UCLA
Issues in Applied Linguistics

Title
Looking Within and Beyond: An on-the-Ground Account of Arizona Teachers' Implementation of the Four-Hour English Language Development Model

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5pw9w0fv

Journal
Issues in Applied Linguistics, 18(2)

ISSN
1050-4273

Authors
Peer, Karisa
Pérez, Karla

Publication Date
2010

DOI
10.5070/L4182005338

Copyright Information
Copyright 2010 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at https://escholarship.org/terms

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

Looking Within and Beyond: An on-the-Ground Account of Arizona Teachers' Implementation of the Four-Hour English Language Development Model

Karisa J. Peer and Karla C. Pérez
University of California, Los Angeles

This article focuses on teachers' key role as implementers of language policy. It looks at how teachers uphold, modify, or even reject language policy through their teaching practice. First, we touch on the English-only movement in the United States, which influenced the creation and implementation of the 4-hour English Language Development (ELD) model in Arizona. Next, we present the components of the 4-hour ELD model (i.e., Discrete Skills Inventory, Super SEI Strategies, time allocations). We turn to Ricento and Hornberger's piece (1996), which discusses how policy formation and implementation consists of many layers; teachers' roles are often underemphasized. We then describe the methods and purpose of the Lillie et al. (2010) study and explain how the present study emerged from it. We move on to present three vignettes that capture the varying ways in which teachers enact the 4-hour ELD model. Key findings were that although the 4-hour ELD model was prescriptive, teachers ultimately shaped curriculum in their own classrooms, thereby playing a pivotal role in language policy implementation.

Introduction

> I know that it is not the English language that hurts me, but what the oppressors do with it, how they shape it to become territory that limits and defines, how they make it a weapon that can shame, humiliate, colonize (bell hooks, 1994, pp. 168).

We begin our piece with a quote by bell hooks, a writer and social critic. hooks asserts that the English language can be used as a tool that has the ability to simultaneously empower some groups and disempower others. She notes that it is not the English language itself that negatively impacts people; rather, it is the way in which social actors, institutions, and policies monopolize language that serves to alienate and marginalize disenfranchised members of society. Paul Kroskrity, an expert in the field of linguistic anthropology, also argues that efforts to standardize language at the national level (e.g., the English-only movement in the United States) are directly tied to political and social motives (Kroskrity, 2004, pp. 501). Such movements are often popularized because they are deemed as efficient (e.g., facility of economic transactions, speedier transitions into schools and the workplace, etc.), yet their pernicious effects are frequently disregarded.

The belief that English-only instruction is superior to other types of language instruction (e.g., bilingual education) shaped the creation of Arizona's state-

Issues in Applied Linguistics ISSN 1050-4273
© 2011, Regents of the University of California
Vol. 18 No. 2, 199-214

mandated 4-hour English language development (ELD) model[1] (Martinez-Wenzl, Gándara, & Pérez, 2010). Our 2010 study of Arizona classrooms (Lillie et al.) sought to investigate how the 4-hour ELD model directly shaped and impacted curricular and instructional practices in schools. We found that the 4-hour ELD model disempowered certain groups (e.g., English learners were negatively impacted by lower graduation rates, watered down[2] curriculum, and increased segregation) while it empowered others (e.g., educators, administrators, political figures who were proponents of an English-only model of instruction).

After the completion of the Lillie et al. (2010) study, we felt it was important to create another piece that would provide an on-the-ground account of how Arizona teachers, in particular, were implementing the 4-hour ELD model in their classrooms. In line with this special edition of *Issues in Applied Linguistics*, which focuses on the linguistic diversity in American classrooms, this article will highlight the variation[3] that can be seen among Arizona teachers in their implementation of the 4-hour ELD model. Our primary goal in this piece is to highlight that although language policy may shape and even control the creation and implementation of classroom curriculum, teachers ultimately determine how they will enact such policies in their classrooms (Ricento & Hornberger, 1996). Our study sought to answer the following questions:

(1) What happens *pedagogically*[4] when Arizona teachers are required to operate in a highly restrictive and prescriptive English language development model as mandated by the state?

(2) How does policy implementation (4-hour ELD model) vary as teachers draw from their own teaching experiences and personal backgrounds?

We will now provide some background on the evolution of Arizona's 4-hour ELD Model, followed by a brief description of the methods we employed in our study.

The Evolution of Arizona's 4-Hour ELD Model

National Landscape of Restrictive Language Policy

In order to understand the impact of the 4-hour ELD model, it is crucial to contextualize it along national lines. At the end of the 1990s and continuing into the next decade, voters were asked to determine policy for educating English learners in their respective states (e.g., California's Proposition 227, Arizona's proposition 203, Massachusetts' Question 2, Colorado's Proposition 31, and Oregon's Measure 58). Voters in Colorado and Oregon rejected these English-only initiatives. Yet, anti-bilingual propositions eventually became legislation in California, Arizona, and Massachusetts. Of particular importance to this article, Arizona's Proposition 203 in 2000, mandated that English learners be educated for one year through an

approach called *sheltered* (or *structured*) *English immersion* (SEI). SEI requires that all instruction be conducted in English; students are then expected to transfer into mainstream[5] classrooms.

Historically, the fate of English learners in Arizona schools has been uncertain. For instance, *Flores v Arizona* in 1992 questioned whether the education of English learners was adequately funded by the state (e.g., resources, qualified teachers, and appropriate methods of instruction). In 2000, Judge Marquez ruled that there were certain inadequacies when it came to the education of English learners. He called for several programmatic and legislative changes. Six years passed and due to the state's lack of compliance, HB 2064 was enacted; it mandated a statewide revision of SEI (later to be referred to as the 4-hour ELD model). In 2009, Judge Alito upheld that SEI was a *superior form of instruction* for English learners (Martinez-Wenzl et al., 2010). The *Flores* case currently remains in dispute.

The Components of the 4-Hour ELD Model

When SEI was written into law in 2000 with the passing of Proposition 203, it was loosely defined. This meant that the assistance provided to ELs[6] varied drastically in Arizona schools. As a result, the English Language Learner Task Force was established with the intent of outlining more specific parameters to better serve English learners. The Task Force drafted what was termed the 4-hour ELD model. It specified that English instruction be conducted in four-hour blocks that targeted discrete language skills of language production (e.g., conversation, grammar, reading, vocabulary, and writing). Table 1 describes the 4-hour time allocations and separate language skills targeted within each block of time.

Table 1.
*Time Allocations for Elementary School Level (10% flexibility)**

English Language Proficiency Level**	Conversation	Grammar	Reading	Vocabulary	Prewriting
Pre-Emergent & Emergent	45 min	60 min	60 min	60 min	15 min
Basic	30 min	60 min	60 min	60 min	30 min
Intermediate	15 min	60 min	60 min	60 min	45 min

Note. *Adapted from *English Language Learner Monitoring Process for Compliance* (ADE, 2009);
** Based on *Arizona English Language Learner Assessment* (AZELLA) scores.

In addition, the revised version of SEI (4-hour ELD model) included a Discrete Skills Inventory (DSI), which is defined as the "logical and linear ordering of English language concepts and skills" (see Table 2). This supposes that students learn language best when taught grammar explicitly and that this grammatical instruction should follow a certain progression. A kindergarten teacher, for example, would receive a chart divided into parts of speech (e.g., noun, verbs, pronouns, etc.). Within the same chart, parts of speech were further divided into grammati-

cal concepts and the order in which these should be taught (e.g., common nouns, proper nouns, and then singular nouns). Lastly, these grammar skills were linked to grade-level standards[7]. The goal of the DSI approach to language instruction was that students gain the "comprehensive grammatical foundation"[8] necessary to achieve grade-level standards.

Table 2.
*Sample DSI Chart**

Part of Speech	Review	ELL III Skills Progressions		
Nouns	Singular common nouns Plural common nouns Proper nouns Plural proper nouns Articles	Common nouns with determiners (a bird) Plural nouns (friends)	Proper nouns (Arizona) Irregular plural nouns (see grad-appropriate chart)	Singular possessive nouns (friend's)* Plural possessive nouns (friends')

Note. *Adapted from *Discrete Skills Inventory document* (ADE, 2009). Each level of this chart represents a different set of progressions.

The implementation of this revised model to teaching language (4-hour ELD model) was monitored with walk-throughs conducted by state administrators. A Monitoring Protocol was utilized to check off (i.e., indicated by a yes/no response) which components of the model were being implemented correctly.

In addition to overseeing correct time allotments and the use of DSI in classroom instruction, the inspectors assessed other salient components of the 4-hour ELD model also known as the Super SEI Strategies (see Table 3). These Super Strategies include: 1) Language objectives, 2) the 50/50 rule, 3) productive discomfort, 4) students respond in complete sentences, and 5) English learners are engaged in learning. In a typical walk-through, an assessor would check if the language objective of the day was written out for students (e.g., on the whiteboard); he or she might informally assess whether or not students were speaking in complete sentences; or if the classroom instruction was conducted in only English (among many other observable components of the 4-hour ELD model).

Effective Language Instruction Versus the 4- Hour ELD Model

Arizona's revised version of SEI (4-hour ELD model) has been critiqued by experts on many fronts (see Civil Rights Project Studies, 2010). For one, the literature suggests that exposure to the English language is a critical component of English language acquisition. However, the 4-hour ELD model requires that

students be isolated from English monolinguals for 80% of the school day (4 out of 6 instructional hours). In our study, it was evident that students at the K-12 level rarely had opportunities to interact with their English dominant peers. Furthermore, research demonstrates that English-dominant speakers are linguistic models for students learning English as a second language. In a 4-hour block of instruction, English learners had little exposure to these linguistic models. Even more critical for issues of equity is the fact that students were segregated from the rest of the student body for a significant portion of the school day.

Table 3.
*Descriptions of Super SEI Strategies**

Type of Super SEI Strategy	Description
Language objective	The language objective is observable in the classroom and/or in the teacher's lesson plans.
50/50 rule	During the period of observation, students speak at least 50% of the time.
Productive discomfort	One or more of the following is observed during the observation period: The teacher directs questions at individual students to check for understanding. The teacher asks higher order thinking questions/ open-ended questions that promote a student response such as why, how, compare/contrast.
Students respond in complete sentences	During the period of observation, students respond in complete sentences or were prompted to answer in complete sentences at least 75% of the time.
English learners engaged in learning	Monitors observe students actively involved in their learning.

Note. *Adapted from *English Language Learner Monitoring Process for Compliance* (2009)

In addition to these concerns, experts do not agree with many of the linguistic principles supported by the 4-hour ELD model of language instruction (see Krashen, Rolstad, & MacSwan, 2007). Some critique the 4-hour ELD model's focus on the order of language acquisition (DSI) or the fact that it allots a 4-hour block to teach grammar in isolation. Stephen Krashen, an expert in linguistics, surmised that the most conducive environment to learn a language is one in which students use language in a natural setting (e.g., a debate about pollution). Krashen also emphasized the importance of settings that provide ELs with high levels of motivation along with low levels of anxiety. Jim Cummins (1979), an expert in psycholinguistics, made

an important distinction between everyday language (BICS – Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills) and academic language (CALP – Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency). Students develop everyday language much faster than academic language. None of these principles, although widely recognized, are explicit features of the 4-hour ELD model.

Teachers Implementing Policy

In their poignant article, "Unpeeling the Onion: Language Planning and Policy and the ELT[9] Professional," Ricento and Hornberger (1996) use the metaphor of an onion to unfold the many layers that ultimately are part of the complete picture of language planning and policy. Using the framework proposed by Ricento and Horberger we can see that in Arizona, the outer layer of language policy and planning is the larger political context and the policies with regards to language (e.g., Proposition 203). This political context and its policies play out at various levels—national, institutional and interpersonal. At the center of the "onion" are the *planning agents*, or those who actually enact policy. In the case of Arizona's classrooms, at the center of policy implementation are teachers. We present these vignettes and illustrations of Arizona's classrooms to contribute to Ricento and Horberger's claim that teachers are the primary agents in implementing education policy. As agents "[teachers] may reinforce dominant cultural values (to one degree or another), or they may question and even oppose those values, thereby modeling possible alternative views of social reality…" (pp. 421).

Methods

As we mentioned earlier, this paper emerged from our involvement in the Lillie et al. (2010) study, which sought to answer the question, "What are the characteristics of the 4-hour ELD model in practice?" In order to obtain an answer to this question, we employed ethnographic observation methods (e.g., interviews, observations, and artifact[10] and archival data[11] collection). Classroom observations took place over the course of seven weeks during the spring semester of the 2009-2010 school year. Data collection included thorough observations of Arizona's 4-hour ELD block[12] across 18 different K-12 classrooms in five districts. The research team prepared for observations by familiarizing themselves with documents that had been published by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) and were viewed as foundational to the 4-hour ELD model. These documents were the 4-hour ELD Monitoring Protocol as well as PowerPoints used by the ADE to train teachers in the 4-hour ELD model. The Monitoring Protocol (see Table 1 for a glimpse of what it included) was comprised of a checklist that was used during walk-throughs by the ADE in order to quickly assess whether or not teachers, schools, and districts were adhering to the 4-hour ELD model. We utilized the Monitoring Protocol during our observations in the Lillie et al. (2010) study, as a means of gaining a greater understanding of the 4-hour ELD model and its implementation from the

ADE's vantage point. Renowned educational researchers have purported (Erickson, 1984) that categorical assessments and/or protocols (such as the ADE's Monitoring Protocol) are oftentimes problematic because they provide a narrow view of events and people. Hence, in addition to the Monitoring Protocol, we wrote fieldnotes that captured instructional practices, teacher/student interactions, the social and physical environment, and other observable data.

During the coding and analyses phases of the Lillie et al. (2010) study, we noted that a great amount of data had been collected that specifically revealed the ways in which teachers executed various components of the four-hour ELD model to differing degrees. Due to the size and scope of the Lillie et al. (2010) study, teachers' voices could not be captured in great detail. We were therefore motivated to write another piece that would provide readers with rich descriptions of how teachers' employment of the 4-hour ELD model varied across classrooms.

For the present study, we chose to focus on the three teachers that we had observed in the larger study.[13] We had spent a significant amount of time in their classrooms (a total of 42 observation hours) and had collected detailed notes of our observations in each of the three classrooms. Our next step was to independently revisit our ethnographic fieldnotes, transcriptions of the 45-60 minute interviews that we had conducted with each teacher, and the ADE Monitoring Protocol that we had filled out for each teacher (i.e., Ms. Smith, Ms. Richards, and Mr. Salcedo). Between the two of us (Peer and Pérez), we had observed three different teachers in the larger study. We both had the opportunity to conduct separate observations in Ms. Richards' second grade classroom on different occasions; a total of three observations were completed in her class. One of us conducted two observations with Mr. Salcedo's 3rd -6th grade combination class and the other completed two observations in Ms. Smith's kindergarten class.

We were further able to corroborate our data for these teachers because another researcher who focused on elementary school teachers in the Lillie et al. (2010) study also conducted observations in these three classrooms on separate occasions. Hence, each of the researchers was able to look at the data from her perspective. What we found is that observation of behavior, instructional practices, and teachers' stated beliefs about language seemed to overlap and contribute to the theme of variation.[14] In other words, observations revealed that some teachers closely adhered to the 4-hour ELD model; others made minor modifications; and still others used previous pedagogical knowledge and experiences to attempt to supersede the use of the model.

Findings

The following section will present three vignettes that highlight that although the 4-hour ELD model contains clearly delineated components (i.e., Discrete Skills Inventory, Super SEI Strategies, time allocations) and strict measures which evaluate implementation (Monitoring Protocol), ultimately teachers shaped the

ways in which curriculum was implemented in their own classrooms. Factors that influenced implementation included years in the teaching profession, time spent teaching English learners, certifications and/or credentials, ability and/or willingness to exert flexibility in the implementation of the 4-hour ELD model, and teachers' beliefs about language. It is important to note that we specifically chose these three vignettes because they elucidate the general patterns of variation[15] that we witnessed in our observations.

Vignette One

Teacher: Ms. Smith was Anglo-American,[16] in her early sixties, and had taught ELs for ten years. She had both English as a Second Language (ESL) and Bilingual Credentials issued by the Arizona Department of Education.

Classroom: Kindergarten 4-hour ELD Classroom

Description: Every morning, Ms. Smith engaged her students in conversation before starting her grammar lessons. On the day the researcher observed Ms. Smith's classroom, Kim (a recently arrived immigrant) eagerly raised her hand to share her response with the teacher and the class.

Transcript:

Teacher: Talk to your buddy and tell them about your favorite toy.
Students talk among each other for two minutes. They then return to whole group.
Teacher: Okay, so what is your favorite toy, Kim?
Kim: Jet. ˈdjɛtˈ [17]
Teacher: Kim likes her toy jet.

Discussion: Ms. Smith exemplifies one of the many teachers in the larger study (Lillie et al., 2010) who used her agency[18] to supersede certain components of the 4-hour ELD model. In an act that might be considered ordinary to some individuals, Ms. Smith challenged one of the Super SEI Strategies, which requires teachers to prompt students to respond or answer in complete sentences 75% of the time. She did not prompt Kim to use a complete sentence because the student produced a one-word response ("jet") with great difficulty. Kim, a recent immigrant with little previous exposure to the English language, had felt confident enough to verbalize a response. Ms. Smith understood that the student was appropriately challenged at that point in time and did not push her any further. Ms. Smith even made the word ("jet") a central part of the classroom lesson for the day. In doing so, Ms. Smith also recognized that Kim was a valuable contributor of knowledge to their learning community. Ms. Smith placed the content and effort of Kim's response ahead of her own fidelity to the 4-hour ELD model (i.e., requiring Kim to respond in a complete sentence).

Such a simple act performed by a teacher is actually quite important and can ultimately lead to changes in policy. Ricento and Hornberger (1996) assert, "Teachers are policy transmitters and can become policymakers if they so desire" (pp. 420). Ms. Smith chose to place her students' learning experience, at that moment, ahead of the expectancy (from administrators, her peers, the ADE, etc.) that she would scrupulously carry out the 4-hour ELD model. Other teachers that we observed interpreted the sentence completion component of the Super SEI Strategy, as requiring them to prompt students to produce complete sentences, regardless of ELs' language proficiency. Hence, these teachers' actions upheld and transmitted the 4-hour ELD model.

What were some of the factors that aided Ms. Smith's choice to deviate from the 4-hour ELD model requirements? Ms. Smith employed the model with a flexibility informed by her ten years of experience in the teaching profession (specifically with ELs), the background she acquired through the bilingual and ESL credentialing process, and her lived experiences that shaped her beliefs about language. Ms. Smith was able to meet students where they were at linguistically and expose the class to a more expanded linguistic form while fostering a healthy sense of community in her classroom. Our observations indicated that Ms. Smith did not believe that the 4-hour ELD model was the ideal program to meet her EL students' needs. Hence, time and again, she challenged the 4-hour ELD model and English-only policy by employing methods that drew from other models—such as utilizing students' native language and engaging them in meaningful conversations that connected to their own lives.

Vignette Two

Teacher: Ms. Richards was African-American and in her early forties. She had taught for a total of four years and this was her first year teaching a class of ELs. Ms. Richards was unaware of the fact that she was going to teach in an ELD classroom until a week before school started. As a result, it took three months into the school year for her to receive her SEI credential.

Classroom: 2nd grade ELD classroom

Description: In order to make instruction "easier" (Interview, March 6, 2010), Ms. Richards preferred whole group instruction. In this particular lesson, the students reviewed the vocabulary from their Read-A-Loud as they sat as a class on the rug. The teacher called on students sequentially as they were positioned in the circle. Students sat quietly as they waited for the teacher to call on them. They had been chattering before the lesson started and Ms. Richards had sternly stated, "When my voice is out—you put yours away!" Students were expected to define the vocabulary words on their list in complete sentences (e.g., "A city is a large town"). It was Juanita's turn.

Transcript:

Juanita: A feas |fis|[19]
Teacher: A *fish?!* |fiʃ?!
[Class laughs.]

Discussion: Ms. Richards was one of the numerous teachers in the Lillie et al. (2010) study that chose to implement the 4-hour ELD model with the utmost fidelity. This teacher employed the 4-hour ELD model by the book—even if it resulted in disparaging her students. Ms. Richard's interaction with Juanita depicts a component of the 4-hour ELD model known as *productive discomfort*. According to the Monitoring Protocol, one of the elements of productive discomfort is that the teacher directs questions at individual students to check for understanding. As bell hooks (1994) asserted, "It is not the English language that hurts [people]...but what [others] do with it…how they make it a weapon that can shame, humiliate, colonize." In and of itself, productive discomfort seems harmless. In fact, when a teacher asks a child a question to check for understanding, it could be beneficial to both the student and teacher. Yet, the ADE's directives in *how* to implement productive discomfort may prompt teachers (who are key players in policy implementation) to employ this Super Strategy in ways that may shame students. In 2009, the ADE created a PowerPoint that is used to train teachers and administrators. The document instructs educators to "ALWAYS push students to productive discomfort." By using the word "always," the ADE may influence the implementers of the 4-hour ELD model (i.e., teachers) to view language production in extremes (e.g., a child is either right or wrong; there is no room for ambiguity or growth).

Ms. Richards' lack of experience with ELs (i.e., she had never taught in an ELD classroom) made her more likely to follow the 4-hour ELD model with little room for flexibility. Unlike other educators (e.g., Ms. Smith) who had experience with alternative language models, Ms. Richards was only trained in the 4-hour ELD model. For instance, her interaction with Juanita depicts Ms. Richards' lack of familiarity with second language acquisition research, which might have aided her understanding of the most effective ways that ELs learn new vocabulary. In her daily lessons, Ms. Richards provided students with vocabulary words that were a part of an assigned text and then students were expected to create sentences with these new words. Feast was one of the select vocabulary words; yet it is not a word that is generally used in everyday speech (e.g., on the playground). Thus, ELs may need more explicit instruction in how to use and pronounce this word. Cummins' (1979) theory of BICS versus CALP might have helpfully informed Ms. Richards' teaching practice. If Ms. Richards had been aware of the distinction between how students acquire academic versus conversational vocabulary words—perhaps she might have implemented her lessons under the 4-hour ELD model in an alternative way (e.g., used vocabulary that was used in conversation as well as academic arenas).

Another significant point is that Ms. Richards believed that the 4-hour ELD model was ideal for new teachers because of its organization and structure. She noted that she particularly benefited from the Discrete Skills Inventory because it outlined the specific parts of speech she should teach her ELs, the order in which she should teach those elements, and how these lessons tied into grade level content standards (Interview, March 5, 2010). In sum, teachers who had less experience teaching ELs (like Ms. Richards) might have found that the 4-hour ELD model provided useful guidelines for teaching ELs. However, this may come at the price of sacrificing students' integrity when not considering essential research that is more often than not overlooked by the 4-hour ELD model.

Vignette Three

Teacher: Mr. Salcedo was in his late thirties and of Cuban descent. He had worked with other immigrants for the past couple of years with a church-based organization. Mr. Salcedo's teaching experience with ELs spanned over four years. Mr. Salcedo possessed both SEI and ESL credentials and had taught ESL in his home country.

Classroom: Third through sixth grade combination ELD class.

Description: Students sit in neat rows facing Mr. Salcedo. Most students sit upright in their seats, their eyes glued to their teacher. This morning, students look forward to their weekly vocabulary challenge. Every Friday, Mr. Salcedo leads students in a *Pictionary*-type game. It is a review of the vocabulary that the class learned over the course of the week. The rules are that Mr. Salcedo pulls out flashcards that display pictures of different nouns. Students are divided into teams and one person from each team goes up and buzzes if they know the vocabulary word that corresponds to the picture on the flashcard. Mr. Salcedo holds up a flashcard of a cow.

Transcript:

Padcha: That is a cow.
Mr. Salcedo: Great! One point for the blue team.
Mr. Salcedo: What is this?
Antonio: That is a tiger ltaigəll[20]
[Class erupts into laughter.]
Mr. Salcedo: When I first learned the word "tiger"ltī gərl it took a lot of practice to be able to pronounce it. We should never laugh at each other. In this classroom, we are all English learners.

Discussion: Mr. Salcedo represents another approach taken by teachers in the larger study. He acted to modify certain aspects of the 4-hour ELD model. Mr. Salcedo fairly adhered to the 4-hour ELD model because part of his experience in teaching and learning English in his home country focused on a strict language

standard. In other words, what was valued in this part of his teaching and learning experience was the "correct" production of language - without taking content into account. Yet, he used his prior experience teaching ELs for a number of years, his ESL and SEI credentialing background, and his personal experience as an English learner in order to mediate a respectful environment where students and teacher were willing and even eager to take language risks. Mr. Salcedo's own background as an EL, who had only recently immigrated to the US, shaped his instruction of ELs. He had purposefully taken the time to create a respectful environment where students understood that they were all ELs - they were there to aid each other in their English language development.

This aspect of language learning, creating a respectful and comfortable environment for language learners, was noticeably neglected in the articulation of the 4-hour ELD model. Instead, the model directed teachers to pay close attention to time allocations and grammar (DSI); these components are of no consequence if students are in an environment where they are not confident in taking the risk to actually produce language. Those who have studied a second language may understand the emotional susceptibilities that students undergo when speaking in front of a classroom.[21] Mr. Salcedo personally experienced learning English as a second language; thus, he was able to identify the importance of creating a respectful environment in his instructional practice. Mr. Salcedo used the 4-hour ELD model to guide him in the instruction of grammar principles but he modified its delivery by placing respect at the center of his teaching practice.

Conclusion

The three vignettes embody Ricento and Hornberger's (1996) analysis of language planning and policy. Teachers stand at the forefront of policy delivery; therefore, they must be considered by others as well as view themselves as *policy-makers*. We have sought to elucidate the force and impact of daily teaching practices through our vignettes.[22] Ms. Smith rejected a one-size-fits-all/unidirectional approach to teaching language. Instead, she utilized the repertoire of teaching practices that she had acquired in her vast amount of years as a teacher of English learners. Ms. Richards closely followed the guidelines outlined by the 4-hour ELD model. Not having other models readily available for teaching ELs, nor the knowledge that comes with teaching experience - Ms. Richards fostered an environment hostile to the acquisition of a second language. Mr. Salcedo altered the 4-hour ELD model by allowing his experiences as a former EL to also direct his teaching practices. He placed a great value on fostering a respectful classroom environment - a point grossly neglected by the 4-hour ELD model.

The 4-hour ELD model emerges from a highly contested political stance towards language and learning (i.e., language instruction in linguistically diverse classrooms should be in English-only). It is evident that during the creation and formation of the 4-hour ELD model, research that highlights best practices for

acquiring language were obscured by a narrow political stance towards language. As education policy is shaped by a political climate in Arizona that "cracks-down" on difference, it is not surprising that the 4-hour ELD model reflects these trends. It is a prescriptive approach to teaching language that highlights *English* grammar and neglects other vital parts of strong language and learning programs (e.g., how to foster a respectful classroom environment, teaching academic language to all students, etc.). This pedagogical approach to teaching language seems antithetical to a nation defined by diversity.

Language teaching and learning are complex social activities shaped and even manipulated by political climates and restrictive language polices. However, teachers are individuals that have the ability to make a great difference. While there are policies that restrict the use of language in classrooms (e.g., Arizona's Proposition 203), there are also teachers like Ms. Smith who celebrate and incorporate difference into their teaching practices. Civil rights activists contest the inequities in schools and society at large, but "in the meantime, teachers have daily opportunities to make small changes in their practices…" (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996, pp. 421) that ultimately determine the ways in which language policy is delivered in classrooms. The greatest implication of this analysis is that teachers must see *themselves* as policymakers (Ricento and Hornberger, 1996) and important agents of change.

Notes

1. We will refer to the 4-hour English development model as the 4-hour ELD model throughout the rest of the piece.
2. Academic content was not aligned to grade level standards. The 4-hour ELD model emphasizes that English language acquisition supersedes academic content (Lillie et al., 2010).
3. Variation refers to the wide array of instructional practices that teachers used to implement the 4-hour ELD model.
4. Pedagogy is defined as of or related to the art of teaching.
5. Mainstream classrooms are generally intended for English dominant students or those who have tested out of English language development programs. Students who are English dominant are presumed to have grown up speaking primarily English.
6. A wide array of terminology has been used to label students who are not fluent English speakers. Limited English Proficient (LEP) was once widely utilized by practitioners and still appears in many legislative documents. The term English Language Learner (ELL) has replaced LEP in many areas. Moreover, the term English Learner (EL) has gained popularity, especially in the Western United States due to ease of expression; thus, we chose to use the term and its acronym (EL) for the sake of simplicity.
7. These are standards that have been created by each state to delineate what students should learn at each grade-level.
8. http://www.docstoc.com/docs/1065270/Discrete-Skills-Inventory-DSI---English-Language-Acquisition-Services.
9. English Language Teaching is abbreviated as ELT.

10. Researchers collected background information and artifacts from each site. Some background information (e.g., teacher certification) was accessible to the public. Examples of artifacts acquired included course materials, lesson plans, curriculum maps, district curricular overviews for the ELD levels, and classroom rosters showing class size and proficiency levels of students.
11. Archival data were acquired from resources and information provided online by the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) to the public (see e.g., http://www.ade.state.az.us/oelas/). This included specific policies, laws, instructional suggestions per the SEI training to teachers and administrators, and other SEI model implementation presentations (such as PowerPoints) created by the ADE.
12. Refers to the time allotment (sequential 4-hour block) that the ADE designates for the execution of the 4-hour ELD model. The Lillie et al. (2010) study found that: "Elementary districts did not necessarily have the [4-hour ELD] model implemented as a sequential 4-hour block, but rather had the four-hours included throughout the entire school day. High school schedules allowed for a stricter adherence to four distinct hours. Therefore, researchers in the elementary district spent the entire day at the school while those observing high schools observed only the 4-hour block" (pp. 6).
13. As stated previously, seven researchers conducted observations in a total of eighteen classrooms in the Lillie et al. (2010) study; this included ten high school and eight elementary classrooms. We were assigned to a total of 3 elementary school classrooms.
14. Although the 4-hour ELD model was quite restrictive (e.g., Monitoring protocol, Discrete Skills Inventory, Super SEI strategies), teachers implementation of the model varied widely.
15. Some teachers closely adhered to the 4-hour model; others made minor modifications, while still others used previous pedagogical knowledge and experiences to attempt to supersede the use of the model.
16. Racial categories determined through a series of conversations and interactions with teachers.
17. We have provided phonetic transcription (where needed) for your convenience.
18. Refers to the capacity of individuals to act independently and to make their own free choices.
19. The student read the word feast but did not pronounce the final |t|
20. Antonio pronounced the word tiger as tie gul.
21. Those who have studied a second language may understand the emotional susceptibilities that students undergo when speaking in front of a classroom.
22. We assert that teachers hold a unique role as implementers of language policies. It is important to note that administrators, policymakers, and society at large also hold distinct and pivotal roles as policy transmitters. We are all responsible for the role we play in enacting policy.

References

Arizona Department of Education (ADE). (n.d.). *Discrete skills inventory* (DSI). Retrieved from: http://www.ade.state.az.us/oelas/

Arizona Department of Education (ADE). (2007). *Curricular framework for SEI endorsement*. Retrieved from: http://www.ade.state.az.us/oelas

Arizona Department of Education (ADE). (2008). *Structured English immersion models of the Arizona English language learners task force*. Retrieved from: http://www.ade.state.az.us/ELLTaskForce/2008/SEIModels05-14-08.pdf

Arizona Department of Education (ADE). (2010). *Administrator's model implementation training 06-04-2009* [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from: http://www.ade.state.az.us/oelas/

The Civil Rights Project/el proyecto de derechos civiles. (2010). *Nine studies document the educational condition of arizona's English learners*. Retrieved from: http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/news/press-releases/9-new-studies-document-the-educational-condition-of-arizonas-english-learners

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism, No.19*, pp. 121-129.

hooks, bell. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Krashen, S. (1981). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* New York: Pergamon Press.

Krashen, S., Rolstad, K., & MacSwan, J. (2007). *Review of 'research summary and bibliography for structured English immersion programs' of the Arizona English language learners task force, Arizona State University*. Retrieved from: http://bale.wiki.educ.msu.edu/file/view/Krashen_Rolstad_MacSwan_review.pdf/37126027/Krashen_Rolstad_MacSwan_review.pdf

Kroskrity, P. (2004). Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (Ed), *Companion to Linguistic Anthropology,* (pp. 496-517). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Lillie, K., Markos, A., Estrella, A., Nguyen, T., et al. (2010). *Policy in practice: The implementation of structured English immersion in Arizona*. Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project.

Martinez-Wenzl, M., Pérez, K., and Gándara, P. (2010). Is Arizona's approach to educating its ELs superior to other forms of instruction? Los Angeles, CA: The Civil Rights Project. Office of English Language Acquisition Services (OELAS), Arizona Department of Education. (2009-2010). *English language learner monitoring process for federal and state compliance*. Retrieved from: http://www.ade.state.az.us/oelas/downloads/2009-2010EnglishLanguageLearnerMonitoringProcessforCompliance.pdf

Ricento, T. K., & Hornberger, N. H. (1996). Unpeeling the onion: Language planning and policy and the ELT profession. *TESOL Quarterly, 30*(3), pp. 401-427.

Karisa Peer completed her Bachelors degree at Middlebury College, and after that she taught ESL in Madrid. She then moved on to become the Childcare Program Director for a non-profit organization called South Central L.A.M.P., which provides preschool classes for children while their mothers take parenting and ESL classes. After her positive experiences at L.A.M.P., Karisa decided to get her Master's degree in Teaching from the University of San Francisco. Karisa spent the next five years as a bilingual elementary school educator in San Francisco and Los Angeles. She decided to return to school in 2008 to research issues that directly affect the Latino English learner population that she had worked with over the course of her teaching career. Karisa is currently a Ph.D. student in Education in the division of Urban Schooling at UCLA. Karisa was a part of the

2010 Arizona English Language Learner Study, a collaborative research project among researchers and graduate interns from ASU, the University of Arizona, UCLA, and Stanford University. She was able to conduct ethnographic work in various elementary school classrooms that followed the four-hour English language development model.

Karla Pérez completed her Bachelors degree at Pomona College, after that she taught in a fourth grade ESL classroom. During this time she reflected on her own experience as an ESL student in Los Angeles' urban schools and returned to school to complete a Masters degree at University of California, San Diego in Latin American Studies with an emphasis in Literature and Gender Studies. It was during this time that she further cultivated her profound interest for language and learning by serving as a Spanish Instructor for undergraduate students. After completion, Karla returned to Los Angeles to teach high school Spanish for five years. During this time she served as chair of her department and actively participated in teaching conferences and workshops around the subject of language learning. Her participation in Education and her commitment to teaching languages as a form of social justice prompted her return to graduate school. Currently, Karla pursues a Ph.D. in Education, Urban Schooling Division. In 2010 she participated in Arizona English Language Learner Study, a research collaborative between ASU, University of Arizona, UCLA, and Stanford University. Along with her team, she conducted ethnographic studies in Arizona schools.