goes for science, social studies and language arts.

Mrs. Trahan tells students to take out language books and notebooks. Thomas, Leslie and Nat are at the Mrs. Trahan's desk. Other students are moving about getting their books (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Mrs. Trahan: Ok in your social studies book turn to page… (She walks back to her desk and starts writing something) (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

These transitions often required students to go to their cubbies or search through their book sacks to get all their materials. Mrs. Trahan tried to remind, threaten, and cajole the students into bringing the books they needed at a certain time to their desks but it never happened.

Mrs. Trahan: In your workbook you need to do page 122. She writes "Workbook 122" on the board. She tells students that she will give demerits for students who have to get their books from their cubbies.

At the very beginning of the school day, about an hour into school, during the reading lesson, nearly one-half of the students left for either gifted or resource education. During this time, and at various other times through out the day, Mrs. Trahan gave students an assignment which required a lot of copying. Mrs. Trahan seemed to use this time to get administrative duties out of the way and to ensure that students had all made up their tests and turned in their homework. It must also be noted that there was a Special Education (SPED) student in Mrs. Trahan's class who was often disruptive and who had a full-time aide watching him the entire time.

Mrs. Trahan asks Jessica if she wants to do her make-up tests at recess or start now. Jessica: Can I start one now? Chris, Karl and Laticia [three African-American students] are working quietly copying the overhead. Other teacher comes in with a green card. The other teacher teases Dennis[the SPED student] about not running away (because of the crutches) [he just had surgery on his leg].
Dennis does not see it as a joke and he gets mad and says he can run away.
Mrs. Trahan threatens to take him to the office and that she had a good week last
week (When Dennis was out for surgery).
Mrs. Trahan scolds Nicky for copying and then defining instead of just copying
because she wants to remove the overhead (FN, D3, February 25, 2002).

**Teacher/student Interaction at Dautrive Elementary**

For the most part, Mrs. Trahan called on and interacted with students who were engaged
who obviously wanted to and knew how to learn. She taught to those who were motivated, who
asked questions, who were eager to respond while other students disengaged and played.

Mrs. Trahan asks what shape is the face of a cylinder
Jerry: A cube.
Mrs. Trahan has the students look at a cylinder.
Dennis gives an answer.
Jerry: Sphere.
Mrs. Trahan: Circle. So which picture.
Jerry: A
Nat answers correctly.
James is playing around (FN, D3, February 25, 2002).

When a student answered a question incorrectly Mrs. Trahan had three strategies 1) she skipped
over them to find a student who knew the right answer, 2) she continued questioning the student
until he understood or 3) she skipped to another student who knew the correct answer and then
returned to the student who answered incorrectly to explain.

Mrs. Trahan: Number eight Nicky.
Nicky responds.
Mrs. Trahan: No.
Mrs. Trahan skips to Dylan and then asks the extension question to Nicky (FN,
D3, February 25, 2002).

Further, Mrs. Trahan pushed the engaged students to extend their answers, often making
reference to the LEAP test and whether their responses would be appropriate for the test.

Mrs. Trahan summarizes and tells Grant to explain how.
Grant: Multiply by two.
Macy: You supposed to add.
Mrs. Trahan shows how they could multiply by two.
Macy says she did something.
Mrs. Trahan tells her that's not an acceptable answer that it is not acceptable for
the LEAP (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).

Gender, ethnicity and proximity all appeared to be factors that differentiated engaged
from disengaged students. The students who seemed to demand the teacher's attention, who
were always asking questions, eager to answer questions and always demanding help, were the
white boys at the front of the class.

Nicky has a question. Mrs. Trahan helps.
Laticia is tearing paper.
Mrs. Trahan scolds Laticia and then continues helping Nicky (FN, D2, February
20, 2002).

The most disengaged students were the boys who were furthest from the teacher, at the back of
the class, both the higher and lower achieving African-American boys and two white boys
(except for the last two observations in which the seating was rearranged and one of the
disengaged white boys was moved from the back to the front).

James and Thomas are passing notes back and forth (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Nat (as he sharpens his pencil): Mrs. Trahan
Mrs. Trahan is turned away from him and helping Nicky.
Nat pretends to kick Mrs. Trahan in the butt (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Jerry is still in his chair when other students leave for P.E.
When I ask him what he was doing he said he fell asleep and he stretches (FN,
D2, February 20, 2002).

In addition, the African-American boy, Karl, and the African-American girl, Chris, at the front of
the class were more engaged than the other African-American students who were either
disengaged, socializing, sleeping or engaged but disruptive.

Mrs. Trahan continues reading.
Jerry keeps clicking his pen.
Laticia's book is closed.
Chris is engaged flipping through her book.
Blanca is playing with her nails.
Jerry is still clicking his pen (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

There were two students who were engaged but disruptive in the class and they both had similar
c characteristics, they were bright, minorities and seated at the back of the classroom--Nat, the
higher achieving African-American boy and Lily the Hispanic girl.

Nat yells. Mrs. Trahan asks a question (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Lily is always ready to answer outloud the answers: 125, 125, 150 Mrs. Trahan
(FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Some of the students' disengagement might be due to the teacher's lack of interaction
with the class. Mrs. Trahan often answered her own questions in class and even answered the
problems for entire assignments in order to have the class move along more quickly. The only
problem was that none of the students appeared to actually correct their work when Mrs. Trahan
told them the answers. Thus, the students had little engagement with, and received little
feedback on, their work. Moreover, the copying and individual work described earlier, while
allowing for a quiet classroom, did little to increase student/teacher interaction and teacher
feedback on the students' work.

The majority of the students did engage in the class during lectures when Mrs. Trahan
used real-life examples, from her own personal experiences or from the collective culture of the
hometown of both Mrs. Trahan and the students. These real-life stories also allowed the students
to relate their lives to Mrs. Trahan' life.

Mrs. Trahan gives example of her Dad after Thanksgiving or Sunday dinner
saying "I'm going to get horizontal"(FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Most of the time Mrs. Trahan had a terrific sense of humor and she often joked with her students.
The African-American students in particular appeared to understand and appreciate her humor.

Mrs. Trahan walks in with a box of rocks she shakes the dust off her shirt and
accidently touches Jerry. She says, "sorry" but then she does it two more times
(smiling). Then they both laugh (she and Jerry) and Mrs. Trahan admits that the first time was an accident but the second she was teasing (seems friendly and humorous) (FN, D7, March 20, 2002).

She also transformed from joking to sarcasm when she was frustrated and at one point she just simply lost it and got angry with her students.

Mrs. Trahan (eyes closed): God give me the strength.
Mrs. Trahan: Dylan go into the hallway.
Nicky and Nat sharpen pencils.
Mrs. Trahan has hand on hip.
Dylan is talking from the door.
Mrs. Trahan: You gonna stand in the hall?
Another teacher peeks in the door.
Mrs. Trahan (to other Teacher): Because I have all the idiots in here who won't let me teach. Nicky won't shut up.
Mrs. Trahan and other Teacher: It is the parent/teacher meeting tonight.
Mrs. Trahan: Nicky if you open your mouth again I'm calling your maman to come pick you up because I'm afraid I'm gonna hurt you.
Other Teacher: Call Sandra… no call Henry (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Mrs. Trahan in addition to putting her hand on her hip had other non-verbal cues that indicated to her students that she was not happy.

Jerry and Nat are talking.
They get "the look" from Mrs. Trahan.
Nat: That was Jerry (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).

There did not seem to be a rule for which students were scolded or punished and which students were not. Sometimes students were allowed to blurt out questions and answers in class and sometimes they were not.

Mrs. Trahan questions the class.
Lily answers without raising her hand.
Mrs. Trahan expands on what she says (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Chris: Mrs. Trahan…
Mrs. Trahan: Chris shush (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

There were, however, some differences in student/teacher interaction that appeared to be based on ethnicity and perhaps the students' strategies to capture the teacher's attention.
Mrs. Trahan question and answer session was all white students except Nat (the higher achieving African-American boy) (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Ty [a white boy] and Blanca [the higher achieving African-American girl] have their hands up.
Ty is waving his fingers.
Mrs. Trahan calls on Ty (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Laticia keeps her hand up even though Mrs. Trahan is outside the class (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Further, the African-American students were rarely called on when they raised their hands during individual work time. Mrs. Trahan did always get to them, but often it was after she helped other students who she had called on or other students who were in her path on the way to the African-American students.

Mrs. Trahan helps Katie.
Laticia's hand is up.
Mrs. Trahan answers a question that Grant talks out.
Laticia still has her hand up.
Lily and Laticia both have their hands up.
Mrs. Trahan scolds Dylan and says he should behave better because his grandma works at school. (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

This could be explained by the white boys dominance of the class. The white boys were very needy and aggressive in their demand for help and Mrs. Trahan was used to helping them first.

Mrs. Trahan is helping Ty.
Mrs. Trahan: Laticia turn around.
Mrs. Trahan is helping Ty again (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

Mrs. Trahan is explaining something to Nicky.
Thomas is laughing.
Mrs. Trahan: Excuse me. If I don't think its funny, it's not funny. Thomas.
Mrs. Trahan keeps explaining to Nicky who has his book on his head (FN, D3, February 25, 2002).

In addition, when the entire class was noisy, Mrs. Trahan ended up shushing the African-American students more than the white students.
Nat: Mrs. Trahan, I'm done.
Mrs. Trahan shushes him
Nat: Ok (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Chris gives a suggestion (I think it is to get the gum off Page)
Mrs. Trahan: Chris, shut up.
Chris: But I was just trying to help.
Mrs. Trahan: But your interrupting my class (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Student/student Interaction at Dautrive Elementary

Students rarely had any on-task interactions with their peers. Class time consisted of on-task student/teacher interaction, on-task silent individualized work or off-task student socialization. Students socialized mostly during copying time, when individual work was finished and during transitions between subjects. During quiet classroom times students used silent socialization. They made eye contact, gestures, mouthed words to each other and passed notes (or wrote large notes on their notebooks and flashed the messages to each other).

During observation Laticia, Leslie and Dylan were passing notes (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).

James and Thomas are wording and communicating.
Thomas is showing James his work.
Both boys keep looking at me (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).

Students also socialized by meeting each other at the pencil sharpener, at the cubbies or at the Kleenex box. Additionally, students would simply turn around and talk to a nearby student.

Laticia is down on her knees by the cubbies next to Blanca.
They are talking.
As Mrs. Trahan nears Laticia she gets up with a notebook page in her hand and she throws it away (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

There were two distinctive groups whose socialization was not merely based on proximity. I termed one group the "disruptive group" whereas the other group consisted of the African-American girls. The disruptive group socialized, or rather, played nearly the entire class period and consisted of two permanent member; two white boys, James and Thomas. Along with
these two white boys the "disruptive group" occasionally included the lower and higher achieving African-American boys and Lily the Hispanic girl.

James and Thomas nod their head to Lily (who looks back at them).
Lily then raises her hand: Mrs. Trahan, Mrs. Trahan.
James and Lily look at each other (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Nat: Look Thomas.
Thomas is standing behind the podium.
Mrs. Trahan: Thomas get off.
Thomas: I ain't doin' nothing.
Mrs. Trahan: Yes you are (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

The African-American girls socialized with other students but they appeared to socialize more often with each other.

Blanca is communicating with Chris and Laticia.
She has some loose-leaf.
Laticia is wording (whispering to her)
Laticia and Chris talk; they are laughing (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

The African-American girls appeared to be very close. Two incidents demonstrated their closeness, some apparent racial/gender tension in the class and an underlying theme of justice.

Laticia is up again and getting a Kleenex.
She tells James excuse me, because his stuff is in the way.
James goes by Laticia and pretends to get his pencil off the floor.
Laticia looks upset and worried and she looks back at me.
Chris passes the same way over James's stuff.
James pretends to get his pencil again and he and Chris begin to kick each other (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

Students yell out.
Laticia has her hand up.
Mrs. Trahan calls on her, but other students' yell out answer.
Mrs. Trahan calls on Audry.
Chris yells out answer.
Mrs. Trahan shushes her and let's Audry answer (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).
The Teacher at Dautrive Elementary: Mrs. Trahan

Introduction to Mrs. Trahan

Mrs. Trahan was a bit overweight, in her thirties with jet black hair and very fair skin. She was a white teacher and spoke with a Cajun accent. She was from the Dautrive elementary area. Mrs. Trahan had been teaching for four years. She received her bachelor's degree from the local university. All four years of her teaching career Mrs. Trahan had taught in her home parish. She was now teaching in her hometown.

Mrs. Trahan's Perceptions

Mrs. Trahan did not feel happy or empowered by her teaching position. In informal interviews she discussed Behavior Disorder (BD) students and behavioral problems and how schools cannot control these kids because of SPED Laws. She went on to discuss the SPED child in her son's class who beats up her son and the BD child in her class who gets a full-time aide and how that was "our tax dollars." She also discussed how parents "don't discipline their children." I responded that parents do discipline to get respect for themselves. She retorted that they should discipline to be respectful of teachers. I changed the subject and asked her for a seating chart (INT, Trahan, March 20, 2002). Later, when the SPED teacher made an announcement over the intercom, Mrs. Trahan continued her discussion of the problems with special education.

Mrs. Trahan says something sarcastic, a remark, and then talks about how SPED teachers looks down on her and make her change her schedule and how she teaches. She also complains about her schedule being chopped with non-academic things and her desire to get back to the basics (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).

Mrs. Trahan believed that the greatest challenge students have to face was "growing up in households where their family doesn't love them and not knowing how to handle that. And not
knowing how to handle, it's social, social issues. Not knowing how to behave in situations."

When asked to describe her best students she again discussed home situations, she related how the best students

[c]ame from parents who required good grades, you know. Education is important to the parents. So therefore the kids exhibited, you know. 'I have to do this, because my mom, you know, my mom said…' And I can tell the ones that don't, you know, could care less (INT, Trahan, March 20, 2002).

In her teaching journal she equally mentions how the home situation of students causes them to be "ill mannered" and how this "saddens" her. Moreover she felt that, as a teacher, her hands were tied because she could not do "what works" to teach the students manners and humility.

Mrs. Trahan finds that her current class gets along well, but they were "uh, immature, lazy, (laughs) yein, yein (they complain about every little thing)."

She believed that home motivation, or a lack thereof was responsible for students' successes or failures in school. She believed that "the student, primarily" but also the parents were responsible for students' learning. Her description of her role as a teacher was passive.

To present them with the information, explain it so that they can understand it, um, in some part, make it as interesting as possible so they'll wanna learn, but I can't force 'em. I can't, I don't have that ability to just pour it in (laughs) (INT, Trahan, March 20, 2002).

Mrs. Trahan related that her greatest challenge was motivation.

Making the kids want. Trying to find ways to… I mean, how do you compete with Nintendo and Game Boy and all this interactive and highly visual stuff? How, how, it's, it's hard to interact, I mean to get that, keep their attention, make it fun, make it interesting (INT, Trahan, March 20, 2002).

She mentions the challenge of motivating students in her teacher's journal also.

Mrs. Trahan did not see any significance to the LEAP. While she saw the need for accountability she asked, "But why can't it be the report card?" She felt that passing should be based on a child's grades. She related a story of a girl with "straight F's" who passed the LEAP
last year while others with good grades simply froze up on the test. Further, she felt that students' dialect (slang) and the cultural differences of students in rural Louisiana could negatively affect their standardized test scores.

They ask questions that kids from this area are not familiar with, like a bus station or a train depot, or...I mean, we don't, we don't have, you know, nobody takes... Nouvelle Ville doesn't have a bus or a transport, you know, a city bus. Uh, we don't have a train, we have a train depot, but you don't hear of people getting on the train and traveling. So, questions that are going to refer to these, you know, type, what I consider are made my Yankees, (laughs) are not. Not that there's anything wrong with the test, but ask them something about a pirogue or an airboat or some type of transportation that we have around here. Make it a fair test of their knowledge. I mean, our kids are not dumb. They're just not familiar with those kinds of things (INT, Trahan, March 20, 2002).

When asked what her students think of her she related what they had told her.

They tell me I'm too nice. When I would say, "Why, y'all didn't do this for so-and-so?" "Cause you're too nice." I would say, ok, so, you mean, if I were mean and nasty then I could get what I, you know, then they would be scared I guess. So that's what they tell me. That's what they tell me. "You're too nice" (laughs) (INT, Trahan, March 20, 2002).

Student Participants and Their Perceptions at Dautrive Elementary

Nat: The Higher Achieving African-American Boy

Nat's Perceptions of Self and School

Nat was a higher-achieving African-American young man, according to his ITBS scores.

He was 10 years old, of average height and build and the only African-American student in the class who was in the gifted program. Nat was both constantly engaged in the classroom instruction and often disruptive.

Nat: You doing 1-50.
Mrs. Trahan: Nathanial.
Nat: I'll shut up.
Mrs. Trahan tells him good while she is doing 1-50 he can finish the homework assignment. He didn't do it.
Mrs.Trahan: Get it! I want it completed (FN, D2, February 20, 2002).
Nat raises hand and answers.
Mrs. Trahan asks why.
Nat explains why (FN, D4, March 5, 2002).

When questioned about what he learned in school Nat gave an elaborate description and revealed a positive view of his own intellect.

Nat: Math problems, like division, multiplication. In G/T we're reading a novel.
Researcher: Which novel?
Nat: It's called From the Mixed-Up Files of Mrs. Basil E. Frankweiler. And like every year we have to do a journal on the book, when we finish reading it. And every year a lady comes, she teaches art, and we get to paint stuff. I think she comes back Tuesday.
Researcher: And you enjoy doing those things?
Nat: Yeah.
Researcher: Do you think they're easy or hard?
Nat: They're easy to me (INT, Nat, March 22, 2002).

Even though the work was "easy," Nat's grades were lower this year. When asked why he replied "I don't know, I wasn't studying." Nat's preferred subject was spelling because "I always make A's on it". His least favorite subjects were social studies and science because, "I hate to write questions and the tests are hard."

In terms of problems at school, Nat only mentioned his own behavior, "I talk a lot in class, get demerits (the school wide punishment system)." Further, he believed the teacher looked on him as a child who "talks a lot, was bringing his grades down, and not doing his homework, that's all really." The demerits and the falling grades encompass an overall negative attitude toward school that was supported by Nat's responses to the personal self-esteem portion of the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview. The only positive trait that Nat did not attribute to himself was "those who like to go to school." This finding was further supported by Nat's responses on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire. While Nat felt that he was a good member of the school community and that other positively perceived his school, he did not feel that school was important to forming his identity.
Nat's Perceptions of His Peers

For Nat, both friends and non-friends were described by their bad behavior.

Researcher: Tell me about your friends in your class. What are they like?
Nat: Sometimes, Thomas, sometimes he acts bad, to go to the office, to not do his work. And, Taylor, he laughs a lot at Leslie, and Taylor, he gets in trouble a lot, and...
Researcher: Those are your main friends?
Nat: Yeah.
Researcher: What about other kids in the class? Ones you wouldn't necessarily call your friends? How do you feel about them?
Nat: Umm, Macy, a lot of times she gets in trouble, and she's always passing notes in class.
Researcher: What's the difference between the people you consider your friends and the people you don't consider your friends?
Nat: Um, the ones that I consider my friends, like, will do things for me. Like Thomas, I gave him a quarter to get me a bouncing ball, and it took him a few minutes to get it for me, but he gave it to me. And the ones I don't consider my friends, they would go tell on me if I do something bad (INT, Nat, March 22, 2002).

Nat only mentioned white students as friends and non-friends. Similarly, Nat's responses in his Wright and Taylor (1995) interview suggest that Nat lived in a white world. In the Wright and Taylor interview Nat again mentioned only white students when asked who his friends were. On the whole, Nat thought of white students much more than African-American students. He attributed positive traits to white students in 24 of the 30 possible choices and negative traits to white students in 9 of the 10 possible choices. This white worldview was reiterated in Nat's responses to the ethnic membership portion of the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire. When responding to questions concerning his ethnic group, Nat did not consider himself a good member of his ethnic group, nor did he feel positively about his ethnic group. He especially felt that others negatively perceived his ethnic group. Overall, Nat was unsure of how important his ethnic group was in forming his identity. In terms of gender, Nat appeared to view boys more positively than girls, but gender differences were not as pronounced as the racial differences. Of
the possible choices for positive traits, Nat attributed 19 of 30 to the boys and of the possible choices for negative traits; Nat attributed four of the ten to the boys.

**Nat's Perceptions of His Teacher**

Nat felt that Mrs. Trahan was "kinda mean if you're sassy to her," but "if you're nice to her she'll be nice to you." Nick believed that Mrs. Trahan treated the best students better saying that "she wouldn't do them nothing." However, other students, such as Nat, did not get such good treatment,

Nat: But like James, Macy, Jessica, Skyla, she would pick on them and slap them.
Researcher: Where would she slap them?
Nat: On the shoulder.
Researcher: Has she done that to you?
Nat: Probably two or three times (INT, Nat, March 22, 2002).

Though I never observed Mrs. Trahan slap the students, once she did get very angry at Dylan, a lower-achieving white student, for misbehaving and called him outside to speak with him.

Dylan comes in from talking with Mrs. Trahan outside.
He is holding his arm.
Mrs. Trahan punished (physical?) (FN, D5, March 6, 2002).

When Nat was asked what he felt about Mrs. Trahan he said, "I feel that she shouldn't hit people that hard if they in trouble, with her ruler." I never observed Mrs. Trahan hitting or even threatening to hit the students with rulers. Nat's suggestions for improving teaching included

Nat: Um, probably, give a little bit more homework, and, I don't know...
Researcher: Think about whenever you're in class.
Nat: Send them to the office more when they act bad or talk a lot. And give them homework over the weekends.
Researcher: For someone who doesn't get his homework done, you sure have a good belief in homework! (INT, Nat, March 22, 2002).

**Nat's Perceptions of Language**

Nat stated that he did not notice differences in his friends' language spoken at home and at school. However he noticed a difference in his non-friends' language
They wouldn't talk as much as they do in school. They'd just come by and say, "Hey Nick" and they'd leave like that (INT, Nat, March 22, 2002).

Nat said that his own language differs between home and school in that the subject he talks about at home were non-academic

At my house, I talk about like what I want for my birthday, and what kind of cake I want and stuff, and at school, we're always talking about 4-wheeling and dirt bikes (INT, Nat, March 22, 2002).

Nat had many family members who speak French as a heritage language.

Researcher: Does anyone in your family speak a language that's different, other than English?
Nat: My grand--, like hardly all my family, they speak French.
Researcher: Wow, that many speak it in your family?

Blanca: The Higher Achieving African-American Girl

Blanca's Perceptions of Self and School

Blanca was a very stylish African-American girl. She was ten years old and taller than many of her classmates and her hair was usually in plaits. Often during the lesson she could be seen digging in her purse, playing with her brightly polished nails or looking in a mirror.

Blanca's ITBS scores were the highest of the three African-American girls in the class. What was interesting about Blanca was that before either her teacher or I had discussed the ITBS scores, Mrs. Trahan had told me in informal interviews that Blanca was one of her weakest students. Mrs. Trahan complained that Blanca's mother did not do enough for Blanca at home to make her work. Blanca's mother, according to Mrs. Trahan, was working on getting a degree in school and while Mrs. Trahan said she applauded Blanca's mother's attempts at "bettering herself," she felt that Blanca's mother was not being diligent enough in getting Blanca to do her work. Ironically, my notes indicate that Mrs. Trahan's critiques of Blanca's mother, for her lack of diligence in getting Blanca to work, were mirrored in Mrs. Trahans' interactions or lack of
interactions with Blanca. Blanca was constantly preening, yawning and socializing during class. Mrs. Trahan was adamant that Blanca was not her highest student. When I asked her to get me the identity of the student with the highest test scores, Mrs. Trahan came back with the test scores of another African-American girl saying that there must be some mistake and that Blanca could not possibly be her highest African-American girl. Later Mrs. Trahan explained to me that Blanca's higher test scores were due to the remediation she received during the test. I agreed that this remediation (which allowed an aide to read the test to her) might have explained her language scores, but that Blanca's math scores were in the 90th percentile and that reading math to her still did not diminish her ability in math. Mrs. Trahan then admitted that Blanca was good at "calculations."

Blanca, when asked about what she learned in school, reported not only her subjects but also her progress in those subjects.

I learn about Math, and Spelling, and I have trouble in that, but I'm working on it, Language I'm doing great, Social Studies and Science, I need to work on it, and Reading, I'm doing great. And I like my Math and Reading.
Researcher: They're your favorite? Why?
Blanca: Because I understand it better. I don't have trouble in it, but I still have to go to Resource for Reading, because sometimes I don't understand the words that I read (INT, Blanca, March 22, 2002).

Blanca characterized schoolwork as "sometimes it's easy and sometimes it's hard." Blanca's responses on the personal self-esteem portions of the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview indicate that Blanca did not feel that she was a smart student and that she was one of students in the class who needs the most help with her schoolwork. Furthermore, on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire, Blanca's responses indicated that she did not feel that school was as intrinsic as family and ethnicity in forming her identity. She said that her grades were dropping this year
and that they were better in the third grade because her third grade teacher was "stressful."

When I asked her what she meant by "stressful" she explained:

She would be mean to me, and she would say, well, she wouldn't say it to me but she would say to other people, well, she'd say that I'm not good at stuff, so I had to do something to show her that I was good at stuff (INT, Blanca, March 22, 2002).

This year Blanca said that she had no problems in school and that she was looking forward to the fifth grade and in particular she was looking forward "to be able to go to French and do good in all my classes."

**Blanca's Perceptions of Her Peers**

Blanca believed her family affected her peers' treatment of her.

Blanca: They, will like talk to nice [out of school], but at school they would do all kind of other things.
Researcher: And why do you think that is?
Blanca: Probably because, when I'm at school, and... I don't know, maybe because my mama's there (INT, Blanca, March 22, 2002).

Unlike Nat, Blanca did not live in a white world, both family and ethnicity were important to Blanca. While she did attribute positive traits to more white students than African-American students, the margin was not as substantial. Blanca attributes positive traits to 17 white students and 13 African-American students. In terms of negative traits, Blanca attributes very few to African-American students, only two of ten. In terms of friends, Blanca chose three students within her ethnic group, all three African-American girls, and three students outside of her ethnic group, one of which was the Hispanic girl in the class, as those who she considers as friends. Her responses on the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire equally demonstrate that she believes that both her ethnic group and her family to be important in forming her identity, much more so than her school.
On the subject of gender, Blanca did tend to focus on girls rather than boys. Blanca mentioned girls more on her responses to the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview—21 of 30 positive response and 6 of 10 negative responses. Additionally, Blanca only mentioned girls as friends.

**Blanca's Perceptions of Her Teacher**

Blanca description of Mrs. Trahan was mixed:

Blanca: She's nice, and she's kind. And when kids are being bad, she likes to scream at them.
Researcher: And how do you feel about her?
Blanca: I like her.
Researcher: And how does she treat you?
Blanca: She treats me nicely when I'm good, and sometimes she makes me laugh.
Researcher: And when you aren't being good?
Blanca: She fusses at me (INT, Blanca, March 22, 2002).

Even though she believed that Mrs. Trahan helped her whenever she needs help, when I asked Blanca if Mrs. Trahan treated everyone the same way she smiled and with a humming sound responded "hmmmm…you could say that." When I mimed the sound back to her questioningly, she just laughed. The only problem that Blanca discussed occurred with last year's third grade teacher.

I wrote her this letter, and I told her that these girls that were not my friends were being mean to me, and she started fussing at me and not at them (INT, Blanca, March 22, 2002).

Overall the only suggestion that Blanca gave for teachers to improve their teaching was to "[g]o slower in subjects."

**Blanca's Perceptions of Language**

Blanca did not notice any differences in how other people talked at home or at school, rather she noticed differences in how they acted as mentioned about with her peers acting nicer when they were around her mom. Nonetheless, Blanca did notice differences in her own speech.
"I have a Texas accent, so, I talk with my Texas accent when I'm at home and I use it sometimes at school." There was a heritage language speaker in Blanca's family.

Researcher: Oh, okay. Does anyone in your family speak a language besides English? Your grandparents, or aunt and uncle...?
Blanca: I think on my Daddy's side.
Researcher: Your daddy's side? What different language?
Blanca: My granny.
Researcher: And what language does your granny speak?
Blanca: I don't know (INT, Blanca, March 22, 2002).

Jerry: The Lower Achieving African-American Boy

Jerry's Perceptions of Self and School

Jerry, the lower achieving African-American boy, was 11 years old. He was taller and bigger than all of the other students in the classroom. His build and stature resembled that of a high school student. In school, Jerry stated "I learn to read, spell." Reading was he favorite subject because, he declared "I love reading." He disliked math because "It's hard." Jerry grades ran the gamut.

Researcher: How are your grades so far this year?
Jerry: In math?
Researcher: In general.
Jerry: (inaudible)
Jerry: And F's. A's, B's, C's, D's, F's (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

Jerry acknowledged that his grades had changed from earlier grades; his grades were better in earlier years because "it was easier." Jerry was looking forward to fifth grade, but he was not optimistic about his prospects for the coming year.

Researcher: Are you looking forward to fifth grade?
Jerry: Yes, ma'am.
Researcher: What are you looking forward to?
Jerry: Fifth grade.
Researcher: Just getting there?
Jerry: And try to pass.
Researcher: How do you think you'll do in fifth grade?
Jerry: Badder.
Researcher: Badder? Like, not good?
Jerry: Mm-hmm.
Researcher: Why do you think you'll do bad?
Jerry: Because I'm falling behind in fourth grade (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

Jerry's negative perception concerning his academic abilities were reiterated in his responses on the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview. Jerry did not consider himself to be "smart" or "good at many things." Additionally, Jerry said that he was one of the students who "was not as good at school work and needed the most help from the teacher." When asked how he thought Mrs. Trahan would describe him, he expected her to say he was:

Jerry: A good student.
Researcher: Anything else?
Jerry: And try hard (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

Jerry's Perceptions of His Peers

Jerry's perception of his peers was closely related to his perception of the school environment. He stated that this year he was having problems.

Jerry: I get into a lot of fights. Teased a lot.
Researcher: What are you teased for?
Jerry: A lot of stuff.
Researcher: And what's been done to help these problems?
Jerry: Ms. D.
Researcher: Who's that? A counselor? (Jerry nods.) What did she do?
Jerry: She solved the problems (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

Like Nat, the higher achieving African-American boy at Dautrive Elementary, when Jerry described those classmates who he did not consider his friends, he described them in relation to their behavior in school, "most of them get into trouble." Additionally, Jerry believed that school was having a negative effect on his friends' behavior.

Jerry: They [his friends] fuss a lot.
Researcher: Where would they fuss, at your house or at school?
Jerry: At school.
Researcher: Why do you think that is?
Jerry: Because that's all we do is fuss (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

Jerry's description of his friends in class, "They're like brothers" indicated a gender preference. This gender preference was supported by Jerry's responses to the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview in which five out of the six friends he mentioned were boys. Further Jerry's 19 of 30 choices for positive traits and five of the seven possible choices for negative traits indicated that Jerry thought mostly of boys when he thought of his classmates.

Like Nat, Jerry chose mostly white students when asked about students with positive and negative traits. Jerry attributed most of the positive and negative traits in the Wright and Taylor interview to the white students--24 of the 30 possible positive choices and six of seven negative choices. Jerry mentioned only two students who did not have lots of friends, instead of the requested five students). According to the Caldwell (1999) questionnaire, Jerry felt that others did not positively view his school, family or ethnicity. Both instruments seemed to point to an external point of view that influenced both of the African-American boys at Dautrive elementary.

Jerry's Perceptions of His Teacher

Jerry's above aversion to fussing was apparent in his description of how teachers could teach better.

Researcher: Think of things in your class that you like, that we could do more of, and think of things that aggravate you, that we could stop or do something to change.
Jerry: The noise.
Researcher: The noise bothers you? So you'd like that to change, the noise lowered? Anything else?
Jerry: That's it. The fussing.
Jerry: That's it (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

Jerry's description of Mrs. Trahan was complimentary.

Researcher: Tell me about your teacher. What is she like?
Jerry: My mom.
Jerry believed that Mrs. Trahan treated him "[f]air, like everybody else," and that she was nice to him and helped him when he needed help. When asked if he had a favorite teacher Jerry replied, "No, they're all of them the same." There was only one teacher that Jerry mentioned not liking and that was because "she'd fuss a lot."

**Jerry's Perceptions of Language**

When discussing differences in how people talked, Jerry referred to how people acted rather than their speech. As mentioned above Jerry's friends fussied more at school than at home. His non-friends, on the other hand, played "fairer at school." When asked if there was a difference in how his parents and teacher spoke, Jerry noticed no differences. His own speech, contrasted to that of his friends.

Jerry: I talk lower at school, and fuss a lot at home.
Researcher: And why is there that difference? Why do you fuss at home and not at school?
Jerry: My sisters (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

In terms of family members speaking a heritage language, Jerry replied affirmatively

Jerry: My uncle, my cousins.
Researcher: And what do they speak?
Jerry: They speak Spanish. They don't understand English.
Researcher: Do you have any grandparents that speak other languages?
Jerry: Not that I know of (INT, Jerry, March 22, 2002).

**Laticia: The Lower Achieving African-American Girl**

**Laticia's Perceptions of Self and School**

Laticia, the lower achieving African-American girl, was 11 years old of average height but a bit slender. In school, Laticia learned "math, social studies, and science." She enjoyed learning, but when questioned as to whether learning was "easy or hard," she replied "they're
kind of both." Laticia's reason for enjoying her favorite subject did not seem to match the subject.

Researcher: Do you have a favorite subject?
Laticia: Social Studies.
Researcher: And why is that your favorite subject?
Laticia: Because you can do experiments and learn about new things (INT, Laticia, March 22, 2002).

I did not catch this until I read the transcripts and thus I did not get to ask her if she meant science. Laticia's least favorite subject was math, "because it's kind of hard." Overall, Laticia declared that she was doing better this year due to her efforts.

Researcher: And are your grades different this year from what you got in first, second, or third grade?
Laticia: Yes, ma'am.
Researcher: How are they different?
Laticia: Sometimes I used to make B's and C's sometimes, and it was hard to make the Honor Roll.
Researcher: And now you make the Honor Roll a lot?
Laticia: Yes, ma'am.
Researcher: And why do you think that is? Why do you think your grades changes?
Laticia: I wasn't trying harder in first, second, and third grade like I do in fourth (INT, Laticia, March 22, 2002).

When discussing herself, Laticia focused on her behavior in school, which she did not view positively. She believed that Mrs. Trahan saw her as "nice in a way, but kinda sassy. And always getting fussed at for something." However, Laticia's responses in the Wright and Taylor (1995) interview, in which Laticia attributed to herself all the positive traits and none of the negative traits, indicated a very positive self-esteem. This positive view of herself coupled with the perception that others viewed her negatively was reflected in Laticia's responses to the Cadwell (1999) questionnaire. Whereas Laticia positively viewed her membership in her school, family and ethnicity, and she considered her membership in her school family and ethnicity as important to forming her identity, she did not feel that others positively viewed these institutions.
Laticia's Perceptions of Her Peers

Laticia's only perceived problems in school this year revolved around one of her fellow students--the disruptive SPED child whom Mrs. Trahan complained about during an informal interview.

Laticia: Like I always get punched or something by this boy named Dennis. He does not like me.
Researcher: Dennis was in your class? And what has been done about the problem?
Laticia: Mrs. Trahan would fuss at him or send him to the office, either one.
Researcher: And has it stopped?
Laticia: Actually, no (INT, Laticia, March 22, 2002).

While this was the only problem that Laticia mentioned, her discussion of her other peers did not paint the picture of a positive welcoming classroom. Laticia described her friends as "they are mean in some ways, but they're my friends." Of those who she did not consider her friends, Laticia said, "they just don't like me." When she was asked the difference between her friends and students who she did not consider to be her friends, Laticia was not able to answer and just shrugged her shoulders.

Like Blanca, Laticia did not live in a white world but also like Blanca she attributed positive traits to more white students than African-American students. In fact, the margin was precisely the same for Laticia and Blanca. Both girls attributed positive traits to 17 white students and 13 African-American students. In terms of negative traits, Laticia attributed even fewer negative traits to African-American students, only one of ten. However, in terms of friends, Laticia, again like Blanca, was more democratic choosing all the African-American girls, a white boy and the Hispanic girl.

On the subject of gender, Laticia, unlike Blanca, had more balanced responses to the Wright and Taylor interview. Laticia attributed to girls 15 of 30 positive responses and three of
ten negative responses. Nevertheless, Laticia only mentioned one boy as compared to five girls as friends.

**Laticia's Perceptions of Her Teacher**

In describing Mrs. Trahan, Laticia summed her up as "kinda nice in a way, but if somebody be bad or something she, like, gets very mad." In response to questions concerning Mrs. Trahan's treatment of her, Laticia again mentioned how negative behavior could affect Mrs. Trahan's treatment of her.

```
Researcher: Okay, how does she treat you?
Laticia: She treats me good.
Researcher: Is she nice to you? or not?
Laticia: Kinda.
Researcher: Why do you think that is?
Laticia: Because sometimes I be catching an attitude with her (INT, Laticia, March 22, 2002).
```

While Laticia said that Mrs. Trahan helps her whenever she needs help, she later contradicted this statement. When asked if Mrs. Trahan treats everyone the same way, Laticia said that "sometime we'll ask her for help, but she'll say not right now, try to figure it out on your own." Laticia did not define who she was referring to when she said "we."

**Laticia's Perceptions of Language**

In terms of language difference, Laticia found that context appeared to influence how "nice" a person was.

```
Researcher: Is there any difference in the way you talk at school and the way you talk at home?
Laticia: I talk a lot nicer when I'm around my Mom.
Researcher: Your Mom brings out the nice in you? Why do you think that is?
Laticia: Because I think my Mom teaches me more like saying "yes ma'am" and "no ma'am." (INT, Laticia, March 22, 2002).
```

Equally, she believed that her friends were nicer outside of the school context.

```
Researcher: Why do you think that is?
```
Laticia: I think it's just the way they react around people.
Researcher: So it's other people that kinda make them meaner, like in school?
Laticia: They say they get in trouble in school and they're taking it out on you, but I didn't really do anything (INT, Laticia, March 22, 2002).

Contrary to herself and her friends, Laticia saw her non-friends as nicer in the school environment. She did not say why. When discussing the language of her parents and teachers, Laticia again mentioned how they treated her. She said, "my parents just tell me to go to my room and Mrs. Trahan will, like, fuss at me first and then she'll tell me to go to the corner." In terms of heritage language speakers Laticia had no heritage language speakers in her family.

Overall, Dautrive elementary had more teacher control but less student/teacher interaction. The student/teacher interaction that occurred ranged from very positive (humor and real-life anecdotes) to antagonistic (corporal punishment and threats of corporal punishment). Student found strategies to work around the teachers' control and socialize and/or play. The African American participant boys in the class seemed to disengage from their ethnicity while the African American girls clung to each other for friendship and support.

Summary
Both immersion classes had less teacher control and more student control of the classroom. Aria elementary, the Extreme Immersion (EXI) class, had a definite imbalance in the student/teacher power structure wherein the students had control of the classroom due to LEAP test pressures. While Comeaux elementary, the Typical Immersion (TI) class, was a more student-controlled classroom with student actively engaging in their own education. Both regular education classes were more teacher-controlled. Blue Willow elementary, the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) class, varied in their student teacher interaction according to the teacher. Mrs. Porte's class was postive, nurturing and strict. Mr. Chenille's class was repetitive, structured and strict and Mrs. Lebrun's class was chaotic. Dautrive elementary, the Typical
Regular Education (TRE) class, had much more teacher control but less student/teacher interaction.

The African-American participating students at Aria elementary (EXI) had a positive view of schooling and their teachers. They controlled their teachers and interacted as siblings in class in that they were both helpful and antagonistic to one another. Student/teacher interaction at Comeaux elementary (TI) was often a negotiation with students and the teacher debating pedagogical and disciplinary methods, while the student interaction also resembled that of siblings. The students of Comeaux elementary (TI) had even worked out a system in which they could socialize without interfering with their instruction. In the regular education classrooms the interactions varied. At Blue Willow elementary (EXRE) the students socialized less in the strict environments with student/student interaction being controlled by the teachers. However, student/teacher antagonism was high between the African-American participant students and Mr. Chenille and Mrs. Lebrun. The student/teacher interaction at Dautrive elementary (TRE) ranged from very positive (humor and real-life anecdotes) to antagonistic (corporal punishment and threats of corporal punishment). Students at Dautrive found strategies to work around the teachers' control and socialize and/or play.

In terms of students' perceptions of their own ethnicity, the African-American immersion students at Comeaux (TI) were more focused on other African-American students in the class. At Dautrive elementary (TRE) the African American participant boys in the class seemed to disengage from their ethnicity while the African American girls clung to each other for friendship and support.
CHAPTER 6:
QUALITATIVE CROSS-CASE COMPARISON AND FINDINGS

This study used a two-phase mixed model design to investigate the impact of the French immersion context on the experiences of 4th grade African-American students. Chapter 6 reports the findings of Phase II, the qualitative phase which examined the interactions and perceptions of African-American students and their teachers' interactions and perceptions both in general and with regards to African-American students in particular in four different contexts: Aria Elementary: the Extreme Immersion (EXI) classroom; Blue Willow Elementary: the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) classroom; Comeaux Elementary: the Typical Immersion (TI) classroom and Dautrive Elementary: the Typical Regular Education (TRE) classroom. To facilitate the reading of this chapter Table 6.1 lists the participating classrooms, teachers and students within each context.

Table 6.1 Participating Classrooms, Teachers and Students Within Each Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Hi AA boys</th>
<th>Hi AA girls</th>
<th>Lo AA boys</th>
<th>Lo AA girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Maurice, Kaiga, Aussi</td>
<td>Shea</td>
<td>Falina</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Extreme</td>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>Porte, Chenille, Lebrun</td>
<td>Donovan</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>Dusty</td>
<td>Raylyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Immersion</td>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>Kole</td>
<td>Cienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td>Regular Education</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>Laticia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chapter begins with a cross-case comparison of school and classroom environments across the four contexts. Then each of the four qualitative research questions is addressed describing differences, similarities and outstanding features of the four participating classrooms. A summary outlining the emerging themes for each question is provided. A brief summary of the findings closes this chapter.
Cross-case Comparison of School and Classroom Environments

School Environments

In terms of school environment the differences and similarities between the four classes appeared to depend on the SES levels of the school and the students rather than on the classroom contexts in which the students found themselves. Both of the extreme case classrooms, Aria Elementary (EXI) and Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), were situated in less well-equipped, older school buildings, and nearly all the students in these two schools were African-American students, 99% of the student population. The typical case schools, Comeaux Elementary (TI) and Dautrive Elementary (TRE), had newer looking buildings, better-equipped classrooms, impressive libraries and a mixed ethnicity student population. The school in the worst condition by far was the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) School, Blue Willow Elementary, with a leaking, dilapidated roof and the constant construction noise. Conversely, the best-equipped school in the best condition was the Typical Regular Education (TRE) School, Dautrive Elementary. Dautrive Elementary was also the only school of the three in which there were substantially more white students than African-American students.

While the faculty and administration in all four contexts discussed high-stakes testing and tests, only the extreme case schools had frequent announcements regarding the LEAP test and ITBS tests and the need for academic improvement. Both of the extreme case schools, Aria Elementary (EXI) and Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), had received accolades and checks from the state because of their improved achievement on standardized tests. However, the immersion teachers at Aria Elementary, (EXI) had the additional pressure from the parents who did not feel that teaching LEAP subjects in French would allow the students to do well on a test that was written in English. The other immersion school, Comeaux Elementary, the Typical
Immersion (TI) school, was in corrective action because of falling test scores. The pressure from the tests at Comeaux Elementary was heavy and oppressive. Teachers were constantly under observation by a team of experts who were trying to determine what was wrong with the school. Teachers complained about the lack of administration support in terms of discipline. However, according to the teachers, the team of experts, the District Assessment Team (DAT) team, lauded administrators but blamed the falling test scores on the schoolteachers' low expectations and lack of creativity. Dautrive Elementary (TRE) school, mentioned the LEAP test less than the other schools although the school did offer an after-school tutoring program for students who they felt might need help on the test.

Amongst the teaching faculties, the most cohesive teaching corps was found among regular education teachers in both typical case contexts. The teachers I observed at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), were very much like a family. These teachers, all of whom were white Americans, seemed to have known each other for a long time. They attended classes together, shared food and were constantly joking with one another. Similarly, the fourth grade teaching corps of Comeaux Elementary (TI), again all of whom were white Americans, was very cohesive with the exception of the immersion teacher. Madame Mauriac (TI), the immersion teacher was white but she was French. She often felt excluded and gave examples of not of being informed of meetings and other school news. Additionally, Madame Mauriac often fought to be excluded from school activities with which she did not agree, such as recess detention or an intensive LEAP review week.

Madame Mauriac did have a good working relationship with her English counterpart, Mrs. Price. However, Mrs. Price was at school only long enough to teach English language arts to the fourth grade immersion students, so she had little contact with the fourth grade teaching
Further, that positive relationship was strained as the LEAP testing drew near and the two teachers had to vie for instructional time and for the responsibility of going over the required test review (which was in English). At one point this pressure came to a head when the English teacher stormed out of the classroom saying that the Madame Mauriac and I--the observer--had given each other a "look" concerning how she taught the LEAP review. Madame Mauriac, hurt and discombobulated by the accusation, ran out of the room, and I was left to teach the lesson.

In the extreme case classrooms the teachers' schedules were so intense that they were not conducive to socializing or even hallway discussions. However, this did not prevent the participating regular education teachers and principal of Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), all of whom were African-Americans, from meeting to discuss my initial case study findings in order to decide whether or not to continue in their participation as well as what they felt needed to be explained or elaborated on in my study. As with the Dautrive Elementary (TRE) teachers, this meeting amongst Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) teachers revealed a certain cohesiveness within the regular education teaching corps. In Aria Elementary (EXI), as in Comeaux Elementary (TI), the immersion teachers, who were black Africans, did not fit into the teaching corps. Further, there appeared to be a sentiment that they were not as important as the English teachers. This point was emphasized by the meetings and important news that were not forwarded to Madame Mauriac (TI) and by the English teacher who interrupted Madame Maurice's (EXI) math class to ask her to go and make copies for her English class.

One theme identified across all the schools was the teachers' perceptions of the parents as pivotal to their child's success or failure. While all the participating teachers attributed a certain amount of blame to the parents for the behavior and academic problem of the students, only one school, Dautrive Elementary (TRE), appeared to have this attitude embedded in the quotidian
school life. This attitude was evidenced by the talk in the hallways and the teachers' lounge concerning problem children. However, two incidents most clearly revealed this hostile attitude towards the parents at Dautrive Elementary (TRE). The first involved one of the secretaries at the school who got off the phone with a concerned parent who could not bring his or her child to LEAP tutoring after school and then exclaimed to the other office personnel "Get a job, get a life, get a car." The second incident was a quote taped to the wall in the teachers' lounge, which said, "It is easier to build a child than to fix an adult." Underneath the quote was hand-written, "Tell the parents!!"

**Classroom Environments**

As with the school environments, many of the differences and similarities among the physical environments of the four classes depended on the SES level of the school and the students rather than on the classroom contexts in which the students found themselves. The extreme classrooms had much more student movement and many more transitions each day. While all the students left their classrooms and had different instructors for P.E. and Computer Lab, the extreme classrooms had a different teacher for each subject--English language arts, math/science and social studies. The students in both extreme classes also had French teachers who came in to teach French language arts for 30 minutes each day. This constant movement created more difficulties in Aria Elementary (EXI), where the students were more active and had to change classrooms four times a day with one of the classrooms being located across campus (not including P.E. and computer lab). In Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), while the students had three teachers they only moved between two classrooms and that movement was across the hall and after recess.
The typical case classrooms had much less movement of students and fewer teachers. In Comeaux Elementary (TI), Madame Mauriac, the immersion teacher taught mathematics, science, social studies and French language arts and the students stayed in the same classroom for English language arts. Similarly, at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), the students left the room and changed teachers only for P.E., computer lab and French. The teacher, Mrs. Trahan (TRE), taught mathematics, science, social studies and English language arts.

In terms of technology in the classroom, as with other physical features in the four schools the typical contexts were better equipped. Dautrive Elementary (TRE) was by far the best equipped of all the schools--having a big screen TV, a VCR, and two computers-- while the teacher supplied her own refrigerator and microwave. Class Comeaux(TI), was the second best equipped with two older model computers and access to a observed TV/VCR. Although there was only one computer and no TV/VCR's that were specifically designated for the classroom, Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) was the only participating classroom connected to the Internet. Technologically, Aria Elementary (EXI) was by far the worst equipped; there were no computers and no TV/VCR's for the classroom.

As with the physical classroom environment which depended mainly on the school environment, there were many differences in classroom composition that depended on classroom context--typical or extreme, immersion or regular education. Some of these differences were evident by either examining the school records or simply by walking though the door of the classroom. One difference, already discussed in the methodology section, was the class size. The immersion classes were smaller than the regular education classes. In addition, both participating regular education classrooms had one Hispanic girl whereas in the immersion classrooms no other minority groups, beside African-American, were represented. In terms of
the teachers within the classrooms, all of the participating teachers in the extreme classrooms were black--African or African-American--and both of the teachers in the typical classrooms were white.

Summary of Findings: Cross-case Comparison of the School and Class Environments

A global view of the school and classroom environments identified several emerging themes. The most prominent theme was that the less privileged and mostly minority students, the students in the two extreme contexts, had more obstacles to overcome in terms of building conditions, lack of equipment, constant student movement and adjusting to different teachers. In addition, the participating teachers in the mostly minority schools, the extreme schools, were all African or African-American. Differences in classroom composition between the immersion and regular education context included the fact that immersion classrooms had fewer students and no other minorities besides African-American students. While visible in all schools, the pressure for the LEAP was more tangible in the immersion contexts. The regular education teaching corps was more cohesive while immersion teachers were more excluded from that teaching corps. All teachers perceived parents as pivotal to their students' successes or failures but Dautrive Elementary was more adamant in attributing student failure to the parents. The following sections will examine cross-case differences and similarities of the classrooms according to the four initial research questions.

Student/teacher Interactions

1) Is there a difference between student/teacher interaction in the French immersion and student/teacher interaction in the regular education context as measured by direct observation and as triangulated by the Southwestern Cooperative Educational
Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (SCIOS) (Bemis & Liberty, 1970) and the Classroom Interaction Rating Form (Knox, 1983)?

a. Does this difference increase if the students are African-American?

The differences in the student/teacher interactions in the four contexts depended on the different teaching and disciplinary styles of the teachers. This section will examine how these different approaches resulted in divergent student/teacher interactions. The differences found in the student/teacher interactions manifest themselves in the different instructional activities (on-task), in the number of times teachers disciplined student, in the style of disciplinary methods that occurred, and finally in the affiliation and/or antagonism between students and teachers that occurred in the various contexts.

**Student/teacher Instructional Interactions**

The student/teacher instructional interactions were by far the largest body of data analyzed. The interactions that occurred were classified according to four categories: 1) Teacher control and student self-determination; 2) Correct answers, extensions and divergent thinking; 3) Differential treatment of students; and finally 4) Student/teacher affiliation and antagonism.

**Teacher Control and Student Self-determination**

According to the Classroom Interaction Rating Scale (Knox, 1983) both regular education contexts had a more formal and controlled instructional environment while the immersion classrooms were more opened and informal (See Knox Table 6.2). Additionally, on the Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (SCIOS) (Bemis & Liberty, 1970) the regular education teachers were more dominant while the immersion teachers were more permissive (See Table 6.3). This formal and controlled instructional environment was evidenced in the regular education context by the very structured
lessons which all the teachers had, except Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE). At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), Mrs. Porte's lessons were very creative, engaging and they followed a familiar rhythm, whereas Mr. Chenille, contrarily, had a less creative and very repetitive (same lesson for five weeks) structured lesson. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), Mrs. Trahan' lessons were "by the book." She began each subject by telling students the page numbers and giving them a moment to change to the new books and workbooks. Class consisted of lecture, a question and answer session followed by individual work. Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) was the only exception in the regular education contexts, because her lessons were unstructured and at times it appeared as if she made up the lesson as she went along.

Table 6.2 Classroom Interaction Rating Form (Knox et al., 1983)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Advanced Planning</th>
<th>Open v Controlled</th>
<th>Students' needs met</th>
<th>Teacher evokes participation</th>
<th>Students not attentive</th>
<th>Formal instruction</th>
<th>Positive reinforcement</th>
<th>Teacher minimizes failure</th>
<th>Physical setting distracting</th>
<th>Student &amp; teacher on same wavelength</th>
<th>Total Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer D</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHB</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>
<tr>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.3 Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (SCIOS) (Bemis & Liberty, 1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observer</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>T dominance</th>
<th>T permisiveness</th>
<th>T affiliation</th>
<th>T talkative</th>
<th>T helpfulness</th>
<th>T courtesy</th>
<th>T nurturance</th>
<th>Total interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 1/23</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/15</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/19</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER 2/19</td>
<td>Maurice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/23</td>
<td>Kaiga</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/28</td>
<td>Kaiga</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/28</td>
<td>Aussi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Aria</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/16</td>
<td>Chenille</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/30</td>
<td>Chenille</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/16</td>
<td>Lebrun</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/30</td>
<td>Lebrun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/25</td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/30</td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Blue Willow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/18</td>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3/18</td>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER 3/18</td>
<td>Mauriac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Comeaux</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/20</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/25</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3/5</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3/25</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER 3/25</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Dautrive</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The more open and informal immersion environment was evidenced in both Madame Maurice's (EXI) and Madame Mauriac's (TI) immersion classrooms with the frequent use of group and pair work. Neither Madame Maurice (EXI) nor Madame Mauriac (TI) appeared to
instruct "by the book." Their use of group or pair work engaged their students in the lesson and their use of creative lessons and hands-on experiences excited their students about learning and captured their students' interest. Unlike Madame Mauriac (TI) and Madame Maurice (EXI), in the two 30 minutes classes in Aria Elementary (EXI), M. Kaiga and Madame Aussi both followed a very structured methods of teaching. However, M. Kaiga utilized a creative selection of topics to interest his students in the subject matter and allowed students to respond freely to the topic without the formal raising of hands that the regular education. Madame Aussi's class was similar to Mr. Chenille's (EXRE) in its repetitive nature and lack of creativity.

The result of the different teaching styles was that in the immersion contexts the more open and informal environment allowed for much more frequent teacher/student as well as student/student interaction and created very noisy classrooms. In the immersion classrooms there was constant student/teacher interaction, though not all the students were included. The more controlled and formal environment of the regular education classrooms resulted in quieter classrooms wherein less student/teacher interaction occurred while students did quiet, independent work and/or copied assignments. The only copying activity observed in the immersion classrooms took place during a test review in M. Kaiga's class (EXI), when he put some key phrases to study on the board, then went over them with the students as they copied. However, neither the classroom discussion nor the students' behavior or incessant questioning was controlled by the teacher during this activity.

At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), copying was assigned in order to allow Mrs. Trahan time to do administrative tasks; she was usually at her desk filling out paperwork while the students copied. This constant copying affected the interaction in the TRE class. There was one observation, the peer observation on March 25th, in which Mrs. Trahan (TRE) only interacted
three times with her class during a 45 minutes time period while students copied work (See Total 
Interactions, Table 6.3). At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), Mrs. Porte and Mr. Chenille both 
had the students work quietly on individual work while they remediated students who needed 
help individually.

Though the teacher-directed activities in the regular education classrooms determined 
whether and how much student/teacher interaction occurred in the classroom, nearly all the 
student/teacher interactions in the immersion classroom were determined by the students rather 
than the teacher. This self-determination of the students in immersion was in direct opposition to 
the teachers' control in the regular education classrooms. This finding is reiterated in the SCIOS 
observational schedule in which the regular education classes scored higher on teacher 
dominance and the immersion classes scored higher on teacher permissiveness (See Table 6.3).

At Aria Elementary (EXI), the teachers tried to get the students to answer correctly or at 
least answer the questions they asked. However, there was a power conflict in immersion; the 
students and teachers struggled for control of the class. Most of the student/teacher instructional 
interaction at Aria Elementary (EXI) was more student-directed rather than teacher directed. 
Student participation involved African-American girls who dominated instruction and directed it 
towards themselves and away from the boys. Although the teachers, especially Madame 
Maurice (EXI), tried to include the disengaged African-American boys into the class discussions, 
they usually misunderstood what was asked of them, answered incorrectly or the African-
American girls cut them off before they had a chance to answer. Soon thereafter the African-
American boys re-disengaged and/or became disruptive. In addition, the African-American girls 
were so energetic, motivated and eager to answer that they either volunteered information before
the teacher had a chance to call on anyone else, or the teachers called on them nearly exclusively since they were almost always ready to answer.

The African-American girls were highly motivated and even disengaged girls were rarely disruptive; they worked on assignments from other classes when they did not participate in class. The girls also demonstrated their self-determination by utilizing the power that their parents' insecurity and the teachers' inexperience provided and by controlling the teacher through the "non-comprehension LEAP trump card." By simply stating, "I don't understand" they manipulated their teachers into abandoning their French explanations and explain everything in English to ensure that the students would have the knowledge they needed for the LEAP test.

The African-American boys at Aria Elementary (EXI) class expressed their desire for self-determination through overt disruptive behavior, through resistance. Drew, the lower achieving African-American boy, asserted his self-determination by being non-responsive to the teacher thereby forcing the teacher to stop her lesson, ignore the disruptions or answer her own questions. The teachers in turn tried to ignore the boys' disruptive behavior or, in the case of the girls, ignored statements not expressed in French.

Likewise, students at Comeaux Elementary (TI) determined their own participation in on-task work with the assistance of Madame Mauriac who allowed students to choose their own subject matter and partners with whom to work. Students, such as Cienna the lower achieving African-American girl, suggested ways in which the study of a subject could be turned into a game. In addition, both gifted boys, Seth, the higher achieving African-American boy and Cory the higher achieving white boy, often cut in and took over the answering of questions directed at other students. The Comeaux Elementary (TI) students also demonstrated their self-determination in off-task behavior when Madame Mauriac scolded the students, especially the
boys. They negotiated with her; letting her know who was really at fault, or as in the case of her scolding them for not speaking French how her argument was flawed. Madame Mauriac had told her students that it was rude to speak English to her because she did not know how to speak it; Seth, the higher achieving African-American boy, countered by questioning whether it was rude to speak English to a Chinese person if they (the students) did not know Chinese. A discussion on how well the students spoke French ensued. Further, as will be seen in the student/student interaction section, the Comeaux Elementary (TI) students had a symbiotic system which allowed them to participate in class while at the same time they could socialize with each other.

In the regular education classes any student arguments for why they should not be punished were doomed to fail. Even in Mrs. Porte's class (EXRE), a decidedly non-antagonistic and caring environment, when Teresa, the higher achieving African-American girl at Blue Willow (EXRE), attempted to talk her way out of punish work she only succeeded in getting herself into more trouble--but she did feel comfortable enough to try in Mrs. Porte's class.

"Correct" Answers, Extensions and Divergent Thinking

The general theme of both regular education classrooms was the movement towards the correct way of doing things or the correct answer. At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), when Teresa tried to show Mr. Chenille a new way to do long division, different from the one they studied during the previous four-weeks of instruction, he told her they had to do division the "right way" and that Teresa was not using the "right process." When Mr. Chenille remediated students who answered incorrectly he would have them work on problems at the board by repeating the steps of the algorithm again and again until the student came up with the correct answer. However, often those students would be back up at the board during the next
observation having the same problem. Although, the correct or "right process" was important to Mr. Chenille he was not able to get every child to learn using his one "correct" process. The "correct" way of doing things at Blue Willow (EXRE) extended to language and vocabulary also. Mrs. Porte often corrected students' language or questioned them about if that was the correct way to say things. Similarly, Mr. Chenille insisted on the children learning the correct vocabulary for each step of long division.

This drive for the correct answer determined with whom the teachers interacted at Blue Willow. While both Mrs. Porte and Mr. Chenille had a system to ensure that all students were participating and that their work was being reviewed each day, they both spent a great deal of time remediating students who were having problems doing things correctly. Mr. Chenille's focus on the correct answer and his showmanship was further brought to light when he went through the steps of long division on the board and complimented students on their mastery of the algorithm, however, Mr. Chenille had only called on the higher achieving students to answer his questions, students who were sure to give the answer he was looking for. In Mrs. Lebrun's class students yelled out answers to participate and if the answer was incorrect she skipped around looking for a student who had the correct answer.

Moreover, the correct answers at Blue Willow Elementary were not always correct per se. When the students in Mrs. Lebrun class yelled out possible answers to the kinds of maps that exist, she would skip around until she found the student who gave her the answer she wanted even though the other maps suggested were not incorrect, they were just not what Mrs. Lebrun had in mind. Mrs. Lebrun praised students for following the "correct" procedure for doing things. Unfortunately, Mrs. Lebruns' information was sometimes incorrect. When asked how to spell "shook" she spelled it "shuk," She even scolded students for searching for a map in the
social studies book by going directly to the index and praised the student who simply flipped through the pages of her book until she found the map in question.

At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), Mrs. Trahan's "by the book" teaching style focused teacher/student interactions on covering the material and getting to the "correct" answer. There were many times during observations when the students wanted to answer questions but Mrs. Trahan was in such a rush and she simply wanted to get to the correct answer so she answered all the questions herself. When the students answered questions in class students who answered incorrectly were either skipped over or they were remediated until they responded with the correct answer. Likewise, the teachers at Aria Elementary (EXI) tried to move the students toward the correct answers, but because of the inversed power structures in the classroom, the students were capable of diverting the discussion onto a tangent or into an English translation.

At Comeaux Elementary (TI) students were encouraged to find a variety of answers to a single question. When Comeaux Elementary (TI) students did answer incorrectly or answered correctly but needed to use a more precise language, Madame Mauriac used a questioning remark to try and get them to correct or extend their responses. There were only three examples of Madame Mauriac skipping over students who answered incorrectly and all them occurred in the same fashion. A lower achieving white girl would answer, somewhat, a question but the teacher would want more. Instead of encouraging the girl to extend her answer Madame Mauriac would skip to the gifted white boy or explain the answer herself to the white girl. In fact, both of the gifted boys, Seth the higher achieving African-American boy and Cory, the gifted white boy, had many questions and extensions asked of them.

In terms of extension questions in the classroom in the regular education context, Mrs. Porte (EXRE) utilized various activities and games to encourage all her students to extend their
answers and to be creative in their work for her. Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) used her personal
experiences to extend the students' discussions on topics such as civil rights, Mardi Gras and
mapping skills. However, there were very few student-initiated extensions in which the student
would extend their discussion of topics. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), Mrs. Trahan offered
extension questions almost exclusively to Nat, the higher achieving African-American boy.
Interestingly, Mrs. Trahan rarely addressed any extension questions to Audrey, a white gifted girl
who was called on extensively in class.

Extension questions, discussions and actions in immersion were much more creative and
were often student-initiated. At Aria Elementary (EXI) there were times when the students
invented creative and unique ways to participate. Charlotte, the lower achieving African-
American girl took the initiative to created her own paper science manipulatives (protons and
neutrons), since the other two girls in her group were dominating the activity. Drew, the lower
achieving African-American boy and his friend Deon postulated on how the gallon, quarts, pints
and cups in "Gallon man" related to body parts on a real person. Madame Maurice drew upon
their discussion to extend the lesson and integrate a human skeleton mini-lesson into the day's
instruction.

At Comeaux Elementary (TI), the creative, divergent thinking was exceptional. In fact,
there were two major themes underlying the teacher/student interaction at Comeaux Elementary
(TI): creative thinking and self-determination. These two themes were in opposition to the
structured teacher-directed guidance and the focus on the "correct" answer that was prevalent in
the regular education context. At Comeaux Elementary (TI), Madame Mauriac taught via group
work in which the students frequently chose their subject and choose how they would present
their work to their peers. For example, Deanna, the high achieving African-American girl and
her friend, Thalia, decided to illustrate a poem which the entire class had learned to perform for
the other immersion classes; and students let Madame Mauriac know on which historical figure
they wanted to write a biography.

The students were not the only creative forces in the classroom; Madame Mauriac (TI)
had a knack for integrating content throughout the class day so that the students forgetting their
poems at home suddenly became a math problem on percentages. At Comeaux Elementary (TI)
the students were eager to answer questions. They tried to answer questions despite being poked
at or yelled at by other students in the process of answering. They were very proactive about
going and determining their education. Students were more autonomous and were often seen
automatically using reference tools such as dictionaries, the computer and the Internet to look up
materials for their chosen projects.

**Differential Treatment of Students**

At Comeaux Elementary (TI) there was a difference in how certain students were treated.
For classroom discussion, the differential treatment of students was based on gender and focused
on the kinds of questions for which students were called on to answer. The girls would often be
called on to answer lower-level questions or to read while the higher level questions were
directed at boys again especially the two gifted boys, Seth and Cory. Further, Madame Mauriac,
in three incidents, incorrectly attributed answers from one African-American girl to another
African-American girl. She simply seemed more aware of the boys, perhaps because they forced
her attention onto them. This was in direct contrast to Aria Elementary (EXI), in which the
African-American girls were the students who dominated the teachers' attention. The African-
American girls proactive participation in the class created an atmosphere of differential
treatment. Even when Madame Maurice (EXI) tried to include the African-American boys in
instruction, the African-American girls would cut them off or answered for them. The African-American girls were so dominant at Aria Elementary (EXI) that M. Kaiga, in opposition to his cultural background which viewed boys as more scholarly than girls, named the African-American girls more "motivated" and more "intelligent." As with Comeaux Elementary (TI), the self-determination of the students appeared to be a driving force in differential treatment.

In Mrs. Trahan's class, at Dautrive Elementary (TRE) there was also a noticeable differential treatment with regards to who participated in classroom discussions. This differential treatment was based on ethnicity. During question and answer sessions in Mrs. Trahan's class (TRE), white students were often called on more than African-American students. Although this was not surprising because there were many more white students in the class than there were African-American students, there were sessions in which the teacher called on the same white boy or white girl three times in one session while African-American students were called on only once or not at all. Furthermore, there was a disproportionate amount of remediation time offered to white boys in particular to two white boys, Nicky and Ty.

Comeaux Elementary (TI) also had an incident in which there appeared to be differential treatment of students based on ethnicity. In this activity, students were asked to choose a historical figure about which they wished to write. By the time Madame Mauriac arrived at the very disruptive African-American boy, Breen, and asked him whom he wanted to write about, he was upset that all of the African-American figures that the class had studied had already been chosen. There were, in fact, many more figures such as Fredrick Douglass and Sojourner Truth, but the historical figures, which the class studied, were for the most part white. Another disruptive incident occurred after the teacher, instead of her initial intent of allowing students to choose their subject, forced some white students to illustrate African-American subject matter
such as the first slave or "Plessy vs. Ferguson." At the same time, she refused to allow Kole, the lower achieving African-American boy who volunteered to study that subject matter, to illustrate those African-American themes. Both boys, Breen and Kole, railed against the injustice and a solution was found to both their problems. Breen was given Fredrick Douglass to study and present to the class and Kole took over as teacher helper and was given the task of organizing all the illustrations in chronological order. What both these incidents bring to light is the self-determination that the students expected and for which they fought.

At Dautrive Elementary (TRE) where the class was under the control of the teacher the African-American students were not as proactive about confronting injustice, at least with regards to the teacher. While Nat, the higher achieving African-American boy, received more positive interaction than other students in the class, the other African-American students were not as fortunate. Chris, the African-American girl whom the teacher perceived to be the higher achieving African-American girl, was often shushed when she tried to help other students or when she tried to get the teacher's attention. For the African-American students whom Mrs. Trahan (TRE) perceived as the lower achieving students there was a sense of invisibility. Often the African-American students raised their hand and were not called on to respond. This is not to say that they did not get helped. Mrs. Trahan (TRE) eventually went to them, but observations revealed that on at least ten occurrences, Mrs. Trahan (TRE) helped other students, beforehand in particular two white boys--Nicky and Ty. The African-American students, in particular the girls, would have their hands up for 5 to 10 minutes. However, since Mrs. Trahan (TRE) was engaged in helping the other students it was not a deliberate attempt on her part to ignore the African-American students. In addition, the African-American girls did not have as productive a hand-raising strategy as the white students. There were times when Laticia, the lower achieving
African-American girl, raised her hand and kept it up despite the fact that Mrs. Trahan (TRE) had left the room or Blanca would just raise her hand and keep it still. In contrast, both Audry and Ty were adept at getting their teacher's attention. They were observed waiting for the teacher to look at them and then simultaneously raising and shaking their hands to get Mrs. Trahan (TRE) to call on them. Their strategy worked.

There was some irony in the statements Mrs. Trahan (TRE) made in the face of this theme of invisibility of African-American students in her class. Blanca, who Mrs. Trahan (TRE) believed to be the lower achieving African-American girl but who was in fact the higher achieving African-American girl, was often seen playing with her hair or nails instead of following along or participating in class. Coincidentally, Mrs. Trahan (TRE) in informal interviews was critical of Blanca's mother because she did not ensure that Blanca completed her homework at night. Jerry, the lower achieving African-American boy was often completely ignored in class whether he was sleeping or clicking his pen for the entire class period. In addition, Jerry's underbreath comments, heavy sighs and eye rolls were either not perceived or ignored by Mrs. Trahan (TRE). This again was interesting because in informal interviews Mrs. Trahan (TRE) discussed how she wished she could devote more time to helping Jerry who was motivated to work rather than wasting so much time taking care of her special education problem student.

While the African-Americans, of whom there were six, at times appeared to be invisible in the classroom, Lily, the Hispanic girl in the class was not even close to invisible. Lily had more questions addressed to her than any other student. She also received more extension questions than any other girl. In an informal discussion, Mrs. Trahan (TRE) lauded Lily's progress. She said she had just learned the language and was already quite proficient in English.
This discussion developed into a discussion of dialect, in particular the African-American dialect with Lily serving as the "model minority." Mrs. Trahan (TRE) used an example of Blanca's writing to show Blanca's use of phonetic spelling of non-standard English when she wrote. In informal discussions, I brought up the ideas of Ogbu (1999) and the link between culture and language. Mrs. Trahan (TRE), then used her own experiences as an example of what could be done. She recounted that when she returned home from college she listened to her family and said, "Do I talk like that?" Afterwards, she went on and learned how to speak "correctly."

**Student/teacher Disciplinary Interactions**

Overall, the regular education teachers were found to discipline their students more often than the immersion teachers. While around 60 incidents were observed in which immersion teachers disciplined their students, observations in the regular education classes established that discipline occurred more often in these classroom with around 100 incidents in which teachers scolded or punished students. Thus the theme of control in the regular education context, which was evident in the teachers' teaching styles, equally emerged in the teachers' disciplinary style. In addition, the SCIOS observational scale revealed that the regular education teachers were more dominant in the classrooms (See Teacher dominance, Table 6.3) than the immersion teachers. As with teaching style, there were differences in the various styles of discipline among the teachers in the various classroom contexts.

Mrs. Porte (EXRE), whose interactions with the students differed from the other regular education teachers, disciplined her students by questioning them "Who is not ...(insert procedure):" She did this to let them know she was not pleased and that she wanted their attention. Furthermore, she constantly reminded the students about the rules of the classroom in order to keep them from getting punished. When she did punish them her discipline was firm,
even-handed and did not disrupt instructions. She would discipline students by either having
them kneel on the floor (a technique used throughout the parish when students misbehaved),
which she did without hesitation and without making a scene, or she would contact the students'
family. Mrs. Porte (EXRE) tried not to single children out and when she did she often used
humor to keep from angering the child but still allow them to understand that she was aware of
their misbehavior. Even students who were on their knees punished were still included in all
class activities. The students in turn were respectful and student interviews indicated that Mrs.
Porte's (EXRE) discipline of the students did not anger the students, unlike the discipline of the
other Blue Willow (EXRE) teachers. Teresa, the high achieving African-American girl,
mentioned in her interview how Mrs. Porte seemed to understand them.

The other Blue Willow (EXRE) teachers were not as even–handed or as vigilant as Mrs.
Porte. Like Mrs. Porte, Mr. Chenille (EXRE) scolded students for teasing, used proximity or a
reminder that the students would be the next to answer questions to keep them on-task.
However, Mr. Chenille (EXRE) was not even-handed in disciplining students and was prone to
scolding the boys and Teresa, the higher achieving African-American girl, more often than the
other girls. This disciplinary disparity was perceived by the students as evidenced in the high-
achieving African-American boy, Donavon's, interview in which he divulged that Mr. Chenille
(EXRE) only "whip the boys." While Mr. Chenille was more prone to discipline the boys and
Teresa, Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) did not appear to have any logical approach as to why she punished
some students but not others. This illogical application of discipline was equally perceived by
the students as evidenced in Raylyn's interview in which she reported that "she's [Mrs. Lebrun]
always fussing when somebody not doing nobody wrong." Yet, Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) was the
only Blue Willow teacher who ignored or did not respond to overt disruptive behavior. During
the transition times after Mrs. Lebrun's (EXRE) class, when she was ready to leave class but no one had arrived to take over, Mrs. Lebrun let the students socialize and ignored the disruptive students' activities.

At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), Mrs. Trahan's (TRE) disciplinary style more closely resembled Mr. Chenille's (EXRE) and Mrs. Lebrun's (EXRE) rather than Mrs. Porte's (EXRE), disciplinary style. Although, like Mrs. Porte, she did have a good sense of humor which she used when she disciplined the entire class. Of the 126 incidents in which Mrs. Trahan (TRE) scolded students 55 were directed to white boys. Further there were 12 incidents in which the teacher scolded students (of varying ethnicity and gender) because they were interrupting her extensive remediations of two particular white boys, Nicky and Ty. There was also a disparity in the way in which African-American students were disciplined in the classroom. The African-American students whom the Mrs. Trahan (TRE) perceived as the higher achieving students were disciplined more often, in 21 of the 30 incidents, while the other four African-American students were rarely disciplined. This again supports a theme of invisibility for African-American students whom the teacher perceived to be lower achieving.

This theme of invisibility appeared to be evident at Aria Elementary (EXI). However, the students that the immersion teachers appeared to ignore, like Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) during transition periods, were the overtly disruptive students, the boys. While the numbers were even for how often girls and boys were scolded at Aria Elementary (EXI), the reasons students were disciplined varied extensively. There was a huge disparity in what was expected in terms of student behavior as evidenced by whom the teachers disciplined and for what offense. The African-American girls were scolded for socializing, working on academic work for other classes, interrupting the teacher or speaking in English. The African-American boys were
disciplined for fighting, disruptive behavior or not paying attention during class. However, the African-American boys had to be quite disruptive before they attracted the teachers' attention. So while Drew was busy pounding his fist on his desk, as in Madame Maurice's (EXI) class, or sharpening his pencil in the broken noisy pencil sharpener for the fourth time, as in M. Kaiga's (EXI) class, the teachers ignored that and instead scolded Rashona for not speaking in French when she answered her question.

At Comeaux Elementary (TI) differences emerged in who the teacher punished. One of the major differences from all the other classrooms was the dominance of one very disruptive African-American boy, Breen. Out of the 54 scoldings recorded in the classroom 19 of them were directed at Breen. Students who were never or rarely scolded included both gifted boys, one of whom was the higher achieving African-American boy, Seth, and the white girls. This was despite Seth's constant disruptive behavior which was similar to the disruptive behavior ignored in the Aria Elementary (EXI). Out of the 54 scoldings, a total of 44 were directed at African-American students, 19 towards Breen, six toward Kole, the lower achieving African-American boy, six towards Cienna, the lower achieving African-American girl, 12 towards other African-American girls and one to Seth. The other ten incidents were divided between the white girls (3), and Arty (6), the lower achieving white boy, with one directed to Cory the white gifted boy. Additionally the boys, both African-American and white, in the immersion class argued with the teacher when they were scolded. They would back up their arguments as well as each other's stories. Madame Mauriac's (TI) word was not law and it was apparent that she listened and took into consideration the students' arguments and excuses. There were even moments when the Madame Mauriac's (TI) word was simply disregarded as when Cienna, the lower achieving African-American girl, was told to move her clothespin and she very purposely did
not. These interactions supported the theme of self-determination within French immersion students.

Social Interactions

The student/teacher interactions that were not specifically related to on-task (instructional) or off-task (disciplinary) interactions were the social interactions. These interactions offered insight into how well the teachers connected to or affiliated with their students. The social interactions were classified into two groups: 1) affiliation and antagonism; and 2) humorous and real-life interactions.

Affiliation and Antagonism

Besides the more creative interactions which occurred in the immersion context, there was also a more open environment (See Knox Table 6.2) in which the students, especially the lower achieving African-American students, felt secure and believed that they could be helpful members of the class. Both Charlotte (EXI) and Kole (TI), were constantly helping with managerial tasks from passing papers to distributing supplies to helping the teacher read in English for the LEAP practice test. Further, the incident in the Comeaux Elementary (TI), wherein the white girl told Madame Mauriac that her fly was open illustrated a somewhat less antagonistic student/teacher relationship. The SCIOS affiliation scores of the immersion teachers were also higher, though not by much, than those of the regular education teachers (See SCIOS Student Profile Table 6.4). Teachers and students who connected, who associated together to various degrees, were seen as affiliating.

Compare this student/teacher affiliation to the antagonism observed between students and teachers in the regular education contexts. At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), one of the African-American boys flipped off Madame Lebrun. Likewise, in Dautrive Elementary (TRE)
the lower achieving African-American boy, Jerry's, constant under breath critiques or the higher achieving African-American boy, Nat's pretending to kick the teacher in her backside equally demonstrated antagonism in the classroom. To further underline the more antagonistic student/teacher interaction, was the fact that both of the higher achieving African-American boys in the two regular education contexts, Nat and Donovan, mentioned in their interview about getting a whipping, being slapped (on the shoulder) and/or getting hit with a ruler by their teachers. A report of antagonistic behavior that was not observed occurred during the open interview with Teresa, the higher achieving girl at Blue Willow (EXRE). Teresa insisted that Mr. Chenille was much nicer when I was in the room. This sentiment was reiterated on my last visit to the school when I went to the playground to tell the students good-bye and they begged me to come back and observe because Mr. Chenille was nicer when I was there.

Mrs. Porte (EXRE) was the exception to this antagonistic environment in the regular education context. There was a similarity in teaching styles alluded to in the Classroom Interaction Rating Scale (Knox et al., 1983) between Mrs. Porte and the immersion teachers with regards to their relationship with their students. The immersion classrooms and Mrs. Porte scored highest in meeting students' needs, keeping students interested and evoking students' participation (See Knox Table 6.2).

While the examples of antagonism in the classroom focused on antagonism in the regular education classrooms, that does not negate the student/teacher conflict in the immersion classes. In the immersion classes though, conflict arose around control of the classroom. In the case of disruptive activity that could have led to antagonism in the classrooms, the immersion teachers ignored the disruptive behavior. At Comeaux Elementary (TI) class, Madame Mauriac often ignored disruptive behavior by the boys, even when that behavior was directed at students who
were attempting to answer questions and at times even when the behavior was antagonistic towards other students. This withdrawal from student conflicts underscored the teachers more open, less controlling approach to teaching.

**Humorous and Real-life Interactions**

Even as regular education appeared to be more antagonistic with regards to student/teacher interaction, regular education teachers were able to create a friendlier environment and connect with their students when they used humorous and/or social interactions. Humor appeared to be utilized much more frequently by the regular education teachers than the immersion teachers. This may have been due to the high level of language mastery needed to understand humor in a second language. Mrs. Porte (EXRE) employed humor to encourage her students to do more and to soften the edges of her very strict discipline. For example, when a student was playing around pretending to sleepwalk in class, Mrs. Porte (EXRE) refocused the students by telling her she was, "about to wake her up." Mrs. Lebrun and Mr. Chenille (EXRE) were not observed utilizing humor in their classes, although in his interview Mr. Chenille stated that he hoped that the students believed him to have a good sense of humor. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), Mrs. Trahan was observed using humor more often with her African-American students than with her white students. It seemed to be an effort to affiliate, to connect with, the African-American students. The TRE African-American students really appreciated her humor while the white students with whom she tried to joke became embarrassed, or seemed to feel like the butt of the joke. In the immersion setting, Aria Elementary (EXI) teachers were not found to use humor in the classroom, while the Typical Immersion (TI) teacher, Madame Mauriac often used humor, but the students were never observed comprehending her jokes.
While humor was one successful social interaction of the regular education teachers, in particular Porte (EXRE) and Trahan (TRE), the regular education teachers also interacted socially in the classroom to connect with their students by incorporating their and their students' real-life experiences into their instruction. For the most part these real-life references were used to further the students' knowledge of the curriculum. Mrs. Porte (EXRE) had students discuss how language was used in their homes in an effort to get the students to differentiate Standard English and their own home dialects. Mrs. Labry (EXRE) discussed her own life growing up in the segregationist South or her vacations to other places in order to bring to life her history and mapping lessons. Mrs. Trahan (TRE) additionally used examples that students might experience in real-life, often referring to local businesses, places of interest and cultural gatherings with which the students were familiar.

At Aria (EXI), real-life experiences were also used to further instruction. Madame Aussi used songs she learned as a child to enrich an animal lesson. The most notable was M. Kaiga's use of his experiences as a citizen from a once colonized African nation and his comparing that with the students' own history as southern African-American students. Madame Maurice did not use her own personal experiences within her observed lessons, however, the fact that her daughter went to school at Aria Elementary (EXI) and sometimes came to visit her class often initiated several off-task social discussions before instruction began.

However, the only teacher who allowed the students' social discourse not as an off-task behavior or as a means of furthering a lesson but rather as an educational discourse was Madame Mauriac (TI). In an effort to further the use of French in her classroom beyond the academic setting Madame Mauriac (TI) gave the students a list of commonly needed words in fourth grade social discourse such as "Tu m'agaces" (you bother/bug me). She initiated discussions of what
the students had done over the weekend and allowed the conversation to develop amongst the students stepping in to control it only when it became antagonistic. Further, she allowed the students to play popular board games as a reward. While playing, students were allowed to socialize but they were constantly asked to speak in French. Further Madame Mauriac (TI) tried to incorporate her real-life experiences into instruction, sharing postcards and posters from places she had traveled. Finally, rather than simply incorporating the students' real-life experiences and places with which they were familiar, Madame Mauriac (TI) instead pushed the students to expand their experiences and perspectives. She used an aerial map of their town to test their mapping skills of what they knew, and to show them how to view familiar things from a different perspective. She also created real-life experiences for her students by finding them pen pals with whom they corresponded and exchanged pictures. This nurturing and creation of real-life experiences for the students in Madame Mauriac's class (TI) was reflected in her much higher nurturing score on the SCIOS (see Table 6.3), the highest of all the teachers.

Summary of Student/teacher Interaction Findings

The student/teacher interactions identified in the four classroom contexts were instructional, disciplinary and social interactions. The first finding with regards to instructional interaction concerned teacher control vs. student self-determination in the classroom. In the regular education context there was less student/teacher interaction because the teachers held the power in the classroom. In the immersion context the teachers did not seek and at times were not allowed to be fully in charge.

The next finding concerning instructional interactions concerned "correct" answers vs. extensions and divergent thinking. In the regular education context, instruction was directed by teachers to help the students find or tell the students the "correct" answer or way of doing things.
Whereas the immersion teachers relinquished some of their control of the class to encourage autonomous learners, divergent, creative thought and allow for different perspectives. Extensions in all classes appeared to be directed for the most part to whomever the teachers perceived to be the higher achieving students.

In terms of instructional interaction and disciplinary interaction, differential treatment of students was discovered both in immersion and in regular education. In all contexts, the students who dominated the class, who were proactive and adept at getting the teachers' attention, were also found to dominate instruction and discipline in the class. In immersion, the differential treatment was based more on gender with the African-American girls dominating at Aria Elementary (EXI) while the boys, both African-American and white, dominated at Comeaux Elementary (TI). Dautrive Elementary (TRE) was found to emphasize discipline and instruction to the white boys but for African-American students in the classroom teacher interaction both disciplinary and instructional was directed at the African-American students who Mrs. Trahan (TRE) perceived to be higher achieving. At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) instruction and discipline did not single out a specific subgroup of students, except for discipline in Mr. Chenilles' class which was focused on the African-American boys and the higher-achieving African-American girl, Teresa.

Within this category of differential treatment, a theme of invisibility emerged. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE) there was a sense of invisibility of lower achieving African-American students in terms of instructional and disciplinary interactions. This was despite Mrs. Trahan (TRE) specifically mentioning certain African-American students as needing attention in the classroom. This invisibility was partly due to the white students being adept and proactive about getting the teachers' attention while the African-American students were more passive. In
immersion, the teachers often ignored overt disruptive behavior in the classrooms. African-American boys overwhelmingly committed this behavior.

Overall the immersion teachers disciplined their students less than the regular education teachers reiterating the theme of control in the regular education context. Furthermore, when they would punish students the students would debate or ignore the punishment, thereby underscoring the students' vehement self-determination in the immersion context.

In the regular education context, Mrs. Porte (EXRE) was the only teacher whose punishments were not later held against her in student interviews. This points to an affiliation with Mrs. Porte (EXRE) vs. an antagonistic relationship between the students and the other regular education teachers. Mrs. Porte's (EXRE) connection with her students mirrored that of the immersion teachers'. While the students felt comfortable and part of the group in Mrs. Porte's (EXRE) and the immersion classes, there was a stark antagonism among the regular education students and their other teachers with both the higher achieving African-American boys relating incidents of corporal punishment, with students interviewed complaining that teachers "fussed for nothin'" or that teachers were meaner when the researcher was not observing and finally, there were incidents of student antagonism directed toward the teachers, "flipping the bird"(EXRE) and pretending to kick the teacher in the "butt"(TRE).

Despite the antagonism, the regular education context offered students something that they were not able to appreciate or perhaps understand in the immersion context, humor. For Mrs. Porte (EXRE) humor created a friendlier environment, softened the edges on strict discipline, and encouraged students to extend their work. For Mrs. Trahan (TRE), humor allowed her to relate to her African-American students. Another social interaction that was prevalent in the regular education context was the use of students' and teachers' real-life
experiences to enrich students' learning. The immersion teachers also used this technique. However, the use of social discourse as an educational discourse was a feature unique to Madame Mauriac's (TI) class. Madame Mauriac allowed social conversation, stretched students' perspectives using aerial maps and created, not just interjected, but created real-life experiences for student in the class by using pen pals.

Student/student Interactions

2) Is there a difference between student/student interaction in the French immersion in the French immersion context and student/student interaction in the regular education context as measured by direct observation and as triangulated by Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (SCIOS) (Bemis & Liberty, 1970)?

a. Does this difference increase if the students are African-American?

Students Socializing

Immersion students engaged in much more social behavior than the regular education students. Nearly half of the off-task behavior at Aria Elementary (EXI) was social and over half of the off-task behavior at Comeaux Elementary (TI) was social. For the regular education students' socialization accounted for much less of their off-task behavior, around 35%. Further, at Comeaux Elementary (TI), this off-task socialization did not impede the students' academic participation; students were able to interact socially while continuing to perform academically. The TI students accomplished this using a social network that allowed socialization to occur wherever the teacher’s attention was absent. In the regular education classrooms there was also a highly refined social system but it was not as overt. The students relied mainly on silent
socialization, and at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), students would drop and retrieve school objects
to or meet at the pencil sharpener or cubbies in order to socialize.

There were differences with whom and how the student socialized. At Comeaux (TI), the
African-American students quizzed the white students about their culture (inquiring whether the
white students knew song lyrics or famous people such as Diana Ross). Furthermore, African-
American students in at Comeaux (TI) class often interacted socially with one another in French
with cut downs, jokes and language play (C’est wac…”That's wac" is a colloquial expression
indicating that something is not the way it should be) while the white immersion students
interacted socially in English. In both immersion classrooms, the students exhibited a preference
for associating with their own gender. Cross-gender associations were normally antagonistic or
academic in nature. The immersion girls often corrected the boys' language. While on the
surface these corrections could be construed as students helping students, the boys' frustrated
reaction to the corrections emphasized an underlying cross-gender antagonism.

Although gender was important in the regular education contexts other characteristics
often determined with whom the students associated. At Blue Willow (EXRE), the higher
achieving students often associated with other high achieving students, regardless of their
gender, but the lower achieving students showed more of a gender preference in their
associations. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE) social interactions were based more on proximity
except for two student groups: the disruptive group and the African-American girls. The
disruptive group consisted of two white boys, Thomas and James who normally played around in
class, in addition the group would associate with a lower achieving white girl, Macy; the
Hispanic girl, Lily; and occasionally the higher and lower achieving African-American boys, Nat
and Jerry. The other social group at Dautrive Elementary (TRE) was the African-American girls
who formed a close social network in which they socialized, helped and protected one another. Though the African-American girls in the immersion context were also close, and often associated together, they were more antagonistic and quarreled much more often than the Typical Regular Education (TRE) African-American girls.

**Student/student Conflict**

Overall, students were more disruptive in the immersion classrooms. The disruptive nature of the students in the immersion classroom was brought to light in the SCIOS student profile. Disruptive and hyperactive were the two descriptors in which the immersion students in both contexts scored higher than both the regular education students (See Table 6.4). Many of the disruptions observed in the immersion context were student on student antagonism and disputes. The antagonism was on various levels within and between genders at Aria Elementary (EXI) class and within and between gender and ethnicities at Comeaux Elementary (TI). At Comeaux Elementary (TI), there was occasional cross racial taunting such as when African-American students teased white students for not knowing Diana Ross or when Arty teased using a reference to the Ku Klux Klan. This antagonism seemed prompted by a number of observed factors in the classrooms: 1) the immersion teachers allowed socialization in the classroom and in Madame Maurice's (EXI) and Madame Mauriac's (TI) classes social interaction was encouraged through group and partner project work; 2) all the immersion teachers exhibited less control over the students than the regular education teachers and the somewhat chaotic ambience drew the teachers' attentions elsewhere, allowing student conflicts to escalate; 3) the immersion teachers' lack of understanding of English or students' cultural knowledge permitted the students to say and act unkindly to one another and the teachers would not intervene because, they did not
realize what was happening; and 4) the immersion students had been together for such a long time that they knew exactly what to do to anger and aggravate their fellow students.

Table 6.4 Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory Interaction Observation Schedule (SCIOS) Student Profile (Bemis & Liberty, 1970)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day and observer</th>
<th>Classroom and teacher</th>
<th>Security</th>
<th>Boredom</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Shyness</th>
<th>Disruptive</th>
<th>Hyperactive</th>
<th>Ambivalence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R 1/23</td>
<td>Maiga</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/28</td>
<td>Maiga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/23</td>
<td>Madame Maurice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/15</td>
<td>Madame Maurice</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/19</td>
<td>Madame Maurice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER 2/19</td>
<td>Madame Maurice</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/28</td>
<td>Mossi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Aria</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>11.29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/16</td>
<td>Chenille</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/30</td>
<td>Chenille</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/16</td>
<td>Lebrun</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/30</td>
<td>Lebrun</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/25</td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 1/30</td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Blue Willow</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/18</td>
<td>Madame Mauriac</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3/18</td>
<td>Madame Mauriac</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER 3/18</td>
<td>Madame Mauriac</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Comeaux</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/20</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 2/25</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3/5</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R 3/25</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER 3/25</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>Dautrive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the regular education classrooms students were more antagonistic towards one another when the teacher lost control of the class as in Mrs. Lebrun's (EXRE) classroom or when there was a substitute in the room. Overall the regular education teachers kept tight control over the overt socialization and this in turn eliminated much student/student antagonism. Student conflicts in immersion often did not involve the teacher while in regular education classroom, especially at Blue Willow (EXRE), the teacher was usually involved or intervened immediately to settle the dispute. Mrs. Porte (EXRE) was especially adept at resolving disputes and ensuring fairness and politesse in her classroom. She would stop the conflict, have the students apologize and then ensure that the apology was accepted.

There did not appear to be a pattern as to who fought with whom at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE). At Dautrive Elementary (TRE) close to half of the student/student conflicts were either between African-American students and white students or between Nat, the higher achieving African-American boy and the other African-American students. In fact, only seven of the 40 conflicts recorded through observations at Dautrive Elementary (TRE) involved no African-American students (two involved the Hispanic girl and white students while the other five were between white students). Additionally, since Mrs. Trahan (TRE) interacted less with her students overall, she was not as involved with settling the students disputes as the Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) teachers.

In the immersion classrooms, as with the Class Dautrive (TRE), the African-American students, particularly the boys, were more often involved with student/student conflicts. At Aria Elementary (EXI) all but two of the forty-three student conflicts recorded involved African-American boys. At Aria Elementary (EXI), the teachers' interventions did not help resolve the problem, as was the case in Mrs. Porte's (EXRE) class. The teachers usually ended up scolding
the boys. In addition, over the course of the five weeks when I observed Aria Elementary (EXI),
three separate fights broke out among the African-American boys. On these occasions, the
principal or vice-principal had to be called in to resolve the situation. All three fights were
during Madame Aussi's 30-minute class.

Similar to the Aria Elementary (EXI) class, at Comeaux Elementary (TI), many of the
conflicts involved African American boys--44 out of 64 recorded conflicts. Sometimes the
conflicts involving both African-American and white boys appeared to be the students' horse
playing rather than actual conflicts. The other third of the conflicts which occurred at Comeaux
Elementary (TI) were spread out amongst the different genders and ethnicities. In other words,
there was no student group, gender or ethnicity at Comeaux Elementary (TI) free of conflict. As
with Aria Elementary (EXI) class there appeared to be gender differences in how the problems
were resolved. At Comeaux Elementary (TI), when the conflicts involved girls the teacher
intervened and tried to stop the conflict either by proximity or by scolding the students.
However, when the conflict involved boys either African-American or white, the teacher often
did not respond or did not notice this behavior.

Students Helping Students

Despite, or perhaps due in part to the daily antagonism in the immersion classrooms,
there was a familial atmosphere in both the classrooms. The system of socialization and
communal help was highly refined in the immersion classrooms. The immersion students often
helped one another with academic work. Immersion students in both classrooms spontaneously
finished each other phrases, created phrases together, played language games and created
language in French and English. If the teacher did not call on or help some students, other
students would help by providing the necessary material or by getting the teacher to call on them
to answer the unanswered questions. Students shared notebooks, pencils and pens, and they had a system for passing materials amongst themselves. This socialization continued during teacher lectures using silent socialization without interrupting the students' learning.

At Aria Elementary (EXI), the "help" often came from African-American girls translating for the class. While, this was counterproductive to the students' language learning, it mimicked the teachers' dependence on translation. Other help provided by Aria Elementary (EXI) students had to do with the students' lack of supplies (paper, pencils and notebooks were shared and passed to students who needed them). Shae, the higher achieving African-American boy at Aria Elementary (EXI), underlined this helpfulness despite antagonism with an off-handed commentary during his Wright and Taylor (1995) interview in which he remarked that his immersion classmates are "all like family." At Comeaux Elementary (TI), while the students who received help included students across all gender and ethnic lines, African-American students provided most of this help. In addition the help provided was mostly of an academic nature discussing academic subjects in French.

Students (even antagonistic students) helped one another more frequently in immersion classrooms than in the regular education classroom. The SCIOS student profile underlines the helpful nature of the immersion students based on their scores on affiliation and security (See SCIOS Student Profile, Table 6.4). For the SCIOS security entailed the students volunteering information whether to the teacher or other students as well as, while affiliation was when students copied from or helped other students. In the security score both immersion classes outscored the regular education classes. The affiliation score was only higher for the Comeaux Elementary (TI) with the highest score (2) while the Extreme Immersion (EXI) whose "help" was more translating and less actual help, had the lowest affiliation score (See Table 6.4).
In the regular education classroom students helping one another was controlled by the teachers; the help was either discouraged as when Mrs. Trahan (TRE) scolded Chris for trying to help Patty get gum off of her or forced as when Mr. Chenille (EXRE) forced students to help other students while he remediated at the board. At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), the help that was willingly offered, not forced, often-entailed higher achieving students helping lower achieving students. Blue Willow (EXRE) students often tried to help each other but their teachers stopped them and then in turn remediated those who needed to be helped. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), a difference was discerned in terms of ethnicity; not much help was given to African-American students by other students, although it was mainly the African-American students who offered help in the class. Further, the higher achieving African-American boy, Nat, helped other African-American students, but with disdain. Such as the time he helped a high achieving African-American girl in his class, then walked back to his desk and called her "stupid."

**Summary of Student/student Interaction Findings**

Student/student interactions in the immersion class were both overt and silent and often revealed gender gap in the classroom. Cross gender interactions in immersion were usually either antagonistic or of an academic nature. In the regular education context silent socialization was more prevalent. At Blue Willow (EXRE) the higher achieving students would socialize across gender but the lower achieving students tended to socialize within their own genders. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE) the student socializations were based on proximity except for the disruptive group of two white boys which sometimes included either a white girl, the Hispanic girl and/or the lower and higher achieving African-American boys and the other group, the African-American girls in the class.
There were more frequent student/student conflicts in the immersion context due to the teachers' teaching and disciplinary styles, teachers' lack of the students' cultural knowledge, and the students' long-term relationships with one another. While most of the conflicts in the immersion contexts involved African-American boys, Comeaux Elementary (TI) had many conflicts that were across all the different genders and ethnicities. In regular education, there were more conflicts at Dautrive Elementary (TRE) than at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) and these conflicts usually involved or were between African-American students.

In both the immersion and regular education context differences were observed in how the teachers dealt with conflicts. In the immersion classes differential treatment was based on the gender of the students involved. Conflicts involving girls received more attention than conflicts among boys. In the regular education context the teachers' control of socialization reduced the frequency and severity of student/student conflicts. However, at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), where the teacher interacted less frequently with the students, more conflict occurred.

While the African-American students were involved in more conflicts at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), they were also the students most likely to try to help other students. Meanwhile other students in the class rarely helped the African-American students, except for Nat the higher achieving African-American boy, but he did not like helping the other African-American students. African-American students were also the most helpful at Comeaux Elementary (TI). Students helping other students in the regular education classrooms were generally discouraged, if it was student initiated, or forced, i.e. teacher initiated. In the immersion context students were often observed helping students with materials, with their
academic work and with their language across genders and ethnicities. This help was never observed to be discouraged by the immersion teachers.

**Teachers' Perceptions**

3) Is there a difference between how teachers perceive their teaching and their students in the immersion context and how teachers perceive their teaching and their students in the regular education context as measured by direct observations, open-ended interviews, informal interviews and triangulated by the "Responsibility for Student Achievement Questionnaire" (Guskey, 1981)?

a. Does this difference increase if the students are African-American?

Teachers' perceptions varied according to the context, immersion or regular education, in which the teachers were situated. The perceptions were categorized according to the teachers' perceptions of responsibility for classes, the teachers' perceptions of the LEAP test, the teacher's beliefs concerning adaptation to differences, the teacher's belief about assimilation, exclusion and inclusion.

**Responsibility**

All the teachers, regardless of context, exhibited a cultural deficiency view of their students; most of them blamed the parents or the students' background for the students' problems and or successes in school. This was especially the case for the regular education teachers. Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) teachers took much more responsibility for positive than negative outcomes in the classroom, and they all stressed the importance of parental involvement in assuring students' success. Mrs. Trahan (TRE) was the most disempowered of all the teachers in the study and took the least responsibility for both positive and negative outcomes in her classroom. She felt that students' successes were totally dependent on the student's home culture.
and the parents' attitudes. Conversely, the immersion teachers took more or the same amount of responsibility for the negative than for the positive outcomes in their classrooms (see Gusky's Teacher Responsibility Scale, Table 6.5).

Table 6.5 Teacher Responsibility Scale (Gusky, 1981)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Positive Responsibility</th>
<th>Negative Responsibility</th>
<th>Total R score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Madame Mauriac</td>
<td>78.33</td>
<td>93.33</td>
<td>85.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M. Kaiga</td>
<td>57.00</td>
<td>62.66</td>
<td>59.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Madame Aussi</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Porte</td>
<td>78.67</td>
<td>51.87</td>
<td>65.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Chenille</td>
<td>94.27</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>78.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Lebrun</td>
<td>72.33</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>55.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Madame Mauriac</td>
<td>56.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Trahan</td>
<td>47.73</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>40.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The LEAP Test

During their interviews the immersion teachers discussed the undermining pressure that the LEAP test placed on the immersion program and on education in general. At Aria Elementary (EXI), Madame Maurice felt that the LEAP test was an assessment of her own teaching rather than the students' progress while M. Kaiga worried that the test could be biased, unfair and/or inaccurate. At Comeaux Elementary (TI), Madame Mauriac discussed--in her cerebral fashion--how the test was developmentally inappropriate for the students' age-level and how, in her view, the only thing the test succeeded in doing was to force her to teach in an inappropriate manner in order to prepare her students for the test. The only immersion teacher who did not criticize the LEAP test was Madame Aussi (EXRE) but she did not even know that the test was nor was she responsible for teaching any of the test content and therefore was not under any LEAP test pressure. Despite, their criticisms of the LEAP test, only M. Kaiga felt that language would affect the students test scores.
While the regular education teachers were not so much worried about language affecting the LEAP test scores, two of the regular education teachers, Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) and Mrs. Trahan (TRE) were worried about the students not being familiar with the test content and the content being biased against their students. Mrs. Lebrun did discuss the language of the test saying that she wished she could paraphrase the test in a way that students would understand its questions. Mrs. Trahan (TRE) wished the content of the test would reflect the children's lives (boudin, air boats, pirogues) she thought the content of the test showed that it was written by and for "Yankees."

Adaptation to Differences

While Mrs. Lebrun's (EXRE) and Mrs. Trahan's (TRE) comments indicated their appreciation for their own culture, and they equally revealed a view of differences as a stumbling block. This view was contrary to that of the immersion teachers. All the immersion teachers discussed how successful learning was dependent on their ability to adapt their teaching to the children's different learning styles and needs. This sense of a need for adaptation to differences was the strongest theme found in the immersion teachers' perceptions. In the immersion classrooms the teachers viewed linguistic, cultural and learning styles/differences as positive. They also viewed their own and their students' adaptations to these differences as an enriching and important experience in terms of academic success and more importantly in terms of having a successful life and being a successful person (which M. Kaiga (EXI) referred to as being "a person with a capital 'P'”).

All the immersion teachers spoke of learning about different languages and/or cultures as being a challenge to which the students needed to rise. All the immersion teachers felt that the students were not doing all they could to rise to that challenge. They spoke of the students'
laziness, reverting to "easier" English, and the invasion of English in the classrooms. However, the teachers themselves were not immune to using English in their classrooms. This was evidenced by the extreme immersion teachers succumbing to the students' "LEAP trump card" and by the typical immersion teachers' use of English and reliance on her English counterpart to prepare for the LEAP test. It is important to note that both English influences on the French immersion class stem from the LEAP test.

Whereas the immersion teachers perceived differences as positive, the regular education teachers viewed differences as an obstacle. This perception was evidenced in the regular education teachers' actions. At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), (1) Mrs. Porte constantly corrected the students' home dialect hoping that they would be able to make the distinction between their dialect and "correct" English for the LEAP; (2) Mr. Chenille's use of the exact same lesson and method over and over again despite some students' inability to learn the content plus the incident in which Mr. Chenille rejected Teresa's alternative suggestion for dividing both allude to a resistance to different approaches; (3) Mrs. Lebrun's work with parenting classes for rural at-risk students parents suggested a cultural deficiency belief in how other parents raise their kids. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE), Mrs. Trahan's informal discussion of the "necessary" integration of the African-American and white churches, which in effect was not an integration but the assimilation of the African-American church into the white church, demonstrated her desire for "sameness." Seeing differences as negative and as an obstacle, Mrs. Trahan (TRE) described her church as well built and well-funded and she saw no reason why African-Americans hesitated to become part of her church when their church was falling apart and had no money. Further demonstrating Mrs. Trahan's (TRE) disregard for "other," in a measuring activity she discussed the distance from "THE" church to another building in town.
Describing this year's class, the Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) teachers gave glowing reviews of the students (it must be remembered that this class was selected by the principal to participate in the study) while the Aria Elementary (EXI) teachers all mentioned discipline problems and ways in which they dealt with these problems (this was the class nicknamed "the class from Elm Street" by the P.E. teachers). In the typical contexts, Comeaux (TI) teacher Madame Mauriac mentioned that there were students who misbehaved but over all she perceived her class as better trained and with better attitudes than her previous immersion class. At Dautrive Elementary (TRE) Mrs. Trahan saw her class as lazy and immature and she gave as an example how the students were upset when they did not receive the grades they wanted because they did not do the work they needed to do.

The teachers' views of differences were brought to light in their perception of "problem" students and behavioral problems. When asked about whether they had any children with behavioral problem all the Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) teachers said "yes" but then did not want to give out the names of these students. On the other hand, the immersion teachers said they did not have children they would call "problems," but they did volunteer the names of the students who were not motivated or having academic problems. Mrs. Trahan (TRE) immediately volunteered the name of her "problem child" and other students with whom she was having difficulties. Further, in follow-up questions, when asked in general how they dealt with these children, the Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) teachers all told anecdotal success stories, the immersion teachers discussed how they were resolving these problems, how much the situation had improved and their hopes that the students would be successful. Mrs. Trahan (TRE) discussed her inability to resolve these problems and indicated that she was documenting all activities to make sure that she left a "paper trail" in other words to make sure that she would not
be blamed for the failure to help the children. These descriptions of problem children again demonstrated how in regular education differences in students are viewed as an obstacle to be overcome, as in Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), or not, as in Dautrive Elementary (TRE) while the immersion teachers discussed their on-going adaptations to students' differences.

Assimilation vs. Diversity

The regular education teachers' aversion to differences underscored a tendency toward assimilation apparent in the regular education classrooms. The movement of all students toward the central goal of same language, same knowledge base and the belief that the students could or could not overcome their cultural backgrounds, all describe the students' differences in a pejorative manner, as though that is what is holding students back. This reverence for "sameness" was also apparent in the teachers' perceptions and relationships with other teachers. Amongst the regular education teachers, there was a sense of camaraderie which not only was not observed amongst the immersion teachers but which excluded the immersion teachers from the regular education teaching corps in immersion schools.

Although the Aria Elementary (EXI) teachers socialized and were friendly in and outside the school they did not take part in the extracurricular activities which the Dautrive (TRE) teachers shared, nor did they have the community ties that both the Blue Willow (EXRE) and Dautrive (TRE) teachers had. The immersion teachers all mentioned feeling like outsiders, both within their classrooms, as viewed by their students, and within the school, as viewed by their colleagues. They perceived their colleagues as considering them as less important and they felt that being an outsider was a disadvantage for them. However, they all spoke of how their cultural differences enriched the lives of their students, and how much they learned and were enriched by learning of the students' cultures. This was especially apparent at Aria Elementary
(EXI) wherein the teachers explored similarities and differences between their respective African cultures and the students' African-American background.

Additionally, the backgrounds of the teachers themselves along with their varied teaching experiences illustrated the immersion teachers' diversity. They had all come from different regions of the world and had taught different subjects in different countries and at different levels. Immersion teachers had to adapt to differences in terms of having to learn how to teach at a new grade level, with new teaching methods while at the same time becoming familiar with a new living environment. This afforded the immersion teachers different perspectives on what, who and how they were teaching. Meanwhile, all the regular education teachers had a fairly homogenous teaching experience. They all taught in their home parish and in fact, in or near their hometowns. Although Mrs. Porte was teaching out of her certification level and Mrs. Lebrun did teach for a few years in Missouri, for the most part the regular education teachers were teaching what they had been trained to teach (from Louisiana universities) in their home towns.

Teachers' responses to the question asking them to describe their best, their ideal student, offered a good example of the importance of heterogeneous qualities (of divergent and creative thought) emphasized by immersion teachers and the importance of homogenous qualities (assimilation, aversion to differences and the "correct" answer) emphasized by the regular education teachers. When discussing their best, their ideal student, all the teachers mentioned motivated and eager students, but the immersion teachers preferred students who looked for challenges and autonomous learners while the regular education teachers wanted involved parents. In other words, the immersion teachers wanted students who followed their own path.
while the regular education teachers' view of ideal students included everybody pulling together
to move towards a central goal.

Summary of Teacher Perceptions Findings

The teachers' perceptions findings were categorized into how they acknowledged their
responsibility for occurrences in the classroom, how they adapted to or perceived differences in
the classroom and finally their views on assimilation vs. diversity.

In the regular education classes the teachers took less responsibility for negative
outcomes in their classrooms than positive outcomes. Mrs. Trahan (TRE), took little
responsibility for any outcome of her classroom. She was very disempowered by her view that
outside powers, such as parents and administrators, controlled the outcomes in her classroom. In
the immersion context, except for Madame Aussi (EXRE), the immersion teachers took as much
or more responsibility for negative than the positive outcomes. Immersion teachers felt they
were responsible for ensuring that they adapted their teaching to the students' learning styles.

This adaptation to differences in a nutshell reveals the greatest difference between the
immersion and regular education contexts. In regular education difference was seen as a
stumbling block. In the immersion context, they did not see differences as obstacles to overcome
rather, they saw their students' and their own adaptation to differences as an important and
enriching experience and as essential to the students becoming better people and/or having a
successful life. The way that the teachers perceived and discussed their problem children
reflected their views on difference; the students' academic and behavior problems were seen in
immersion as a need for adaptation but were seen in regular education as an obstacle to be
overcome (or not).
In the same way that difference was seen as a problem in regular education, sameness and in a sense assimilation was considered a positive. Regular education teachers all worked toward instilling in the students the same knowledge base (the one that would pass the LEAP), and the same language/dialect. Even the teacher's own experiences in education were very homogenous. They were all raised near their school, they had all gone to Louisiana universities and they were all teaching in or near their hometown. In contrast, immersion teachers' heterogeneous teaching experiences reflected differences. The immersion teachers were aware of the negative perception of difference by their regular education teaching colleagues. Finally the teachers' conceptions of an ideal student reflected the immersion teachers' reverence for diversity and adaptation and the regular educations teachers desire for homogeneity. While both groups of teachers wanted motivated and eager students, all the regular education teachers wanted students who had parents who would be involved and help the teacher teach the students what they needed to learn. In immersion, all the teachers mentioned that they wanted students who looked for challenges and were autonomous learners. They did not perceive students who learned and were helped to learn what they were supposed to learn as ideal student, rather they considered ideal those students who pushed themselves to learn and were not afraid of to learn different and new things on their own.

Student Participants and Their Perceptions

4) Is there a difference between how African-American students in the French immersion context perceive themselves, their teachers and their peers and how African-American students in the regular education context perceive themselves, their teachers and their peers as measured by open-ended interviews and triangulated by a
revised interview version of Wright and Taylor's "Self and Collective Esteem Inventory" (1995) and Caldwell’s (1998) revised "Collective Self-Esteem Scale?"

The section details the finding concerning the perceptions of the selected African-American participants. The perceptions on which this study focused were as follows: the perceptions of self and school, the perception of peers, the perceptions of teachers and the perceptions of language.

**Perception of Self and School**

**How Are You Doing in School?**

There was a gender difference in terms of how the students viewed their grades. All the boys, except the lower and higher achieving Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) boys, believed that their grades were low or that they were dropping this year. However, Shae (EXI) was the only higher achieving boy who did not feel that school was "easy," rather he felt that his "A's and B's" were low and that he had a problem understanding in class. Although at the time of the interview I found Shae's attitude surprising, subsequent observations revealed that he did not always understand, even simple requests and his failure on the math portion of the LEAP test underscored Shae's difficulties in comprehension. As opposed to the boys somewhat negative attitudes concerning their grades, all the African-American girls, except for Deanna (TI), Cienna (TI) and Raylyn (EXRE), believed their grades were good and said something positive about them.

**What Do You Think the Teachers Think About You?**

With regards to how students believed that teachers perceived them, seven of the sixteen participant, three immersion and four regular education, felt that their teachers would describe them in only positive terms. In immersion, all three of the students were girls while the regular
education had an equal number of each gender sharing this positive viewpoint. Students who felt that their teachers viewed them in an overall positive light but with some negative descriptors were mostly boys in immersion (three boys and one girl) and equally distributed in regular education (one and one). There were only three students who felt that their teacher had an overwhelmingly negative view of them. One was Shae (EXI), who was discussed in the previous section and who felt his teachers, like himself, perceived his academic work negatively. The other two students were both at Dautrive Elementary (TRE). Also at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), the girls believed that their teacher's negative views about them were directed not toward their behavior but toward their person, i.e., that they were "sassy" or "mean." All the students at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) felt that Mrs. Porte had a positive view of them. Although, Dusty, the lower achieving boy modified this positive view to a lesser degree by using the adverb "kinda." Similarly, both lower achieving boys in immersion lessened their perceived positive view by using "kinda" and "not all the time." In general, in immersion, all the lower achieving students felt that their teachers had a fairly positive perception of them but both higher achieving boys and the higher achieving girl, at Aria Elementary (EXI), Falina, felt their teachers had a somewhat negative view of them. In regular education, there were stark differences between the extreme and typical contexts. At Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) the students perceived Mrs. Porte view of them as very positive while three of the four students in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) felt their teacher had a somewhat negative view of them. In general, the lower students and the girls felt that their teachers viewed them very positively.

**Personal Self-esteem**

In examining the students' personal self-esteem scores, students with the lowest self-esteem scores were all found in the typical context, particularly at Comeaux Elementary (TI).
Lower achieving boys in the two typical settings had the lowest personal self-esteem scores of all the participants. In addition, the higher achieving boy and the lower achieving girl with the lowest self-esteem were at Comeaux Elementary (TI). While the higher achieving African-American girl with the lowest self-esteem was at Dautrive Elementary (TRE) (See Table 6.6).

Table 6.6 Highest and Lowest Scores for Personal Self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aria (EXI)</th>
<th>Blue Willow (EXRE)</th>
<th>Comeaux (TI)</th>
<th>Dautrive (TRE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher achieving boy</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher achieving girl</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower achieving boy</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower achieving girl</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.7 Wright and Taylor Personal Self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Achievement level and gender</th>
<th>Positive personal self-esteem (6-0)</th>
<th>Negative personal self-esteem (3-0)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Shae</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Falina</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Dusty</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Donavon</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Raylyn</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Kole</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Cienna</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Laticia</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the four students with the highest personal self-esteem scores were found in the extreme contexts--two in immersion and one in regular education.
Although the lower achieving girls in the regular education context had higher personal self-esteem than the lower achieving girls in immersion, they did not exude as much confidence. During her interview, Raylyn, the lower achieving girl at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), appeared too shy to speak, often did not answer and fidgeted all through the interview. Whereas Laticia (TRE) discussed how she believed that her teacher saw her as "mean." In contrast, the lower achieving immersion girls were vociferous, smiling and at ease for their interviews. Additionally, they believed their teachers would use words like "nice," "bright," and "helpful" to describe them.

**Collective Self-esteem**

With the students' collective self-esteem, gender was again an important factor. All the girls, except for Cienna, the lower achieving girl at Comeaux Elementary (TI), perceived ethnicity, family as important to their identity. All the girls, except Blanca, the higher achieving girl at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), perceived school as important to their identity. As with personal self-esteem the students' view of their ethnicity was worse in the typical context. Both TRE boys listed ethnicity as the least important to their identity which underlined an emerging theme in Nat, the higher achieving boy's experiences which I termed, his "white world." Further, Cienna and Kole, the lower achieving students at Comeaux Elementary (TI) class both listed ethnicity as least important to their identities. On the other hand, three of the four students at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), all but Donavon the higher achieving boy, rated ethnicity as most important or just as important to their identity as school and family. All of the students at Aria Elementary (EXI) rated their family as having the highest score, as most important to their identities. Both higher achieving students at Comeaux Elementary (TI) and the lower achieving girl at Aria Elementary (EXI) all considered ethnicity as equally important as family to their
identities as did both TRE girls (See Table 6.9). In terms of the total collective self-esteem score, the immersion students, with the exception Cienna (TI), had higher total collective self-esteem scores than the regular education students (See Table 6.9).

Table 6.8 Highest and Lowest Scores for Collective Self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aria (EXI)</th>
<th>Blue Willow (EXRE)</th>
<th>Comeaux (TI)</th>
<th>Dautrive (TRE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher achieving boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher achieving girl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower achieving boy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td>Lowest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower achieving girl</td>
<td>Highest</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lowest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.9 Caldwell (1999) Collective Self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Achievement level and gender</th>
<th>Total Ethnicity</th>
<th>Total Family</th>
<th>Total School</th>
<th>Total Collective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Shae</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Falina</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Dusty</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Donavon</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Raylyn</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Kole</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Cienna</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Laticia</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In fact, three of the four highest scores were at Comeaux Elementary (TI) and the fourth was at Aria Elementary (EXI) (See Table 6.8). Overall, ethnicity was not viewed as important as either family or school in the typical context. On the other hand ethnicity, at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) was viewed as very important to students' identities.
The Collective Self-esteem Scale further revealed how many students, particularly regular education students, considered their schools, ethnicity and families to be negatively perceived by others. Only one of the immersion students, Shae (EXI), felt that others negatively perceived his school. Only one immersion student, Kole (TI) felt that others negatively perceived his family. The lower students at Comeaux Elementary (TI) and the boys from Aria Elementary (EXI) class did feel that others negatively perceived their ethnicity (See Table 6.10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Achievement level and gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity is negatively perceived</th>
<th>Family is negatively perceived</th>
<th>School is negatively perceived</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Shae</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Falina</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Dusty</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Donavon</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Raylyn</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Kole</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Cienna</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Laticia</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast, all but one of the regular education students felt that others negatively perceived their school, family and/or ethnicity. Six of the eight students felt that their school was negatively perceived. Five students believed that others perceived their ethnicity negatively. Three of those five were at Dautrive Elementary (TRE) further underscoring the negative effects on African-American students' perceptions of ethnicity in that context. In addition, half of the regular education students felt that their families were also negatively perceived. Overall the
regular education student envisioned themselves as being perceived much more negatively than the immersion students envisioned themselves, especially with regards to schooling.

**Perception of Peers**

**Who Are Your Friends and Why?**

An emerging theme in participants' perception of peers was that conflict and avoiding hurtful situations in the classroom was pivotal in differentiating friends from non-friends. All the boys, except Dusty (EXRE), and all the higher achieving girls, except Falina (EXI), mentioned conflict in their discussion of friends and non-friend. Raylyn, the lower achieving girl at Blue Willow (EXRE) also shared these sentiments with the higher achieving African-American girls. Both higher achieving boys in immersion mentioned girls in relation to that conflict. However the other lower achieving girls, Falina (EXI) and Dusty (EXRE) had a hard time differentiating between friends and non-friends. Two lower achieving students, Laticia (TRE) and Drew (EXI) used "mean" as a characteristic of their friends. Four students, the two EXRE girls, Teresa and Raylyn, and the two typical higher achieving boys, Seth and Nat, mentioned tattling and spreading rumors as a characteristic of non-friends. Following in the theme of living in a "white world," Nat only mentioned white students in his discussion of his friends.

**Perceptions of Peers Based on Gender**

All of the students, except the regular education boys, attributed a majority of positive traits to the girls. All of boys in the regular education context, except Donovan (EXRE), the higher achieving boy, attributed most of the positive traits to boys. For negative traits the girls selected either boys or both boys and girls. The boy's selection of friends appeared to correspond to the boys' selections for positive traits. The two higher achieving boys who selected the most boys as having positive traits, Shae (EXI) and Nat (TRE), selected no girls as their friends. In
addition, Dusty, the lower achieving EXRE boy, lived in a virtually all African-American boy world; all of his friend were African-American boys and he attributed 36 of 40 traits, both positive and negative, to African-American boys (See Table 6.11).

Table 6.11 Wright and Taylor (1995) Collective Self-esteem Based on Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Achievement level and gender</th>
<th>Positive In-group</th>
<th>Positive out-group</th>
<th>Negative in-group</th>
<th>Negative out-group</th>
<th>Friends in-group</th>
<th>Friends out-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Shae</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (EXI)</td>
<td>Falina</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Dusty</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Donavan</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Raylyn</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Willow (EXRE)</td>
<td>Teresa</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Kole</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Cienna</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Laticia</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were other data indicating boys preference to have boys as friends, especially the lower achieving boys. Jerry (TRE), in his interview described his friends as being like "brothers." While Drew (EXI) did not say that his non-friends were girls, his description of students who "answered without raising their hands" and "before he had a chance to answer," fit the description of the dominating girls in his class. Another finding from the Wright and Taylor (1995) measure that corresponded with observational data was that the higher achieving students at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) selected both genders as friends and they had the nearly an equal number of each gender. One of the findings concerning student/student interaction was
that the higher achieving students at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE) socialized across genders while most of the other classes stayed within their gender group (See Table 6.11).

Perceptions of Peers Based on Ethnicity

There was a distinct difference in how ethnicity was perceived between the typical regular education and typical immersion contexts. In the immersion context, the African-American students were dominant; they were selected more often as having both negative and positive traits (except in the case of Kole who chose white girls more for negative traits and Seth who chose more white students for positive traits). In the regular education context, white students were overwhelmingly chosen for both negative and positive traits. While these choices could be explained based on which students were in majority in the class, students chosen as friends offers insight into whom the students affiliated with. In the typical immersion setting African-American students were selected to be friends nearly exclusively (two exceptions) whereas in the regular education classroom the African-American boys selected nearly exclusively white boys as friend (one exception). For Nat, this again reveals his penchant for a "white world" (See Table 6.12).

Table 6.12 Wright and Taylor (1995) Collective Self-esteem Based on Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Achievement level and gender</th>
<th>Positive In-group</th>
<th>Positive out-group</th>
<th>Negative In-group</th>
<th>Negative out-group</th>
<th>Friends In-group</th>
<th>Friends out-group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Kole</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Seth</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Cienna</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comeaux (TI)</td>
<td>Deanna</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Nat</td>
<td>HB</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Laticia</td>
<td>LG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dautrive (TRE)</td>
<td>Blanca</td>
<td>HG</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On the other hand the African-American girls in regular education selected all the African-American girls along with the Hispanic and some white girls. Likewise, the African-American girls in immersion chose almost exclusively African-American girls as friend (two exceptions). This data indicated a strong preference and affiliation between African-American girls in both classes. Observational data mentioned previously supported this finding of very cohesive African-American girls, particularly at Dautrive Elementary (TRE).

Perception of Teachers
Affiliation, Antagonism and Criticism

All of the immersion students except Seth (TI), were overwhelmingly positive about their teachers. They considered them to be, "helpful," "kind," and to "teach [them] a lot." Seth was for the most part complimentary but he revealed that his teacher, Madame Mauriac was at time "aggravating." When the immersion students gave suggestion about how their teachers could improve education, they did not criticize their teachers' behavior and instead they focused on academic improvement for the entire class--they were deeply concerned with their fellow students. There were two suggestions that were alternately mentioned by all but two of the immersion students; 1) learning needs to be more fun so that students are more interested in it and 2) teachers need to ensure that all the students understand and when they do not the teachers need to help them. The only students who did not mention the academic well-being of the entire class were the boys at Aria Elementary (EXI), Shae and Drew. Shae had no suggestion for improving education while Drew's suggestion reflected the other students concerns but on a more individual level. Drew simply suggested to his teachers, "help me."

In regular education, Mrs. Porte (EXRE) was again the exception. She was held in as high esteem as the immersion teachers, even more so. All of the participating Blue Willow
students considered her their favorite teacher. The other regular education teachers were not so highly regarded.

The only students in regular education who made no complaints about their teachers during their interview were the two lower achieving boys, Dusty (EXRE) and Jerry (TRE). But classroom observation data on Jerry indicated that he may not have been as happy with his teacher, Mrs. Trahan (TRE) as he stated during his interview. Besides falling asleep in class, Jerry would "roll his eyes," click his pen for entire class periods, and constantly talked back to Mrs. Trahan (TRE), not directly, but under his breath.

Both higher achieving regular education boys criticized their teachers for using corporal punishment. Donovan (EXRE) mentioned Mr. Chenille "whipping" the boys and Nat (TRE) said Mrs. Trahan (TRE) "slapped" students and "hit [them] with rulers." Teresa, the higher achieving girl at Blue Willow Elementary (EXRE), also complained about Mr. Chenille and informed me that he was "nicer" when I was observing in the room. Other students in the class reiterated this belief. Mrs. Lebrun (EXRE) was not spared from student criticism. Two of the students, Donovan and Raylyn, portrayed her as always "fussing" and "mean." When the regular education students gave suggestions as to how their teachers could improve education, they usually dealt with how the teachers maintained control or treated the students. Suggestions included, "less fussing," "not hit[ting] people that hard," and "be nicer."

The immersion students had a more positive yet more critical view of their teachers while the regular education students' view of their teachers (excluding Mrs. Porte) ranged from ambivalent to very negative. All of the regular education teachers, except Mrs. Porte, received negative feedback on their treatment of the students. While immersion students said their teachers needed to me more fun and most of them gave suggestions for the teachers to help them
teach content or to ensure that learning was occurring in the classroom. Of the regular education students, only Teresa (EXRE) criticized how her teachers taught. Most of the regular education students' suggestions for how to improve school dealt with conflict and discipline in class. Both higher achieving boys in regular education mentioned corporal punishment they received. Overall, it appeared that the immersion classrooms and Mrs. Porte's classroom were the most positively perceived and that higher achieving boys in regular education had the most negative views of their teachers.

Language

Perceptions of Language

Most of the students only noticed that subject matter of conversation changed between home and school. However, four students, three of them from Comeaux Elementary (TI) and the other having French as a heritage language, discerned a difference in how language was spoken at home, Donovan (EXRE), Seth (TI), Deanna (TI) and Kole (TI). The first three students understood that different dialects were perceived differently and that if they spoke at school as they spoke at home it would get them in "trouble." In terms of heritage language, the immersion students and the girls were more likely to have a heritage French speaker at home. Yet, over one half of the African-American students in the regular education context also had a French heritage speaker in their family (See Table 6.13).

Table 6.13 Percentage of Participating Students with French Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Aria (EXI)</th>
<th>Blue Willow (EXRE)</th>
<th>Comeaux (TI)</th>
<th>Dautrive (TRE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>African-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Heritage Language</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Heritage Language</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Heritage Language</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overwhelmingly, the heritage language speaker was the student's grandmother. While all the other higher achieving African-American girls knew that their grandmothers spoke French, Blanca had no idea what language her grandmother spoke; she just knew it was not English. Due to having a heritage language speaker in their family, two lower achieving immersion students, Cienna, (TI) and Drew (EXI) were able to differentiate standard French from other French dialects (Creole and Cajun French). Overall it appeared that immersion in Louisiana was a heritage language program for many students and that having a heritage language speaker at home and/or learning a second language gave students insight into both their first and their second language.

Language Use

As mentioned in the student/teacher interaction and the student/student interaction, French was used much more prevalently at Comeaux Elementary (TI) than at Aria Elementary (EXI). At Aria Elementary (EXI) the teachers never challenged the students with the French language. They buttressed their French and they translated to English but the students did not have to negotiate meaning of the French language. At Comeaux Elementary (TI), it was observed that African-American student were more likely to socialize in French and that the social use of language was encouraged in this classroom. Further at Comeaux Elementary (TI) written language was encouraged and according to the Madame Mauriac's interview, she considered writing as pivotal to becoming an autonomous learner--a goal for all the immersion teachers. Students wrote biographies, reports on animals and to their pen pals. The students with exceptional oral language skills were the two participating African-American boys, Kole and Seth. Both boys communicated nearly exclusively in French and mentioned their good
writing skills and Madame Mauriac pulled me aside to proudly show me a letter that Seth had
written to his pen pal which demonstrated his excellent writing skills.

Summary of the Findings: Student Participants and Their Perceptions

In the students' perceptions it appeared that gender, ethnicity, student achievement level
and educational context appeared to affect students' perceptions of themselves, their peers, their
teachers and their language(s). When asked how well they thought they were doing in school the
girls in all the contexts generally thought they were doing well and the boys felt that they were
doing poorly or that they were doing worse than the previous years. When questioned about how
they thought their teachers would describe them most of the girls and lower-achieving students
believed that their teachers had a positive perception of them. The most divergent responses
were between the regular education contexts with Mrs. Porte's (EXRE) students all feeling she
viewed them positively and three out of four of Mrs. Trahan's (TRE) students feeling that she
viewed them somewhat negatively. In immersion the lower achieving students in general
believed that their teachers held them in high esteem while the higher achieving students were
more critical of themselves.

In the typical contexts, particularly Typical Immersion, (TI) students had the lowest
personal self-esteem. However, for lower achieving girls in both immersion and regular
education, their self-esteem scores did not correspond to observational and interview data--the
immersion girls, who had lower personal self-esteem scores, appeared much more self-confident
than the regular education girls.

While Typical Immersion (TI) had the lower personal self-esteem they had the highest
collective self-esteem. However Typical Regular Education had low scores on both measures.
Overall, the immersion students felt that others did not negatively perceive their school and they
were less likely to feel that other negatively perceived their family and ethnicity than the regular education students. The regular education students believed that others had a much more negative conception of their school, family and ethnicity. This was particularly true for the Typical Regular Education (TRE) context.

Nearly all the boys and higher achieving girls mentioned hurt and conflict in differentiating friends from non-friends. Although all the other students viewed girls more positively and boys more negatively, most of the regular education boys attributed more positive traits to boys. This boy's preference for boys corresponded to recorded data. Furthermore, it was found that in the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) the higher achieving students chose friends of both genders more than the other students. This corresponded with observational data which described how higher achieving EXRE students interacted socially across gender lines with other higher achieving students. In terms of ethnicity and peers, African-American students dominated the TI students' selections while white students dominated the TRE students' selections. When coupled with the choices for friends the TI students appeared partial to African-American students, the TRE boys appeared partial to white boys and the TRE girls appeared to have a balanced view of the class but with a preference for the African-American girls.

Immersion students were overwhelmingly positive about their teachers and their critique of their class related to the academic improvement for the entire learning community. Regular education teachers, (except for Mrs. Porte who was admired by her students) were for the most part negatively perceived and observational data on antagonistic student/teacher interaction supports this perception. Two teachers were harshly criticized by the higher achieving boys for inflicting corporal punishment on them and others.
In terms of language, it appeared that students in immersion or with a heritage language background appeared to be more discerning with regards to differences in both their first and second language. In typical immersion, where the teacher encouraged both the social use of French and writing in her class, the TI students were more adept at both written and oral language. The TI boys, Kole and Seth, had an exceptional grasp of the language and used it nearly exclusively throughout the day.

Overall, in terms of collective self-esteem, perception of how others viewed them, perceptions of peers, perceptions of teachers and use and perceptions of language immersion appeared to positively affect African-Americans perceptions. The following section will summarize all the findings in the cross-case comparison chapter.

Summary of Qualitative Findings

With regards to the school and classroom environment it was found that there were inequalities between the extreme poorer contexts and the typical richer contexts; the poorer contexts had less while the richer contexts had more in terms of building amenities and equipment. There were differences with regards to immersion and regular education in the student-teachers interactions. Regular education was found to be a more teacher-controlled assimilating environment in which interactions focused on finding the "correct" answer. On the other hand, the immersion context was a more open environment in which divergent thought and student self-determination were encouraged. Furthermore, students in immersion showed more affiliation with, and were more connected, to their teachers. Regular education student and teachers were more antagonistic (with the exception of Mrs. Porte). Humor and real-life experiences did help
the regular education teachers affiliate with their students. While humor was not used in immersion with any success, real-life experiences were; at Comeaux Elementary Madame Mauriac worked with the students to create new experience together with her students rather than just share older experiences.

Student/student socialization, help and conflict were more prevalent in the open immersion environment. In immersion the cross-gender interaction were either academic or antagonistic. EXRE higher achieving students socialized across genders, while in the TRE context, two student groups, the disruptive group and the African-American girls, socialized outside of their proximity. Most student/student conflict involved African-American students, especially the boys. However, most of the self-initiated help offered to students by other students was offered by African-American students, particularly by the girls. This self-initiated help was encouraged in immersion but discouraged in regular education.

In regular education the teachers felt more responsible for positive occurrences in their classroom and less responsible for negative occurrences. In contrast, immersion teachers felt equally responsible for negative and positive occurrences in the classroom. Additionally, regular education teachers were more homogeneous, they perceived differences negatively, as obstacles, and wanted students and parents to work to assimilate, to have the "correct answers," the same knowledge base and the same language. Immersion teachers were more heterogeneous; they viewed diversity and adaptation to difference as pivotal to learning.

Differences in students' perceptions were not always between immersion and regular education students and varied according to student. In terms of difference
between immersion and regular education students' perceptions it was found that immersion students overall had the highest collective self-esteem. In regular education, the two contexts represented two extreme perceptions. The TRE students had lower personal and collective self-esteem while the EXRE class had higher personal and collective self-esteem. All of the classes, except the EXRE class, believed the teacher had both positive and negative view of them but the EXRE students felt that Mrs. Porte had a positive view of them. In terms of their perceptions of peers, African-American students and girls dominated the perception of participants in the immersion context while white students (for all students) and boys (for the boys) dominated the perceptions of regular education participants. African-American girls, particularly at Dautrive Elementary (TRE), were found to affiliate with one another more than other groups in the study.

Finally, with regard to perception of their teachers and perceptions of language, the immersion teachers and Mrs. Porte were viewed positively while the other regular education teachers were criticized harshly, particularly by the higher achieving boys in regular education who had both endured corporal punishment by the teachers. In terms of language, Louisiana immersion appeared to be a heritage program for many students and the study of a second language or having a heritage language at home seemed to offer insights into both the first and second language of the immersion students.
CHAPTER 7:
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

To facilitate the reading of this final chapter, I begin with a restatement of the research problem, a review of the methodology and a summary of the findings organized by phases: quantitative and qualitative. Next, I discuss those findings, elaborate on their pedagogical implications and finally, I give some suggestions for future research.

Statement of the Problem

The Black/White achievement gap has serious repercussions for the perpetuation of social stratification in the U.S. If this achievement gap is not addressed, the increased use of high-stakes testing will widen this gap and solidify racially unequal social stratification. The dominant teacher ideologies, which consider minority students as having cultural deficiencies or needing to be assimilated into the mainstream, dominant culture (Sleeter, 1993), are ideologies which conform to a very static view of education. Likewise educational theories which view education in terms of cultural capital, reproduction or resistance, fix students’ and teachers’ roles based on the frame of the regular education context.

Tyson (1999) discusses how African-American students and their teachers construct their identities within the context of schooling and how this social self-construction affects achievement. Kumashiro (2000) points out that students learn through "upsets" through the negotiation of the borders and spaces between teachers/students and what students know/what teachers want to teach. French immersion offers an alternative context to regular education. French immersion is founded on cultural and linguistic variety. It is a site where students and teachers can
construct identities which do not reproduce the fixed results from which the regular
education context seems unable to escape. Previous studies on French immersion have
shown that minority students, specifically African-American students, receive additional
academic benefits in a French immersion context (Caldas & Boudreaux, 1999; Gastright
& Met, 1987; Holobow, Genesee, Lambert,). This study re-examined whether or not
there were academic benefits for African-Americans in the immersion context while
positing that the interactions between, and perceptions of, students and teachers in the
immersion classroom affect both student achievement and student social self-
construction.

Review of the Methodology

This study was a two-phased mixed model design, which investigated the impact
of the French immersion context on the school experiences of 4th grade African-
American students. Phase I of this study examined the frames which have been
heretofore used to define African-American students, namely standardized tests, and
investigated whether different classroom contexts resulted in different test scores. In
Phase II of this study I observed the African-American students’, their peers’ and their
teachers’ interactions and listened to African-American students’ and their teachers’
voiced perceptions in two different classroom contexts, French immersion and regular
education. Using direct observation, test scores, questionnaires and interviews, I
explored how students and teachers interacted and perceived themselves and others in
both the French immersion and the regular education contexts, and how these two
different classroom contexts affected the academic achievement of African-American
students.
The first phase of this study was a quantitative comparison of immersion and non-immersion, fourth grade LEAP test scores. Using the fourth graders' third grade Iowa Test of Basic skills (ITBS) scores as a control, this phase investigated 1) whether there were significant differences in academic achievement between African-American students and white students, 2) whether there were significant differences between French immersion students and regular education students and 3) whether there was any interaction between classroom context and ethnicity.

The second phase of this study used data from Phase I to determine the typical case sampling and the extreme case sampling. In the typical case sampling two schools, one French immersion and the other regular education, were selected according to the average achievement of African-American students. In the extreme case sampling, two schools, one French immersion and the other regular education, were selected using the criteria of schools having over 90% poverty in the school population. Using observations, interviews and questionnaires, this phase involved a constant-comparative case study of emergent themes regarding immersion and non-immersion fourth grade students’ and teachers’ interactions and perceptions of self and other.

The following two sections summarize the findings of these two phases in the study.

**Phase I: Quantitative Findings**

Phase I investigated whether there were significant differences between the LEAP test scores of African-American and white students, between French immersion and regular education students and whether the interaction of context and ethnicity affected those scores. The study found that African-American students overall had scores
significantly lower than those of white students on the LEAP test in both mathematics and language. Furthermore, French immersion students overall scored higher than regular education students in both mathematics and language on the LEAP test in their respective ethnicities; however, this difference between the scores was only significant for the mathematics LEAP scores and not for the language LEAP scores. Finally, there was no significant main effect of the interaction between classroom context and ethnicity on LEAP scores in either mathematics or language.

A more detailed examination of African-American scores found that in mathematics there was no significant difference between the LEAP math scores of African-American French immersion students and those of white students in regular education, which may indicate an improvement or a bridging of the achievement gap in math. However, there was also no significant difference between the LEAP mathematics scores of African-American students in French immersion and the LEAP mathematics scores of African-American students in regular education. Only the white French immersion students scored significantly higher than all the other groups in mathematics. In terms of language LEAP scores, only ethnicity had a main effect on these scores. The white students in both contexts scored significantly higher than the African-American students in both contexts. Overall, French immersion students had scores that were equal to or, higher than, their non-immersion peers.

Phase II: Qualitative Findings

Phase II, the qualitative phase, investigated differences in the overall school environment, the interactions between students and teachers and African-American students and their teachers' perceptions of themselves and others in the classroom.
School Environments

The most evident differences between school environments in the four participating classrooms were not between French immersion and regular education but, rather, between the typical case classrooms and the extreme case classrooms. Extreme case classrooms had the fewest resources, the worst buildings, and teachers who arrived halfway through the year to begin teaching their classes. Furthermore, in both extreme case schools the students had to adjust to three different teachers who taught them their main content areas rather than having one single teacher. This resulted in having to adjust to a variety of different teaching styles and being subjected to a more disjointed learning experience.

Student/teacher Interactions

In student/teacher interactions three main themes emerged. A difference was evident between French immersion and regular education in classroom control and the instructional delivery that this control engendered. In regular education, the teachers controlled the classroom and directed learning to "correct" answers or processes. In immersion there was less teacher control in the class and more student self-determination. This student self-determination, at times, resulted in a power struggle between teachers and students in the classrooms. In addition, the immersion teachers relinquished much of their power in favor of autonomous learning, and to encourage diverse and creative answers. The teachers were not the final authority in the immersion classroom; students gave suggestions or argued with the teacher concerning academic and disciplinary issues.

Another theme which emerged in the classrooms was the teachers' strategies to engage the students in the learning process. In immersion, Madame Mauriac (TI) and
Madame Maurice (EXI) used concrete examples to ensure students' comprehension and group or pair work to elicit the students' participation. Two strategies used successfully to engage students in regular education were the use of humor and real-life experiences. Humor did not appear to be a successful strategy in the French immersion class; the students never "got" the jokes. The French immersion teachers were able to utilize their real-life experiences to engage students, but Madame Mauriac (TI) had a more successful approach than the other teachers. She drew her students into instruction by actually creating real-life experiences for them through pen pals and by encouraging social interaction through games and group or pair work. Further, the Typical Immersion (TI) class engaged students by encouraging the social use of the French language.

An additional emerging theme affirmed the old adage, "the squeaky wheel gets the oil." The dominant students in the participating classes, the ones who were proactive about demanding attention, received most of the instruction and most of the discipline also. In the Extreme Immersion (EXI) class, the dominant students were the African-American girls. In the Typical Immersion (TI), the dominating students were the boys; the two gifted boys dominated instructional interactions and the African-American boys dominated the social scene and commanded the disciplinary attention. In the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) class students were not allowed to dominate. However, differential treatment of students was observed in Mr. Chenille's class. He tended to discipline his African-American boys and the higher achieving African-American girl, Teresa, more than the other students. As for the Typical Regular Education (TRE) context white boys dominated both instruction and discipline while African-American students, whom the teacher perceived to be lower achieving, were nearly invisible. The
African-American boys within the Extreme Immersion (EXI) context could also be categorized as nearly invisible with regards to instructional attention. In the Typical Regular Education (TRE) and Extreme Immersion (EXI) classrooms, the dominant students were very proactive even aggressive about getting and taking the teachers' attentions away from other students. This dominance allowed the less proactive students, the invisible students, to disengage, disrupt or socialize.

Student/student Interactions

A major difference in student/student interactions between the two contexts was the type and amount of interactions. In the regular education context the teachers' control of the classrooms allowed for less social interaction, and of the social interactions that occurred, silent socialization was the most prevalent. In the French immersion contexts, there were a plethora of student/student interactions of every sort, so much so that the student/student interactions were more plentiful than student/teacher interactions.

Within these interactions gender was important. In French immersion, a gender gap existed, and cross gender interactions were usually either antagonistic or of an academic nature. Gender was also important in the regular education context. In the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) class, the gender gap appeared among the lower achieving students, but the higher achieving students socialized across genders. Within the Typical Regular Education (TRE) classroom, most of the interaction was based on proximity, but gender was important with regards to the African-American girls in the class who were very cohesive.

More student/student conflict occurred in the immersion context due to the teachers' pedagogical and disciplinary styles, the teachers' lack of familiarity with
students' cultural knowledge and the students' long-term relationships with one another. In the regular education context, the teachers' control of socialization reduced the amount of student/student conflict, but less so in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) classroom because the teacher interacted less with the students. In both immersion contexts most of the conflicts involved African-American boys, and in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) class most of the conflicts also involved African-American students, both boys and girls.

While the African-American students overall were involved with more conflicts in their respective classes, they were also the students most likely to try to help other students. This was especially true of African-American girls. In contrast, in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) class, other students rarely helped African-American students. Even Nat, the higher achieving African-American student, only helped other African-American students with disdain. By and large, students helping students in the regular education classrooms was generally discouraged, (if it was student initiated), or forced (i.e., teacher initiated). In the French immersion context, students helping students was a common occurrence. This help included providing materials, discussing their work and providing linguistic support. Students helped other students across genders and ethnicities, but in the Extreme Immersion (EXI) class the dominating African-American girls appeared to be more helpful.

**Teacher Perceptions**

Two main themes emerged with regards to teacher perceptions: responsibility and the teachers' perception of and reactions to differences. In the regular education classes the teachers took less responsibility for negative outcomes in their classrooms than they
did for positive outcomes. Mrs. Trahan, the Typical Regular Education (TRE) teacher, was very disempowered, taking little responsibility for any outcome, be it negative or positive, in her classroom. In the immersion context, except for Madame Aussi (EXRE), the teachers took as much responsibility for negative outcomes in their classrooms as they did for positive outcomes, or even more. Immersion teachers deemed that they were responsible for ensuring that they adapted their teaching to the different learning styles of their students.

This adaptation to differences emerged as a major theme in French immersion. All the French immersion teachers mentioned cultural and linguistic differences and how it was important for them and for their students to adapt to those differences. Further, they did not view differences as obstacles to be overcome. Rather, they perceived the students' and their own adaptation to differences as an important and enriching experience which was essential to the students' becoming better students, better people and/or having a successful life. Whereas in the regular education context "sameness" and, in a sense, assimilation were considered positive and desirable, while differences, whether linguistic, cultural or behavioral, were seen as a stumbling block.

Regular education teachers' own homogenous experiences in education may be related to how they viewed differences. They were all raised near their schools, had all graduated from Louisiana universities and were all teaching in or near their hometowns. Immersion teachers' experiences reflected differences in nationality, pedagogical training, and in both linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Furthermore, the view of differences as an obstacle in the regular education context surrounded the immersion context and negatively affected the immersion teachers on a personal level. The immersion teachers,
aware of the negative perception of difference by their regular education teaching
colleagues, all mentioned that they felt like outsiders. They felt that they or their
teaching were perceived as less important, or that their work was mistrusted by parents,
other teachers and administrators.

The teachers' conceptions of an ideal student reflected the immersion teachers'
desire for diversity and adaptation, and the regular education teachers' desire for
homogeneity. While all the teachers wanted motivated and eager students, the regular
education teachers wished for students whose parents were involved and helped the
teacher teach the students what they needed to learn. On the other hand, the French
immersion teachers all stated that they wanted students who looked for challenges and
were autonomous learners.

Student Perceptions of Self

Overall the African-American students in the typical case contexts had lower
personal self-esteem than the students in the extreme contexts. This was especially true
in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) context. Moreover, the TRE African-American
boys regarded their ethnicity as less important to their identity than school or family. In
contrast, in the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) context, ethnicity was seen as very
important to the students' identity. In the immersion context, school was seen as more
important to students' identity than for the regular education students.

Student Perceptions of Peers

In terms of the students' perception of their peers, on the whole, the girls were
perceived more positively and the boys more negatively. However, for three of the four
regular education boys, boys were viewed more positively and selected for more positive
traits. In terms of ethnicity--examined only in the typical case contexts--immersion students' perceptions for both negative and positive traits focused on African-American students, except for Seth, the TI higher achieving boy, who selected more white students for positive traits. In the Typical Regular Education (TRE) context, the white students were selected for most of the negative and positive traits.

While the negative and positive traits could be attributed to classroom composition, having more white students in the typical case regular education class and more African-American students in the Typical Immersion (TI) class, the choices for friendship were more revealing. African-American students in the Typical Immersion (TI) class chose nearly exclusively African-American students as friends. The only exceptions were the African-American boys who each chose one white boy who was on the same academic level as they were. In the Typical Regular Education (TRE) class, the African-American boys chose white students nearly exclusively as friends (one exception) whereas the African-American girls chose all the other African-American girls and then selected the Hispanic girl and white girls.

**Student Perceptions of Teachers**

In general, the immersion students had a more positive view of their teachers but they were also more critical saying that their teachers needed to be more fun. Moreover, the immersion students gave suggestions to help their teachers teach content or ensure that learning occurred in the classroom. The regular education students' perceptions of their teachers ranged from ambivalent to very negative, with the exception of Mrs. Porte (EXRE), who was always viewed positively. The most negative views were by the higher achieving African-American boys who both mentioned that they had received and
witnessed corporal punishment (being hit by rulers, slapped or whipped) by their teachers. While the French immersion students critiqued their teachers' pedagogy, the regular education students' suggestions to improve school involved ideas about how the teachers controlled the classroom. The students' perceptions of teachers appeared to parallel the teacher/student interactions in their respective contexts in that the immersion students wanted more diversity in their education while the regular education students focused on control of the classroom.

Language

With regard to the context being a heritage language context, it was found that many of the students, in particular the immersion students and the girls, had a heritage French speaker in the family. Again, the conception of difference came into play in the way students referred to their heritage languages. Blanca, the higher-achieving African-American girl from the Typical Regular Education (TRE) context had no idea which language her grandmother spoke; she only knew it was "different" from English. On the other hand, two lower achieving French immersion students--the lower achieving girl in the Typical Immersion (TI) context, Cienna, and the lower achieving boy in the Extreme Immersion (EXI) context, Drew--were not only able to differentiate between French and English, they were also able to differentiate between which of their grandparents spoke French like their teachers at school and which had different French dialects. Drew, the lower achieving boy in the Extreme Immersion (EXI) context was even able to differentiate between Cajun, Creole, and standard French. Another finding in the Typical Immersion (TI) context was that the African-American students were more likely to use their French language in both social and academic discourse. Moreover, the two
participant African-American boys were very adept at understanding and speaking French and both boys were proud of their writing skills in French.

Discussion of the Results

This section reports my interpretations of the findings as well as the relation between this study and previous research. After this discussion, the pedagogical implications of this study are outlined and suggestions for future research are detailed.

Interpretations of the Findings

This section details my interpretations of the findings of this study and how they relate to previous research.

Academic Achievement

Overall, this study supports the findings of Lindholm-Leary (2001) that African-Americans in dual language education do as well as their non-immersion peers. However, this study does not fully support the findings of Caldas and Boudreaux (1999) who found that the achievement gap in math, which was evidenced in regular education between African-American and white students, was not apparent in the French immersion context. In this study, although African-American students in the immersion context did bridge the achievement gap between themselves and white students in regular education in mathematics, the achievement gap between African-American immersion students and white immersion students remained.

In addition, qualitative data in the Typical Immersion (TI) class support Holobow, Genesee, Lambert, Gastright and Met (1987) who found that African-American students received additional linguistic benefits in immersion. This was evidenced by their more extensive and continual use of French for both academic and social discourse as
compared with that of the white students in the class, and especially by the remarkable French of both the higher and lower achieving African-American boys. Holobow, Genesee and Lambert (1991), the follow-up study to Holobow et al. (1987), which found that African-American students' writing was not as strong as their verbal language arts skills, was not supported by qualitative data in the Typical Immersion class since the students were observed writing multi-page biographies and letters to pen-pals, and both participating TI boys boasted about their writing skills.

Another qualitative contribution to the level of achievement in the classroom is that within the extreme schools, the majority African-American schools, several observed factors could have contributed to the African-American students' lower test scores. These factors, including late-starting teachers, school building conditions and administrative regulations, reflect MacLeod's (1995) description of poorer schools which reproduced the unequal social hierarchy. These differences are discussed in the next subsection. These school and classroom characteristics may need to be taken into account as factors relating to students' achievement or lack thereof. Much research on achievement has instead focused on ethnicity (Herrnstein & Murray, 1994), student background (Jencks & Phillips, 1998) and teacher expectancy (Rist, 1970/2000) rather than on the existence of unequal school characteristics in the educational institutions and the effect of those institutionalized inequalities on students' achievement. Trent (1998), who did examine two school characteristics (school size and concentration of poverty) found that African-American students were more likely to be enrolled in schools with a high concentration of poverty and that students enrolled in these schools showed depressed achievement. This tendency for educational research to look outside the educational system to find
reasons for students' failure within the educational system reflects the regular education teachers' tendency to attribute negative occurrences inside their classrooms to factors outside them.

**Inequality in the Extreme Contexts**

In their seminal work "Schools in Capitalist American," Bowles and Gintis (1976) discussed the reproductive nature of educational institutions and unearthed the relationship between schools organization and the economic condition of their students, relating how poorer students' schools reproduced lower social status. The quantitative data gathered by this study indicated lower test scores for African-American students, a lower number of African-American students (less than 30%) in the highest achieving schools and a strong concentration of African-Americans in the poorest schools--schools with 90% level of poverty had a 99% African-American student population. All this data support Bowles and Gintis's reproductive theory. Additionally, MacLeod (1995) criticized how poorer schools were lacking even the most basic equipment; this criticism underlines one of the most conspicuous differences observed in the qualitative observations--the overwhelming evidence that there was something inherently unequal and unjust about the distribution of basic equipment and building amenities, such as a functioning copy machine (EXRE school) and a library (EXI school), between the extreme and typical contexts.

However, the reproductive nature of the educational institutions studied go beyond examining the test scores and how well equipped the schools are or are not. The qualitative data gathered emphasized Bowles and Gintis's (1976) "correspondence principle" in which the reproduction of social classes is dependant on "the relationships
of authority and control between administrators and teacher, teachers and students, students and students…” (p. 12). Bowles and Gintis (1976), in their discussion of working class versus suburban schools, articulated how working class schools breed conformity through regimentation and behavior control. The existence of this reproductive working class environment is substantiated by qualitative data gathered within the extreme contexts schools. The administrative control in which the students' schedules were disjointed and in which the focus of the school was the LEAP test, illustrated what Bowles and Gintis (1976) described as an extrinsic motivation system.

This focus on the LEAP test and regimented administrative control was most oppressive in the Extreme immersion (EXI) context. In this context, the fear of the LEAP tests was underscored by the use of English rather than French textbooks, by the students' ability to control the class with the "LEAP trump card," and by the teachers' constant translation in the face of the "LEAP trump card." Overall, the LEAP pressure led to more translating and less learning in the Extreme immersion context. This qualitative finding sheds further light on the quantitative findings of this study since 33% of the African-American immersion participants came from the Extreme immersion context.

Bowles and Gintis (1976) offer another view of the unequal schooling. They describe the success that was bred in students in suburban schools offered to affluent students; within these schools there was "greater student participation, less direct supervision, more student electives and in general, a value system stressing internalized standards of control" (p.132). Out of all the schools in this study, observational data discerns that this description aptly describes the Typical Immersion (TI) school. In this
school the administration was very flexible in regards to its immersion program.

Teachers were free to schedule their own school days and the students were provided with textbooks, software and tradebooks in French. This difference, allowing teachers flexibility in their classrooms, was in turn less oppressive to the teachers and students. Furthermore, the LEAP scores in this less oppressive context were just as high or higher than the scores in the regular education class. But while the administration at the Typical Immersion (TI) school appeared to offer the immersion teachers a measure of self-determination, the administration at the Extreme Immersion (EXI) school did not. This demonstrates that immersion programs are not a shield from the reproductive nature and inequalities of educational institutions.

Control, Power Struggles and the "Bâton Blanc"

Resistance theorists such as Willis (1981), Foley (1990), MacLeod (1995) and Ogbu (1995a, 1995b, 1999) all discussed students' reactions to reproductive educational institutions whose fixed educational process attempts to breed conformity and acquiescence. In this fixed educational context the educational process was defined by the administration and enforced by the teachers. The students either accepted what they were supposed to do, accepting "sameness,"--as with the higher achieving African-American students which Fordham (1988) described as "acting white"--or resisted it, as with the students in Willis's (1981), Foley's (1990) and MacLeod's (1995) case studies.

Observational and interview data in the regular education classrooms and schools attest to a very fixed educational context. In this structured hierarchy, the administrators wielded power through the LEAP test and accountability. The LEAP test was the goal of the entire school year and all instruction was directed toward the test. Within the
classrooms the regular education teachers enforced these goals by controlling students and directing learning toward the test. This fixed social hierarchy resembles the "discourse of colonialism" which Bhabha (1994) discussed, i.e., the "fixity," the "rigidity" and the "unchanging order" (Bhabha, 1994, p. 42).

The importance of the LEAP test in fixing this oppressive hierarchy cannot be overstated. Tyson (1999) discussed how "Goodness" and the standards for achievement in the all-Black schools she studied seemed to be associated with "White middle class cultural styles" (p. 246). Similarly, the LEAP test appeared to be what I termed, a "Bâton Blanc"--i.e., the white middle class language and content were the yardstick by which the students were measured. According to the educational hierarchy, the LEAP test theoretically reified the teachers' power. However, the qualitative data unequivocally found that the LEAP test, in fact, disempowered teachers, particularly in immersion. As Fanon's (1967) described the "no less alienated (duping and duped) whites" (p. 29), the teachers were duped into buying into the "Bâton blanc," thinking that it would save or help their students; instead, it created an atmosphere of tension where the "correct" answer was prioritized over learning.

Dolby (2000) found that power structures in the classroom affect the students' identities. This study found that the power structures in the classroom affected students' interaction, self-perceptions and their perception of their peers. The rigid hierarchy I observed in the regular education classrooms was set up in the classroom that prioritized the "Bâton Blanc." This in turn gave more power to students who were most apt to understand the learning goals. These students were able to dominate instruction and monopolize the teachers' attention which in turn affected the access that other more
"invisible" students had to instruction. This focus on the "Baton Blanc" appeared to also affect the students' perceptions of themselves and their peers, particularly in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) context. In that context, Nat, the higher achieving African-American boy was better able to assimilate to, and master, the "Bâton blanc." He therefore, identified with other students who held the same power as he did, i.e., the white students. Nat lived in a "white world." This corresponds to Fordham's (1988) conception of "racelessness," but Fordham found that girls tended to exhibit this trait. Yet, the African-American girls in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) class formed a very cohesive group amongst themselves and exhibited no signs of "racelessness."

In the extreme contexts, the "Bâton Blanc" was surrounded by a context of ethnic pride and community and thus in terms of personal-self esteem it did not have as deleterious an effect as it did on Nat. In fact, African-American students in the extreme classrooms appeared to possess more positive personal self-esteem than the students in the typical classroom, and on the whole, they had high collective self-esteem. This finding supports Wright and Taylor's (1995) study which concluded that Inuit students' personal and collective self-esteem increased significantly in the heritage language classroom--a classroom which consisted of almost exclusively Inuit students or mixed heritage (Inuit/white) students and which was created in an effort to empower heritage language speakers in the community.

In addition, in terms of students' perceptions of peers and student/student interaction, this study found that boys are particularly affected by the power structures in the classrooms. In the Extreme Immersion classroom, the lower achieving boys who were excluded from instruction, due to the African-American girls' dominance or because
of their inability to master the "Bâton Blanc," interacted together exclusively. In contrast, the higher achieving boy in the Extreme Regular education classroom interacted with his equals, the higher achieving girls; they had all mastered the "Bâton Blanc" and shared power in the classroom. In the typical settings, both higher achieving boys had a more positive perception of white students than African-American students and preferred socializing with students on their level, i.e., the teacher or white students. Nat, the gifted African-American boy (and the TRE higher achieving boy) seemed particularly affected by this "Bâton Blanc." Nat appeared to live in a "white world" and showed disdain for his African-American peers. This supports not only the "racelessness" defined by Fordham (1988) but also the importance of power structures in forming students' identities as described by Dolby (2000). To that I add that it appears that the African-American boys, who are at particular risk in the educational system, may be influenced more by unequal power structures within the classroom.

The influence of the "Bâton Blanc" affected teachers' and students' perceptions and use of language in the classroom as well. Valdés (1997) discussed how the main problem of intergroup relations in dual-track immersion schools was the impact of the larger society's values on the teachers and students. She pointed out that the white middle-class standard is still the base against which all "others" are measured. This study corroborates Valdès's findings. In the Extreme French immersion classroom it was found that the fear of the LEAP test, the "Bâton Blanc" initiated a decline in power of both the immersion teachers and their language. The administrators' and parents' test anxiety resulted in the mandatory use of English textbooks and test preparation packets which in turn created an English language dominance in the classroom. Moreover, the students,
affected as they are by the classroom power structures as Dolby (2000) discerned, capitalized on this anxiety using their "LEAP non-comprehension trump card" in which the students would take control of the classroom language by feigning misunderstanding of the French and forcing the teachers to translate into English. This further depreciated French in the classroom. This inequality undoubtedly affected the students' perceptions of French. Valdés (1997) discussed how children are keenly aware of the attitudes toward languages. To that effect, the EXI students' rejection of the French language supported Lindholm-Leary's finding that African-American students in the dual language context had a social detachment from the L2. Furthermore, the strong preference for English revealed a resistance to the academic language similar to that found in the Lafayette community in Ogbu's (1995a, 1995b, 1999) study and immersion students in Tarone and Swain's (1995) study.

Within the Typical Immersion (TI) classroom, the power struggle was more productive and dealt more with the students' negotiating and blurring of the borders between teachers and students. This conforms to Anzaldúa's (1987) "mestiza" space which is "[t]he coming together of two self-consistent but habitually incompatible frames of reference" (p. 78) that transcends duality. This study found that power was negotiated and not fixed in the Typical Immersion (TI) classroom. The students argued about punishments and rules they were supposed to follow. They would not just become angry, they gave rationales as to why they should not have to follow rules or be punished. Furthermore the students chose their subject matter and gave suggestions to the teacher as to how she could teach better. This blurring of the line between teacher and students was facilitated by the teachers' integration of socialization and social language in the
classroom. The students blurred the lines also by ensuring that they helped one another when help was needed and that they helped the teacher with administrative as well as academic tasks. Anzaldúa stated, "The answer to the problem between the white race and the colored… lies in healing the split that originates in the very foundation of our lives, our culture, our languages, our thoughts" (p. 80). If so, then the negotiation of identities in the Typical Immersion classroom may be a starting point toward achieving the "mestiza" consciousness.

**Negotiating vs. Assimilating Differences**

The most apparent theme within the two contexts was how difference was perceived and dealt with. In regular education, the results of the present study confirm the findings of Sleeter (1993) with regards to teachers' perceptions of their students. Sleeter's (1993) study found that many teachers insisted that their students accommodate the valued culture. An informal discussion with Mrs. Trahan (TRE) illustrated this attitude. In this conversation, Mrs. Trahan attributed Blanca's poor language abilities to her African-American dialect. Mrs. Trahan used two lines of reasoning to explain why Blanca should be able to overcome the obstacle of her cultural dialect. First, she explained how she herself learned the "correct" way to speak and that Blanca needed to do the same. This rationale reflects Omi and Winant's (1986) ethnicity theory which assigned African-Americans the same role as earlier Europeans (cited in Sleeter, 1993, p. 160). Then, Mrs. Trahan used Lily, the Hispanic girl, as a model minority (Lee, 1998). That is to say she used Lily as a hegemonic device to belittle Blanca. She discussed Lily's acquisition of English to demonstrate how minorities can overcome their linguistic deficiencies. In both examples, Mrs. Trahan built the case that Blanca's difficulties were
her own fault for not doing what needed to be done. As with the teachers in Sleeter's (1993) study, Mrs. Trahan never examined the complicity of white institutions which may have contributed to Blanca's difficulties.

Sleeter (1993) described the cultural deficiency model in which teachers attribute blame for student difficulties onto the students' background. This perspective was evidenced by all the teachers in this study; however, it was for the most part the regular education teachers who worried that the students' differences--be they cultural, linguistic or both--would interfere with their test scores. For the regular education teachers, overcoming one's own difference led to success on the LEAP test, which would later lead to a successful life. This overcoming of one's differences and this view of difference as an obstacle to be overcome, created an atmosphere of cohesion and assimilation similar to that described by Kailin (1999) and Sleeter (1993).

One reason for the regular education teachers' aversion to differences may be due to the teachers' homogeneous experiences. In the regular education context all the teachers were from Louisiana, went to Louisiana universities and taught in or near their hometowns. This homogeneity created a cohesiveness among teachers within the school. This was readily apparent with the white regular education teachers in both typical education schools, and it created an "us vs. them" mentality amongst the faculty. For the Typical Regular Education (TRE) teachers, the "them" were the parents, and for the Typical Immersion (TI) school regular education teachers, the "them" were the administration or the French immersion teacher, Madame Mauriac, depending on the situation.
The cohesive nature of teachers is described by both Kailin (1999) and Sleeter (1993). Kailin (1999) pointed out how the cohesiveness of the teachers resulted in the "don't rock the boat" mentality and a conspiracy of "silence." This study supports Kailin with regards to overt racism, but in this study, the cohesiveness of the Typical Regular Education (TRE) teachers was by no means silent; it was aggressive. In the Typical Regular Education (TRE) school the teachers blamed their academic and disciplinary troubles on the students' backgrounds, and when these teachers were among themselves, they were openly hostile towards the students and their parents. Likewise, the regular education teachers in the Typical Immersion (TI) school blamed students' falling test scores on discipline problems which they deemed were caused by the administration. In both cases, the regular education teachers did not empower themselves by accepting responsibility for what occurred in their classrooms, but instead looked aggressively outward for someone to blame, much like the teachers in the studies of Rist (1970/2000), Kailin (1999) and Sleeter (1993).

Sleeter (1993) suggested that a more racially diverse teaching corps could work to remedy this situation. However, Tyson's (2000) study of all-Black schools found little difference with regards to the teachers teaching the "correct" subject matter or language and attributing "goodness" to white cultural styles. This finding was supported in the data of the all African-American Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) teachers who themselves possessed a cultural deficiency model of education and prioritized the "Bâton Blanc." Yet, it must be noted that although the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) school attributed the students' failure to the parents' lack of support and students' home environment, they did not exhibit the animosity and anger toward the students and their
families which was observed in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) school. These findings support Sleeter's call for a more diverse teaching corps to avoid the "us vs. them" mentality in schools.

In contrast to the regular education teachers' aversion to difference, the immersion teachers, coming from the perspective of being different, saw differences as important and enriching. They and their students negotiated between control/self-determination, conflict/aide and French/English to a "third space." This "third space" is consistent with Bhabha's (1994) description, "it is the in-between space--that carries the burden of meaning in culture… And by exploring this Third Space we may elude the politics of polarity and emerge as the others of our selves" (p. 38-39). Immersion teachers believed that adapting to, or negotiating with, cultural and linguistic differences was an enriching, important experience for the students and that this adaptation or negotiation would then in turn lead students to be successful individuals, or as M. Kaiga called them "People with a capital 'P'" (INT, Kaiga, January 15, 2002). Immersion teachers discussed how they and their students would grow by exploring differences and similarities in each other's cultures and languages. As a class they created a community, an almost family-like environment in the classroom, and within that environment, students and teachers negotiated their differences.

The importance of this negotiation with regards to language is particularly relevant to this study. Bruner (1999) referred to Jacobson's metalinguistic gift and the capacity to "transcend [a languages] limits." Further he stated that the "real victims of the limits of language are those least aware of the language they speak" (p.19). Bruner went on to add, "If the limits imposed by the languages we use are expanded by increasing our
'linguistic awareness,' then another function of pedagogy is to cultivate such awareness" (p. 19). The immersion teachers—who had all benefited from learning second (or third or fourth) languages—appeared, like Bruner, to believe that learning another language was important for learning about oneself and for pedagogy in general. Mauriac was particularly insightful in saying the negotiation that students had to do between their mother language and French allowed them to become aware of language itself. This observation brings to light not only the importance of metaglinguistic awareness but also of the negotiation of difference which is necessary for its existence. This observation finds support in Egéa-Kuehne's (1996) belief that to develop this "metalinguistic competence," in fact to learn in general, students need to develop "a competency in understanding anything other than and different from, learners' prior knowledge" (p. 157).

This "metalinguistic gift," this ability to be aware of language itself, was observed in students' awareness of the many forms of French as in the cases of Cienna (TI) and Drew (EXI); the students' ability to perceive not only a difference in their home language but to understand that their home language was not viewed positively by the school, as in cases of Donovan (EXRE but with a heritage language background) Seth (TI), Deanna (TI) and Kole (TI).

As with language, negotiation of differences were also important in student/teacher interactions. In the regular education context, student problems or "problem students" were seen as obstacles which either you overcame—as in the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) class—or which you failed to overcome and then blamed on others—as in the Typical Regular Education (TRE) class. By contrast, in the immersion
classroom students' problems, like the students' learning style, were something to which teachers believed they must constantly adapt. They discussed the various ways they used to try to negotiate and work through both behavioral and pedagogical difficulties the students had. This supports Ellsworth's (1997) belief that educators must negotiate the "space between… what the teacher teaches and what the students learn" (cited in Kumashiro, 2000, p. 31). In immersion the teachers adapted to the students' differences while in regular education the students were supposed to conform to the teachers' method.

Engagement: Letting All the Students In

Rist (1970) related how teachers who excluded students from the educational process were in fact maintaining the unequal social hierarchy. In the regular education context (even in Mrs. Porte's EXRE class) students were excluded from much of the educational process; the control of subject matter, activities, help and remediation were in the hands of the teacher. If students did help other students, often it was not out of their own good will, but because a teacher told them to do it. In the Typical Regular Education (TRE) classes there were moments when the students were superfluous. When Mrs. Trahan went over all the correct answers, the students were not included despite the fact that they raised their hands to answer questions. The important thing was the correct answer and the teacher interacted with that and not with the students. In the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) class, when Teresa wanted to change the algorithm for long division, her "different method" was rejected, excluding her from having an impact on her educational process despite her efforts.
In this study, data reveal that the typical immersion students were very much engaged in their own education, which does not reflect the disengagement and resistance of students Ogbu (1995a, 1995b, 1999), Willis (1980), Foley (1990) and MacLeod (1995) described in their studies. Students' engagement in their instruction was observed in both the extreme and typical immersion contexts, and evidenced by their critiques of the teachers' teaching methods, their suggestions for different activities, their determination of subject matter studies in Typical Immersion (TI), and finally, their desire to make their learning experience "fun." Overall, inclusion in education was very important to immersion students. They were concerned not only with their own success but with the success of their fellow students as well. Immersion students helped other students in getting the teacher to respond; they helped with academic and linguistic problems and in providing the materials needed to do the work. Furthermore, when the students spoke of how to improve education they did not speak of improving education to help "me" (first person singular), rather they spoke of "us" (first person plural). In other words, the students considered one another as intrinsic parts of the educational experience in the immersion context. The immersion students' lower personal self-esteem and higher collective self-esteem could equally be attributed to the immersion students' concern and focus on the collective rather than on their individual selves. This is particularly important with regards to African-American students if, as Caldwell (1998) proposed, collective self-esteem is a more salient aspect than personal self-esteem for members of more collectivistic cultures such as African-Americans.

Ladson-Billings' (1994) description of successful teachers of African-American students depicted three of her four participant teachers as having culturally relevant
teaching practices which engaged their students in the learning process. Two aspects of culturally relevant teaching that Ladson-Billings (1994) described were found in the regular education context: using humor and real-life anecdotes. Underlying the teachers' strategy of humor and real-life experiences was the need for teachers to be insiders and to show that they belonged to the same community as their students. In the Typical Regular Education (TRE) class, Mrs. Trahan conducted measuring activities using the distances to places in town as examples. In the Extreme Regular Education (EXRE) class, Mrs. Lebrun used her own experiences with Mardi Gras and segregation in her hometown to engage her students' interest. This description of an insider working was underlined in Ladson-Billings suggestion that teacher preparation programs "systematically require teacher candidates to have prolonged immersion in African-American culture" (p.134).

Unlike the regular education teachers, the immersion teachers were not able to use humor in the classroom (because the students' language comprehension level was not advanced enough to comprehend humor... they did not "get" the jokes). However, the immersion teachers, who were definitively outsiders and had no "systematic" exposure to African-American culture, were equally able to share their experiences with their students using postcards from abroad and stories or songs they learned when they were children. In addition, they were found to use other aspects of Ladson-Billings culturally relevant practices such as having students learn collaboratively, and making connections between the students' community and global identity. Thus perhaps the important point for the teachers, both within this study and within the Ladson-Billings's (1994) study, was not whether their instruction was "culturally relevant" per se but rather whether they were willing to shore up what Ellsworth (1997) described as the "space between' the
teacher/teaching and learner/learning for instance, who the teacher thinks the students are and who they actually are" (cited in Kumashiro, 2000, p. 31).

In terms of teachers engaging and educating all their students, two teachers were very adept at negotiating the "space between" themselves, their students and education. Madame Mauriac (TI) and Mrs. Porte (EXRE) were both able to engage all their students in instruction by utilizing their students' own experiences as the starting point for that instruction. Neither teacher perceived where the students came from as "ignorance" as Britzman et al. (1993) described. Rather, both teachers saw the utilization of their students' experiences as an important way to link those students' lives to the knowledge they were trying to teach. How they ensured that all their students were engaged reflected the context--regular education or immersion--in which they taught. Mrs. Porte utilized very controlled games which required students to describe or relate their experiences. She called on each child one at a time to play the game. Madame Mauriac utilized student-selected projects and group or pair work to ensure that all students were included and engaged in instruction.

While humor was successfully used in the regular education context exclusively, the use of French socially engaged students in the Typical Immersion (TI) class. This social use of French supports Aguirre's (2000) findings that students prefer to engage in additive language learning situations, rather than imposed ones. Furthermore, the prevalence of L2 use in the Typical Immersion (TI) context compared to the lack of French use in the Extreme Immersion (EXI) context confirms Tarone and Swain's (1995) findings that upper elementary students have a predilection for their social language over their academic language. Since French was a social language in the Typical Immersion
(TI) class it was used more often than the purely academic French of the Extreme Immersion (EXI) class. This does not imply that the Extreme Immersion (EXI) students did not want to learn social French vocabulary as evidenced by their asking me specifically how to say "shut up" and "you crazy" much like the students in Tarone and Swain's (1995) study asked a classroom aide how to say "dweeb" in Spanish.

Besides the absence of socializing in L2, other factors kept Extreme Immersion (EXI) students from engaging in the French language: the "language safety nets" and the "LEAP non-comprehension trump card." The trump card will be explained in the following section, but the language safety nets existed in French and in English in the Extreme Immersion (EXI) classroom. The French "language safety net" consisted of the immersion teacher guessing what the students wanted before they finished their utterances or by completing the students' sentences to keep the student from struggling with the French language. The English "language safety net" was simply translating without the students' asking for a translation, so that teachers were assured of their students' comprehension. In other words the "language safety nets" kept students from having any conflicts with the French language, and this absence of conflict distanced the students from the French language and kept them from learning. Egéa-Kuehne (1996) discussed the importance of conflict in education. She stated that "'intellectual competence' means including otherness and multiple, even conflicting voices." She went on to state that "neutralizing education" such as providing language safety nets which keep students from grappling with the French, is "tantamount to a political decision not to educate" (p. 158).
Ancillary Findings

The Importance of Gender

The cohesiveness and helpfulness of African-American girls was a dominating theme which emerged in the study in three of the four contexts. The learning environment in the French immersion classroom, particularly the Typical Immersion (TI) classroom which focused on social interaction and peer/group instruction, was compatible with the African American girls' cohesiveness and their helpfulness. The finding of the importance of gender within the classroom, specifically the positive effect of immersion on African-American girls' student/student interactions and students' perceptions of other students replicates the conclusion of the pilot study (Haj-Broussard, 2002). Furthermore, the TRE African-American boy's self and collective self-esteem was much lower than all other groups in the study. This finding coupled with the corporal punishment complaints of the higher achieving African-American boys in regular education and the unequal treatment of boys in one EXRE class (Mr. Chenille's) point to a negative effect of the regular education classroom on African-American boys.

Using Mixed Methodology

The benefits of using mixed-methods within this study comprise another ancillary finding. The major reasoning for initiating this study was that mixed-methods allowed me to examine not only if immersion affected students' achievement but also how the immersion context differed from the regular education context. It was as if it opened the "black box" of research and allowed me to see the "why?" Furthermore, each method, both the quantitative and the qualitative, informed the other method. The descriptive data from the quantitative phase of this study determined which classes were selected to
participate in the qualitative phase, both typical and extreme classes. While the qualitative phase allowed for a different perspective and alternative explanations for the quantitative findings. For instance, the lack of significant difference in African-American scores could be related to the lack of true immersion instruction in the classroom that housed over one third of the African-American immersion students. Finally, the use of mixed-methods transformed limitations into productive spaces. For instance, the specific context of Louisiana French immersion, considered a threat to external validity in terms of quantitative methods, was essential to qualitative methods. Lincoln and Guba (1985) discuss how in qualitative studies "it is not possible to understand any phenomenon without reference to the context in which it is embedded" (p. 302). Thus mixed-methods created a hybrid space in which interpretation of the data was negotiated, a research "mestiza" (Anzaldúa, 1987).

Implications

The following pedagogical implications are suggested by this study. They concern classroom practices, conceptual transformation and French immersion programs.

Pedagogy

For classroom practice, the most important recommendation, whether in immersion or regular education, is to ensure that students are engaged in the learning process. All the successful instructional strategies used by the exceptional teachers in the study--humor, real-life experiences, group or pair work--involved approaches in which the students' input was necessary for interaction. Furthermore, students who could have an effect on their instruction, who had some measure of self-determination, were further engaged in learning. Overall, the findings relate that learning cannot be something "out
there," a "Bâton Blanc" to which the students need to accommodate, but rather learning must be a process in which the students interact with and have some sort of effect on instruction.

In terms of teacher education, it is vital that course work equally allows Student Teachers some measure of self-determination and input into their pedagogical education to ensure that they have experienced learning in which the learners and teachers interact and negotiate instruction. This way, their learning will reflect them and they can learn in the same manner as the one they need to teach.

Foundations of Education

Two recommendations regarding conceptual transformation are deduced from this study. The first is that it is imperative that teachers take responsibility for not only the positive occurrences in their classrooms but the negative ones also. It was found that the teachers who did not consider themselves as a pivotal force in the classrooms felt disempowered and did not hold out much hope for their struggling students. If teachers do not take responsibility, they relinquish their ability to affect the students and thusly will become disempowered. Further, administrators could help to empower teachers by allowing them more self-determination. Administrators whose fear of high-stakes tests led them to control all aspects of instruction only served to further disempower teachers and allowed them to relinquish responsibility for outcomes in their classrooms.

I also recommend that teachers, administrators and teacher education programs view linguistic and cultural differences as contributing to the richness and diversity of the learning experiences. Teachers who viewed differences as a chance to adapt oneself and grow were more likely to encourage autonomy and divergent thinking in their students.
In contrast, a focus on high-stakes tests in the schools and teacher education programs converges energies toward instilling students with the "Bâton Blanc" concept. It creates a hierarchical mechanistic environment in which the students become merely the recipients of the "Bâton Blanc" and all else is considered an obstacle to passing the test. But learning did not occur with the constant repetition of curriculum, it occurred when students interacted with, and had some sort of effect on, instruction.

**French Immersion Programs**

With regards to French immersion in Louisiana in particular, some shortcomings were identified within the program and need to be addressed. Primarily, professional development needs to be strengthened for Foreign Associate Teachers who are chosen to teach in the immersion context. This professional development needs to focus on the teaching of immersion pedagogy and classroom management. Too much precious time was lost in chaotic classrooms and English translation rather than using that time to further instruction. Moreover, the process of immersion needs to be more fully explained to the parents and administrators so that they do not undermine the process by insisting on translation for the LEAP tests or on English content books. In addition, professional development is needed in which administrators and teachers collaborate on the actual planning and implementation of the immersion class schedule to ensure that teachers and students are given solid blocks of time in the immersion context. Enough time needs to be given to ensure that a cohesive and articulated instructional program is not broken into transitional moments.

Finally, due to the tremendous constraints and pressures the regular education system puts on the immersion program it is recommended that a charter French
immersion school be established. A school which would not need to conform to the schedules of the regular education teacher and in which the immersion teachers could celebrate their students' differences without themselves being excluded, overlooked or look down upon.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

Because of the use of the third grade ITBS scores as a covariate, the four years of immersion prior to taking the ITBS were not taken into account. A longitudinal study of immersion could account for those four years. Because of the pivotal role of parents who choose to place their children in immersion, the effect of this parental involvement on the children's academic achievement and perceptions needs to be examined. The lack or absence of African-American students in immersion programs situated in schools with large African-American populations underscores the need to study which students enter or leave immersion and why. Finally a replication of this study in a geographical area where French is not a heritage language of the African-American students could increase the generalizability of the findings in this study and allow for conclusions regarding the effects that learning a heritage language versus simply learning a second language have on students.

**Conclusion**

Immersion is not a panacea for ameliorating African-American students' education. This was evidenced by the apparent debilitating effects on African-American immersion students due to actions taken out of fear of the LEAP test, such as the pro-English environment at the Extreme Immersion (EXI) school. Immersion, particularly programs with inexperienced teachers, cannot completely shield students from the system
in which it must work. However, in terms of the education of African-American students, this study does bring to light some issues and ideas which could positively affect African-American students' experiences in the classroom setting. In all contexts, the importance of engagement and negotiating the spaces between teachers and students, students and students, and students and curriculum cannot be overemphasized. In addition, the absence of complaints of corporal punishment in the immersion classrooms coupled with a more positive view of their school and a higher collective self-esteem appear to indicate that immersion offers African-American students some benefits that were not found in regular education. Furthermore, the positive collective self-esteem, extensive language skills and high LEAP scores of the Typical Immersion students indicate that immersion, when correctly implemented, is a beneficial environment for African-American students.
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Student Interview Guide

Code: ____________
School: _______________
Date: _______________
Time of Interview: Start _______ (AM/ PM)  End _______ (AM/ PM)
Interview location: __________________________

Open:
First I wanted to begin the interview talking about you and your fellow classmates. Now, I’m going to list some words and you tell me who you think of in your class when you think of these words. Tell me 5 people for each group. We will start with some easy words

Those who are boys…Who are the boys in the class? And would you go in that group?

Those who are girls…Who are the girls in the class? And would you go in that group?

+ Those who are happy…Who do you think are the five happiest students in class? And would you go in that group?

+ Those who are nice…Who do you think are the five nicest students in class? And would you go in that group?

+ Those who are smart…Who do you think are the five smartest students in class? And would you go in that group?

+ Those who are good at many things…Name five children in class who are good at many things? And would you go in that group?

+ Those who have many friends…Name five children in class who have many friends? And would you go in that group?

+ Those who like to go to school…Name five children in class who like to go to school? And would you go in that group?
- Those who the other children don’t like? Name five children in class who the other children not like as much? And would you go in that group?

- Those children who are not good at school work… Name five children in class who are not as good at school work… needs the teacher’s help the most? And would you go in that group?

+ Out of all the children in your class who would you most like to be best friends with?

+ in group _____  - in group _____
+ outgroup_____  - outgroup_____

(highest possible + 35 ; lowest possible –10)

If you were to name another group one that you felt described you and some of your friends, what would your group’s name be and who would you put in the group?

Notes and comments: (Record child’s demeanor, expressions etc)
APPENDIX C
OPEN-ENDED STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE
(REVISED FROM TYSON, 1999)

STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE (Tyson, 1999)

Code: ________________
School: ___________________
Date: ________________
Time of Interview: Start _______ (AM/ PM)  End _______ (AM/ PM)
Interview location: __________________________

OPEN:
I’ve been in your classroom for a little while and I know some of things that you all do, but I would like to
know how you see things in school. I want a student’s view. So if you can for a moment, pretend that I
don’t know and tell me in your own words what school is like for you.

SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT/ EXPERIENCES (1-16)

CLASSMATES (1-4)
Tell me about:
   1. Your friends in your class. PROBE: What are they like?

   2. the other kids in your class. PROBE: How do you feel about them? Why?

   3. Is there any difference between how your friends talk to you at school and how your friends talk to
      you at home?
      a. If so, what is the difference?

      b. Why do you think that is?

   4. Is there any difference between how your other classmates talk to you at school and how your
      friends talk to you at home?
      a. If so, what is the difference?

      b. Why do you think that is?

PERCEPTIONS OF TEACHER/TEACHER TREATMENT (5-9)
Tell me about:

   5. your teacher. PROBE: What is she/he like? How do you feel about her/him?

   6. how your teacher treats you. PROBE: Is your teacher nice to you or not? Why do you think that
      is?

   7. Does she help you whenever you need help?

   8. Do you think that she treats everyone the same way?
9. Do you have a favorite teacher? If yes, who and why is (was) she or he your favorite?

10. Have you ever had a teacher you didn’t like? What was she or he like?

11. Is there any difference between how your teacher(s) talk to you at school and how your parents talk to you at home?
   a. If so, what is the difference?
   b. Why do you think that is?

LEARNING (11-13)
Tell me about:

12. what you learn in school. PROBE: What kinds of things do you learn?
   a. Do you enjoy learning about those things?
   b. Do you think they’re easy or hard?

13. Do you have a favorite subject? If yes, what is it? Why?

14. Is there any subject that you do not like? Which is it? Why?

ACHIEVEMENT (3-7)
15. How are your grades so far this year?

16. Are your grades this year different from grades you’ve gotten in earlier grades? If yes:
   a. How so?
b. Why do you think that is?

17. Have you ever been on honor roll/ principal’s list? If yes, which one, when and how many times?

18. Do you think your grades say something about you? What do you think they say?

PROBLEMS
19. Have you had any trouble or problems in school? If yes, could you tell me about it?

SELF-PERCEPTIONS AND SELF-EXPECTATIONS (15-20)

KIND OF STUDENT
20. Let’s say you were Miss/Mrs/Mr/ Mme/ M ____________ sitting here with me now, and I asked her “Miss/Mrs/Mr/ Mme/ M ____________ tell me about __________, what kind of student is he/she?” What do you think she would say to me?

LANGUAGE USE
21. Is there any difference between how you talk at school and how you talk at home?

a. If so, what is the difference?

b. Why do you think that is?

22. Does anyone in your family speak a different language besides English?

a. What language do they speak?

EXPECTATIONS AND ASPIRATIONS (16-18)
23. Are you looking forward to the 5th grade?

C. If yes: What are you looking forward to?

D. If no: Why not?

24. How do you think you’ll do?
25. What do you want to be when you grow up?

SCHOOL PLANS (12-13)
26. Will you be going to this school next year?
   e. If not, why not and where will you be going?

IMMERSION ONLY
27. Will you be continuing in the immersion program next year?
   f. If not, why not and where will you be going?

CLOSE
Any other comments?

Notes and comments (Record child’s demeanor, expression, etc.)
APPENDIX D
OPEN-ENDED TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE
(REVISED FROM TYSON, 1999)

TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE (Tyson, 1999)

Code: _______________
School: ___________________
Date: ____________________
Time of Interview: Start _______(AM/ PM)  End _______(AM/ PM)
Interview location: __________________________

CAREER/SCHOOL CHOICE (1-3)
1. Tell me about your choice to become a teacher. PROBE: Why did you become a teacher.

2. Tell me about your teacher-training program.
   a. What kinds of things were required of you?

   b. What would you say are some of the most important things your training taught you?

   c. Do you think your training adequately prepared you for your present assignment? Why or why not?

SCHOOL CHOICE
3. What brought you to this school to teach?

TEACHER TRAINING AND BACKGROUND (4-5)
4. How long have you been teaching here?

5. Have you taught anywhere else? If yes, where?

SCHOOL EXPERIENCE (6-8)
6. What has your experience here been like?

7. Do you envision yourself teaching anywhere else in the future?

8. Would you like to teach in another setting? Why or why not?

EXPECTATIONS AND PERCEPTIONS OF STUDENTS (9-11)
STUDENT LEARNING
9. In your opinion, how do children learn best?

10. What do you see as the greatest challenge affecting young students today?
11. Does the language/dialect a student uses affect his/her learning? If so, how?

CHARACTERISTICS OF A GOOD CLASS (12)
12. Tell me about the best class you’ve had to teach so far.

   a. How does this year’s class compare to that class?

CHARACTERISTICS OF GOOD/BAD STUDENT (13-14)
13. How would you describe the best students you’ve ever had?

14. Have you ever had any students you considered problems? What happened and how did you handle it (them)?

DESCRIBE STUDENTS
15. Tell me about your class this year.

EXPECTATIONS FOR CLASS (GROUP) (16-17)
16. How have things been going with your class this year?

17. Do you have any concerns about this class?

EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENTS (INDIVIDUAL) (18-19)
18. Do you have any concerns about individual students? Could you describe what kind of problem they are having? Do you know why?

19. At any point thus far in the year were there any students who you thought you might need to be retained? What weakness will cause them to be retained?

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF CLASS/STUDENTS (20-21)
20. When you think about your students who aren’t doing well, what do you think are the reasons for this?

21. When you think about your students who are doing well, what do you think are the reasons for this?

TEACHER PRACTICES (22-26)

VIEWS OF TEACHER ROLE
22. Who is responsible for student’s learning?

23. What is your central mission as a teacher?
24. What is the greatest challenge that you face as a teacher today?

MISC.

25. What is the significance of the ITBS/LEAP for you as a teacher? How and for what purpose are the results used?

QUESTIONS CONCERNING INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

Additional comments

TEACHER DEMOGRAPHICS

1. MALE / FEMALE

2. ETHNICITY _____________

3. Age range ___20's ___30's ___40's ___50's ___over 50 years young

4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
   ___ Bachelors Degree with teacher certification
   ___ Bachelors Degree without teacher certification (specify # of credit needed___)
   ___ Masters Degree ____
   ___ Specialist ______
   ___ Other advanced degree (please specify) ____________

8. What is your annual salary from your school board before taxes?
   under 20,000
   ___ 20,000-24,999
   ___ 25,000-29,999
   ___ 30,000-34,999
   ___ 35,000-39,999
   ___ 40,000-44,999
   ___ 45,000-49,999
   ___ 50,000 or over

389
A- Do you have any concerns about individual students? Could you describe what kinds of problems they are having? Do you know why?

B- Do you think the language / dialect a student uses will affect their LEAP scores? If so, how?

C- Overall, how do you think your students would describe you? Are there any students you think would give a completely different description? How would their description differ from the first one?

D- This question varied for some teachers and was not asked of others.

Maurice: With regards to translation, or the dominance of English in the class, what would you do or like to see happen next year that might ameliorate that situation?

Kaiga: Over the course of my observations, I’ve noticed that the girls are more eager to respond and that they volunteer information. While the boys basically need to be called on in order to be engaged in the class. Do you agree with this observation? And why do you think that is?

Chenille: Alright. Um, what kinds of, cause like I said I haven't been able to see your science class thus far, and, um, we've been doing the, um, division, long division math… What kinds of hands-on activities do you do in your class to kind of give me, instead of just a description of the ones, some of the activities that I've missed?

Lebrun: What do you think is missing from education today?
Contact Summary Form (Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Contact type: Observation or Interview Site:
Written by: Contact date:

1. What were the main issues or themes that struck you in this contact?

2. Summarize the information you got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions you had for this contact.

   Question/s
   Information

3. Anything else that struck you as salient, interesting, illuminating or important in this contact?

4. What new (or remaining) target questions do you have in considering the next contact with this site?
DIRECTIONS: For each of the following questions, please give a weight or percent to each of the two choices according to your preference. For example:

If most students complete a home assignment you make, it is usually
a. because of their personal motivation. Or
b. because you were very clear in making the assignment?

You may feel that students complete assignments more because of personal motivation than because of your clarity in making the assignment. In that case you might answer:

85% a
15% b

Or you may feel quite the opposite. The percentage will vary according to how strongly you feel about each alternative. You may see choose (b) totally responsible for students completing assignments and might give it 99%. Choice (a) would then get 1%. The two must add up to 100%.

1) If a student does well in your class, would it probably be
   a. because that student had natural ability to do well  _____ or
   b. because of the encouragement you offered?  _____

2) When your class is having trouble understanding something you have taught, is it usually
   a. because you did not explain it very clearly, _____ or
   b. because your students are slow in understanding difficult _____ concepts?

3) When most of your students do well on a test, is it more likely to be
   a. because the test was very easy, _____ or
   b. because you let them know what you expected?  _____

School:
Date:
Initials:

The responsibility for student achievement questionnaire (Guskey, 1981)
4) When a student in your class can’t remember something you said just moments before, is it usually
   a. because you didn’t stress the point strongly enough _______ or
   b. because some students just don’t pay attention? _______

5) Suppose your principal says you are doing a fine job. Is that likely to happen
   a. because you’ve been successful with most of your students, _______
       or
   b. because principals say that sort of thing to motivate teachers? _______

6) Suppose you are particularly successful with one class. Would it probably happen
   a. because you helped them overcome their learning difficulties, _______
       or
   b. because these students usually do well in school? _______

7) If your students learn an idea quickly, is it
   a. because you were successful in encouraging their learning efforts, _______
       or
   b. because your students are basically intelligent? _______

8) If your principal suggests you change some of your class procedures, is it more likely
   a. because of his/her personal ideas about teaching methodology, _______ or
   b. because your students haven’t been doing well? _______

9) When a large percentage of the students in your class are doing poorly, does it usually happen
   a. because they have done poorly before and don’t really try, _______ or
b. because you haven’t had the time to give them all the help _______ they need?

10) When your students seem to learn something easily, is it usually
   a. because they were already interested in it, _______ or
   b. because you have helped them organize concepts? _______

11) When students in your class forget something that you explained before, is it usually
   a. because most students forget new concepts quickly, _____ or
   b. because you didn’t get them actively involved? _______

12) When you find it hard to get a lesson across to particular students, is it
   a. because you haven’t insisted on their learning earlier _______
   lessons
   b. because they are just slow in understanding and learning? _______

13) Suppose you present a new idea to your students and most of them
   remember it, is it likely to be
   a. because you reviewed and re-explained difficult parts, _______ or
   b. because they were interested in it even before you explained it?_______

14) When your students do poorly on a test, is it
   a. because they didn’t really expect to do well, _______ or
   b. because you didn’t insist that they prepare adequately? _______

15) When parents commend you on your work as a teacher is it usually
   a. because you have made a special effort with their child, _______ or
   b. because their child is generally a good student? _______

16) If a child doesn’t do well in your class, would it probably be
17) Suppose you don’t have as much success as usual with a particular class. Would this happen

a. because you didn’t plan as carefully as usual, _______ or

b. because these students just had less ability than others? _______

18) If one of your students says, “Ya know, you’re a pretty good teacher,” is it probably

a. because you make the learning environment interesting for that _______ student, or

b. because students generally try to get on the teacher’s good side. _______

19) Suppose you find that many students are eager to be in your class. Do you think this would happen

a. because most students feel you have nice a personality, _______ or

b. because you encourage most of your students to learn well? _______

20) Suppose you are trying to help a student solve a particular problem but she/he is having great difficulty with it. Would that happen

a. because you may not be explaining it at her/his level, _______ or

b. because she/he is not used to being helped by adults? _______

21) When you find it easy to get a lesson across to a class, is it

a. because you could get most students to participate in the lesson, _______ or

b. because the lesson was an easy one to teach? _______
22) When a student in your class remembers something you talked about weeks before, is it usually

a. because some students have that potential to remember things well, _______ or

b. because you made the point interesting for that student? _______

23) If you are working with a student who can’t understand a concept and he/she suddenly gets it, is it likely that happened

a. because you have given him/her regular feedback on each learning step, _______ or

b. because he/she usually works on something until he/she gets it? _______

24) When you are having a hard time getting your students interested in a lesson, is it usually

a. because you didn’t have time to plan the presentation well, _______
   or

b. because your students are generally hard to motivate? _______

25) If one of your students says, “You’re a rotten teacher!” is it probably

a. because many of your students have learning problems, _______ or

b. because you haven’t been able to give that student enough individual _______ attention?

26) When your students seem interested in your lessons right from the beginning, is it

a. because the topic is one students generally find interesting, _______ or

b. because you were able to get most of the students involved? _______
27) If you were to discover most of the students in your class are doing very well, would it probably be

a. because their parents were supporting the school’s efforts, or ______

b. because you had been able to motivate them to work hard? ______

28) When your students seem to have difficulty learning something, is it usually

a. because you are not willing to really work at it, or ______

b. because you weren’t able to make it interesting for them? ______

29) If a parent is critical of you as a teacher, is it likely to be

a. because you have difficulty getting the parent’s child to do the work you ______ require, or

b. because that parent’s child is developmentally not ready to do well in your ______ class?

30) On those days when you are depressed about teaching, is it

a. because learning is a difficult activity for many of your students, ______

or

b. because you just weren’t able to motivate your students to work as hard as ______ they should?
APPENDIX H
REVISED COLLECTIVE SELF-ESTEEM SCALE (CALDWELL, 1998)

Revised collective self-esteem scale (Caldwell, 1998)

PART I. Please tell us about yourself

Student ID # ____________________________

School ID # ____________________________ School Name ____________________________

1. Circle one: Girl Boy

2. What is your ethnic background? A. Black/African American ______ D. Native American ______
   B. Latino/Hispanic ______ E. Asian/Pacific Islander ______
   C. White/European American ______ F. Other ______

3. How old are you? ______ 4. What grade are you in? ______
### PART III.

Please circle the answer that best describes how you feel. Circle "A" for Agree, "D" for Disagree, and "NS" for Not Sure. Please read each sentence carefully before answering.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I am a good member of my <strong>SCHOOL</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel I don’t have much to offer to my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I cooperate with others in my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am a bad member of my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I wish I did not belong to my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am glad to be a member of my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I feel that my school is no good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel good about my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other people think that my school is good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Most people think that my school is worse than other schools</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other people respect my school</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Other people think that my school is no good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My school has very little to do with how I feel about myself</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. School is an important part of who I am</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. My school is not important to what kind of person I am</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My school is important to my self-image</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix B.6: Familial Collective Self-Esteem Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17. I am a good member of my <strong>FAMILY</strong></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. I feel I don’t have much to offer to my family</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I cooperate with my family members</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am a bad member of my family</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I wish I did not belong to my family</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I am glad to be a member of my family</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I feel that my family is no good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I feel good about my family</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Other people think that my family is good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Most people think that my family is worse than other families</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Other people respect my family</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Other people think that my family is no good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My family has very little to do with how I feel about myself</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My family is an important part of who I am</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My family is not important to what kind of person I am</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My family is important to my self-image</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B.7: Ethnic Collective Self-Esteem Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33. I am a good member of my <strong>ETHNIC GROUP</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I don’t have much to offer to my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I cooperate with others of my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I am a bad member of my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. I wish I did not belong to my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I am glad to be a member of my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I feel that my ethnic group is no good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I feel good about my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Other people think that my ethnic group is good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Most people think that my ethnic group is worse than other ethnic groups</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Other people respect my ethnic group</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Other people think that my ethnic group is no good</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. My ethnic group has very little to do with how I feel about myself</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. My ethnic group is an important part of who I am</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. My ethnic group is not important to what kind of person I am</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
48. My ethnic group is important to my self-image  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>NS</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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LSU INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD (IRB) for
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APPLICATION FOR EXEMPTION FROM INSTITUTIONAL OVERSIGHT

Unless they are qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/projects using living humans as subjects, or samples or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

Instructions: Complete this form. If exemption seems likely, submit it. If not, submit regular IRB application. Help is available from Dr. Robert Mathews, 578-8692, irb@lisesu.edu or any screening committee member.
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If Student, name supervising professor  Dr. Egér-Keuch  Ph: 578-2429

Mailing Address  1044 Leger Rd  Ph 332-0413

Project Title  What's the difference, cher?: Comparing experience of African American students in a French immersion context and regular education curricula
Agency expected to fund project  MLA

Subject pool (e.g. Psychology Students) Louisiana 4th grade public school students

Circle any "vulnerable populations" to be used: [ ] children <18  [ ] the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the aged, other. Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.
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   NO    Continue to see if research can be exempted from IRB oversight.
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</tr>
<tr>
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AUTHORIZATION FORMS

Louisiana State University
Supervisor's Authorization Form

What's the difference, cher?:
Comparing experiences in French immersion and regular education

Michelle Haj-Broussard
& Dr. Egéa-Kuehne, faculty advisor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Phone: 337-332-0673 (after 6)
Cell: 337-781-4997 (anytime)
e-mail: mhajbr1@lsu.edu

PURPOSE OF STUDY
French Immersion has been shown to teach content as well as regular education while teaching a second language. This study will compare the experiences of students in the French immersion classroom to experiences of students in the regular education classroom.

PROCEDURES:
The study employs student and teacher interviews, questionnaires, standardized test scores and direct observation. The classes will be observed once a week over a five-week period.

POTENTIAL RISKS:
The study will not cause any psychological harm to the participants. The researcher will select some students to be interviewed, but the students' participation in these interviews will be voluntary and they can decline at any time before or during the interview.

BENEFITS:
The benefits of this study include:
(1) Providing a global evaluation of Louisiana's French immersion program in terms of student self-esteem and academic achievement.
(2) Providing an analysis of student and teacher interactions that may affect the students' academic achievement and/or self-esteem
(3) Providing an analysis of student and teacher perceptions that may affect the students' academic achievement and/or self-esteem
(4) Discovering factors from one context, whether it be regular education or French immersion, which may be important in the other context to improve students' academic achievement and/or self-esteem.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
To ensure confidentiality, the schools, teachers’, learners' and parents’ names will be coded in the study.
## Outline of Research Design and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline:</th>
<th>Procedure:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Septemb er and October 2001</strong></td>
<td>Authorization forms: IRB, School Board and Principal, Consent forms: Parents Assent forms: Students Data Collection: Demographic data and ITBS scores <strong>(ALL PARTICIPATING PARISHES)</strong>. Select 4 classes statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>November 2001</strong></td>
<td><strong>WITHIN THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS ONLY</strong> Classroom observations Student interviews <strong>(interviews will be done during non-LEAP subjects)</strong> Teacher interviews ½ DAY A WEEK FOR A TOTAL OF 4 WEEKS IN EACH OF THE <strong>4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>December 2001</strong></td>
<td><strong>WITHIN THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS ONLY</strong> Classroom observations (FINISH UP 4TH WEEK OF OBSERVATION) Revision of final interviews based on classroom observations and initial interviews. Student interviews <strong>(interviews will be done during non-LEAP subjects)</strong> Teacher interviews Questionnaires LAST MONTH IN THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>January 2001</strong></td>
<td>Analysis of observations, interviews and questionnaires Provide an individual classroom case study report to each teacher for his/her comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>February 2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>March and April 2001</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>May 2001</strong></td>
<td>Data Collection: LEAP Scores for the fourth grade <strong>(ALL PARTICIPATING PARISHES)</strong>. Data analysis: integrate scores into final case study</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I authorize this study on students' experiences in the immersion classroom or in the regular education classroom.

If, during the course of this study, significant new information becomes available that may relate to my willingness to continue to authorize this study, this information will be provided to me by the investigator.

I understand that my authorization is voluntary and that I may withdraw my authorization for this study at any time.

I understand that any information derived from this research project which personally identifies anyone involved will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subject rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Matthews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, 225-578-8692. I authorize the study described above and acknowledge the researcher's obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form if signed by me.

I have been fully informed of the above-described procedure with its possible benefits and risks and I give my permission for participation (or participation of my child) in the study.

________________________________            __________
Supervisor's signature                      Date

________________________________
Supervisor's  name (print)

Please check one:

As a participating parish, I would like a summary of the study findings.

_____ yes       _____ no
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PARENT/TEACHER CONSENT FORMS

Louisiana State University
Consent Form

What's the difference, cher? :
Comparing experiences of Louisiana students
in a French immersion context and a regular education context.

Michelle Haj-Broussard
& Dr. Egéa-Kuehne, faculty advisor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Phone: 337-332-0673 (after 6); Cell: 337-781-4997 (anytime)
E-mail: mhajbr1@lsu.edu

PURPOSE OF STUDY
French Immersion has been shown to teach content as well as regular education while teaching a second language. This study will compare the experiences of Louisiana students in the French immersion classroom to experiences of students in the regular education classroom.

PROCEDURES:
The study employs student and teacher interviews, questionnaires, standardized test scores and direct observation. The classes will be observed once a week over a five-week period.

POTENTIAL RISKS:
The study will not cause any psychological harm to the participants. The researcher will select some students to be interviewed, but the students' participation in these interviews will be voluntary and they can decline at any time before or during the interview.

BENEFITS:
The benefits of this study include:

(5) Providing a global evaluation of Louisiana's French immersion program in terms of student self-esteem and academic achievement.
(6) Providing an analysis of student and teacher interactions that may affect the students' academic achievement and/or self-esteem
(7) Providing an analysis of student and teacher perceptions that may affect the students' academic achievement and/or self-esteem
(8) Discovering factors from one context, whether it be regular education or French immersion, which may be important in the other context to improve students' academic achievement and/or self-esteem.

CONFIDENTIALITY:
To ensure confidentiality, the schools, teachers’, learners' and parents’ names will be coded in the study.
### Outline of Research Design and Procedures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September-December 2001</td>
<td>Authorization forms: IRB, School Board and Principal,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent forms: Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assent forms: Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data Collection: Demographic data and ITBS scores (ALL PARTICIPATING PARISHES),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Select 4 classes statewide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2001</td>
<td><strong>WITHIN THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS ONLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interviews (&lt;span style=&quot;color:blue;&quot;&gt;interviews will be done during non-LEAP subjects&lt;/span&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>½ DAY A WEEK FOR A TOTAL OF 4 WEEKS IN EACH OF THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2001</td>
<td><strong>WITHIN THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS ONLY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Classroom observations (FINISH UP 4TH WEEK OF OBSERVATION)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revision of final interviews based on classroom observations and initial interviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student interviews (&lt;span style=&quot;color:blue;&quot;&gt;interviews will be done during non-LEAP subjects&lt;/span&gt;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LAST MONTH IN THE 4 SELECTED CLASSROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2001</td>
<td>Analysis of observations, interviews and questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide an individual classroom case study report to each teacher for his/her comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2001</td>
<td>Data Collection: LEAP Scores for the fourth grade (ALL PARTICIPATING PARISHES),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data analysis: integrate scores into final case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I agree to participate (or have my child participate) in this study on students' experiences in the immersion classroom or in the regular education classroom.

If, during the course of this study, significant new information becomes available that may relate to my willingness to continue to participate in this study, this information will be provided to me by the investigator.

I understand that I may withdraw from this study at any time.

I voluntarily consent to participate in this study.

I understand that any information derived from this research project which personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered. I may direct additional questions regarding study specifics to the investigator. If I have questions about subject rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Matthews, Chairman, LSU Institutional Review Board, 225-578-8692. I agree to participate in the study described above and acknowledge the researcher's obligation to provide me with a copy of this consent form if signed by me.

I have been fully informed of the above-described procedure with its possible benefits and risks and I give my permission for participation (or participation of my child) in the study.

Subject or Parent/Guardian signature

Subject or Parent/Guardian name (print)

Date
I _______________________ agree to participate in this study about student experiences in the French immersion classroom and the regular education classroom.

If, during the course of this study significant new information becomes available that may relate to my willingness to participate in this study, this information will be provided to me by the investigator.

I understand that I may withdraw from this study at any time.

I voluntarily agree to participate in this study.

I understand that any information which personally identifies me will not be voluntarily released or disclosed without my separate consent, except as specifically required by law.

The study has been discussed with me and all my questions have been answered.

________________________           ______
Witness               DATE

SIGNATURE OF CHILD                                      DATE
APPENDIX M
CLASSROOM INTERACTION RATING FORM (KNOX ET AL., 1972)

1) Teachers vary considerably in the extent to which they plan in detail for learning activities. Some teachers plan every step of the lesson in advance. Others sketch out the major objectives. Still others seem to make no advance plans. To what extent did this class's learning activities seem to be planned in advance?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Seemed not to be planned</th>
<th>Major objectives seemed to be planned but not the details</th>
<th>Every step seemed to be laid out in advance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At all</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Some classrooms appear to be open and free. Others are more controlled and regulated. Students may participate spontaneously, or only when the teacher clearly expects them to do so. How would you rate this class?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlled: Students</th>
<th>Open: Students talked Spontaneously to Teacher and among Themselves.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participated only when</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly expected or Required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) Students in classroom situations may become anxious and uncomfortable. One reason is that they may need help in their learning activities but are reluctant to ask for it. The kinds of help they might profitably use ranges from clarification of instruction to the detailed explanation of a point to outright help in solving a problem. How attentive did the teacher seem to be to the student's various learning needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Completely inattentive to Students' needs for Help in learning activities</th>
<th>Very attentive to Students' needs for Help in learning activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To students' needs for Help in learning activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Student may become uninterested in what goes on in the class unless their interest and feelings are met. Students' interests may be accommodated by tailoring course
content to specific needs or by the manner of presentation of more traditional content, e.g., through examples, references to everyday life. How much effort did the teacher put forth to accommodate students’ interests and feelings?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made no attempt to Accommodate students’ Interests and feelings</th>
<th>Continually attempted To meet students’ Interests and feelings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Some students are naturally enthusiastic while others need to be aroused to participate in learning activities. To what extent did the teacher evoke participation in learning activities intended for the class as a whole?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher did not seem Able to evoke any Participation from students</th>
<th>Teacher evoked Enthusiastic participation From students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Some teachers hold students’ attention; in other classes, many students are "miles away." To what extent did students remain attentive to classroom activities and work steadily?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students consistently Attentive and worked Steadily</th>
<th>Students’ attention Wandered, little time Spent actually working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Overall, how formally was the class conducted? Did the teacher refer to students as Mr., Miss? To what extent did the teacher act in a reserved, official manner, and expect the class to show deference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher conducted class Quite informally</th>
<th>Teacher conducted class Very formally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) When it was appropriate, how frequently did the teacher make encouraging remarks to students or act in some other positively reinforcing way to students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never gave positive Reinforcement</th>
<th>At every opportunity Gave positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) During the class sessions, as students recite or talk, they may give wrong answers or show that they misunderstand, etc. How did the teacher handle such situations? To what extent did the teacher attempt to minimize *a sense of failure* in the students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Made evaluations of</th>
<th>Made evaluations of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students' performance</td>
<td>Students' performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So as to heighten their</td>
<td>So as to minimize their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of failure</td>
<td>Sense of failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

10) To what extent was the physical setting of the class distracting? (For example, lighting, acoustics, outside noise, dirt, disrepair of furniture)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Few or no distractions</th>
<th>Typical classroom</th>
<th>A great many distractions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

11) Were the teacher and students tuned in on the same wavelength? Did each seem to know what the other was talking about? To what extent did they *understand each other*?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Almost always seemed to</th>
<th>Deep and complete understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Be talking past each other</td>
<td>of what each was saying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
**APPENDIX N**

**THE SOUTHWESTERN COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY**

**INTERACTION OBSERVATION SCHEDULE (SCIOS)**

*(LIBERTY & BEMIS, 1970)*

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIOS</th>
<th>Section I</th>
<th>Section VI</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rc1</td>
<td>ps ftsg in seats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc2</td>
<td>ps lvg seats (lqht perm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc3</td>
<td>ps spkg inapprop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc4</td>
<td>ps lkng at obs at rear of ra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc5</td>
<td>ps inttrptng others (tlkg, pokng, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc6</td>
<td>ps drppng objcts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rc7</td>
<td>ps refusng t rqst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIOS</th>
<th>Section II</th>
<th>Section VII</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rs1</td>
<td>ps ign t rqst</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs2</td>
<td>ps not wrkg on assgned tsk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs3</td>
<td>ps making inapp, disruptive rsp (unsol,comm)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs4</td>
<td>ps shy, fearful (head down, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs5</td>
<td>ps drpgmg (gas out wind.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rs6</td>
<td>ps copying frm othes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCIOS</th>
<th>Section III</th>
<th>Section VIII</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vl</td>
<td>ps rsg hand bef spkg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v2</td>
<td>ps askng q abt s cmtnt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v3</td>
<td>ps askng t fo hlp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v4</td>
<td>ps askng t fo appl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v5</td>
<td>ps vlngng info</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v6</td>
<td>ps ofrng assist or coop to fally p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v7</td>
<td>Majority of cts mks solicited rsp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Teacher:**
**School:**
**Observer:**
**Date:**
**Time:**
**Boys:**
**Girls:**

**Timing**
- I 0-2 min.
- II 2-4
- III 4-6
- IV 6-8
- V 8-10
- VI 10-12
- VII 12-14

---
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Subject Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oral Language Program</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Language Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>Arts and Crafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV or Radio</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section IV

| a1 | t alls p lv st whot perm |
| a2 | t prs p |
| a3 | t cala p hny, der, etc. |
| a4 | t tchs p |
| a5 | t asks or alls p to hlp ech other |
| a6 | p ask fo hlp a t hlpd imm |
| a7 | t uses enc rsk, pr rwd vrbbl |
| a8 | t gives or prmises rwd |
| a9 | t spol |
| a10 | t alls p spk whot perm |

Section V

| d1 | t wrns p (or thrtns.) |
| d2 | t frne, gls at p |
| d3 | t punsh p |
| d4 | t cala on non-vol |
| d5 | t uses scrm |
| d6 | t crit or corr p |
| d7 | t spks ovr p noise |
| d8 | t igns, int, rej p ans or q |
Contact Summary Form (Miles & Huberman, 1994)

Contact type: Observation __X__ or Interview __X__ Site: LEE
Written by: MHB Contact date: 2/4/02

5. What were the main issues or themes that struck you in this contact?

- Students encouraged to talk in French about non-academic subjects
- As the teacher is teaching there is a lot of social interaction (esp between boys, boys somewhat segregated)
- Seth seems disengaged and bored yet the teacher doesn't perceive him like that
- Teacher integrates other subjects and French language in her instruction

6. Summarize the information you got (or failed to get) on each of the target questions you had for this contact.

Question/s

1) Do teachers stay on students who don't understand?
2) How do teachers call on girls/boys?

Information

1) Students ask questions when the don't understand (proactive!). Teacher asks questions to verify that students have understood
2) During the timeline activity the boys were asked to answer questions while the girls were called on to read definitions (called on equally but different tasks)

7. Anything else that struck you as salient, interesting, illuminating or important in this contact?

- Students socializing does not interrupt instruction as much as class A (but teacher's time isn't as limited)
- Interruptions from English teacher contribute to English Dominance (her remarks are instructional and related to the topics at hand or help w/ discipline, but they don't help the language situation)

8. What new (or remaining) target questions do you have in considering the next contact with this site?

Do teachers call on W or AA more or the same?
Focus on the 8 students and their attitudes, behavior and interactions.

Concern: I need to pay attention to students who don't understand, but that didn't seem to happen.
APPENDIX P
QQ PLOT MATHEMATICS
APPENDIX S

BOX PLOT LANGUAGE
Michelle Haj-Broussard was born in Beloit, Wisconsin, to Sami Haj and Mona Ristovv. After dropping out of high school, she attended the University of Southwestern Louisiana (USL) where she graduated in 1991 with a degree in French and a minor in anthropology. She earned her master's degree in education at USL in 1995 by taking evening and summer classes while she taught French and French immersion at the K-12 level. She has been teaching French in Acadiana for ten years and has worked to launch three French immersion programs in three different parishes in Louisiana. She is currently the president of the Louisiana Consortium of Immersion Schools.

Michelle entered the doctoral program at Louisiana State University in the fall of 1997. While working toward her degree, she has presented at various international, national and regional conferences; she has published her pilot study and she has co-authored a book chapter. She is currently working on two manuscripts, one of which has been submitted for publication. Michelle will receive the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in curriculum and instruction in August 2003.