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Abstract

LEWIS, MICHELLE E., Ed. D., December 2016, Educational Administration

What Personal, Professional, and Contextual Characteristics of Ohio Elementary Principals Influence Their View of FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary School) Programming?

Director of Dissertation: William Larson

Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs in the United States are not flourishing, nor are their middle- and high-school counterparts. The current global recession has imposed marginal decreases on school funding and has thus influenced curriculum decisions to cut back on such perceived frills as foreign language (FL) instruction. Since FL is not part of high-stakes testing, it remains as an extra on the periphery of curriculum, no matter how crucial it might be culturally, intellectually, and perhaps therefore politically and economically. Kindergarten through twelfth grade administrators appear to be in a unique position to shed light on the American foreign language dilemma, as they are in trenches daily with students and teachers and are involved in curriculum and policy decisions.

A survey instrument was sent to all of the public school elementary principals in Ohio. Surveys were successfully delivered to 1427 principals. Although 103 survey responses were received, only 95 were complete and used for data analysis, resulting in a 6.66% response rate. The first step in examining the data involved calculating descriptive statistics for each item in the instrument. Next, a regression analysis was used to determine if there was a relationship between the independent variables (personal and contextual) and the dependent variable, principals’ attitudes toward FLES. The regression
analysis included nine independent and covariate variables. They are the value of FL and the importance of FL when compared against the covariates of gender, ethnicity, number of years as a principal, number of years as a teacher, the participants’ status as being bilingual or multilingual, the number of FLs studied by the participants, and whether the participants’ schools have a FLES program.

The study’s findings indicated that Ohio elementary principals do perceive FLES programs favorably. None of the demographic information individually proved to be important to the perception of FLES programs. Attitude regarding FL proved to be significant in the findings. The two influencing factors that contributed to the manner that the participating principals expressed positivity toward FLES programming pertained to the manner that they valued FL and their perceptions of the importance of FL.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Life in the information age seems wondrous, surprising, and, in a word: handy. The technology available to the average human seems to spring straight from a 20th century science fiction novel. High technology products are used in every aspect of daily life: computer-driven washing machines and dishwashers; GPS systems that help a driver arrive at a destination without stopping at a gas station for directions, or that help a runner to know pace, calories burned and heart rate; and iPhones with applications that can tune a violin or be used as a level. It seems that each day brings forth diminutive new miracles. Nonetheless, for all that science has created, technology cannot exercise or lose weight, nor can it communicate for us, fully or well. The day of being able to “insert a chip” to stop smoking, understand trigonometry, or speak a foreign language (FL) has not yet arrived.

Technology is available, of course, that can translate from one language to another, so much so that even the free programs available on the Internet are quite efficient. Human beings, however, have not been replaced in the arena of language translation. When the stakes are high, accuracy mandatory, subtlety the point, or human presence essential (i.e., as in real life) the skills of a polyglot are irreplaceable. Freedman (2012) fantasizes about the translators available to Captain Kirk, but the reality is not quite Star Trek. He tested translators by engaging in “Google-mediated conversations” with native speakers (para. 7). He spoke English into his phone and then “thrust the phone in my interlocutor’s face so he could immediately hear the translation. The phone would then Anglicize my reluctant partner’s non-English reply” (para. 7). His conclusion was that there were problems with word order and word recognition when using the cell...
phone application. Specifically, statistical translation systems such as these find the closest match for a group of words. Freedman gives the example,

If I say, 'I want to go to the beach,' and the system translates it as 'I want to go to the sandy strip,' that's a little awkward. But if it translates as 'I don't want to go to the beach,' that's just one word off, but it's dramatically different in meaning. And that's not exaggerating the potential pitfalls. In French, for example, the expression for ‘There's no more’ is ‘Il n'y en a plus’ but Google translates it as ‘There are more.’ (para. 8)

In a real sense, language use is what distinguishes humans and enables their accomplishment and their understanding. Noam Chomsky describes language as a unique trait:

Humans are different from other creatures, and every human is basically identical in this respect. If a child from an Amazonian hunter-gatherer tribe comes to Boston, is raised in Boston, that child will be indistinguishable in language capacities from my children growing up here, and vice versa. This unique human possession, which we hold in common, is at the core of a large part of our culture and our imaginative intellectual life. That’s how we form plans, do creative art, and develop complex societies (Long, 2011, p. 5).

A common denominator of the human condition is language.

Lantolf and Sunderman (2010) examined FL study over the past 80 years. The cultural understanding associated with language study was a recurring theme presented as a means of preventing war. Buehner (1952) agrees:
If you want to understand a nation’s tendency toward aggression, look to its frustrations, many of which will remain mysteries until you have studied its language behavior (Do we begin to see the importance of language study for future world peace?). (p. 82).

Buehner further explains that the decline of civilization would be due to the inability to understand each other both linguistically and culturally. As a result, he advocates that more funding should be allocated toward FL study and less for weapons. He reasons that it is only through communication or language that any type of agreement can be reached. He explains,

They tell us that it costs billions of dollars to produce the atomic bomb and that it will cost many more billions to produce the hydrogen bomb. This of course is wise economy. Together or separately these two bombs can destroy the world, so that no one will ever need to spend another dime. Then over the atomized hulks of all the dead nations the Creator may inscribe this legend: ‘They could not understand each other.’ (p. 83)

Indeed, the consequences for foreign language deficiency in matters of national security are dire. Furthermore,

When intelligence fails, the consequence is the Korean War in 1950. The consequence is the Vietnam War in 1965. The consequence is 9/11. The consequence is Iraq today. The long war in which we are engaged is an intelligence war, and we will win it or lose it by virtue of our intelligence (Weiner, 2007, p. 1).
Whether it is national security, a high-level international political event, parent teacher conferences, or a police officer reading Miranda rights, a demonstrated need for multilingual beings prevails nearly everywhere, even, and perhaps especially, in the U.S.

In this age of globalization, the ability to speak a foreign language (FL) is a “21st century skill” as important, according to some observers, as being able to communicate fluently in one’s native language. The late Senator Paul Simon (1980), a proponent of FL study, had this to say regarding the dismal state of foreign languages in the United States: “There is more than one reason for the lack of emphasis on foreign languages in the United States, but one word, Americanization, explains the major part of it” (pp. 11-12).

Met, 1994, argues that

One area of the curriculum where American schools are truly incomparable—in the worst sense of the word—with those of the rest of the world is foreign language. No developed country allows so few of its students to study languages. The absence of a national policy in the United States has left a void that has been filled by a number of stakeholders whose priorities may conflict with those of others and are not always focused on producing a language-competent America (pp. 162-3).

Although Senator Simon wrote in the early eighties and Met a decade later, their words still appear to ring true in 2015.

Today the planet is more connected and distant lands and cultures more accessible than ever; in fact, communication is instant due to modern technology. Despite that access to the rest of the world, one might argue, on the basis of the forgoing testimony, that Americans do not currently have the language and culture skills necessary to keep
pace with technology or with economic political and global cultural developments. Furthermore, the problem perpetuates itself from generation to generation with current attitudes toward culture and language study. This is why Simon’s truth from 1980 is so predictable for 2015.

American children are not making up for the lack of knowledge on our part. Our society seems to be aware of the problem, yet very little is being done to ameliorate the lack of FL instruction and cultural knowledge in the United States. Simon (1980) said it well: “We are linguistically malnourished” (p. 5). American students do not know enough about the rest of the world, including its religions, cultures, economies, politics, and ways of living; neither our children, nor we in short, study FL. Indeed “the problem of linguistic isolation coincides with cultural isolation” (Simon, 1980, p. 10). Earlier in the World War II era, Holzhauser (1942) believed that FL was a tool for confronting societal problems.

Military racial, and economic barriers are being erected everywhere. Differences are emphasized and hatreds fostered. What will combat these forces more effectively than the enlightenment of education? Prejudice against other human beings can be overcome only by sympathetic understanding, and this understanding can come only as the result of knowledge. It is imperative that every effort be made to instruct the coming generation in fairness and open-mindedness. In the average college, the Foreign Language Department is peculiarly equipped to render this service. In fact, it is this department’s most valuable and indispensable contribution to present-day education (p. 340).
For many decades it has been suggested that knowledge in the areas of FL and culture could be a solution to many world problems. The Committee for Economic Development (CED, 2006) concurs, saying that it is imperative that American students “be better versed in the languages, cultures, and traditions of other world religions… so we can build a more secure future for both our nation and the world” (p. 2).

FL study has been given a high priority outside of the United States. This circumstance is evident in the results of a recent European Union (EU) survey that found that more than 50% of its citizens speak a second language. Of that percentage, 34% spoke English as a second language, thus perpetuating the idea that “everyone” speaks English. However, of the Anglophones (those whose first language was English), 30% spoke at least one other language, whereas across the “pond” in the United States, the result was only 9% (Blake & Kramsch, 2007, p. 247). Perhaps the Anglophones in the EU are better able to see the utility in speaking a FL due to their close proximity to many speakers of other languages.

Many other countries begin FL study at the elementary school level. However, FLES (foreign language in elementary schools) programs in the United States have been on the decrease despite the positive results that are shown to accumulate across the curriculum from such instruction (CED, 2006). To begin with, benefits prominently include the transfer of language skills attained in the FL to the native language. Cunningham and Graham (2000), for instance, studied elementary students in a Spanish immersion program and found, “that Spanish immersion has a positive influence on the development of children’s native English vocabulary and that foreign language cognates do transfer to the first language” (p. 47). It gets better (and thus worse for the losses
accumulating in the U.S.): The positive outcomes for FL study have been documented for decades, and they are not limited to language arts. For instance, Rafferty (1986) identified and reported the benefit of FL study on math scores. By the 5th grade, elementary students in her study, regardless of race or gender, who studied a FL were outperforming non-foreign language students in both math and language arts.

According to Cooper (1987) and Eddy (1981), the cognitive benefits of FL study last a lifetime. Cooper found that students who took a FL “achieved significantly higher [SAT] test scores that those who elected not to take foreign language” (p. 385) and Cooper’s data supported Eddy’s in that test scores increased with the length of time a student studied foreign language, beginning with a minimum of one year (Cooper, p. 385, Eddy, p. 88). Furthermore, Cooper found that

Economic background, as measured by percentage of subsidized school lunches, did not affect students' performance. This find is quite heartening since students who came from less than optimum economic circumstances, but who took foreign languages, performed basically just as well as their more fortunate peers (p. 385). Regardless of economic backgrounds, students who studied a FL benefitted academically.

The benefits of FL study are not limited to young people. Adults who continue to speak a second language may realize a better quality of life. Bialystok (2011) studied bilingual and monolingual adults to determine if the cognitive process involved in bilingualism might prevent mental decline due to ageing. The data from the study reflected that being bilingual did afford protection against mental decline. A brain fluent in two languages seems to postpone dementia by five years (p. 232). Such claims are not necessarily definitive, of course, but similar ones have also been made for musical
training and accomplishment: “music improves our brain development and even
enhances skills in other subjects such as reading and math” (Weinberger, 1998, p. 36),
and such claims do proceed from scientific research.

Sadly, FLES programs in the United States are not flourishing, nor are their
middle- and high-school counterparts. Indeed, the number of students who study a FL
has been declining across recent decades. Grittner (1973) commented upon the fact that
the United States is one of the few “developed” countries that does not value FL study as
an integral part of the curriculum:

Thus, in the more advanced nations all over the world, an educated citizenry is
growing up with foreign language study being considered a "natural" part of each
individual's experiential background. America, however, stands out as the major
country in which a majority of young people are denied any significant contact
with a language other than English. (p. 248)

In addition, the current global recession has imposed marginal decreases on school
funding and has thus influenced curriculum decisions to cut back on such perceived frill
such as FL instruction. Such is our national, state, and local leadership. Former Director
of the CIA and Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta (1999) gave a presentation at Stanford
entitled “Foreign Language Education: If ‘Scandalous’ in the 20th Century, What Will It
Be in the 21st Century?” This conference addressed the state of FL study at the university
level. He states: “The United States may be the only nation in the world where it is
possible to complete secondary and postsecondary education without any foreign
language study whatsoever” (p. 1). Grittner, Panetta, and Simon (1980) all concur that
FL instruction is not what it should be in this country.
The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 2002, which is commonly referenced as the No Child Left Behind Act, establishes English, language arts, math, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history and geography as core subjects. However, only three of these core subjects are included in mandated high-stakes testing: English/language arts, math, and science. Budget woes in tandem with the standardized testing being required by NCLB have foisted difficult and bad decisions on administrators. School administrators appear to have been forced by the recent recession and cultural prejudice to cut back their offerings and eliminate entire language programs (CED, 2006; Dillon, 2010; Yount, 2010). Therefore, the importance of FL is negligible regarding most perceptions of curriculum since the imposition of such mitigating factors. FL still seems to be an extra course for college-bound students. Thus, struggling school districts do not perceive that they have a choice but to reduce or eliminate FL instruction and other non-tested subjects when allocating already limited funding (CED, 2006; Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011).

In 2006, the National Language Security Initiative was created to address FL deficiency in the U.S., in particular to increase the speakers of FL deemed critical to national security and to overall increase their presence in K-12 schooling. However, no dollar amount was specifically allocated to FL study, with the only disclaimer being that this program was to “share” in the funding designated for several departments and offices. Not surprisingly, given the weak rationale and the American cultural history and the negligent funding provision, the program has not yielded measurable results to date (Zhao, 2009).

The situation for FL education has not improved. The Committee for Economic
Development (CED, 2006) reports that many public schools in the United States have stopped offering FL instruction in order to give more instructional time to math and reading, subjects that are measured for accountability purposes. Dillon (2010) and Yount (2010) reported that administrators cited NCLB as the reason for reducing or eliminating FL classes.

Administrators are responsible to the education and political bureaucracies, and across the nation, accountability “report cards” do not rate or even mention FL study. Despite being part of the core curriculum, FL assessment is not a part of NCLB testing, nor is it a part of state accountability in Ohio. Furthermore, the National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Language (NCSSFL, 2010) examined state graduation requirements in FL and found, that among the states that provided information, none had an across the board graduation requirement for all students. Even if administrators view FL study as essential, the circumstances and structure of schooling diminish the odds that language learning will receive anywhere near the attention it seems to deserve in view of the practical considerations, let alone the intellectual significance of language study. It is an arguable national tragedy that the cultural and intellectual asset of knowing a second language receives hardly any play (CED, 2006; Panetta, 1999; Simon, 1992; Tochon, 2009). In a report for the Rand Corporation, Bikson and Law (1994) noted that American students are “strong technically” (p. 27); however, they are lacking in cross-cultural experience and more or less “linguistically deprived” (p. 27). Another respondent in the report commented, “If I wanted to recruit people who are both technically skilled and culturally aware, I wouldn’t even waste time looking for them on U.S. college campuses” (pp. 28-29).
NCLB has arguably deformed the institution of American education according to many commentators, and one of these deformations is clearly the neglect of FL learning. Now not only the student receives a report card, but the school and school district as well. Under the regimes of accountability, entire organizations are thus treated with a degree of paternalism positioned to diminish the good sense that school leaders might otherwise exercise, including the good sense needed to lead language-learning efforts. Since FL is not part of high-stakes testing, it remains as an extra on the periphery of curriculum, no matter how crucial it might be culturally, intellectually, and perhaps therefore politically and economically. When asked about deficiencies in the American education system, most administrators will admit that FL study is not what it needs to be. Things appear to be getting worse, not better. Better leadership is clearly called for.

**Statement of the Problem**

English is just one of the world languages with more than 100 million speakers. Other languages in this category listed by number of speakers are Chinese, Spanish, Hindi/Urdu, Arabic, Portuguese, Russian, Turkic, Bengali, Japanese, French, and German (Tochon, 2009, p. 657). In addition, several of the countries where these languages are spoken, specifically Brazil, Russia, India and China (BRIC) are home to thriving economies. Jacques (2009) discusses China as a rising 21st century world power, noting that:

> It is estimated that by 2032 the share of global GDP of the so-called BRICs, namely Brazil, Russia, India and China, will exceed that of the G7, namely the US, Canada, the UK, Germany, France, Italy and Japan. And by 2027 it is
projected that China will overtake the United States to become the world’s largest economy (KL 2637-2640).

American complacency about Foreign Language (FL) learning is unwarranted and carries with it negative consequences.

Many of the listed languages are deemed critical in matters of national security and economics. So, why are these languages not being offered in American schools? Cultural and intellectual importance aside, the utilitarian importance of language knowledge would argue for intense FL study in the U.S., but as illustrated previously, language learning is not a priority in American schooling. Regarding the results of such neglect, Panetta (1999) says:

As long as elite U.S. schools and universities continue to put little emphasis on the acquisition of foreign language capabilities, American executives will be monolingual and U.S. corporations will have to try and use English or buy foreign nationals who have the language ability where the business is located. A sad commentary for the strongest and most competitive economy in the world (p. 7).

Why has foreign language not become a priority in education? What role do administrators play in the dilemma of language learning in the U.S.? What do they know or think about it? More than an unacknowledged national security problem, the state of language learning in the U.S. represents a professional dilemma for administrators whose mission has been narrowed by accountability mandates.

This study will investigate administrators’ beliefs that are prospectively relevant to engaging, articulating, and understanding the dilemma of American FL learning (CED, 2006; Panetta, 1999; Simon, 1980; Zhao, 2009). How do administrators perceive their
FL programs? As the literature in the following chapter will demonstrate, researchers have devoted little attention to this purported important problem. Continued American language ignorance appears to be part of the reported decline of American leadership in the world (Bikson & Law, 1994; Panetta, 1999; Simon, 1980). Americans could do better; knowing languages would help; and administrators are perhaps those individuals who are best positioned in schools to make a difference with language learning.

**Research Question**

Kindergarten through twelfth grade administrators appear to be in a unique position to shed light on the American Foreign Language (FL) dilemma, as they are in trenches daily with students and teachers and are involved in curriculum and policy decisions. It therefore seems logical to explore the perceptions of school administrators regarding FL education. Wilkerson (2006) examined adult attitudes toward FL study, in particular college faculty perceptions in this area and found that “individuals’ initial language learning experience influences their beliefs and perceptions about languages and that these beliefs persist relatively unchanged throughout adulthood” (p. 317). Administrators’ own experiences with FLs influence the decisions they make (Sweley, 2007).

This study focused on the elementary administrator’s perspective at the beginning of the K-12 sequence. The study sought to answer the following research question: What personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES (foreign language in elementary school) programming?
Significance

The reason for commencing such a study was simple, *saber es poder* – knowledge is power. The research question hoped to investigate the situation of Foreign Language (FL) education at the beginning of the American education system, the elementary school. It seemed important to know what elementary school principals were thinking regarding FL study. Were accountability mandates preventing the growth of FL in the elementary school? Were administrators’ own experiences with FL influencing their decisions with regards to curriculum? Perhaps testing requirements, personal experience and other unknown variables were the mitigating factors in the American foreign language deficiency. The point was that the news about the value of FL study would unlikely receive adequate attention, if administrators did not perceive FL deficiency to be an area of concern in their curriculum.

Definitions and Operational Terms

Amerindian: A term used to describe the indigenous peoples of the United States.

“Another term for American Indian, used chiefly in anthropological and linguistic contexts” (Amerindian, n.d.).

Anglocentrism: “Anglocentric ideas, attitudes, or behaviour; a tendency to regard English culture, society, or language as pre-eminent” (Anglocentrism, n.d.).

Bilingualism (subtractive): Limited bilingualism, or subtractive bilingualism, can occur when children’s first language is gradually replaced by a more dominant and prestigious language” (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006, p. 8).

FL (Foreign Language): This term refers to the second language being learned (Curtain & Pesola, 1994).
FL versus second language (SL): “The basis for this distinction is the geographical context in which a language is spoken. An ESL situation is one where English is widely used in commerce, administration and education. It is a foreign language (EFL) in a country where English plays no such role. When English is taught to non-native speakers in an English-speaking country, ESL usually refers to people who are long-stay or permanent residents, whereas EFL is taught to those who return after a period of time to their own country” (Johnson & Johnson, 1999, pp. 133-134).

Second language versus Foreign Language (FL): “In a second-language acquisition situation the language is spoken in the immediate environment of the learner, who has good opportunities to use the language by participating in natural communication situations. Second-language acquisition may, or may not, be supplemented by classroom teaching. In a foreign-language learning situation the language is not spoken in the immediate environment of the learner, although mass media may provide opportunities for practicing the receptive skills. The learner has little or no opportunity to use the language in natural communication situations” (Ringbom, 1980, pp. 38-39).

FLES (Foreign Language in the Elementary School): This term describes programs that are usually taught “three to five times per week for class periods of twenty minutes to an hour or more. Some FLES classes integrate other areas of the curriculum; others focus most often on the second language and its culture” (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 34).
FLEX (Foreign Language Exploratory): In a FLEX program, “students to not attain any degree of language proficiency. They are self-contained short term programs, most often lasting three weeks to one year” (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p.35).

Fossilization: When learning a FL, “progression toward nativelike competence is not linear. Students move forward and back, and forward and back again, all the while stretching to increasingly more advanced levels… Although the movement of progression is generally forward, there may be times when students seem to reach a plateau in the process, beyond which they seem unable to move. We say that at this point or for that particular structure the students’ interlanguage has fossilized” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p.28).

Immersion Program: “Usual curriculum activities are conducted in second language. In this setting the new language is the medium as well as the object of instruction” (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 31).

Interlanguage: This term refers “to the progression taking place within each language learner” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p. 28).

L1 (First Language): This term is used to describe the native language (Richard-Amato, 1996).

L2 (Second Language): The target language or foreign language being learned (Richard-Amato, 1996).

LAD (Language Acquisition Device): Chomsky (1959) coined the term. “He claimed that language is not learned solely through a process of memorizing and repeating, but that the mind contains an active language processor, the language
acquisition device (LAD), that generates rules through the unconscious acquisition of grammar” (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006, p. 55).

LOE (Language other than English): The word foreign can have negative connotations. LOE is being used to refer to foreign languages that Americans or Anglophones learn (Robinson, Rivers, & Brecht, 2006).

Linguistic Assimilationist: “[Linguistic] assimilationists seek state policies that will ensure the status of English as the country’s sole public language (Schmidt, 2000, p.4).

Linguistic Pluralist: “[Linguistic] Pluralists favor using the state to enhance the presence and status of minority language in the United States” (Schmidt, 2000, p.4).

Monolingualism: This term refers to “(of a person or society) speaking only one language” (Monolingualism, n.d.).

Motherese: “This involves the simplification of speech in an intense desire to on the part of the caretaker to be understood by the child” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p.42).

Social Meliorists: In curriculum reform, social meliorists “saw the schools as a major, perhaps the principal, force for social change and social justice. The corruption and vice in the cities, the inequalities of race and gender, and the abuse of privilege and power could all be addressed by a curriculum that focused directly on those very issues, thereby rising a new generation equipped to deal effectively with those abuses” (Kliebard, 2004, p. 24).

Target Language: The term used to describe the language that is being learned (Curtain & Pesola, 1994).
Summary

Despite the advances in technology, Foreign Language (FL) remains a domain that is best conquered the old-fashioned way, by learning to speak it. Electronic devices and computer programs are not able to replicate the subtle nuances inherent in human thought that result in speaking a FL and in the cultural knowledge for human interactions. The consequences for the American FL deficiency are serious and are at times a matter of national security. A history of monolingualism and the notion of Americanization have been contributing factors to this problem. Most Americans are aware of this dilemma from parents, to educators, to government officials. Nonetheless, the lack of FL proficiency in the United States is a predicament that appears to merit a solution.

The literature review in Chapter 2 provides a historical context to the research question: What personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES programming? For the purposes of this study, the bodies of literature to be examined are in the areas of: (a) Historical Context of American monolingualism; (b) foreign language learning; and (c) curricular struggles and FLES programming. The first section of the literature review examines the history of FL in the U.S., its relationship with English, and the resulting American language policy. Next, FL acquisition theories and practices in education are discussed. Lastly, the history of curricular struggle in American education, with a lens on FLES programs, are examined. Ohio elementary principals are influenced by the history of their culture, indirectly or directly by FL education, and as administrators are living curricular struggle as part of their job requirements.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

The research question, as presented in Chapter One, is: What personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES (foreign language in elementary school) programming? This literature review begins by framing the research question within American historical context of monolingualism. Ohio elementary principals appear to be influenced by American language policies and the resulting influence upon the culture. Next, the literature review delves into SLA (second language acquisition) and FL (foreign language) learning. It seems that most principals have had some sort of LOE (language other than English) experience whether at the K-12 or the university level. Therefore, the best practices in learning a LOE are pertinent to this study. The concluding area of study is curricular struggles and FLES programming, two areas that are intertwined in administrative decisions regarding FLES.

In four hundred years, the English language has become the language of international communication due to British colonialism and the development of the United States as a world power after World War II (Troike, 1977). Phillipson (1992) explains “Whereas once Britannia ruled the waves, now it is English which rules them. The British empire has given way to the empire of English” (p. 1). However, the increased prominence of English has come at a price. “The advance of English, whether in Britain, North America, South Africa, Australia or New Zealand has invariably been at the expense of other languages” (p. 17).

English has become the language of international commerce; however, Americans have become accustomed to their language being used anywhere, not just in the United
States (Brecht & Rivers, 1999; Clankie, 2000). Moreover, “it is arguable that the monolingualism of the Anglo-American establishment blinds its representatives to the realities of multilingualism in the contemporary world and gives them a limiting and false perspective” (Phillipson, 1992, p. 23). Indeed, a provincial attitude has rendered Americans notorious, both here and abroad, for their inability to speak foreign languages (Clankie, 2000; Committee for Economic Development [CED], 2006; Grittner, 1973). This inability has been a cause for concern for decades in matters of national security and international commerce (Brecht & Rivers, 1999; CED, 2006; Weiner, 2007). Buehner (1952) thought that FL study could ameliorate world problems and possibly prevent a nuclear or atomic end of the world through the cultural and linguistic understanding that would be gained. However, the powerful position of English in the world makes it difficult for Americans to value speaking a FL as a necessary skill (Brecht & Rivers, 1999; Clankie, 2000; Fixman, 1990). The end result is the concern that American students are weak in the area of LOEs (CNN, 2003; Lansford, 2002).

A commonly held belief exists that learning LOEs needs to begin at a young age in order to achieve fluency (Davenport, 1978). However, the data is not so clear-cut. There is information available that indicates it is not so much the age of the learner as the amount of time that is spent engaged in learning the FL and/or the motivation of the learner (Bongaerts, Van Summeren, Planken & Schils, 1997; Carroll, 1960; CED, 2006; Rhodes & Schreibstein, 1983). For that reason, a child who begins to study a LOE in elementary school will have spent more time engaged in learning than the child who begins in high school. “Early language learners tend to be successful ones and emerge from their experiences as confident language learners” (Met, 1994, p. 154). Furthermore,
benefits for young language learners have been demonstrated across the curriculum (Met, 1985; Rafferty, 1986; Rosenbusch & Jensen, 1995). In addition, brain research has confirmed that there are cognitive benefits that last a lifetime for those who are bilingual (Bialystok, 2011).

Information compiled from surveys and studies during the late seventies indicates that the American citizenry supports FLES programs (Donoghue, 1981). This desire continues today. A study group assembled by the National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE, 2003) that examined the role of FL and the arts since the implementation of NCLB, concluded that the public aspires to a wide-ranging education for their children comprised of “history, civics, geography, foreign languages and the arts in addition to other core subjects” (p. 4). Despite the public seeming to want FL instruction for their children, it has not become a high priority in the American education system. Although FL is a “core” subject according to NCLB, is it not part of state mandated testing (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The designation of resources for the other core subjects such as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies in response to the mandates of NCLB has resulted in a reduction and in some cases an elimination of FL instruction (CED, 2006; Council for Basic Education, 2004; Dillon, 2010; Manzo, 2008; Rosenbusch & Jensen, 2005; Yount, 2010). However, the lack and elimination of FLES programs in the United States appear to reflect the low priority given to American children becoming proficient in LOEs (CED, 2006; Met, 1994; Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011; Simon, 1992). The importance of English worldwide has existed for decades while the consequences of NCLB have existed for a little over a decade.
However, FL should, in theory, be a priority in light of globalization (CED, 2006; Tochon, 2009).

Nonetheless, the emphasis in most schools is on raising or maintaining high scores on high stakes tests at the expense of providing subjects for which testing mandates do not exist. The pressure to perform due to NCLB requirements is a given in this day and age and drives many curricular decisions made in American schools today. However, other factors are influencing the amount of instruction in LOEs that is occurring in the schools. It is possible that American attitudes toward LOEs and their perceived value as a school subject are also reasons. Currently, no state in the United States has a mandatory FL requirement for all high school graduates. Several states have graduation suggestions regarding FL instruction. However, there are other elective options that may bypass the “requirement” (Met, 1994; National Council of State Supervisors for Languages [NCSSFL], 2014; Tochon, 2009).

Met (1994) discussed the lack of FL policy in the United States and the resulting ramifications upon LOE study. Policymakers including school boards, superintendents, and principals have become successful without knowing a FL. As a result, they base their decisions on their own personal experiences with FL. “Administrators’ frustrations with their own past FL learning experiences frequently inform their commitment to fostering better programs in their own schools today” (Sweley, 2007, p. 47). Oftentimes these policymakers do not realize that FL study has changed from the days of rote memorization. They “fail to see the relevance or utility of language learning” (p. 153). Wilkerson (2006) studied the attitudes of liberal arts college faculty and administrators who were not FL instructors. A reported outcome of the study is that:
Opinions about languages are formed during an individual’s initial language learning experience (usually during adolescence) and that these beliefs remain unchanged during the span of an individual’s professional career. These perceptions, whether positive or negative, are passed along to students, advisees and, therefore, have the potential to influence foreign language study, attitudes, and enrollment (p. 311).

Ohio elementary principals, who are degreed professionals like the aforementioned college faculty members, and for the most part do not have a background as FL instructors, appear to have developed their beliefs in the same manner. This study aims to investigate the views of Ohio elementary principals in regards to their perception of LOE study in their districts.

The institution of education appears to play a role in American students’ proficiency in LOEs. This study has examined the administrative perspective at the beginning of the K-12 sequence, with a focus on obtaining a better understanding of the personal, professional, and contextual characteristics Ohio elementary principals that influence their view of FLES programming. This dissertation has aspired to shed light upon this matter by collecting survey data from Ohio elementary principals. The thoughts of these administrators seem to represent a beginning to the obtainment of an understanding of the apparent lack of emphasis on FL education. According to the former Secretary of Education, Riley, “More than any other developed nation, the United States has fallen behind when it comes to teaching our students the importance of learning an additional language” (2000, p. 6). For the purposes of this study, the bodies of literature, as mentioned in the first chapter will be examined in the areas of: (a) the historical
context of American monolingualism; (b) foreign language learning; and (c) curricular struggles and FLES programming.

A thorough understanding of FL policy in the United States and the resulting monolingualism is the first step to understanding the history of how FL deficiency has developed and what the role of American policy makers has been. After all, American elementary administrators have been influenced by the predominant American culture. Next, it is essential to understand the tenets of FL acquisition. Few FL teachers make the transition to becoming administrators. Therefore, most elementary administrators, including Americans in general, have not become well versed in the best practices involved in FL learning and curriculum. However, the lack of professional knowledge cannot be assumed to equate with lack of support for LOEs in the curriculum. As previously indicated, the American public favors the study of LOEs (Donoghue, 1981; NASBE, 2003; Robinson, Rivers & Brecht, 2006). Many American adults, educators and administrators alike, retain positive memories associated with their time as students of LOEs, which appear to have resulted in their being strong proponents of LOE study. Lastly, a thorough history of American FLES programs is required to comprehend the curricular struggles in regards to LOEs in order to pursue a study involving administrative opinions regarding these matters.
Historical Context of American Monolingualism

**Assimilation versus multiculturalism.** Although the United States is recognized as an English-speaking country, this country does not have a national language policy. As a result, the United States has seemingly followed the practice of linguistic assimilation or the purging of all other languages (Clankie, 2000; Schmidt, 2008). While an explicit mandate does not exist in the Constitution or in federal law, the unofficial practice in the U.S. consists of “linguistic assimilation for language minorities (subtractive bilingualism), combined with a positive stance toward foreign language study by English-speaking (‘mainstream’) students” (Schmidt, 2008, p. 621). In other words, if one is in the United States, one must learn English, but it would be great if the native English-speaking Americans might also consider learning another language. On the other hand, Kloss (1997) likens the usual U.S. policy as hands-off acceptance. Otherwise stated, if a community wishes to maintain a heritage language they can do so without governmental interference or assistance. Marshall (1986) believes that this firmly ingrained idea traces its roots to the Founding Fathers who wanted to leave language as a matter of choice. Schlessinger (1998) states: “Our public schools in particular have been the great instrument of assimilation and the great means of forming an American identity” (p. 17).

The United States takes pride in its identity as a nation of immigrants and the assimilationist view has developed from this story. However, immigration is only part of the story.

In addition to immigration in search of individual freedom, the American people derives from processes of colonization, an international slave trade, military conquest, territorial from European powers, imperialist aspirations in the Western
Hemisphere and in Asia, and other foreign policy interventions resulting in political refugees claiming special access to U.S. protection (Schmidt, 2000, p. 101).

Schmidt (2000) describes American FL policy, not as assimilation only, but rather in terms of linguistic pluralists and linguistic assimilationists. Linguistic pluralists are interested in “righting wrongs”, the wrongs being the American history of oppression of peoples of color including, African Americans, American Indians, Asian and Pacific Islanders, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans. Linguistic pluralists believe that “linguistic prejudice and discrimination have become surrogates for the arguments and practices of white supremacy” (p. 5). On the other hand, linguistic assimilationists are concerned that immigration poses a danger to national unity and they strongly support immigrant integration. Similar to the Founding Fathers, they support an Americanization process that quickly assimilates immigrants into becoming part of the dominant culture. They maintain that the “English language is one of the few ties that hold this ‘nation of immigrants’ together, and that recently enacted pluralistic language policies threaten to unleash an ethnic separatism that will tear apart the social fabric in highly destructive ways” (Schmidt, 2000, p. 5). Nonetheless, the history of immigration in the United States clearly demonstrates that immigrants tend to stop using their Language Other than English (LOEs) within two or three generations (King, 1997; Spolsky, 2011).
**Heritage languages.** The very premise that the United States does not have a national language suggests an attitude of “tolerance” toward LOEs. As previously stated, the Americanization process resulted in the loss of immigrant languages. The desire to become part of the whole has caused newcomers, especially their children, to try to assimilate into the culture. This phenomenon has been a regular occurrence for generations, continuing even today. Many first generation and beyond immigrant children have been embarrassed by their parents or grandparents whose English was heavily accented. For this group of people, the stigma associated with speaking a FL encouraged a monolingual, English culture to the point of forsaking the language of their heritage. Speaking a LOE was regarded with shame, not with pride as a potential resource to the new country, the United States (Simon, 1992).

Nonetheless, some of the “heritage languages—the non-English languages spoken by newcomers and indigenous peoples” have managed to survive in the United States (Peyton, Ranard & McGinnis, 2001, p. 3). Examples of this practice are in Hawaii where both Hawaiian and English are official languages (Clankie, 2000; Peyton, Ranard & McGinnis, 2001), Louisiana where French is well known as an important heritage language (Clankie, 2000), the territory of Puerto Rico where English and Spanish are the official languages, and in the “Pennsylvania Dutch” area of the Midwestern United States where German is still spoken today. In all of the aforementioned cases, these heritage languages have struggled for survival due to the power of English (Crawford, 2000; Fishman, 2001; Spring, 2011).

The Louisiana Purchase of 1803, sold by Napoleon Bonaparte to the United States, led to a foreign people, the French, becoming part of another country without any
choice in the matter. At that time, 85% of the population in this territory was French-speaking and the Anglophones were the minority (Crawford, 2000). Shortly after in 1812, Louisiana became the 18th state of an English-speaking country (Crawford, 2000). At that point, the position of the French language in Louisiana became precarious. “Hardly more than a century after the first state constitution was introduced in French, the State Constitution of 1921 deofficialized and deinstitutionalized the French language, banning it from state agencies and public schools” (Crawford, 2000; Louisiana Believes, 2013, p. 3). Throughout the 200 plus year history of Louisiana, ten state constitutions have been created, each revealing the status of the French language at that time in the State. In general, each version offered a diminished role and eventual unofficial status for French (Ward, 1997). The Council for the Development of French in Louisiana (CODOFIL: Office of Francophone Affairs) is an organization unique in the United States in that it is dedicated solely to the promotion of French, a heritage language. Due to the diligent efforts of the council, French in Louisiana is growing due to immersion programs and an overall increase in K-12 programs (Louisiana Believes, 2013). However, French does not currently enjoy an official status in the state (Ward, 1997).

Hawaii has followed a path similar to that of Louisiana since the status of Hawaiian, like French, has ebbed and flowed over the last one hundred years. The Hawaiian language was banned in schools when the last ruling monarch, Queen Liliuokalani, was overthrown by the American military in 1893 (Hawaii History, 2014). Hawaii became a U.S. territory in 1898 and a state in 1959 (Hawaii Tourism Authority, 2014). As a result of the ban and Hawaii’s status as a state, English became the language of the majority. However in 1986, after almost one hundred years, the language ban was
lifted in the schools since Hawaii declared two official languages, Hawaiian and English, in 1978 by order of the State Constitution (Wilson, 1998; Hawaii History, 2014). In the end, an appreciation of heritage and history reinstated the Hawaiian language. Prevailing political climates that promote heritage languages have resulted in the growth of the heritage languages of French in Louisiana and Hawaiian in Hawaii to proliferate.

On the other hand, the duality of the language situation in the U.S. Commonwealth of Puerto Rico appears to be unlike that of Hawaii and Louisiana in that English has not become the dominant language. Spanish has not disappeared or lessened in importance, though U.S. authorities have unsuccessfully tried to impose English as the language of instruction in the public schools. Each time this imposition of English occurred, public outcry greatly influenced the legislators to put an end to the mandate and this pressure led more than one Commissioner of Instruction to resign his position (Pousada, 1999). A 1943 U.S. Senate committee “criticized the fact that after 45 years of domination, Puerto Ricans could still not speak English” (p. 42). And now, after a century of English and current mandatory K-12 English, only 20% of Puerto Ricans are bilingual (Clachar, 1997; Pousada, 1999). As a result, Puerto Rico has had both Spanish and English as official languages with a brief period in the nineties where English was dropped and Spanish was the only official language (Pousada, 1999; Rivera, 2014). Johnson (2012) has indicated that most Puerto Ricans (61%) are in favor of becoming a state. However, controversy with regard to language remains a point of contention to this day with major politicians such as former presidential candidate Rick Santorum demanding that speaking English should be a condition of statehood (Reuters, 2012).
One heritage language in the United States, German, “Pennsylvania German”, often referred to as Pennsylvania “Dutch”, has remained in practice for more than 200 years, the only colonial language to engage in such a practice. Pennsylvania Dutch is the language spoken by US Amish groups. Remaining in practice, in this case, refers to this dialect of German being passed on intergenerationally. That is not to say that the language has not changed in the 200 plus years that it has been on this continent. The changes in the currently spoken Pennsylvania Dutch are the same types that have occurred in other languages such as the English spoken in the United States. In 200 years American English has evolved differently than the English of England. In addition to the normal changes that occur in language, the physical separation of the Pennsylvania German groups from the general population aided in its sustenance over the years. “That ability (not unlike the ability among some Amerindian groups and ultraorthodox Jews) is primarily attributable to their jealously guarded physical and cultural distance from the American mainstream” (Fishman, 2011, p. 84).

Hawaii is the only state in the United States to have an official second language, that being Hawaiian. However, there is no federal law that mandates English as the official language of the United States. Nonetheless, thirty-one states have adopted laws designating English as the official language. Indigenous languages in this country have almost disappeared. However, heritage language initiatives among Amerindians are showing remarkable progress due to their own advocacy (Fishman, 2011). Spanish and English have been at “war” in Puerto Rico. The historical status of official state languages other than English can be likened to a pendulum that swings to the whim of prevailing public policy.
One policy maker, who expressed concern with the state of heritage languages in the United States, was the late Senator Paul Simon. He clearly saw the relationship between LOEs and heritage languages and realized that there was a great deal of potential that was being lost. Simon (1992) indicates this regarding LOEs in the United States:

Because of our rich ethnic mix, the United States is home to millions whose first language is not English. One in every fifty Americans is foreign-born. We are the fourth largest Spanish-speaking country in the world. Yet almost nothing is being done to preserve the language skills we have or use this rich linguistic resource to train people in the use of language other than English (p. 4).

Heritage language speakers are readily available in the United States and, they are a resource that has gone virtually untapped (Lambert, 1994; Peyton, Ranard & McGinnis, 2001).

According to the 2011 American Community Survey, more than 300 languages other than English are currently being spoken by 20% of the US population in their homes as forms of heritage languages (Ryan, 2013, p. 4). Indeed, this population should be viewed as a vast reserve of linguists. Secretary of Education Arne Duncan indicated in 2010, only 18% of Americans reported being able to speak a FL, but 53% of Europeans can speak a second language. He puts it simply, “To prosper economically and improve relations with other countries, Americans need to read, speak, and understand other languages” (Skorton & Altschuler, 2012, para. 2). Simon (1992) goes on to explain that there are many reasons for FL deficiency in the United States; however, “…one word, Americanization, explains the major part of it. That word speaks to this nation’s strength and to its weakness” (pp. 11-12).
Americanization – the “new race”. The beginning of this idea of “Americanization” dates back to the Founding Fathers of the United States and their desire for a united and educated citizenry. Education was the method by which citizens would be inculcated into the American way. It was George Washington’s belief that all immigrants were welcome to the United States; however, he advised the newly arrived to cast aside “…language, habits, and principles (good or bad) which they bring with them” and be prepared to become part our people “assimilated to our customs, measures, and laws…” (Schlessinger, 1998, p. 30). Lack of assimilation was also a concern of Benjamin Franklin, who voiced great concern regarding German immigrants who at the time comprised one third of the population. In Pennsylvania, 7000 German immigrants were arriving yearly and threatened to outnumber the Anglophones (Crawford, 2000).

Tyack (1966) discusses the influences of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Rush, and Noah Webster on education and its role in the new United States in post-Revolutionary America. In particular, several conflicting ideals existed, one being that the national idea of liberty that was the basis for this country. However, this idea sometimes conflicted with the notion of creating the ideal citizen. Jefferson was against Americans studying abroad as was George Washington, who promoted the idea of a federal university so that Americans would not risk “contamination” of thought. The fear of European influences ran so strong that in 1785 Georgia passed a law preventing residents from serving in political office for as many years as they had studied abroad. However, all of these men viewed “conformity as the price of liberty” (p. 31). Webster promoted American English, through his textbook in which he was able to standardize spelling, pronunciation, and further the idea of the “homogeneous” American, one whose character has been shaped
by schooling. The purpose of education was “an all-out effort to Americanize” (p. 32). Jefferson, Rush, and Webster believed that federal education standards would ensure the homogeneous American. Webster wrote textbooks that promoted patriotism and also worked to create a uniform language since there were so many variations in individual states. Jefferson wanted Americans to be educated at home, not abroad. Jefferson, Rush, and Webster advocated a standard education; however, they believed that this could be accomplished at the national or state level (Tyack, 1966). As time passed, educational control remained at the state and local level. That practice is not the norm in most other parts of the world. In fact, for the majority of other countries, education curriculum and policy are regulated at the national level (Simon, 1992).

**Anglophonic bias.** Although the colonies included immigrants of British, Dutch, French, and Spanish, descent, the majority of the settlers in the original 13 colonies were from Great Britain. The end result is an Anglocentric “flavor” to American culture and of course, language (Schlessinger, 1998). “For better or worse, the white Anglo-Saxon Protestant tradition was for two centuries—and in crucial respects still is—the dominant influence on American culture and society” (p. 34). This Anglocentrism resulted in bias against speakers of LOEs. However, this bias was not created equal. In the eyes of Anglophones, the country of origin and whether or not an ethnic group was a “conquered people” made a difference in the societal treatment of the group (Crawford, 2000; Spring, 2011).

As mentioned previously in the section pertaining to heritage languages, not all speakers of LOEs were immigrants. The indigenous peoples of the United States did not become English-speakers by choice. They were a conquered people for whom learning
English was a matter of necessity. Native Hawaiians were another conquered people who fall into this category. In addition, other speakers of LOEs found that the language of their “homeland” had changed through purchase or treaty negotiations when their land became part of the United States. Such was the case for the French citizens who were “sold” as part of the Louisiana Purchase. Similar to the French, the homeland of many Mexicans was ceded to the United States in the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo at the conclusion of the Mexican-American War in 1848 (Crawford, 2000; Spring, 2011). Without any physical movement on their part, French and Mexican citizens suddenly found themselves living in a different country and being governed in a FL, English.

The expansion of American land from the Mexican-American War was substantial and included Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Texas, and Utah. Even before the war, a great deal of bias existed regarding Spanish immigrants in the southwest. This was a war about the racial superiority of the Anglo-Saxons, the northern Europeans who comprised the American leadership. According to American Anglophones, Spanish-speaking immigrants were not white since they were not from northern Europe. Furthermore, the Spanish conquerors had intermingled over the years with Native Americans, who were also not considered white. The resulting Mexicans were believed to be inferior on many levels. The non-white bias proved detrimental in matters of citizenship. Although Mexicans were promised citizenship in the treaty, the treaty did not adhere to American policy at the time. American policy dictated that those who were not white were not eligible for citizenship according to the Naturalization Act of 1790. This act classified race according to skin color. As a result, Spanish language rights, as well as citizenship rights that were guaranteed in treaty negotiations, were not
honored because the Spanish were not white. In addition, Spanish-speakers were
criticized for not having learned English and were referred to as “foreigners” by Anglo-
American politicians, even though their geography had not changed, just their country of
affiliation (Spring, 2011). To make matters even more challenging for the Spanish
speakers, the California Land Act of 1851 demanded that all landowners show the title to
their possessions in English-speaking courts. The legal expenses involved in the process
for English-speaking attorneys resulted in over 40% of their landholdings being sold to
defray the expenses (Pitt, 1966). The bias and conflict involving culture and language in
the American southwest have existed for over a century. The struggle today with
language issues, including bilingual education, remains in the forefront of some political
discussions (Spring, 2011).

Asian immigration began with the California gold rush of the 1850s. The
opportunity for prosperity drew a large wave of Chinese immigrants to work the
goldfields. Some immigrants hoped to return to their homeland while others desired to
make a new life in the United States. However, these immigrants faced the loss of their
high wages and the ability to return home to China, as the gold rush declined. As a matter
of survival, they took jobs building the transcontinental railroad and in agriculture, at
very low wages, lower than what white workers were earning at that time (Spring, 2011).

Asian immigration grew to include Japanese who came to Hawaii and mainland
California as well as immigrants from many other Asian countries. In the early 1900s, the
Philippine Islands were taken over by the U.S. As a result, Hawaii and mainland
California received a large wave of Philippine immigrants who were solicited as laborers.
Prior to 1850 the total number of Asian immigrants was less than 1% of the immigrant
population total. Despite the growing number of immigrants of Asian origin, the percentage only increased to slightly less than 2% by 1930. Asian immigrants faced much of the same bias that was faced by Spanish-speakers since both groups were not white and therefore not eligible for citizenship rights. The 1882 Chinese Exclusion Act in tandem with the 1790 Naturalization Law legally denied citizenship to Chinese immigrants. Other Asians, including Japanese, were considered “Mongolian”, not white, and were thus rejected for American citizenship (Spring 2011).

Americanization through education, the ideal promoted by the Founding Fathers, was denied to non-white immigrants. The racial attitudes of Anglo-Americans denied educational opportunities to African Americans, Asian Americans, Mexican Americans, and Native Americans. In California, the school code of 1872 mandated the education of just all white children. Court cases resulted in segregated schooling in the state. However, this was not unique to California. In Mississippi, Chinese children were required to attend the “colored” schools because they were not white (Spring, 2011).

Schlessinger (1998) commented that just as immigration trends on the West Coast were changing with an influx of immigrants from Asia, a shift began in the East that included Germans and Scandinavians “who were regarded as clannish in their fidelity to language and customs of the old country” (p. 35), and the Irish who were described as drunken papists. Feelings between the established Americans and the newcomers became tense in the 1850s, especially in major cities such as New York where “immigrants made up half the population and outnumbered native-born Americans in Chicago” (p. 35). Nonetheless, this pre—Civil War population became Americans. After the Civil War, southern and Eastern European immigrants of “over 27 million arrived in the half-century
from Lee’s surrender at Appomattox to America’s entry into the First World War—more than the total population of the country in 1850” (p. 37). These groups were associated with strange clothing, customs, language and religion. Little by little ethnic enclaves such as “Little Italy” and Chinatown and were forming in response to the perceived imposition of Anglocentric values. The multiple languages of these immigrant groups inspired an Americanization movement by the majority English-speaking population, consisting of classes in language, citizenship, and American history to accelerate assimilation (Altenbaugh, 2003; Schlessinger, 1998).
**U.S. English.** Beginning in the 1920s, immigration quotas changed the American landscape. This resulted in a significant drop in the immigrant population. Hansen and Faber (1997) reported that the foreign-born population in 1910 was 14.9%, but that by 1970 this number had decreased to 4.8%. Decades later, in the sixties, Congress repealed immigration laws that were designed to keep non-European immigrants out of the United States. The repealing of these immigration laws resulted in a dramatic increase in the number of foreign-born in the U.S., an increase to 9.3% in 1996. These immigrants were predominately Asian and Hispanic, effectively doubling the number of perceived “foreigners” in the American population. In addition to the high visibility of non-European immigrants, these people were speaking “their” languages. For many Americans, this was their first experience with non-Anglos that were freely speaking another language. Assimilation did not seem to be occurring, resulting in the idea that English was being threatened (Crawford, 2000; Schmidt, 2000). In addition to the documented immigration that increased with the change in law, the number of undocumented immigrants is unknown. However, three million undocumented immigrants requested legalized status through the amnesty afforded in the 1986 Immigration Reform and Control Act (Silver, 1989; Plumer, 2013). These changes set the stage for the initiation of an organization dedicated to maintaining the American way of life through English, the organization known as U.S. English.

Indeed, the increased visibility of “foreigners” in the United States and the LOEs they were speaking ignited fears in the English-speaking population. These fears were recognized by the U.S. Senate. Despite the wishes of the Founding Fathers that left the United States without an official language, a strong constituency of Americans who
wished to have English recognized as the official language of the United States emerged in the nineteen eighties. Senator S.I. Hayakawa proposed, in 1981 in response to the “English only” movement, a constitutional amendment designating English as the official language of the United States. Although the amendment failed, it was the beginning of the organization known as U.S. English, founded by Senator Hayakawa and an ophthalmologist John Stanton (Crawford, 2000; King 1997; Schmidt, 2000).

U.S. English describes itself “as the nation’s oldest and largest non-partisan citizens’ action group dedicated to preserving the unifying role of the English language in the United States” (U.S. English, 2014, Welcome, para. 2). Crawford (2000) describes Hayakawa, the founder, as a follower of Theodore Roosevelt who frequently quotes the former president’s statement on language, saying that there was “…room for but one language in this country, and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house” (Crawford, 2000, p. 8). By 1999 this group:

…claimed over 1.3 million members…, and has included on its board of directors such American luminaries as Walter Annenberg, Jacques Barzun, Saul Bello, Bruno Bettelheim, Alistair Cook, Walter Cronkite, Norman Cousins, Angier Biddle Duke, George Gilder, Barry Goldwater, Sidney Hook, Norman Podhoretz, Arnold Schwarzenegger and Karl Shapiro (p. 31).

Changes in leadership in the group brought about controversy. Anti-immigrant and in particular anti-Hispanic beliefs by chair John Stanton in the late eighties brought prominent members of the group such as board member Walter Cronkite to disassociate with the group and the President at that time, Linda Chávez, to resign. Strife in the group
continued until the nineties when Mauro Mújica, a South American immigrant took over the organization. His own message, as a Chilean international student at Columbia University in his youth, demonstrated the belief of the group, that immigrants must learn English in order to learn the language of language of “equal opportunity” (Crawford, 2000; King, 1997).

Over the past four decades the efforts of U.S. English have remained constant but it has been necessary to adjust its strategy: “…recent efforts by U.S. English to make English the official language have been so firmly resisted, so their efforts have been redirected to resolutions of city governments and state legislatures” (Spolsky, 2011, p. 1). As a result, thirty-one states have declared English as their official language (U.S. English, Official English, U.S. States with Official English Laws). In 2014, the advisory board still included Schwarzenegger and Podhoretz, but also on the roster are Dr. Denton Cooley (first implantation of an artificial heart), Midge Decter (journalist and author), Dinesh Desai (CEO Forbes), Harvey Meyerhoff (U.S. Holocaust Museum), Arnold Palmer, Alex Trebek, and many others who represent a diverse range of religions, politics, and nationalities, thus indicating support for U.S. English from a wide-ranging constituency (U.S. English, About Us, Advisory Board).

The United States does not have an official language. For this reason, the efforts of U.S. English might seem extreme. There is no question that the dominant language in the United States is English and that most Americans feel “secure” regarding its status (Robinson, Rivers & Brecht, 2006). Wiley (1996) notes that the U.S. has always been “linguistically diverse”. Nevertheless, English is in no danger of being replaced anytime soon (p. 22). However, the concern for linguistic unity is not something new. Crawford
(2000) explained that, Benjamin Franklin promoted an English-only campaign due to the growing number of German immigrants in Pennsylvania. Franklin’s views became more tolerant later in life when he needed the political support of the German community and he grew to support diversity. Franklin demonstrates the change from assimilation to pluralism. The assimilationist idea is that the U.S. is a “melting pot” with all of its peoples becoming one, which includes speaking one language. On the other hand the, pluralists prefer to describe the U.S. as a salad bowl, meaning that the individual “ingredients” or languages maintain their separate flavors but are part of the whole, and are English-speaking as well (Schmidt, 2000).
**Foreign language politics.** Prevailing politics have greatly influenced FL instruction in the U.S. over the past century. During the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the most commonly taught FL was German. Not only was German taught as a foreign language, it was also the language of instruction in many bilingual schools for both children of German descent and non-German children. The German language was highly regarded and valued as the quasi-second language of the United States (Pavlenko, 2003). Nonetheless, anti-German and in general anti-foreign attitudes grew, in the years leading up to World War I, in response to the war (Pavlenko, 2003; Simon, 1992; Wiley, 1998). Prior to World War I, the number of students studying foreign language reached its peak (Simon, 1992). World War I brought about an anti-foreign sentiment that resulted in some states attempting to prohibit the study of FL. As a result, an overall decrease in FL study was experienced with the German language bearing the brunt of the negativity (Altenbaugh, 2003; Curtain & Pesola, 1994; Pavlenko, 2003; Simon, 1992). By 1922, the number of students enrolled in German classes had decreased 98% as compared to 1915 (Simon, 1992). German Americans faced extreme bias and regarding their language, “German as a foreign language was practically legislated out of existence, with policies spreading to all FL instruction” (Pavlenko, 2003, p. 318). The German language all but disappeared from education and society, never to regain its prominence (Altenbaugh, 2003; Crawford, 2000; Wiley, 1998). Xenophobia and overall negativity toward other languages contributed to an increasingly monolingual atmosphere in the United States (Pavlenko, 2003).

The reduction in FL study eventually led to a shortage in linguists during World War II that continued to the Sputnik era of the mid-1950s. In fact, decreasing FL
enrollment forced the War Department to take up FL instruction in order to meet the needs of national security (Simon, 1992). As a result, speaking a LOE began to take on importance as an integral part of national defense (Altenbaugh, 2003; Spring, 2011). The term “critical languages” has been coined to refer to the “less commonly taught languages that are crucial to national security, such as Arabic, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Persian/Farsi, Russian, and Turkish” (CED, 2006, p. 1). In response to Sputnik, the 1958 National Defense Education Act encouraged math, science, and FL instruction, especially in Russian and other critical languages (Altenbaugh, 2003; Spolsky, 2011).

The U.S. Supreme Court case, *Lau v Nichols* (1974), exposed serious bias that existed in the schools for immigrant children. Chinese-speaking children in San Francisco schools were not receiving the assistance they needed to be successful in school. The Supreme Court believed that equality was not a matter of providing the same materials to students but that special programs were needed to facilitate learning for all students. Bilingual education programs would eventually grow, after much litigation, to help Spanish-speakers and other immigrant children in the schools. The 1965 Immigration Act changed the face of the situation with most immigrants no longer coming from regions other than northern Europe (Altenbaugh, 2003; Spring, 2011). The challenges of oppressed immigrant groups in the US, in combination with the new arrivals, sparked discussion of multicultural education, an appreciation of other cultures, and gender equality (Spring, 2011).

The U.S. Department of Education’s publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 was a throwback to the Sputnik fears that the U.S. was falling behind in the global economy due to educational deficits. This fear that the U.S. educational system was not measuring
up would eventually lead to the NCLB Act of 2002 (Rudalevige, 2003). Unfortunately, the high-stakes testing associated with NCLB has had a negative effect on FL education. The emphasis placed on math and English has resulted in untested subjects, such as FL, to experience decreased support (Spolsky, 2011). Over one third of the schools surveyed by Rhoades and Pufahl (2010) indicated that their FL programs had been negatively impacted by NCLB. Although K-12 FL education has been seeing decreases in support, the terrorist attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001 (9/11) were a wake-up call to national defense and the intelligence community (Spolsky, 2011).

**Foreign Language Learning**

Hayward and Siaya (2001) examined survey data from the American Council on Education (ACE) about international education. According to the results from the two ACE surveys on the subject of international education, one a telephone survey of Americans 18 and older, and the other to college-bound high school students, the American public supports international education. These results were true for all regions of the United States and according to Hayward and Siaya, clearly demonstrate community support for FL training. The purpose of both studies was to provide higher education institutions with attitudinal knowledge of the American public in regards to international education. The survey data reflects that survey participants understand that American students need global proficiencies, specifically the ability to interact with people from foreign cultures, which entails cultural and Foreign Language (FL) proficiency. “To do that, our graduates need more international knowledge, strong training in languages, and deeper cultural understanding than most are getting at the present time” (p. 42).
In order for American students to be able to gain this knowledge, more time would need to be dedicated to international education, which includes FL instruction. International issues including FL are often left by the wayside due to the concerns for proficiency in reading, math, and science, the subjects that are part of high-stakes testing (CED, 2006; Council for Basic Education, 2004; Dillon, 2010; Levine, 2005; Manzo, 2008; Rosenbusch & Jensen, 2005; Yount, 2010). However, change is occurring as demonstrated in the 15 states that have requested and received funding from various international organizations to change their curriculum to include the study of international relationships between their states and other countries. In addition, these states are increasing their support of FL programs (Levine, 2005).

The majority of the world begins FL instruction in elementary school; however, in the United States of America, the norm is to begin studying a LOE in middle or high school (Pufahl, Rhodes, & Christian, 2001). In a 2009 collaborative survey between the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) and National Research Center for College & University Admissions (NRCCUA), the results reflected that 30% of the high school students (151,988) indicated that if they would have liked the opportunity to start their studies in elementary school (ACTFL, April 2010, p. 22). Like these high school students, Blumner (2010) laments that language was not offered to her until high school “We all know that language exposure in high school is too late. Foreign languages are best acquired young, very young” (para. 8).
**Younger learners.** A commonly held belief suggests that young children are the most successful FL learners (Curtain & Pesola, 1994; Davenport, 1978; Met, 1994). Many FL instructors that hold this belief subscribe to Lenneberg’s critical period hypothesis, that children best learn a language before puberty (Lenneberg, 1967). Although this theory has not been proved, other considerations should be examined when comparing the language learning of young children with older learners. The language of young children is much less complex than that of older learners (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006). However, studies in the area of phonology or accent show that younger learners are able to achieve an accent closer to that of a native speaker (Oyama, 1976). FL pedagogy Language 1 (L1) refers to the native language, and Language 2 (L2) refers to the second language being learned. Oyama found that the younger the L2 learner, the closer the accent would be to that of an L1 speaker of that language.

Curtain and Pesola (1994) explain that some of the characteristics of younger learners lend themselves to language learning, especially oral skills. Pre-school students from the ages of two to four have short attention spans, need a variety of activities, and are strong learners of oral/aural skills, as they are in L1. This age has “great patience for repetition of the same activity or skill” (p.69). Early elementary age students from the ages of five to seven “like to name objects, define words, and learn about things in their world” (p. 69). This age group learns through oral language; therefore, “they are capable of developing good oral skills, pronunciation, and intonation when they have a good model” (p. 69). Older elementary students, ages eight to ten are open to learning about “people and situations different from their own experience” (p. 69). These children are capable of hands on activities and are ready for “a more systematic approach to language
learning” (p. 70). Nonetheless, “some of the reasons that children are such successful language learners lie in other factors such as the amount of time spent in learning the language and the teaching methodology used” (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 2). The 1983 report, A Nation at Risk, confirms the need for time: “Achieving proficiency in a foreign language ordinarily requires from 4 to 6 years of study and should, therefore, be started in the elementary grades” (Recommendations: Recommendation A: Content: 6).

**Older learners.** As previously indicated, most FL learners in the U.S. are older when learning a second language. According to Richard-Amato (1996), these “older”, non-elementary age learners have many advantages:

They have a greater knowledge of the world in general, they have more control over the input they receive; (e.g., they are able to ask for repetitions, renegotiate meaning, change the topic, and so forth more readily), they are able to learn and apply rules that may in facilitating the acquisition process (unless they are still very young children), they have a first language (and perhaps one or more second languages) from which they can transfer strategies and linguistic knowledge, and they have one or more cultures that give them advanced information about expectations, discourse in general, and how to get things done with language (p. 25).

Díaz-Rico and Weed (2006) concur for the aforementioned reasons, indicating that the research, which compares “adults to children has consistently demonstrated that adolescents and adults outperform children in controlled language-learning studies” (p. 8). Nonetheless, disadvantages exist, which are associated with older non-elementary learners. “Older learners may have increased inhibitions and anxiety and may find
themselves afraid to make errors” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p. 25). Sometimes older learners do not have positive attitudes or they may lack motivation depending upon their reason for studying a FL. Learners might not be very motivated if they are studying a language for a requirement such as a university entrance requirement or if they find themselves in a country where they are not interested in the people or culture (Richard-Amato, 1996). In other words, there are multiple factors that influence L2 learning, which include: “age, aptitude, attitude, motivation, personality, cognitive style, and preferred learning strategies” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 75).

**Grammar-translation method.** The instruction, learning, and examination of languages have existed for over 2,000 years (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Formal language examination and classification began with the early Greeks in the fourth century BC. The grammar system that was developed at this time was then applied to the current languages of scholarship, Latin and Greek (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006). Moreover, the grammar that was identified became the basis for teaching these languages. This method consisted of grammar rules, vocabulary lists, and sentences to be translated, and would eventually be known as the grammar-translation method of teaching FL. Listening and speaking skills were taught; nonetheless, reading and writing were the priority, not oral communication (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

By the Middle Ages, Greek diminished in status and Latin became the written language of the educated classes. In spite of this outcome, the role of Latin had changed and its prominence as a spoken language had diminished. Moreover, the spoken languages or vernaculars were increasing in stature and becoming acceptable as
languages of scholarship (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In fact, by “the sixteenth century, however, French, Italian and English gained in importance as a result of political changes in Europe, and Latin gradually became displaced as a language of spoken and written communication” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 4). Nonetheless, the grammar-translation method that relied heavily upon reading and writing, the most valued skills in Latin, was also the methodology being employed to teach the vernacular or spoken languages (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The grammar-translation method remained prevalent through the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth centuries in American schools (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).
Behaviorism and linguistics. Language scholarship expanded through the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, which led to the scientific study of language, the field of linguistics (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richards & Rogers, 2014). In fact, “the reaction against traditional grammar was prompted by the movement toward positivism and empiricism, which Darwin’s *On the Origin of the Species* had helped promote and by an increased interest in non-European languages on the part of scholars” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p.62). Descriptive or structural linguistics grew out of the comparisons being drawn between languages. Further studies in linguistics resulted in grammatical structures being identified, which also led to sentence diagramming. In other words, the study of language via linguistics was flourishing (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). The scientific approach offered by linguistics would be the basis for a scientific approach to FL teaching that would also include the theoretical construct regarding human behavior that is referenced as behaviorism (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

As a result, the grammar-translation method gave way to new methodologies in the 20th century that were based on behaviorism (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richard-Amato 1996; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Behaviorist theory purports that “learning is defined as a change in behavior brought about by experience with virtually no concern for mental or internal processes of thinking” (Hoy & Miskel, 2005, p. 41). In particular, this approach followed the ideas of Skinner who stressed the value of antecedents and consequences in modifying behavior. Put simply, learning could be explained in terms of antecedent-behavior-consequence (A-B-C). The antecedent is what happens before the behavior and the consequence is the result of the behavior. The concept of A-B-C explains that the consequence of a behavior becomes the antecedent for the next
behavior. The emphasis in behaviorism is on the outcome or the consequence of the behavior. The consequence of the behavior reinforces the behavior. Positive reinforcement happens when a behavior results in a new motivating force whereas negative reinforcement takes place when a stimulus is removed. Focusing on the antecedent that happens before the behavior gives information about which behaviors result in positive and negative consequences (Hoy & Miskel).

Behavioral learning is a matter of a stimulus and response and as applied to FL learning, students acquire knowledge through repetition and reward, a pedagogical application of Pavlov’s work with animals. The concept was that verbal learning consisted of conditioning, which for FL learning meant drill and practice (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). Two popular twentieth century FL programs based on the tenets of behaviorism were the audiolingual method (ALM) and direct teaching (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richard-Amato 1996; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).
Natural and direct methods. The 19th century witnessed the natural method in France. It was based on the idea of immersion, surrounding the learner with the target language in a manner similar to one in which an infant learns, Language 1 (L1) (Richard-Amato, 1996). The direct method movement, popular in the 1920s in the United States, was a derivative of the natural method, and was also known as the Berlitz method (Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Richard-Amato, 1996; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). Similar to the natural method, the Berlitz method was based on the way children learn their native language. Students are immersed in the Language 2 (L2) and the instructor helps the learners to associate phrases with objects and actions, the way infants and young children learn L1. Correct pronunciation is stressed but correct grammar is not, the assumption being that grammar is learned implicitly through the instruction in L2. Drawbacks to this method are the high level of language skills that are demanded of the instructor, and the fossilization of errors by learners due to the lack of grammatical instruction (Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Fossilization occurs when a mistake becomes a rule in the learner’s interlanguage (Richard-Amato, 1996). Interlanguage is the interim language that is a unique combination of the native language, L1, and the language being learned, L2, but has features that pertain neither to the L1 nor to the L2 (Selinker, 1974). Nonetheless, one lasting effect of these methodologies is the concept of methods, using a specific method for FL instruction, and the arguments that arose regarding the manner that a FL should be taught. “The history of language teaching throughout much of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first century saw the rise and fall of a variety of language teaching approaches and methods” (Richards & Rodgers, 2014, p. 14).
The pendulum had swung from the importance of reading, writing, and grammar of the grammar-translation method to the highly oral/aural skills that were favored in the natural and direct methods. In 1923, a study to document the condition of FL teaching in the US was initiated and was eventually published as the Coleman report. The report determined that it was not possible for any one unique method of FL instruction to ensure successful learning and mastery of a language. Another conclusion drawn from the report was the impracticality of focusing on teaching skills that are time-consuming such as speaking, given the limited available amount of classroom time. The main suggestion of the report was that reading should be the skill that is of the utmost importance in FL classrooms. This recommendation appears to have contributed to the decline in FL speakers in the United States through the World War II years (Coleman, 1929).

**Audiolingual method (ALM).** The historical context of FL appears to explain the decrease in American speakers of FL and the necessity for governmental intervention. In the years leading up to World War I, anti-German and in general anti-foreign attitudes grew in response to the war (Pavlenko, 2003; Simon, 1992; Wiley, 1998). Prior to World War I, the number of students studying FL, as previously noted, reached its peak (Simon, 1992). World War I brought about an anti-foreign sentiment that resulted in some states attempting to prohibit the study of FL. As a result, an overall decrease in FL study in the United States was experienced (Altenbaugh, 2003; Pavlenko, 2003; Simon, 1992; Wiley, 1998).

The world was changing and there was an actual need for Americans to speak a FL. However, not many Americans spoke a FL and this resulted in a shortage of soldiers
with this ability. A methodology that could quickly impart speaking skills was necessary. As a result, the Audiolingual Method (ALM) was first employed by the American Army in the years leading up to World War II, as a means to teach the troops useful phrases that they would need while serving in foreign countries. The need for multi-lingual Americans continued after the war. The launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the fear that the institution of American education was in jeopardy resulted in the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which funded FL studies in the 50s and 60s. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 also promoted the ALM being used by the military via FL methodology workshops for teachers who were sponsored by the government (Richard-Amato, 1996).

The ALM was primarily oral and consisted of learners being provided with specific drills in L2, led by a teacher who emphasized correct speaking. In contrast to the grammar-translation method, reading and writing skills were secondary and supported speaking skills. Nonetheless, the speaking skills gained demonstrated excellent pronunciation, but only in contrived situations from constant drilling. The ultimate goal was for the learner to develop the skills of a native speaker (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richard-Amato 1996; Richards & Rogers, 2014). “In order to become proficient in L2, the habits of L1 need to be ‘beaten down’, so to speak, before the habits of L2 can be firmly established” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p. 26). Besides the weakness in reading and writing skills, another weakness was the lack of creativity in oral responses, due to limited vocabulary and practice (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006). Moreover, students of the ALM had difficulty applying their classroom knowledge to real world situations (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).
As previously stated, the ALM and the direct methods were based on behaviorism. However, this approach was only half of the theory that inspired the ALM. The other major theory behind the ALM was structural linguistics (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006; Richard-Amato 1996; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). In the 1950s, the following for structural linguistics grew. According to structural linguistics, languages were viewed as systems and they were compared to each other rather than being compared to Latin only. Furthermore, speech was regarded as language, the spoken word as opposed to reading, writing, and literature. The combination of behaviorism with theories from linguistics and psychology has been the backbone of the ALM (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

The Audiolingual Method (ALM), as implied in its title, addressed aural and oral skills, a drastic change from the previous Latin-driven grammar-translation method. Nonetheless, the ALM was an example of the prevailing mindset of the time that believed language was more than a tool for understanding classic literature; that it was a mode of communication. However, recommendations from the Coleman report suggested a return to instruction that stressed reading skills (Coleman, 1929). This suggestion to focus on a specific skill illustrates the educational tendency to jump on “bandwagons” (Grittner, 1973). By the mid-twentieth century a changing world that included increased immigration and changes in education brought about the need for more FL speakers (Richards & Rodgers, 2014). As a result, changes became an inevitable function in foreign language instructional methodology. “Current theories of language have thus moved away from the merely linguistic components of language to the more inclusive realm of language in use—which includes its social, political, and psychological domains” (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006, p. 55).
**Cognitive model.** A cognitive approach to learning emphasizes what the learner brings to the learning process. More precisely, what the learner knows directs future learning and acts as a scaffold upon which new learning can take place (Hoy & Miskel, 2005). More specifically “a cognitive view of language is based on the idea that language reflects properties of the mind” (Richards & Rogers, 2014, p. 23). A challenge to ALM was initiated by Noam Chomsky in 1959, purporting that constant oral input was not the whole story in L1 and L2 acquisition. Language was not just learned from memorization, but rather “that the mind contains an active language processor, the Language Acquisition Device (LAD), which generates rules through the conscious acquisition of grammar (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006, p. 15). The language environment that the learner is born into will determine how the brain will process the information. To build upon the LAD is the Chomsky’s idea of Universal Grammar. The concept is based on the premise that there are basic principles shared by all languages, that we are born with these, and that they represent the manner in which children learn, at a very young age, something as complex as their native language. These basic grammar rules are products of the LAD. It is theorized that when learning the second language, the brain must reset these parameters to correlate with the FL being learned (Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Richard-Amato, 1996).

Criticism of Chomsky’s theories purports that the social aspects of language are not included in the theories, and that all language learning is not innate (Richard-Amato, 1996) Further discord in the theory concerns the differences between learning L1 as a child and adult learners of L2, as adult learners of a FL rarely become as proficient in L2 as a child does in L1 (Omaggio Hadley, 2001).
**Constructivism.** Many theorists such as Chomsky did not specifically address L2 or FL pedagogy. However, their ideas have been applied to L2 learning. Chomsky’s LAD attempted to describe the remarkable manner in which young children are able to learn language. Rather than being innate, constructivists “emphasize that learners are actively involved in their own process of learning” (Richards & Rodgers 2014). In that vein, Piaget believed that children learn best when exposed to input that meets their current level of development, “maturation precedes learning,” a biological explanation of learning stages (Richard-Amato, 1996, p. 38).

Vygotsky (1978), on the other hand, believed that learning must happen before maturation occurs. The notion was that the learner had dual innate development levels, an actual development level and a potential development level, with the distance between them being the “Zone of Proximal Development”. As the learner moves forward with learning, the potential development becomes the actual development. A learner’s development moves from potential to actual through social interaction, whether with parents, teachers or other adults or with peers. Therefore, learning needs to be a step ahead of actual development.

Freire (2006) discussed the pedagogy of the oppressed in his book of the same title. In the book a proposal is made that an imbalance in power often creates two types of education, banking and libertarian. In banking education, teachers are the bankers depositing information in the students, the interaction between teacher and student does not involve interaction, rather the student is “receiving, filing, and storing the deposits” (p. 72) of information from the teacher. This type of education is not interactive, is not fulfilling to students, and does not prepare them to think critically on their own. On the
other hand, “liberating education consists in acts of cognition, not transferrals of information” (p. 79). In libertarian education teachers and students are partners in learning, and each learns from the other. Although Freire does not specifically address L1 or L2 pedagogy, the concept appears to be applicable to nearly any situation in which a power difference exists, as in the teacher/student relationship, which certainly applies to L2 teaching.

Krashen focused on L2 learning. But similar to Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development, he gives a great deal of attention to the importance of input. According to Krashen, children acquire language but adults learn a language. The difference being that adults are concerned with rules and making sense whereas children are usually in a setting where language is made meaningful through the language modifications made by the teacher. This is similar to their experience in L1 learning. This specialized language or input is often referred to as motherese or teacherese. Krashen (1983) defines it as comprehensible input. Comprehensible input is the sum of FL that a learner can understand, as well as the addition of a small amount extra: input plus one (i + 1). “While Vygotsky stressed the importance of social interaction, Krashen stressed the nature of input” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p. 58). Criticism of Krashen includes disagreement with the concepts of learning, the idea that “language learning is distinct from other kinds of learning” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 63), and that “there is no way of measuring i + 1” (Díaz-Rico & Weed, 2006, p. 58).

Constructivist theory is comprised of the “assumptions we make, our beliefs, and experiences shape what we come to ‘know’. Different assumptions and experiences lead to different conclusions” (Hoy & Miskel, 2005, p. 72). Constructivism puts the student at
the center of learning. It is the student’s effort to construct knowledge from internal and external factors that results in leaning. For Piaget, Vygotsky, Freire and Krashen, “meaningful interaction seems to be the key” (Richard-Amato, 1996, p. 40).

**Foreign language (FL) teaching today.** By the 1970s and 1980s the focus of FL pedagogy was communication. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) embodies a philosophy rather than a single method of teaching a FL. Contrary to previous methods, CLT is referred to as an approach since it did not rely upon any one means of delivery. Important aspects of CLT are that activities in the classroom provide students with the opportunity to communicate in L2, that in real ways, such as performing actual tasks while using authentic language appropriate for the activity (Omaggio Hadley, 2001; Richards & Rogers, 2014). “CLT represents a repertoire of teaching ideas rather than a fixed set of methodological procedures and as such is not easily defined or evaluated” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 118). The goal of this approach is communicative competence through teaching the four language skills: reading, writing, speaking, and listening (Richards & Rodgers, 2014).

Sometimes, methodologies or theories employed in regular English language arts classrooms and the classrooms for other subject areas have been launched in the FL classroom. Examples of this approach are the whole language movement and the concepts of multiple intelligences and learning styles (Richards & Rogers, 2014). What is true is that for as long as we have been learning FLs, there have been *bandwagons to jump* on, and that “controversy over methodological approaches is not just a phenomenon of the twentieth century” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 87). Arguments over which skills to stress, the manner to teach the skills, whether to teach or not to teach grammar,
whether to use a natural approach or a cognitive viewpoint have resulted in FL educators being cautious about the latest trends. (Omaggio Hadley, 2001). FL educators and for that matter educators in general have realized that there does not appear to be a perfect way to teach FL or any other subject (Richards & Rogers, 2014).

The 1980s brought a shift in thought toward agreement about what should be taught versus how it should be taught. “The effort to establish uniform goals and standards for language proficiency following the Carter Presidential Commission on Language and International Studies in 1979 was a manifestation of this need for consensus” (Omaggio Hadley, 2001, p. 88). The use of educational standards was taking over education, including the instruction of FL. In 1995, the Standards for Foreign Language Learning were first released at the annual ACTFL meeting. These standards were organized in five areas: Communication, Cultures, Comparison, Connections and Community (Omaggio Hadley, 2001).
Developing proficiency. Americans do not appear to be learning LOEs at a very high rate. Among the small pool of those who do study a FL “an even smaller number achieve a high level of proficiency in the language(s) they study” (Malone, Rifkin, Christian & Johnson, 2005, p. 1). Hadley describes proficiency as what one needs to know “in terms of grammar, vocabulary, sociolinguistic appropriateness, conventions of discourse, cultural understanding, and the like in order to know a language well enough to use it for some real-world purpose” (2001, p. 2). In other words, proficiency refers to a “whole range of abilities that must be described in a graduated fashion in order to be meaningful” (p. 9). To that end, ACTFL has developed proficiency guidelines that meet the aforementioned criteria, measuring language progressively rather than linearly, in terms of “language ability in speaking, listening, reading, and writing” (p. 12). The guidelines were first introduced in 1986, as an academic adaptation of the U.S. Government’s Interagency Language Roundtable (ILR) Skill Level Descriptions. “The ILR is a consortium of government agencies with a need to hire, train, test, and use employees whose job requires skills in a foreign language” (Lowe & Stansfield, 1988, p. 8).

These guidelines, which have been revised three times, have evolved to reflect trends in education. At the change of the millennium, just as the accountability measures of NCLB had taken hold of the regular education classroom, the concept of accountability and standards took hold of the L2 classroom in terms of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines. For example, “the direct application of the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines is for the evaluation of functional language ability” (ACTFL, 2012, p. 3). Furthermore, the Proficiency Guidelines have fostered the development of the ACTFL
Performance guidelines in conjunction with the National Standards for Foreign Language Learning to see “how well students meet content standards” (p. 3).

Consistency and a well-articulated program are reportedly the keys to developing proficiency; however, the most essential element to language proficiency is the amount of consistent time spent in instruction (Pufahl, Rhodes & Christian, 2001; Walsh, 2012).

Becoming proficient in a FL takes time.

Mastering a foreign language takes extensive study and practice, which suggests that language learning begin with young children. For example, to develop general professional-level proficiency, State Department employees are enrolled in highly intensive daily instruction for almost 6 months (600 class hours) in a Western European language (e.g., French, Dutch or Spanish), about 10 months (1100 class hours) for a so-called “hard” language (e.g., Russian, Hindi or Thai) and 2 years for the most challenging languages (Arabic, Chinese, Japanese and Korean). In higher education where instruction is almost always much less intense, developing professional proficiency takes much longer (Jackson & Malone, 2009, p. 6).

Indeed, most K-12 students spend forty-five minutes in a class that meets five days a week for approximately 36 weeks, resulting in 135 not very intense hours of instruction per school year.

The more time dedicated to learning a FL the better, appears to be a key axiom. Boyson, Semmer, Thompson and Rosenbusch (2013) completed a longitudinal study involving long-term Spanish Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs in Westport Public Schools in Connecticut. The original program in the district was a
grade 5-8 program and the newer one was a K-8 program. The district was in the process of replacing the original program with the K-8 program. There was some question as to whether the older students might perform better than the students who began at such a young age. The researchers found that the K-8 group had reached higher FL proficiency than the students who began learning a FL in the fifth grade.

The fact that immigrant students in the American school system are immersed in English for an entire school day and are surrounded by it outside of the classroom appears to represent an interesting consideration. On the other hand, English-speaking American students who are learning a FL are usually in a FL class five days a week for forty-five minutes each day. This is a considerably smaller amount of time spent on learning, and the necessity to learn the FL is not one of survival as it is for the immigrant student. Nonetheless, time is critical to any learner of a FL. “Even in districts that are considered the most successful in teaching English to EL [English learner] students, oral proficiency takes 3 to 5 years to develop, and academic proficiency can take 4 to 7 years” (Hakuta, Butler & Witt, 2000, p. 13). American students, who are learners of a LOE, do not spend nearly the amount of time learning a FL as immigrant students do learning English. Developing “professional language expertise” is a time-consuming process even for the most talented learner. “Plainly stated, the American educational system produces very few individuals with this degree of knowledge in any language, let alone the critical languages” (Jackson & Malone, 2009, pp. 4-5).
Curricular Struggles and Foreign Language in Elementary School Programming

This portion of the literature review pertains to curricular struggles and Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programming, two areas that are entwined in administrative decisions regarding FLES. Similar to the previous discussion of Foreign Language (FL) pedagogy in the second section of this literature review on FL learning, curricular struggles have also been characterized with bandwagons. In curricular struggles, these bandwagons are competing interest groups vying for control of what and the manner in which FL will be taught. The root of curricular struggles is the purpose of education, and in terms of this study, the role of FL within the curriculum.

An overview of curricular struggle. The purpose of education was addressed within a historical context in the first section of this literature review, the history of American monolingualism. According to the Founding Fathers, education was among the means by which to Americanize the immigrant population, to unite a newly formed nation, and to create a unified American citizenry (Tyack, 1966). During the early history of the United States, an education was not available to all Americans. However, with the passing of time, a primary school education was available for more Americans. Nonetheless, a secondary education remained out of reach for many Americans (Kliebard, 2004; Lazerson, 1987; Spring, 2006).

By the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th centuries, the number of Americans receiving a secondary education began to steadily increase (Lazerson, 1987). In 1890, approximately 7% of secondary age students were enrolled in high school and by 1900 it had reached 11%. By 1920, a third of this population was attending high school. Finally by 1930, close to 50% of secondary age students were able to obtain a
high school education (Kliebard, 2004; Spring, 2011). In addition, the population, which was being educated, had also greatly changed, so much so that Callahan (1962) indicated, “Any white American with ability and willingness to work could get a good education and even professional training” (p. 1). The idea of free public schools had come to fruition and an educational opportunity was available to many young Americans.

Accordingly, the increase in the secondary school population resulted in an increased interest in schools, which ultimately lead to conversations about curriculum. Indeed, curriculum is a mirror to what a society values and to the power that is held by interest groups within the culture (Kliebard, 2004). In other words, “American public schools, because of the nature of their pattern of organization, support, and control, were especially vulnerable and responded quickly to the strongest social forces” (Callahan, 1962, p. 1). The first half of the 20th century saw conflicting interests trying to gain control of the curriculum.

The 20th century brought about transformation in American public schools, in particular a change in attitude about schooling and in administrative control. Spring (2011) described a shift in thought about students to a “meritocracy…a concept of society based on the idea that each individual’s social and occupational position is determined by individual merit, not political or economic influence” (p. 270). Meritocracy correlated with the increased population that was being educated, and so did the structure of administrative power in schools. This movement promoted scientifically managed schools based upon the theories of Taylor, referred to as “Taylorism” (p. 275). The idea of hierarchy to manage workers efficiently appealed to leaders in education. Taylorism in
education began with the downsizing of school boards, which in turn lead to increased power in the hands of school administrators (Callahan, 1962; Spring, 2011).

One of the biggest changes between the 19th and 20th centuries was the idea that the common education, a general curriculum, was not in the best interests of students. Previously, the common education was a college preparatory education given to all, regardless of if they were going to college or not. Reformers felt that this was not appropriate and that some subjects were only applicable to students who were going to college. Certain aspects of college preparatory programs, such as French and algebra, were not viewed as practical for the “average” student. A prevailing idea of that time was that there were many students who simply were not able to master the college preparatory curriculum. Student tracking had begun and was seen as a way of differentiating instruction and learning (Kliebard, 2004; Spring, 2011).

Kliebard (2004) identified four curriculum ideas that competed for control. First, the humanists, made up of leading intellectuals, were tied to the traditional college preparatory curriculum. Reformers comprised the other three other schools of thought. The advocates of the child study movement proposed a curriculum that was based on the needs of the child. The social efficiency educators vied for a curriculum that was differentiated with an end goal of imparting skills in students that would be useful in the labor force. The social meliorists looked upon schools as the means by which society could be bettered. “In the end, what became the American curriculum was not the result of any decisive victory by any of the contending parties, but a loose, largely unarticulated and not very tidy compromise” (p. 24).
The curriculum competing at that time for attention were embodied in movements for equal opportunity through schooling, discourse regarding nature versus nurture, and the beginning of standardized testing. The response to these ideas was the development of vocational education, which involves tracking and grouping by ability; a means by which all students would be able to find their place in American society. During this time period, the junior high school was created as a method to better sort students into their appropriate high school placement through IQ testing (Kliebard, 2004; Spring, 2011).

Competing curriculum thoughts were abruptly focused in the 1960s due to the political fallout as a result of the launch of Sputnik by the Russians in 1957. Americans appeared to be falling behind and the fault was placed on American schooling. In other words, “a growing belief that among U.S. leaders and the general public that Soviet schools were superior to U.S. schools in the teaching of science and mathematics” (Spring, 2006, p. 95). The end result was an increased role of the federal government in American education through the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958. NDEA was the reaction to the fear that American students were not competitive with Russian students. Among the recommendations included in NDEA were: funding for identifying gifted students; funding for math and science via the National Science Foundation (NSF); and the promotion of FL study in response to national security concerns. These ramifications of the Cold War influenced American education policy well into the 1980s (Spring, 2011).

The next major political influence upon the American educational system was the 1983 report, *A Nation at Risk*, published by the National Commission on Excellence in
Education. Spring (2006) explained that the Commission was created in 1981 by the U.S. Department of Education to analyze American schools in comparison to the schools in other advanced nations. The report “blamed public schools for the declining place of the United States in world markets” (p. 212). For the first time in education, politics and economics combined in such a way to ignite fear in the American public. Spring questioned the economic aspect of this crusade, saying that “there was no evidence presented of a relationship between test scores and U.S. economic decline. In fact, there are so many factors determining economic growth and expansion that it is difficult to blame one factor let alone placing the burden on education” (p. 213). Nonetheless, that was the perspective that was caste on the American public.

Just as Cold War initiatives had prompted American leaders to investigate Russian schooling, Japanese schooling fascinated American educational leaders in the 80s. The Nation at Risk report, according to Spring (2006) suggested the implementation of national control of the curriculum and standardized tests similar to what was common practice in Japan. Leading educators of the time within the Department of Education, Diane Ravitch and Chester Finn, worked to promote “government-mandated standardized curriculum and high-stakes examinations” (p. 212). Other recommendations of the report included longer school days, more homework, and learning the “New Basics [which] referred to a uniform curriculum recommended for all high school students” (p.215). The New Basics included 4 years of English, 3 years of math, 3 years of science, 3 years of social studies, and a half-year of computer science. The arts and FL were not included in this curriculum (The National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1984). Spring (2006) describes this approach toward education as the educational security state.
A Nation at Risk in 1983 appeared to lay the groundwork for what would eventually become NCLB in 2002. Ironically, as NCLB was becoming the law, educational reformers in Japan identified the pressure associated with standardized testing and curriculum in their country as leading to growing social and psychological problems with their students. As a result, the Japanese Ministry of Education appointed a National Commission on Educational Reform to investigate their system of standards and testing. A major criticism that emerged from the study was the use of rote learning to help the students score well on high-stakes testing (Spring, 2006).

In the 1980s, Ravitch, through her position as Assistant Secretary of Education, helped to promote the standardized testing that eventually became NCLB. However, Ravitch did an about face on her position nearly thirty years later in her book The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice are Undermining Education (2010). After having championed the high-stakes testing movement, Ravitch reevaluated more than four decades in education. Ravitch indicated “adult interests were well-served by NCLB. The law generated huge revenues for tutoring and testing services, which became a sizeable industry” (p. 101). Unintended results of NCLB included decreased teaching time for subjects such as foreign language and the arts and even the loss of recess time for students. Ravitch now advocates “an excellent curriculum, appropriate assessments, and well-educated teachers” (p. 239). Acknowledged by Ravitch was that the American education system involves many stakeholders “including students, families, public officials, local organizations, and the larger community” (p. 239) that need to be partners in educational reform.
**Foreign language (FL) and academic achievement.** Despite the aforementioned desire to start FL study at a young age, a concern exists that FL, especially in elementary schools, might have a negative effect upon other school subjects (Carroll, 1960; Curtain & Pesola, 1994). Nonetheless, Haak and Leino (1963) and Donoghue (1968) have exhibited that the time taken out of the regular curriculum and given to FL instruction does not negatively influence student learning in the other subject areas. In fact, FL study in elementary students has shown positive effects upon learning. Johnson, Ellison, and Flores (1961) studied two groups of third graders, those who studied Spanish for twenty minutes a day and a control group who did not. The end results revealed that the FL group had higher scores in math and English grammar; however, their scores were lower than the control group in English punctuation, comprehension and vocabulary. Armstrong and Rogers (1997) found that third graders who received thirty minutes of oral/aural Spanish instruction three times a week scored higher in math and language skills than a group of students who did not receive instruction. Reading scores for both groups did not reflect any significant differences. Rafferty (1986) examined third, fourth, and fifth graders who studied FL for thirty minutes a day. Each year these students showed higher English and language arts skills than for students who did not study a FL. By the fifth grade, math scores were higher as well for the FL students than those who did not study a FL.

Immersion programs are another type of FL programming in which the FL is used as the language of instruction for all subjects (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). Concern over the negative impact that an immersion program might have on students appears to be unfounded. Holobow, Genesee, Lambert and Gastright (1987) examined a half-day
French immersion program with students of diverse socio-economic status (SES).

Immersion students of all SES backgrounds scored as well in English as those students who did not take part in the immersion program. It was also found that the lower SES immersion students scored as well in French as did middle class students. A student’s ability to make progress in French was not tied to SES, as is often the case English language testing. Cunningham and Graham (2000) evaluated fifth and sixth grade students who were Language 1 or native (L1) speakers of English but who took part in a Spanish immersion program. In standardized tests, both groups of students, those who studied Spanish and those who did not, scored similarly in verbal ability on the Cognitive Abilities Test. However, the immersion students scored higher on the Peabody Picture Vocabulary test, demonstrating cognate skills that transferred from Spanish to English.

Thomas, Collier, and Abbott (1993) examined the academic progress of 719 1st, 2nd, and 3rd graders involved in two-year partial immersion programs in French, Japanese, and Spanish with 1,320 students of similar age and demographics who did not take part in FL instruction. They found that the immersion students were not hindered in academic or cognitive development by learning a FL. The immersion students moved forward toward midlevel oral proficiency in Language 2 or the second language being learned (L2) by the end of the program. All three of these studies reflected that a FL program, even one as intensive as an immersion program, did not have a negative impact upon elementary students.

FL study may result in short-term achievement gaps. Dolson (1984) suggested FL students experienced cognitive confusion in the early stages of English literacy. Rafferty (1986) explained that “regardless of their race, sex, or academic level, student in foreign
language classes out performed those who were not taking foreign language on the third, fourth, and fifth grade language arts sections of Louisiana’s Basics Skills Tests” (p. 18). However, by the fifth grade, the benefit was doubled as hypothesized that “most children have mastered minimum English reading skills” (p. 18). FL study aided student performance across the board. Turnbull, Hart and Lapkin (2003) compared grade 6 elementary full-day French immersion students with similar students who had not been in a FL program. Their study reflected that achievement gaps that had occurred by the third grade had disappeared by the sixth grade. Instruction for the immersion students was in French for all subjects until the end of third grade. English was introduced the next year and the researchers hypothesized that the immersion students were able to catch up with non-immersion students by sixth grade. These studies indicated that FLES programs resulted in overall academic gains, not losses, to students learning a FL.

The study of FL at the secondary level has shown to be beneficial to high school students who are taking college entrance exams. Cooper (1987) found that at least one year of FL study resulted in increased verbal Scholastic Achievement Test (SAT) scores. In addition, there was a positive correlation between the length of time studying a FL and higher scores. Eddy (1981) reported that students, who have studied a FL longer, score higher than students with less time in FL study, and that overall FL study improved vocabulary development. On the American College Test (ACT), Olsen and Brown (1992) discovered that high school students, who studied a FL, scored higher on the math and English sections of the ACT, as opposed to students who did not study a FL. Timpe (1979) found a correlation between the length of time or years spent studying a FL and higher ACT composite scores, with the peak effect on the English subsection. The benefit
of FL study does not seem to end with standardized testing. Wiley (1985) explored the relationship between high school FL study and achievement at the university level and found that high school FL students achieved at a higher level in college than those students who did not study a FL.

**History of foreign language in elementary school (FLES).** Although FL has been taught throughout American history, FLES programs, though not common, have existed in select immigrant populations. In particular, areas of the US with French and Spanish-speaking immigrants had schools that taught those languages. German was by far the most popular due to the large population of German immigrants. However, anti-German sentiments leading into World War I and an overall anti-foreign sentiment all but eradicated German programs and diminished FL offerings in general (Curtain & Pesola, 1994). World War II brought about the realization that not many Americans spoke a FL, in or out of the military (Richard-Amato, 1996). During the 1940s, FLES programs in the American Southwest grew in response to national concerns regarding “Latin American understanding” (Curtain & Pesola, 1994, p. 16). The launch of Sputnik in 1957 and the fear that the institution of American education was in jeopardy resulted in the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) of 1958, which funded FL studies in the 50s and 60s (Richard-Amato, 1996). This funding provided the basis for a multitude of FLES programs in the United States.

Curtain and Pesola (1994) indicated that the NDEA provided funding for materials, teachers, and teacher training. As a result, the 1960s saw unprecedented growth in FL programs, including FLES programs. NDEA teacher training rolled out the ALM across the country. However “the boom for languages in the elementary schools lasted
barely five years, as programs at this level were in decline after 1964” (p. 17). Andrade and Ging (1988) commented that FLES programs were viewed as enrichment activities rather than a part of the regular curriculum. Despite the funding provided by NDEA, Rhodes and Schreibstein (1983) attributed the demise of FLES programs to a shortage in both competent teachers and pedagogical materials, coupled with an attitude in education that promoted a return to the basics.

Dyess (1975) addressed the decline of FLES in Louisiana. Parlons Français or “Let’s Speak French” was the title of the FLES program that began in 1960 with 108 schools and had declined to a handful of programs as of the early 1970s. “The NDEA and EPDA (Education Professions Development Act) programs for foreign languages were gone and forgotten and even though Russia had launched ‘Sputnik’, America had succeeded in putting a man on the moon” (p. 46). In a decade the mood of a country had changed; however, the decline of FLES programs was the result of more than a change in mood.

The decline in FLES programs was a combination of errors on the part of the public and educational institutions. Woodruff (1975) stated that “failures in FLES have been plagued by public expectations: producing a ‘native speaker’ of the foreign language, preparing the child for a continuing the foreign language sequence in junior high school or middle school” (p. 4). Further problems included curriculum articulation between elementary and secondary schools. Since more than one elementary school usually feeds into a middle school or junior high school, students who were in FLES programs and students who did not take part in FLES were being placed in the same
middle school classes (Curtain & Pesola, 2000). Inadequate planning on many fronts contributed to the demise of FLES programs in the US.

**Theoretical Framework**

This study sought to examine the manner that the personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their views of FLES (foreign language in elementary school) programming. Personal, professional and contextual characteristics fall within the scope of sociocultural theory, as developed by Vygotsky. The theory purports “the interdependence of social and individual processes in the co-construction of knowledge” (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996, p. 191). Application of sociocultural theory to this study means that not only is this theory necessary to understand the make-up of the environment in which Ohio elementary principals find themselves, but also the manner in which their interaction with others and their own personal history tie together. The study also attempted to examine the reason that FLES programs are not a priority in Ohio? How do the leaders of Ohio’s elementary schools think about these programs? The apparent low priority given to FLES programs is a complex situation involving multiple relationships. In order to explore these relationships, a survey will be developed through a sociocultural lens to measure these interrelated variables.

Knowledge about elementary principals’ thinking with regards to FL appeared to be important to this study. Information seems relevant regarding the manner that the opinions of the elementary principals had been formed, the existence of accountability mandates that prevent the growth of FL in elementary school, and the experiences of the principals with FL that influenced their decisions with regards to curriculum. For that
matter, testing requirements, personal experience and other unknown variables may be the mitigating factors in American foreign language deficiency. The use of a sociocultural lens allowed the exploration of the environment of Ohio elementary principals and their social interaction in constructing their beliefs about FLES.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Purpose

A commonly held belief is that children learn foreign language more easily than adults. Immigrant children, for example, often act as interpreters for their parents, effortlessly gliding between the native language and English. Children with foreign nannies or with one non-American parent effortlessly acquire these same skills. Children who watch Sesame Street or Dora the Explorer are able to quickly and painlessly learn a small amount of vocabulary. While this information is rather well known, opportunities for these youngest Americans to learn a FL are not flourishing in this country. As evidence of this phenomenon, Rhodes and Pufahl (2010) examined the results of a national survey on FL conducted by the Center for Applied Linguistics (CAL) and found that in 1987, 17% of public elementary school offered FLES programs. In 1997 this number increased to 24% but by 2008 it decreased to 15% of public elementary schools offering FLES programs.

Nonetheless, Americans usually have the opportunity to study a FL in secondary school, either at the middle school level and/or high school level, and then study a FL again at the university level. Although it is not a mandatory graduation requirement for students in any of the fifty states, many college preparatory students take FL to meet university entrance requirements. FL continues to be viewed in an elite manner, not as a subject for the masses as it is in most other countries. Many American students study FLs without truly mastering them and being able to communicate. Language learners from the Department of State enroll in intensive courses that require 600 hours for a Western European language, 1100 hours for a more complex language such as Russian, and up to
2 years for Arabic or Chinese (Jackson & Malone, 2009). On the other hand, one year of high school study that consists of 45 minutes a day, 5 days a week for 36 weeks yields only 135 of not very intensive hours of study. As a result, a couple of years of high school study does not usually result in a fluent speaker. These same students become, as adults, the leaders in our society and in our educational institutions.

Americans therefore are not known for their ability to speak foreign languages (FLs). FL deficiency seems to be a given in this country. The deficiency raises the question as to what do the educational leaders of our youngest Americans think about FL education. This study aims to explore the beliefs of Ohio elementary principals with regards to FL education. As presented in the first two chapters of this dissertation, the research question for this study is: what personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES programming? This question has been examined, with attention being given to the characteristics of principals, including their own FL study experiences and travels, coupled with their district and school’s characteristics such as size, number of foreign language teachers or presence of FLES instruction, and socio-economic status (SES), and the budgetary matters that influence the decisions being made about the value of FL education.

**Methodology**

Several reasons appear to have existed for conducting research. However, most research can be assigned a purpose or a combination of the following: exploration, description, and explanation. Both qualitative and quantitative techniques are aligned with the “pillars of science”, also known as logic and observation. A researcher from either paradigm is in search of a scientific understanding of the world, one that “makes
sense” and corresponds with what is observed. Furthermore, the platform of social science research is concerned with what is and not what “should” be. The data that results from scientific research does not have a value assigned to it: it is not good or bad. As a result, social science research can contribute to an obtainment of an understanding what is and the reason that it is. It is up to the researcher to determine whether this information is useful in deciding what ought to be (Babbie, 2011).

Researchers must next choose a technique, qualitative or quantitative, that will meet the needs of the topic to be examined. These two paradigms in research reveal a vast divide between each ideology (Creswell, 2007). To begin with, a paradigm is “a model or framework for observation and understanding which shapes both what we see and how we understand it” (Babbie, 2011, p. 32). Each paradigm includes the methods and beliefs that are determined to be acceptable to its members (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Usher, 1996). Although many researchers believe that the question or problem being studied determines the method for research, Glesne (2006) explains that it is the researcher’s belief about what knowledge is that is important. Furthermore, qualitative researchers typically assume that “reality is socially constructed [and] variables are complex, interwoven, and difficult to understand” (p. 5). Quantitative researchers typically assume “social facts have an objective reality [and] variables can be identified and relationships measured” (p. 5). The chasm between both camps is clearly illustrated by such assumptions.

Nonetheless, “every observation is qualitative at the outset” (Babbie, 2011, p. 24). Characterizing someone as intelligent is to provide a qualitative description. A way to quantify such a description would be to use an IQ score (Babbie, 2011). Quantifying a
quality, however, does not imply that quantitative methods are superior to qualitative methods. In fact, a thorough understanding of an issue or subject frequently involves, and perhaps must involve, an application of both paradigms. “Research and evaluation studies employing multiple methods, including combinations of qualitative and quantitative data, are common” (Patton, 2002, p. 5). A marriage between qualitative and quantitative methods yields both data and description, often resulting in a very thorough exploration of a topic.

To be specific, the purpose of research is to explore, describe, or explain a phenomenon. Exploratory social research is performed to “(1) to satisfy the researcher’s curiosity and desire for better understanding, (2) to test the feasibility of undertaking a more extensive study, and (3) to develop the methods to be employed in any subsequent study” (Babbie, 2011, p. 95). The goal of this study is to provide the information necessary to understand the perceptions of Ohio elementary principals regarding FL instruction and learning in elementary schools. While a qualitative approach, which would include the use of focus group interviews was contemplated; a quantitative approach in the form of a survey was chosen as an appropriate first step to explore the topic. The information gathered from the electronic survey might prove to be the basis for a qualitative study in the future. An interview setting would likely result in rich data that would thoroughly explain the perceptions of Ohio elementary principals, about FLES (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). In addition, survey research is considered to be the “best method available” to investigate a larger population (Babbie, 2011, p. 270).
Study Procedures

A survey was developed to procure information from Ohio elementary principals regarding their perceptions of FLES programming and FL. The FLES and FL survey for this study was developed based upon two existing instruments. The need to use two instruments reflected the lack of one existing instrument upon which to base the survey for this study. The two existing instruments contained contents that were relevant to this study. The authors of each of the studies were contacted, and they gave their permission for the content of their instruments to be used for this study. Corbin and Chiachiere (1997), administered a survey to high school seniors that measured attitude toward FL study. The author of the other instrument, Heining-Boynton (1990), administered a survey, FLES Program Evaluation Inventory (FPEI) to principals and administrators to “yield a documentation of the impressions regarding primary issues of concern for all FLES programs” (p. 438). These instruments and the recommendations of their authors were used as a literature-based source for the FLES survey of this study.

Next, a pilot was conducted in order to enhance the likelihood that the survey was reliable and its questions would be appropriate for this study. A panel of former Ohio elementary principals was asked to take the survey and comment on its contents. Panel participants were asked to answer the questions based on their last elementary principal position. Minor changes in wording were suggested by the pilot group and used to revise the instrument. Then, the survey was finalized and disseminated through Qualtrics, a survey platform available to Ohio University students, to all Ohio public elementary school principals.
The final instrument for this study, an Internet survey, was sent to all Ohio public elementary school principals, a population of approximately 1426. An interactive tool available on the Ohio Department of Education website was used to create an Excel spreadsheet that contains the e-mail addresses of elementary principals in the state of Ohio. The survey was constructed using the Qualtrics web-based survey tool that is available to Ohio University students. Qualtrics also served as the vehicle for uploading contact data for the survey population. Data analysis was conducted to synthesize and organize the data for the purpose of answering the research question. This analysis included multiple correlations of independent variables, such as the characteristics of the respondents or their schools, with the dependent variable that pertains to FLES.

Instrumentation

As previously stated, the survey for this study was constructed using the instruments created by Corbin and Chiachiere (1997), Heining-Boynton (1990). In addition, the survey for this study contained questions pertaining to demographic information about the principals. The survey was designed in terms of four factors composed of several questions or statements to measure each factor. The first three factors are (a) Ohio elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs using the Heining-Boynton instrument (the dependent variable), (b) the perceived values of: learning a FL and (c) the importance of FL using the Corbin and Chiachiere instrument (independent variables). The last factor to be evaluated involved the elementary principals’ own FL and professional experiences.
Perceived value of foreign language in elementary school (FLES). The first factor, which was investigated, pertained to the perceived value of FLES programs. The FPEI instrument for principals and administrators, as described earlier in this chapter, has been used by school district curriculum developers to evaluate entire FLES programs. The instrument’s use has not been limited to teacher effectiveness. Other items of interest, which have been gathered with the use of the instrument, include perceived support of the FLES program by other teachers, parents and administrators, perceived benefit of FLES to all students, and perceived benefits of FLES across the curriculum (Heining-Boynton, 1990). The evaluation items of the instrument, which would have been of interest at the end of a program, are items that would also pertain to a potential program. For the purpose of this study, the verb tenses of the survey statements were revised to address respondents that do not have FLES programs, as potential items of concern, and to address respondents that do have a FLES program (Heining-Boynton, 1990). Specifically, this aspect of the survey for this study was constructed to seek information about whether principals believe (a) that parents might support a FLES program or do support FLES programs, (b) that FLES would or does reinforce other content areas in the curriculum, and (c) that FLES is important for all students. The aspects of this factor represented the dependent variable in this study.
**Perceived value of foreign language (FL) study.** The second factor that was investigated related to the perceived value of learning a FL. The questions in this section were taken from the same section of Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) instrument that was administered to high school seniors. An attempt was made to obtain from Ohio elementary principals in the study their beliefs as to whether (a) FL study is a good use of academic time, (b) is a valuable asset and necessary skill, and (c) has multiple uses, both in the U.S. and abroad. The aspects of this factor represented the independent variable in this study.

**Importance of foreign language (FL) learning.** The third factor, which was examined in this study, concerned the perceptions of the participating principals regarding the importance of FL learning. This factor comes from the fourth section of the Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) instrument. Data regarding the manner that Ohio elementary principals feel about the value of FL was pursued. In addition, perceptions were investigated regarding (a) whether learning a FL contributes to a better understanding of English, (b) if learning a FL is a significant part of an education, and (c) if learning a FL represents a first step toward achieving global understanding. The aspects of this factor represented an independent variable in this study.

**Survey Instrumentation: Contextual and Personal Characteristics**

The desired contextual and personal characteristics of Ohio elementary principals were obtained from the principals themselves in the first section of the survey entitled demographics. The principals were asked to disclose their gender, ethnicity, years in administration, years in the classroom, teacher licensure, personal language skills, language learning experiences, language(s) studied, and that they were Ohio elementary
principals, which was used as a control measure. A list of operational definitions for these variables is provided, below.

**Operational Definitions**

- Ohio elementary principal (yes/no) – currently an Ohio elementary principal Variable name: *OH_EL_PRINC*; coded: Yes =0, No = 1.
- Gender (binary) – being male or female as reported on the survey. Variable name: *GENDER*; coded: Female = 0, Male=1.
- National origin (binary) – the country where the principal was born as reported on the survey. Variable name: *ORIGIN*; coded: Native = 0, Foreign = 1.
- Ethnicity (binary) – the ethnicity of the principal as reported on the survey. Variable name: *ETHNICITY*; categories: African American, Asian, Hispanic, Other. coded 0=White, 1=Minorities.
- Years in administration (continuous) – the number of years (exact) the principal has been an administrator as reported on the survey. Variable name: *ADMIN_YEARS*.
- Years in the classroom (continuous) – the number of years (exact) the principal was a classroom teacher before becoming an administrator as reported on the survey. Variable name: *CLASS_YEARS*.
- FLs studied (scale) – the number of FLs (exact) the principal studied at any level during their academic career. Variable name: *FLS_STUDIED*.
- Teacher certification (nominal) – the principal’s classroom teacher certification as reported on the survey. Variable name: *CERTIF*; likely
categories: ELA (English Language Arts), Foreign Language, STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math), Other.

- Bilingual/Multilingual (yes / no) – the principal is bilingual. Variable name: \textit{BILING\_MULTI}: coded: Yes = 1, No = 0.
- FLES offered (yes / no) – FLES is offered at the principal’s elementary school as reported on the survey. Variable name: \textit{FLES\_PROG}: coded: Yes =0, No = 1.

\textbf{Pilot Test}

Previous to distributing the survey to all Ohio elementary principals, a pilot test was performed in order to “give a good sense of how the study procedures will work in practice” (Dillman, Smyth & Christian, 2009, p.228). In social research, a pilot study can serve two purposes; as a feasibility study that is a small-scale version of the proposed study and as a pre-test of a survey instrument (Van Teijlingen & Hundley, 2002). The pilot test for this study will be conducted in the same manner as the actual study but on a much smaller scale. The participants in the pilot study were comprised of a group of five former Ohio elementary principals, who were not part of the actual study group of current principals. The pilot study participants were requested to take the survey in the same manner as the participants in the study. However, these former principals were asked, as an expert panel, to comment on and offer suggestions regarding the clarity and overall construction. The reliability and validity of survey were enhanced with the use of the expert panel, as it appeared to reduce survey (including coverage and sampling) errors, and to result in enhanced clarity and overall construction.
Survey Administration

Survey design and administration constitutes a whole in which one part infuses the others. Attending to the separate parts is important. However, the researcher must attend to the whole because a complete, efficient, and effective survey process is the entire point. In this sense, a comprehensive survey method provides a powerful tool for research (Dillman et al., 2009).

For overall survey design, the present study followed the “Tailored Design Method” as proposed by Dillman et al. (2009). Survey design was accomplished through an intertwining of three main strategies throughout the process. They were: (a) a scientific approach to reduce survey error; (b) survey procedures that “interact and work together” to insure participant response; and (c) attention to the development of a survey protocol that creates positive social exchange (Dillman et al., 2009). Accordingly, this study attempted to contact the entire population of Ohio elementary principals, and administer the survey in an online mode for ease of access by the principals and follow-up by the researcher. Reliability and validity have already been established for the instruments that were used for this study. Additionally, a panel of experts in FL survey will review items that have been modified, and comment on the clarity and wording of the overall construction. Following these design procedures reportedly will help to reduce survey errors including coverage and sampling errors, as well as providing adequate data for analysis.

Survey procedures that interact and work together to insure participant response include the aforementioned principles that reduce survey error and advice derived from
social exchange theory. According to Tailored Design, social exchange theory implies that there are three main questions about creating the survey that are critical. They are:

How can the perceived rewards for responding be increased? How can the perceived costs of responding be reduced? How can trust be established so that the people believe the rewards will outweigh the costs of responding? (Dillman et al., 2009, p. 23).

Employing the aforementioned questions in combination with establishing sound implementation procedures can encourage a strong response rate.

Potential study respondents are often bombarded with requests for surveys. Almost any purchase has the potential of yielding a survey request on the receipt, a pop-up screen at the end of an online purchase, or a follow-up email providing a link for a survey. The potential respondents for this survey, Ohio elementary principals, receive those same personal requests. In addition, they receive many requests for surveys from within their own organization, let alone from various graduate students.

According to Tailored Design (Dillman et al., 2009) researchers are advised to make their request stand out as more relevant and more beneficial with such devices as attending carefully to layout and design, previewing the survey content and form with pilot participants, inviting pilot participants to offer advice via the survey, addressing them personally and expressing thanks. Respondents, in other words, should be made to feel important, not as an anonymous part of a mass mailing; and should understand that the research will protect the confidential nature of the information they provide. Tailored Design also reminds the researcher not to create follow-up messages that merely repeat the first communication as repeating the same will not necessarily yield more results. It is
important to make changes in “the look, feel, and content” of reminders (p. 33). In
order to increase the response rate, this study followed the advice offered by Tailored
Design.

Tailored Design was used in the construction of the survey, as it instills the
importance of delivering an instrument that is easily understood both in directions and
wording, and that is visually easy to follow, meaning that answer choices are clear.
Solutions to this include font changes such as bolding, standard spacing, consistent
design and message, and clear instructions placed where they are needed (Dillman et al.,
2009).

Perhaps the most difficult part of survey design, however, is crafting good
questions. Although cavalier treatment of subjects and inattention to graphic design and
layout would systematically propagate error and depress response rate, poorly designed
items embed fatal substantive flaws—because no matter how sensitively subjects are
treated nor how logical and inviting may be the design, bad items represent garbage in:
guaranteeing garbage out.

Tailored design includes provisions for creating good items. The idea is to craft
items that the subjects want to answer and can answer properly because the items are
comparatively clear and transparent (Dillman et al., 2009). After all, what a response
means depends on its construction (Babbie, 2011).

A tricky part of survey design is that researchers, by themselves, cannot see the
problems of items. In other words, researchers need the help that can be obtained from an
expert panel and/or a pilot study. As already indicated, the instrument for this study was
constructed based upon two existing instruments that followed these suggestions. In
addition, the input of an expert panel to the instrument was obtained, as the survey represented a new construction.

**Data Analysis**

Multiple regression analyses were used to determine if there was a relationship between the independent variables (personal and contextual) and the dependent variable(s), principals’ attitudes toward FLES (and possibly, factors thereof). An important threat to multiple regression studies is multicollinearity, which occurs when “there are moderate to high intercorrelations among the predictors” (Stevens, 2009, p. 74). The variance inflation factor, VIF, is used to determine if there is cause for concern. Myers (1990) estimates that a VIF in excess of 10 is cause for concern. Since it is probable that multicollinearity will exist (several planned variables are, after all, related possibly in a strong way), Stevens suggests combining highly correlated predictors, thus forming a single measure, as a method of combating this problem. Centering is another possible method of dealing with the problem, if it proves conceptually important to retain two related variables (Tabachnick, Fidell, & Osterlind, 2001). These threats were addressed with the recommended procedures.

With the threat of multicollinearity addressed, the next step in this regression study was to select a model regarding order of entry for the independent variables. Initially, the study used direct entry, entering all independent variables (and testing for multicollinearity and making the necessary adjustments to reduce the threat, as indicated by the analysis). This method provided multiple models that were examined to determine the most valid and the most parsimonious.
In addition, categorical variables were given attention as being possibly influential in the regression analyses. The study resorted to using Analysis of Variance techniques (e.g., one-way, two-way, or multiple) to explore such relationship (i.e., if regression analysis suggests them as meaningful).

**Limitations and Delimitations**

The requirements of the IRB of Ohio University for the protection of human subjects were followed. Survey respondents were provided with anonymity through the use of a coding system. The objective of the procedure was to enhance the likelihood that the principal participants would feel comfortable enough to respond openly and truthfully.

A concern for on-line surveys is that there is no interviewer present to help the respondents. Questions can emerge regarding the instructions, the questions, and the ways to submit the completed survey. For these reasons an attempt as previously described, was made to design carefully the instructions and questions for the survey (Dillman et al., 2009).

The response rate of the principals is a potential pitfall, with consideration of the plethora of demands for their time. In Ohio, principals have recently faced an increase in teacher observations tied to new evaluation requirements mandated by the state. The use of student testing data for teacher evaluations is contributing in the schools to an atmosphere of stress and fear of the unknown. Non-tested teachers are now being required to submit Student Learning Objectives (SLOs) to administrators to measure the growth of their students. Of the components of a teacher’s evaluation, 50% are to come from data that measure student growth. Administrators are required to be instructional
leaders and to guide their staffs through these new procedures. As a result of these demands on the time of principals, an attempt was made to submit the survey to them in a timely manner. Even with attention to these matters, a strong response rate can be difficult to obtain.

Coverage errors can occur when the type of survey administered is not appropriate to the potential respondents or when the entire population in general is not afforded the opportunity to respond. In some populations an Internet survey may result in coverage error, “when not all members of the population have a known, nonzero chance of being included in the sample for the survey…[or] as is the case with Internet surveys where a significant number of people in many populations do not have access to the Internet” (Dillman et al., 2009, p. 17). However, all Ohio elementary principals reportedly have easy access to the Internet, even in the most rural locations.

With the data collection process completed from the Internet Survey of Ohio elementary principals, analysis of the data was initiated. Chapter 4 will reveal the results of data analysis.
Chapter 4: Findings

This study has attempted to examine the expressed perceptions of Ohio elementary principals with regards to Foreign Language (FL) education. As indicated in the first chapter of the dissertation, the research question for the study was, “What personal, professional and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programming?” The obtainment of the perspective of elementary principals seems particularly important, as they are typically the educational leaders at the beginning of the kindergarten through twelfth grade sequence of study for students. For this reason, elementary administrators are more and less likely to address FL curricular deficiencies in if they are respectively aware and not aware of their existence.

Since limited literature exists regarding the manner in which elementary principals perceive FL or FLES programs, the literature review for this study began by framing the research question within the American historical context of monolingualism. Of relevance is that Ohio elementary principals appear to be influenced by American language policies and the resulting influence of the policies upon the culture. The literature review also examined SLA (second language acquisition) and FL learning. Most principals, according to the literature review, have had some sort of Language other than English (LOE) experience, whether in kindergarten through twelfth grade or at the university level. For this reason, reported best practices in learning a LOE were considered and treated as pertinent to this study. The concluding area of the literature review pertained to curricular struggles, in particular, those pertaining to the importance of FLES programming.
This study investigated the perceived value of FLES programs by Ohio elementary principals (the participants), which were designated as dependent variables, against the perceived value of FLs and the perceived importance of FLs, which were designated independent variables. The dependent variables pertaining to the perceived value of FLES programs were also compared against the designated covariates, which pertained to contextual and demographic information about the participants. This information included questions regarding whether the participants were Ohio elementary principal, the gender of the participants, the national origin of the participants, the ethnicity of the participants, the number of years that the participants had been principals, the number of years that the participant had been classroom teachers, the teaching certification/licensure of the participants, whether the participant was bilingual or multilingual, how many FLs the participant had studied, whether the participants’ current schools had a FLES programs and the perceptions of the participants of FL studies at the elementary school level. This information can be found in Table 1.
## Table 1

**Variable Identification and Measure of the Participating Elementary Principals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct / Variable Name</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Labels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>OH_EL_PRINC</em> (currently OH principal)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes = 0, No = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>GENDER</em> (national origin)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Female = 0, Male = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ORIGIN</em> (national origin)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Born in U.S. = 0, Foreign = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ETHNICITY</em></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Binary</td>
<td>0 = White, 1 = Minorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ADMIN_YEARS</em> (years as principal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>The number of years, exact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CLASS_YEARS</em> (years as teacher)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>The number of years, exact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>CERTIF</em> (teacher certification/licensure)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>ELA = 1, FL = 2, STEM = 3, Other = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>BILING_MULTI</em> (bilingual or multilingual)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes = 0, No = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FLS_STUDIED</em> (number of foreign languages studied)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>The number of languages, exact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FLES_PROG</em> (school of participant has FLES program)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
<td>Yes = 0, No = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PERC_FLES</em> (participant’s perception of foreign language in elementary school programs)</td>
<td>12:1-6</td>
<td>Likert (5)</td>
<td>Strongly agree = 5, Somewhat agree = 4, Neither agree nor disagree = 3, Somewhat disagree = 2, Strongly disagree = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IVs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FL_VAL</em> (participant’s perception of the value of foreign language)</td>
<td>13:1-6</td>
<td>Likert (5)</td>
<td>Strongly agree = 5, Somewhat agree = 4, Neither agree nor disagree = 3, Somewhat disagree = 2, Strongly disagree = 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FL_IMP</em> (participant’s perception of the importance of foreign language)</td>
<td>14:1-4</td>
<td>Likert (5)</td>
<td>Strongly agree = 5, Somewhat agree = 4, Neither agree nor disagree = 3, Somewhat disagree = 2, Strongly disagree = 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The survey instrument for this study contains four sections which correspond to the variables. The first section is focused on the personal and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals, which are identified as covariates and treated as independent variables in the analysis for the study. The second section is focused on the perceived value of FLES programs by the participants, that was obtained from an instrument by Heining-Boynton (1990) that has been used to measure administrators’ and principals’ perceptions of FLES. The third and fourth sections of the survey pertain to the independent variables and were obtained from an instrument by Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) that has been used to measure high school students’ perceptions of FL. Specifically, section three was used in an attempt to measures the perceived value of FL. In this section, several of the questions (See Table 1) were worded negatively and recoded in the reverse for analysis. The fourth section measures the perceived importance of FL.

As indicated earlier in this chapter, a lack of literature exists regarding the research question. For this reason, the study is exploratory in nature and has been approached in terms of the variables described earlier in this chapter. With consideration of the designated approach, the following null hypotheses have been investigated.

- **H1₀** There is no relationship between elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and their perceived value of FL learning, all else equal.
- **H2₀** There is no relationship between elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and their perceived importance of FL learning, all else equal.
• H30 There is no relationship between elementary principals’ personal and contextual characteristics (covariates) and their perceived value of FLES programs, all else equal.

Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted in order to enhance the likelihood that the survey was reliable and its questions would be appropriate. A panel of former Ohio elementary principals was asked to take the survey and comment on the appropriateness of its contents. Panel participants were asked to answer the questions based on their last elementary principal position. Ten former principals were asked to be members of the panel and seven agreed to participate. However, only five of the seven returned the survey. Four of the participants currently hold district, upper level educational administration positions, and one has returned to being a classroom teacher.

Since the pilot study participants are no longer Ohio elementary principals, they and their reactions were not included in the study. Prior to agreeing to participate in the pilot study, the former principals were assured that their responses would not be used and that the purpose of their involvement was to make certain that the process and the survey questions worked, as intended. The same introductory e-mail message that was used for the actual study participants (Appendix D) was used for the pilot participants. However, an additional paragraph was inserted for the pilot participants reiterating that they were participating in a pilot study and that their feedback was being sought to refine both the process and the instrument. The pilot study was distributed in March, 2016. Minor changes in wording were suggested by the pilot group and used to revise the instrument.
Study Procedures

The survey instrument was distributed to all Ohio elementary principals using demographic information that is available from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). Specifically, a resource available on the ODE website, the Ohio Educational Directory System (OEDS) was used. It is a data system available to the public that allows the user to research the most current information about schools and their districts. Specifically, an Excel spreadsheet (Public School Contact Information) is available that contains information about all kindergarten through twelfth grade public schools in Ohio. This study used the data that was available through the ODE as of March 2, 2016. By using sorting properties in Excel, a spreadsheet was created with the names, schools, districts, and e-mail addresses of all Ohio public school elementary principals that were available in the ODE database.

The web-based survey tool, Qualtrics, that is available to Ohio University students, was the vehicle used to upload the contact information for all Ohio elementary principals ($N = 1448$) and distribute the survey to the principals. The dissemination of the survey via Qualtrics included an initial e-mail invitation with a survey link. In addition, reminder e-mails were sent to those participants that had not yet responded.

Response Rate

The initial e-mail invitation and survey were sent on June 1, 2016, to valid and unduplicated e-mail addresses for Ohio elementary principals, as found in the ODE database. The invitation included a brief explanation of the study, requested participation, provided a link to the study, and included Ohio University’s Adult Consent Form without Signature. The form explained the university’s policies for studies and included the
prospect for an invitee to opt out of the survey (Appendix D). Table 2 contains the data related to the response rate to this instrument. Although the spreadsheet that was created with the information from *Public School Contact Information* from the ODE, it listed a larger number ($N=1448$), as the number of Ohio elementary principals. This study identified ($N = 1427$) as validated and unduplicated e-mail addresses. This first e-mail resulted in a response rate of 2.4% ($N = 34$) from the successfully distributed e-mails that were not duplicate addresses.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Rate Based on Valid E-mail Address</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015 Ohio Principals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals Reported by the ODE</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successfully Distributed E-mail Surveys to Validated and Unduplicated Addresses</td>
<td>1427</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to the Initial Invitation to Participate in the Survey</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Reminder 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Reminder 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses to Reminder 3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Complete and Incomplete Responses</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Used for Analysis, Which Only Include the Complete Responses</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first reminder e-mail was sent on June 7, 2016. The participants, who had not yet responded during the first invitation period, received this e-mail, which included the same information, with one minor change (Appendix E). Through the use of Qualtrics, it
was possible to monitor the amount of time that it took the survey participants to complete the survey. The majority of the participants were able to complete the survey in three to four minutes. The initial invitation indicated that the survey would take less than ten minutes to complete. The revised invitation indicated that the survey would take less than five minutes to complete. Nonetheless, the response rate decreased to 1.55% \((N = 22)\) out of all successfully distributed e-mails \((N = 1427)\) (See Table 2).

The Ohio elementary principals received two more reminder e-mail messages (See Table 2). The second reminder was sent on June 14, 2016 and the overall response rate further decreased to 1.22% \((N = 17)\). The third and last reminder e-mail was sent on June 20, 2016. In order to attempt to address the decreasing response rates, one more aspect of the e-mail invitation was modified. The subject line of the first invitation and reminder e-mails was listed as Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES)”. However, for the final reminder, the subject line was changed to “Data from Ohio Principals (FLES)” . The reasoning behind the change was the thought that the participants might erroneously believe, at first glance, that the e-mail did not apply to them since it was not very descriptive. This last e-mail response rate increased to 2.12% \((N = 30)\) for a final total response rate of 7.28% \((N = 103)\) out of the successfully distributed e-mail surveys \((N = 1427)\).

Despite the fact that 120 Ohio elementary principals began the survey; only 103 principals actually completed the survey. Upon close examination of the data, an observation was made that some participants did not complete all of the questions \((N = 8)\). Therefore, this study excluded any participant that did not respond to all parts of the
survey. As a result, this study used the responses of the 95 principals who answered the survey completely (See Table 2).

**Descriptive Statistics**

The survey items are noted in Tables 1, 3 and 4. The designation in Table 1 refers to the question number that Qualtrics assigned to the items during survey construction. These survey items, consisting of personal, professional and contextual aspects of Ohio elementary principals, are the basis for the covariates used in this study. The first question on the actual survey (Appendix H), Item 15 (See Table 3), was included as a control measure in case of an erroneous e-mail address. Each participant was asked to designate if she/he was an Ohio elementary principal. All respondents answered “yes” and for this reason the answers to the item were not used for further analysis. In addition, the respondents all selected answer choice “Born in the U.S.” for Item 2 pertaining to the national origins of the principals (See Table 4). The basis for the decision to exclude these survey items is that there is nothing to investigate when there is no variability in the response. These independent variables are not valid as potential predictors due to the lack of variability.

In addition, Item 3 of the survey, which referred to the ethnicity of the participants (See Table 4) was recoded for data analysis purposes, from a scale variable with five answer choices “African American, Asian, Hispanic, Other, and White” into a binary variable, 0= White and 1 = All Others. Since the individual responses for the various ethnicities, other than white, were small, combining them appeared to make sense. Finally, upon reflection, Item 6 of the survey, which pertains to teaching certification/licensure of the principals, was unfortunately not worded in a way that
revealed much useful information. Most of the principals \((N = 74, 72.5\%)\) selected
the choice “Other”. The preponderance of the selection “Other” appears to reflect that
many elementary certificates/licenses were general in nature, being for kindergarten
through eighth grade and first through eighth grade. The original intent of the question,
which was to ascertain if a relationship existed between teaching certification/licensure of
the respondents and their perceptions of FLES, was not obtained. For this reason, the
responses to this question were removed from final data analysis.
### Table 3

**Responses to Categorical Variables – Principal Characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>Survey Item #</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th># of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Covariates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OH_EL_PRINC (currently OH principal)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>103 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36 (35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORIGIN (national origin)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Born in U.S.</td>
<td>103 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>6 (5.825%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERTIF (teacher certification/licensure)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>ELA (English, Language Arts)</td>
<td>18 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILING_MULTI (bilingual or multilingual)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11 (10.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLS_STUDIED (number of foreign languages studied)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 (4.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLES_PROG (school has FLES program)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 (14.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contents of Table 4 are focused upon the outcomes of the statements pertaining to the continuous variables from this study. A continuous variable may have an infinite number of values. In this study, continuous variables that refer to year have a value from one to however many years for the most experienced participant. The results were that the responding Ohio elementary principals had been administrators for an average of nine and a half years with a standard deviation of 6.24 years, and had been
classroom teachers for almost 12 years with a standard deviation of 5.59 years, before becoming administrators.

Table 4

*Continuous Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Survey Item</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev.</th>
<th>Skewness (SE)</th>
<th>Kurtosis (SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covariates</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN_YEARS (years as principal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>1.191 (.238)</td>
<td>2.986 (.472)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS_YEARS (years in classroom)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.957 (.239)</td>
<td>.442 (.474)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERC_FLES (perception of Foreign Language in Elementary School [FLES] programming)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.331 (.246)</td>
<td>-.695 (.488)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL_VALUE (value of foreign language)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-1.431 (.245)</td>
<td>1.334 (.485)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL_IMP (importance of foreign language)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.004 (.245)</td>
<td>.600 (.485)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The continuous variables, those which did not refer to years, were based upon a five point Likert scale and accordingly had values from “one” to “five”. The results for these variables were that the mean of the dependent variable pertaining to the perception of FLES programs (4.05), and the mean for the independent variable pertaining to the value of FL in the curriculum (4.58) were higher than the mean score for the independent variable which pertains to the importance of FL (3.22). This result reflects that the participants indicated that they “agree” to “strongly agree” about the value of FLES and FL. However the reactions of the participants reflected indifference, neither agreeing nor disagreeing regarding the importance of FL. All of the continuous variables (See Table 4) were based on a five point Likert scale.
In order to know if the results regarding a variable are distributed normally, skewness and kurtosis have been examined to investigate symmetry, the ideal being a normal distribution that resembles a bell-curve. Skewness detects the symmetry with the center point of the distribution. Kurtosis describes the tails at each end of the distribution, whether they are heavy or light tailed. Skewness for a normal distribution is zero, and the kurtosis for this distribution is three. Positive kurtosis indicates a heavy tail and negative kurtosis indicates a light tail (NIST, 2016). To identify the skewness or kurtosis, the figure that is given in Table 4 is divided by the standard error (SE).

For this study, the skewness for the covariate that addresses the number of years that the participants had been principals is five and the kurtosis is six, indicating a lack of symmetry to the center point (skewness) and a heavy tail (kurtosis). In other words, several of the principals in this study have been principals for many years beyond the mean (9.58). Regarding the variable pertaining to the years as a teacher, the skewness is four and the kurtosis is one. Since this data is describing years, negative numbers are not possible nor is symmetry of the distribution truly possible.

For the other three variables that used Likert Scales, the perception of FLES, the value of FL, and the importance of FL, the skewness (-1.34, -5.84, .010) and the kurtosis (-1.42, 2.75, 1.23), in the order of their presentation in Table 4, suggests that the data is fairly normal.

The difference between the mean scores for the independent variable, which pertained to the perception of the elementary principal participants of the value of FL (4.58), and the independent variable which pertained to their perception of the importance of FL (3.22) seemed to merit further analysis (See Table 4). This was more than a full
point difference on the five point Likert scale that was used to measure these variables. To the naked eye, this difference seems unusual since the participants seem to value FL but on the other hand were ambivalent regarding its importance. To compare the mean scores between these two variables, a Paired T-Test was performed to further examine the mean scores of participant responses to these two variables to investigate the possibility of statistical significance.

A Paired T-Test can be used to examine two different measurements, which in this case was the means for the two independent variables pertaining to the perceived value of FL. Statistical significance is indicated when the p-value is less than .05 (Penn State Statistics, 2016, 3.2; Rumsey, 2003). The responses were very high, which reflected that the participants designated that they “agree” to “strongly agree” that FL is valuable. However, the responses for the variable regarding the importance of FL reflected indifference, that is the respondents did not “strongly agree” or “disagree”. In this case, the Paired T-Test suggests that the difference between the mean scores of these two variables is statistically significant since the significance or p-value is less than .05 \( (t = 16.0, df = 96, p < .001) \).
Table 5

Continuous Variables – Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV: PERC_FLES (Perception of Foreign Language in Elementary School [FLES] programming)</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1 Students participate/ would participate enthusiastically in FLES.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2 Parents seem/ would be pleased with FLES.</td>
<td>(0%)</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
<td>(11.5%)</td>
<td>(49%)</td>
<td>(38.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.3 “At-risk” students are performing/ would perform well with FLES.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.4 Students seem/ would be pleased with FLES.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5 FLES is reinforcing/ would reinforce other content areas in the curriculum.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.6 I support the notion that FLES is/ would be important for all students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV: FL_VAL (Value of Foreign Language [FL] )

| 13.1 Knowing a FL is a valuable asset. | 0 | 1 | 3 | 22 | 71 |
| 13.2 To me, studying a FL is basically worthless. | 79 | 11 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| 13.3 I can think of a dozen uses for a FL, both in the U.S. and abroad. | (81.4%) | (11.3%) | (5.2%) | (1%) | (1%) |
| 13.4 I feel that studying a FL is a waste of time. | 2 | 4 | 12 | 32 | 47 |
| 13.5 In this country, knowing a FL is practically useless for anything more than an ornamental purpose. | (81.4%) | (12.4%) | (6.2%) | (0%) | (0%) |
| 13.6 The more FL I learn, the less I like the language and culture. | 71 | 18 | 7 | 0 | 1 |

IV: FL_IMP (Importance of Foreign Language [FL])

| 14.1 I couldn’t really claim to be educated without knowing a FL. | 30 | 20 | 27 | 13 | 7 |
| 14.2 Learning a FL certainly yields a better understanding of English. | (30.9%) | (20.6%) | (27.8%) | (13.4%) | (7.2%) |
| 14.3 The first step in achieving cross-cultural understanding of a FL. | 2 | 6 | 20 | 51 | 18 |
| 14.4 Studying a FL was probably a significant part of my education. | (2.1%) | (6.2%) | (20.6%) | (52.6%) | (18.6%) |

FLES Program Evaluation Inventory (Heining-Boynton, 1990); Value and Importance of FL (Corbin & Chiachiere, 1997)

Reliability

Reliability is the ability to elicit a consistent response for survey items. In other words, reliable items ascertain what is intended to be measured. Cronbach’s alpha is a
A statistic that is used to measure the internal consistency of scales, such as the Likert scale that was used in this study (Cronbach, 1951). A value of (.70) has been established by Nunnally (1978) as an acceptable reliability coefficient. In general, the higher the score the more reliable the scale, such as the Likert scale that was used by Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) and in the survey instrument for this study.

The study by Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) involved an investigation of the variables that might influence FL achievement in high school seniors. Five dimensions were used to measure students’ attitudes toward FL. The length of FL study by the students, such as the number of years of having studied a foreign language, and the native language aptitude (covariates) were found by Corbin and Chiachiere to be significant predictors of FL achievement. Only the dimension, which pertained to the difficulty in learning a FL and which was not used in this study, was a significant predictor (8.8%). Reliability of the five dimensions is listed in Table 6. For the Corbin and Chiachiere study, the model created in their study explained 44.2% of the variance in achievement in the FL studies of high school students.
Table 6

Corbin and Chiachiere Survey Reliability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 1</strong>: (fascination with learning a foreign language)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 2</strong>: (dislike for foreign language study)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dimension 3</em>: (value of learning a foreign language)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dimension 4</em>: (importance of foreign language learning)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dimension 5</strong>: (difficulty in learning a foreign language)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Corbin & Chiachiere, 1997) (*used in this dissertation study)

The reliability of the dependent variable for this study, which pertains to the perception of FLES programs, is measured overall (See Table 7) by six items (.857), which demonstrates reliability. This portion of the instrument, which was used in this study, came from the Heining-Boynton (1990) instrument that was given to administrators. No information regarding reliability was given in the study. The independent variable which pertains to the value of FL (See Table 7), has an alpha reliability of .518 and does not appear to be consistent with Corbin and Chiachiere’s (1997) reliability of .87 for this dimension. Wording was consistent in both instruments, that is the original Corbin and Chiachiere study and this current study. In addition, three of the six items were worded negatively in both studies. It seems probable that the negative wording and a possible quick reading on a computer screen by busy administrators in June for this study may have contributed to the low reliability. Also, the sample for Corbin and Chiachiere was larger (N=349) than in this study (N=95). The last independent variable, which pertains to the importance of FL (See Table 7), consisted of four items with alpha reliability of .684 which was higher than the original reliability of
.59 that was obtained by Corbin and Chiachiere (1997). It appears difficult to
determine why the differences in reliability occurred between the two studies, the original
by Corbin and Chiachiere and this current study. However, the sample groups were quite
different in age, education, and responsibility. To reiterate, only two of the five
dimensions were used from the Corbin and Chiachiere instrument for this study.

Table 7

*Surveys’ Reliability*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Previous # of Items</th>
<th>Previous Reliability</th>
<th>Current # of Items</th>
<th>Current Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DV: PERC_FLES</strong>&lt;br&gt;(perception of Foreign Language in Elementary School [FLES] programming)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>None given</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV: FL_VAL</strong>&lt;br&gt;(value of foreign language)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IV: FL_IMP</strong>&lt;br&gt;(importance of foreign language)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FLES Program Evaluation Inventory (Heining-Boynton, 1990); Value and Importance of FL (Corbin & Chiachiere, 1997)

**Data Analysis**

A plan for data analysis was included in the third methodology chapter of this study. The plan included the use of regression analysis to determine if there was a relationship between the independent variables (personal and contextual) and the dependent variable, principals’ attitudes toward FLES (and possibly, factors thereof). The omnibus test included nine independent and covariate variables. They are the value of FL; the importance of FL; and the covariates which are the participant’s (a) gender, (b) ethnicity, (c) number of years as a principal, (d) number of years as a teacher, (e) bilingual or multilingual status, and (e) the number of FLs studied. The other covariate
pertains to whether the participant’s school had a FLES program. The variables were
used in an attempt to explain the dependent variable pertaining to the participants’
perception of FLES programming. The results suggest that the overall model consisting
of nine independent and covariate variables and their ability to predict the participants’
perception of FLES, the dependent variable, is significant and that 29% of the variability
can be explained by this model ($F = 3.882; df = 9, 85; p < .001$) (See Table 8).

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Model Significance</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$df$</th>
<th>$p$ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Model</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>9, 85</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Chapter 3’s plan for data analysis, multicollinearity was mentioned as a
possible concern if there were “moderate to high intercorrelations among the predictors”
(Stevens, 2009, p. 74). Multicollinearity occurs when two or more predictor variables are
highly correlated and this can present as a problem in regression studies since “the effects
of predictors are confounded due to correlations among them” (p. 74) which makes it
difficult to ascertain their individual importance. The predictor variables, also known as
independent and covariate variables in this study, are not highly correlated (See Table 8).
The variance inflation factor (VIF) was the statistic used to determine if there was cause
for concern in this study. According to Myers (1990), a VIF larger than ten is cause for
concern. In Table 8, all of the VIFs are smaller than two, which indicate that
multicollinearity was not a cause for concern. The obtainment of the $p$-value was used to
determine statistical significance. It is the calculated probability of obtaining the same result if the null hypothesis were true. To reject the null hypothesis, the p-value is less than .05, and thus is statistically significant (Penn State Statistics, 2016, 3.2; Rumsey, 2003).

In Table 8, the results of the independent variables as individual predictors of the dependent variable are listed. Only two of the independent variables are significant as predictors of the dependent variable. The independent variable that pertains to the importance of FL proves to be a significant variable or predictor of FLES since the p-value (.021) is less than .05 and can uniquely explain 4% of variability, all else equal ($t = 2.360$, $df = 85$, $p = .021$). The independent variable which pertains to the value of FL, is a more significant variable since the p-value is even less (.001) and can uniquely explain 10% of variability, all else equal ($t = 23.518$, $df = 85$, $p = .001$). The entire model which is a combination of the nine independent variables as predictors of the perception of FLES is able to explain 29% of the variability, all else equal (See Table 7).
Table 9

Results of Independent Variables (Predictors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Label</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>$p$ value</th>
<th>Part Correlation</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENDER</td>
<td>-.209</td>
<td>-1.663</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>1.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHNICITY</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>-.671</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>1.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN_YEARS (years as principal)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.603</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>1.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS_YEARS (years in classroom)</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.685</td>
<td>.495</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>1.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BILING_MULTI (bilingual or multilingual)</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>-.480</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>-.063</td>
<td>1.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLS_STUDIED (number of foreign languages studied)</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>1.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLES_PROG (school has Foreign Language in Elementary School [FLES] program)</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.223</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>1.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL_VAL (value of foreign language)</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>3.518</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>1.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL_IMP (importance of foreign language)</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>2.360</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>1.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable – Perception of FLES programming ($PERC\_FLES$)

Summary of Findings

This study employed diverse quantitative methods of data analysis with the information acquired from a survey of Ohio elementary principals. The research question inquired into which personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals might influence their view of FLES programming. The purpose of the study was to investigate the relationship between the independent variables to see if they could predict the principals’ perception of FLES programming. According to the regression model (See Table 7), 29% of the variability can be explained by nine independent variables that act as predictors of the perception of FLES programming, the dependent variable.
In terms of the null hypotheses presented earlier in this chapter, \(H_1\), there is no relationship between participants’ perceived value of FLES programs and FL learning. The null hypothesis is rejected. The independent variable that pertains to the value of FL learning uniquely explains 4% of the variability in the participants’ perception of FLES (See Table 8).

In terms of the second null hypothesis, \(H_2\), there is no relationship between participants’ perceived value of FLES programs and their value of FL learning. The null hypothesis is also rejected. The independent variable that describes the value of a FL, uniquely explains 10% of the variability (See Table 8). As a result, these two independent variables were significant predictors of the dependent variable that pertains to the perception of FLES programming.

In terms of the third null hypothesis, \(H_3\), there is no relationship between participants’ perceived value of FLES programs and principals’ personal and contextual characteristics (covariates). The null hypothesis is accepted. None of the individual covariates were significant predictors of the perception of FLES by the participants (See Table 8). This study’s results in terms of the null hypotheses are listed below in Table 9. Implications of these findings are reviewed in Chapter 5.
Table 10

*Study Hypothesis and Findings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Null Hypothesis</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>H1</strong>&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt; There is no relationship between elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and their perceived value of FL learning, all else equal. (<em>FL_Val</em>)</td>
<td>Rejected the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H2</strong>&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt; There is no relationship between elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and their perceived importance of FL learning, all else equal. (<em>FL_Imp</em>)</td>
<td>Rejected the Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>H3</strong>&lt;sub&gt;0&lt;/sub&gt; There is no relationship between elementary principals’ personal and contextual characteristics and their perceived value of FLES programs, all else equal. (Covariates)</td>
<td>Failed to reject Null Hypothesis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5: Summary and Conclusions

This study examined the perceptions of Ohio elementary principals with regards to foreign language (FL) education, specifically foreign language in elementary school (FLES). A survey instrument was sent to all of the public school elementary principals in Ohio. The data, which emerged from the survey, was analyzed with the intent of exploring the relationships between personal, professional and contextual characteristics of the Ohio elementary principal participants and FLES programming. This chapter includes a review of the study procedures, the study results, the implications of the study, recommendations for future research, and the perspective of the study’s researcher regarding the status of FLES.

Study Purpose

This study investigated Ohio elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and the possible influences upon their perceptions of FLES programming. Many other countries in the world begin FL study in the elementary school. However, this is not the case in the United States where it usually begins in middle or high school (Pufahl, Rhodes, & Christian, 2001). American FLES programs have been on the decrease despite the positive results that are shown to accumulate across the curriculum from such instruction (CED, 2006). For this reason, it seemed logical to examine what elementary administrators in the United States think about FLES, given that they are the instructional leaders of the schools in which most students begin their educations and that most American elementary schools do not have FLES programs. The intent of the study was not to address how such a program would fit into an American elementary school. The intent was to identify the possible influencing factors regarding the perceptions of
elementary principals with regards to FLES programming. By knowing the factors, which might be influencing Ohio elementary principals with regards to FLES programming, the possibility appears to exist that a general understanding of the lack of FLES programs in the United States could be identified.

In order to investigate the dilemma of FLES programming, the following research question guided this study, what personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES programming? Understanding the perspective of elementary principals seems particularly important, as they are typically the educational leaders at the beginning of the kindergarten through twelfth grade sequence of study for students. For this reason, elementary administrators are more and less likely to address FL curricular deficiencies if they are respectively aware and not aware of their existence. The next sections of this chapter briefly summarize the study procedures and results.

**Study Procedures**

An expert panel of former Ohio elementary principals participated in a pilot study of the survey instrument to ensure that its contents were reliable, valid, and appropriate to the intent of the study. Then, the survey was finalized and disseminated through Qualtrics, a survey platform available to Ohio University students, to all Ohio public elementary school principals. The names and e-mail addresses of the principals were obtained from and Excel spreadsheet maintained by the Ohio Department of Education. Three follow-up reminder e-mails were sent to principals that had not previously responded. In the end, the survey had total response rate of 7.28% \( (N = 103) \) out of the
successfully distributed e-mail surveys \((N = 1427)\). Of those 103 responses, 95 were complete and used for data analysis purposes.

**Study Results**

This study used regression analysis to create a model of predictor variables that influence the manner that the participating Ohio elementary principals perceive FLES programming. The variables were investigated in terms of the following null hypotheses.

- **H1\(_0\)** There is no relationship between elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and their perceived value of FL learning, all else equal.
- **H2\(_0\)** There is no relationship between elementary principals’ perceived value of FLES programs and their perceived importance of FL learning, all else equal.
- **H3\(_0\)** There is no relationship between elementary principals’ personal and contextual characteristics (covariates) and their perceived value of FLES programs, all else equal.

These predictor variables included nine independent and covariate variables that were based upon information obtained from the survey instrument. Specifically, these variables pertained to (a) the value of FL, (b) the importance of FL, (c) the gender and the ethnicity of the participants, (d) the number of years the participants have been principals, (e) the number of years the participants had spent in the classroom, (f) whether the participants were bilingual or multilingual, (g) the number of FLs studied by the participant, and (h) whether the participants’ school had FLES programs. This combination of variables was used in an attempt to explain the Ohio elementary principals’ perception of FLES programming. The model reflected that 29% of the variability in the perception of FLES
programming could be explained by the combination of the nine independent and covariate variables. With two of the independent variables combined, the value of FL and the importance of FL proved to be significant on their own. The importance of FL uniquely explained 4% of the model, while the value of FL uniquely explained 10% of the model.

The research question inquired into which personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals might influence their view of FLES programming. According to the model, personal, professional and contextual characteristics accounted for 15% of the variability, but individually these seven variables were not significant. These characteristics individually accounted for 1% to 2% of the variability in the model. The most influential predictors of the participants’ perception of FLES programming were the characteristics pertaining to how the participants perceived the value of FL and their perceived importance of FL.

**Implications**

The results of the study reflected that Ohio elementary principal participants appear to support the idea of FLES programming as evidenced by the high mean score (4.05) out of a possible five possible points from the Likert scale that was used with the survey instrument. The outcome corresponds to a “somewhat agree” response to the statements regarding the perception of FLES programming. The following statements were used to assess the participants’ perception of FLES and were worded for participants, whose schools had or did not have FLES programs. The statements are (a) students participate/ would participate enthusiastically in FLES; (b) parents seem/ would be pleased with FLES; (c) “at-risk” students are performing/ would perform well with
FLES; (d) students seem/ would be pleased with FLES; (e) FLES is reinforcing/ would reinforce other content areas in the curriculum; and (f) I support the notion that FLES is/ would be important for all students (See Chapter 4, Table 5). The participants’ perception of the value of FLES was the dependent variable in this study.

Statements regarding the value of FL were included in the survey instrument to reflect the independent variables (See Chapter 4, Table 5). These statements requested the respondents to rate the manner that they perceived the value of FL in terms of: (a) a worthwhile course, (b) a useful skill in the U.S. and abroad, (c) a good use of time as a course, (d) a useful skill in the U.S., and (e) that learning is valuable that purports positivity toward language and culture. The mean score for the value of FL (4.58) was very high compared to the mean score (3.22) regarding the importance of FL. The importance of FL included statements regarding the manner that the respondents perceived: (a) being considered educated because a FL was studied, (b) that FL yielded a better understanding of English, (c) that FL was the first step in cross-cultural understanding, and (d) that FL was a significant part of an education.

The difference between the mean scores for the value of FL (4.58) and the importance of FL (3.22) was more than a full point and as such seemed to warrant further statistical analysis to verify the significance. The application of a Paired T-Test confirmed that the difference between the variables was indeed statistically significant. The data pertaining to the value of FL (4.58) indicates that participants “somewhat” to “strongly” agree that FL learning is valuable. However, the participants neither agreed nor disagreed about the importance of FL learning as indicated by the mean score (3.22) (See Chapter 4, Table 4).
In other words, the Ohio elementary principal participants in this study reported that they perceived FLES programs and FL learning as being valuable. However, the participants indicated indifference, reflecting that they neither agreed nor disagreed regarding the importance of learning a FL. The meaning of this outcome seems difficult to interpret. Participants may truly be indifferent or there may have been a misunderstanding of a question/statement due to the negative manner in which it was worded. This study used the original wording from the Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) instrument.

Other personal, professional, and contextual characteristics, which were not subjected to the regression analysis, still provided descriptive information that the researcher found interesting. For instance, five \((N = 103)\) of the administrators, or 4.9% of the participants never studied a FL, but on the other hand, four of the principals, or 3.8% of the participants had actually studied three or more FLs. No one in this group \((N = 103)\) had studied more than four FLs. Indeed, most Ohio elementary principals (68%) had studied at least one FL and 23.3% had studied two FLs. Overall, 95% of the principal participants in this study had studied a FL at during their academic career (See Chapter 4, Table 3). The information emerging from the question regarding the certification/licensure of the participants reflected that the teaching area of two of the principals had been FL, prior to the time that they became elementary principals.

**Limitations**

This section of the chapter examines the limitations of the research and findings of this study. First and foremost, each study has limitations that can compromise its findings (Bell, 2010). In light of this study being exploratory and the availability of
literature on the subject being limited, intent existed to provide future researchers, who are focused on the perceptions of principals regarding FL and FLES education, with insights that they could use to overcome the difficulties encountered by this researcher.

One limitation in this study may be attributed to the obtainment of the results based upon the manner in which the participating Ohio elementary principals reported their perceptions of answers to the questions in the survey instrument. In a related manner, the possibility exists that the principals could have misunderstood some of the questions, even with the reliability and validity check that was administered with an expert panel of past principals. In regards to the matter of self-reporting, the principals may have responded based upon a desire to be viewed in a certain way, such as a perceived positive (social desirability). Or, as mentioned above, the respondent may simply have misunderstood a question (Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002; Fisher, 1993). Anonymity was the strategy used to combat this possible problem. An indication was made on the survey instrument that the responses would be maintained in an anonymous manner. However, a promise of anonymity cannot resolve misunderstandings or resolve attempts to be viewed in a certain manner. Nonetheless, the pilot group participants offered no concerns that the contents of the instrument were confusing. In addition, the participants in this study are well-educated individuals, who appear to have the capacity to read and interpret survey questions and statements.

In this study, the principals were asked to self-report data about their perceptions of FLES programming and FL education. To reiterate, the participating Ohio elementary principals indicated that they perceive FLES programming to be valuable, and that they perceive FL learning as valuable. However, their responses appeared to indicate they are
indifferent to these matters, meaning they neither agree nor disagree regarding the importance of learning a FL. Some of the questions were worded negatively in the section regarding the importance of learning a FL. This may have contributed to the somewhat indifferent responses that were more than a full point below the responses regarding FLES and the value of FL. Reliability and validity for these variables on the original Corbin and Chiachiere instrument (1997) and this current instrument were somewhat inconsistent (See Chapter 4, Table 7). A further examination to understand the meaning of these inconsistencies appears to be warranted.

The instrument used for this study was a combination of two previous instruments with an additional section that solicited demographic information. The statements about FLES came from the Heining-Boynton (1990) instrument that measured administrators’ perceptions of FLES programs. The statements about the value of FL and the importance of FL came from the Corbin and Chiachiere (1997) instrument that investigated high school seniors’ attitudes toward FL. Permission was obtained from the authors of the instruments to use them for this study. Related limitations include the possibility of reliability and validity issues, emerging from the use of questions and statements from the two other studies in this study for which the contexts are not entirely the same.

The construction of the survey instrument, as with the instrument for almost any study, is critical in order that it be an instrument that is capable of contributing to the collect pertinent information. As ineffectively worded statements regarding the certification/licensure of the participating principals were included in the demographic information section of the instrument in this study, little useful information emerged. Most of the principals (N = 74, 72.5%) selected the choice “Other”. The predominance of
the selection “Other” appears to reflect that many elementary certificates/licenses were general in nature, being for kindergarten through eighth grade and first through eighth grade. The original intent of the question, which was not obviously achieved, was to determine if a relationship existed between teaching certification/licensure of the respondents and their perceptions of FLES.

Another limitation to this study was the response rate of 7.22%, which included incomplete and complete surveys. The response rate for the survey in this study was at the mercy of the e-mail recipients, “Will they open the e-mail?” Appearing to be just as critical as a well-written, reliable and valid instrument is the wording placed in the title/subject section of the e-mail received by the potential participants. This researcher has concluded that the title/subject might be one of the most critical factors to the response rate. The original invitation/e-mail message and the first and second e-mail reminders had a subject line that read “Foreign Language in Elementary School, FLES”. With that subject, the initial response rate was 2.38%, the first e-mail reminder response rate was 1.54%, and the second e-mail reminder response rate was 1.19%. In order to address the declining response rate, the subject line for the third and final e-mail reminder was changed to “Data from Ohio Principals (FLES)”. The response rate for this final reminder was 2.12%. For this reason, the researcher for this study has concluded that the original subject line was not adequately descriptive. The potential respondents, possibly many of the potential respondents, may have concluded, erroneously, that the e-mail did not apply to their work and then ignored or deleted the e-mail. In other words, the researcher has concluded that the subject line is critical to the survey response rate!
The results of this study showed that the 95 participating Ohio elementary principals perceive FLES programs favorably. The two influencing factors that contributed to the manner that the participating principals expressed positivity toward FLES programming pertained to the manner that they valued FL and their perceptions of the importance of FL. None of the demographic information individually proved to be influential to the perception of FLES programs. Limitations to this study included the possibility of inaccurate data emerging when self-reporting, reliability inconsistency, poor wording of demographic questions, and the low response rate. In addition, only public schools were included in the study.

**Relationship to the Literature**

Since the literature pertaining to the perceptions of elementary administrators on FLES programming was found to be scarce, the research question, “what personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES programming” was constructed purposely within a broad framework in order that an analysis could be conducted, regardless of the dilemma associated with the scarcity of the literature. Chapter 2 of this study summarized the existing literature that appeared to being pertinent to this study. Literature was included regarding American monolingualism, FL learning, and curricular struggles and FLES programming as the areas pertinent to this study. The researcher for this study found interesting that the comments from participants in the actual study and the pilot study aligned well with the contents of the existing literature.

One of the participating principals shared concerns about FL instruction and learning and American monolingualism. The participant indicated “One comment about
FL…my own experience as a FL student back in junior high school and HS was somewhat negative because the style of teaching used was old and boring. FL, especially in an elementary school, needs to be hands on and engaging to be effective” (Ohio elementary principal participant). The researcher for this study has, in turn, concluded that the study that the study would have been enhanced by learning more about the FL experiences of administrators. Wilkerson (2006) studied college faculty and administrators and found that their initial experience learning a FL, positive or negative, influenced their beliefs for the rest of their careers which in turn influenced future students. In the case of negative experiences “Administrators’ frustrations with their own past FL learning experiences frequently inform their commitment to fostering better programs in their own schools today” (Sweley, 2007, p. 47).

Another participant, who was a member of the panel experts that reviewed and reacted to the survey instrument, indicated “To be honest I feel frustrated answering surveys like this that do not put things in perspective. In most districts resources and time are not unlimited. Wanting FLES and believing it is good for kids is a whole lot different than being able to fund it and also make room for it in a very crowded day and curriculum. When we surveyed [name of district’s] parents about FLES they overwhelmingly wanted it but also were unable to suggest anything that should go away in order to provide both the space and the funding. The quality of the experience is also very dependent on the teacher. We lost a couple programs in our districts because the teachers did not create an environment that was positive for kids” (Former Ohio elementary principal, pilot group participant). The reactions of this participant complemented the intent of the instrument, for this study, which was to identify
influencing factors regarding the perceptions of FLES programming. The frustrations expressed by this participant reflected the curriculum struggles with the implementation of FLES, the challenges of implementing the best instructional practices associated with FLES, and the hurdles emanating from American monolingualism.

Both of the participants shared experiences that reflected the existence of ineffective teaching. The responsibilities of a building principal entail many roles, including instructional leadership. Bad or ineffective teaching can reflect possible weaknesses in leadership and teacher evaluation. According to Sergiovanni (2009) “There is a link between how principals want teachers to teach and how principals help them to teach that way” (p.272). For this reason, a relationship appears to exist between successful FLES programs and strong instructional leadership.

Literature exists that indicates that the amount of time spent engaged in learning the FL and/or the motivation of the learner contribute to the success of the endeavor as well as if not more so than might the age of the learner (Bongaerts, Van Summeren, Planken & Schils, 1997; Carroll, 1960; CED, 2006; Rhodes & Schreibstein, 1983). In other words, a child who begins to study a “Language other than English (LOE)” in elementary school will have spent more time engaged in learning than a child who begins in high school. Elementary children who learn LOEs tend to be confident in their skills. In addition, these students often experience benefits across the curriculum (Met, 1985; Rafferty, 1986; Rosenbusch & Jensen, 1995). For that matter, brain research has confirmed that there are cognitive benefits that last a lifetime for those individuals who are bilingual (Bialystok, 2011).
The American public appears to support FLES programs (Donoghue, 1981; NASBE, 2003; Robinson, Rivers & Brecht, 2006). However, wanting and supporting FL instruction for American children do not always coincide. Although FL is a “core” subject according to the NCLB Act, is it not part of mandated testing in each state (U.S. Department of Education, 2002). The designation of resources for the other core subjects such as language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies in response to the mandates of the NCLB Act has resulted in a reduction and in some cases an elimination of FL instruction (CED, 2006; Council for Basic Education, 2004; Dillon, 2010; Manzo, 2008; Rosenbusch & Jensen, 2005; Yount, 2010). The “bottom line” appears to be that the lack and elimination of FLES programs in the United States appear to reflect a low priority given to American children becoming proficient in LOEs (CED, 2006; Met, 1994; Pufahl & Rhodes, 2011; Simon, 1992).

The pressure for students to perform well on state tests, due to the mandates of the NCLB Act appears to be driving many curricular decisions made in American schools today, including the reduction and elimination of LOE instruction. In this study, the participating Ohio elementary principals expressed a positive perception of FLES programming and a perception that FL, which appears to represent a conundrum of sorts to the reduction and elimination of LOE instruction. Perhaps the concept of Americanization and the history of monolingualism in this country are contributing factors, which influenced the participating principals to express concurrently support and indifference (Schlessinger, 1998; Simon, 1992; Tyack, 1966).

The consequences of the apparent American FL deficiency seem to be a serious factor, which can at times represent a potential hindrance to national security
Buehner (1952) explains that the decline of civilization would be due to the inability to understand each other both linguistically and culturally. He advocates that more funding should be allocated toward FL study and less for weapons. He reasons that it is only through communication or language that any type of agreement can be reached. The Committee for Economic Development (CED, 2006) concurs, saying that it is imperative that American students “be better versed in the languages, cultures, and traditions of other world religions… so we can build a more secure future for both our nation and the world” (p. 2).

As previously indicated, a history of monolingualism and the notion of Americanization have been contributing factors to this situation. Simon (1980) said it well: “We are linguistically malnourished” (p. 5). American students do not know enough about the rest of the world, including its religions, cultures, economies, politics, and ways of living; neither our children, nor we in short, study FL. Most Americans, from parents, to educators, to government officials have expressed an awareness of this dilemma. Panetta (1999) said, “The United States may be the only nation in the world where it is possible to complete secondary and postsecondary education without any foreign language study whatsoever” (p. 1). In a report for the Rand Corporation, Bikson and Law (1994) noted that American students are “strong technically” (p. 27); however, they are lacking in cross-cultural experience and more or less “linguistically deprived” (p. 27). Another respondent in the report commented, “If I wanted to recruit people who are both technically skilled and culturally aware, I wouldn’t even waste time looking for them on U.S. college campuses” (pp. 28-29). However, a determination to address the situation has not emerged. For example, the comments, which were shared by the study
participants, illustrated the complexity of recognizing the importance of FL and of FLES instruction and exerting the efforts to address the matter.

**Recommendations**

The complexities related to FL and FLES programming in the United States appear to have been well-described in the comments from the study participants. However, a more in-depth view of the complexities would likely contribute to the results of the study. An improved survey instrument that would glean more information regarding the attitudes of the participants toward FL would likely have been helpful. Better wording of survey statements to remove ambiguity and improve upon reliability and validity also seems to represent a helpful suggestion. A suggestion, in addition to improving the survey instrument, would be the obtainment of a stronger response rate and larger sample. Another recommendation would involve the inclusion of focus groups, comprised of administrators from schools which currently have successful FLES programs and from schools that do not have FLES programs. The administrators of the schools, which have implemented successful FLES programs, are apt to have insightful stories to tell about their failures on the road to success. Having data about these successes might serve as a roadmap regarding to ameliorate the hurdles to the implementation of FL and FLES programs. For example, learning about the manner that schools have been able to fund and sustain the programs seems to represent important information.

This study reflects that the rather limited number of Ohio elementary principal participants seem to support FLES programs. That outcome does not appear to be surprising, as educational leaders tend to support programming that they perceive as
being in the best interests of students. However, perceptions about programs being in the best interest of students do not always coincide with the efforts that have been made to implement such programming. For example, most elementary school leaders support the idea that exercise and physical activity provides health benefits. Yet a lack of physical activity is an acknowledged problem in the United States. In fact, “sitting” has been referenced as the new “smoking” in terms of damaging effects upon health, as related obesity and its negative effects continue to increase in this country (Park, 2014; Sturt & Nordstrom, 2015). FL might be in a similar plight, as the positive cognitive effects, are known, yet little meaningful action appears to have been taken. It has been demonstrated that there are benefits for young language learners across the curriculum (Met, 1985; Rafferty, 1986; Rosenbusch & Jensen, 1995), and brain research has confirmed that there are cognitive benefits that last a lifetime for those who are bilingual (Bialystok, 2011).

Nonetheless, Americans remain, for the most part, monolingual. Continued American language ignorance is part of the decline of American leadership in the world (Bikson & Law, 1994; Panetta, 1999; Simon, 1980).

A Foreign Language Teacher’s Perspective

As the researcher for this study, I feel that my point of view regarding FL and FLES education should be included in this document in attempt to be open and forthcoming. The failure to honor language learning in American schooling not only concerns me as a language teacher, it appalls me. In my view, knowing more than one language is not a “nice option” for college prep students, but an essential capacity for being human. I’m not alone in this, either. Many great thinkers have agreed. Erasmus observed, for instance, “as far as languages are concerned, this age [five] is so supple,
that within a few months a German child learns French, unknowingly while doing other things. Such learning is more effective when carried out in the earliest years” (1529/1990, p.86). Similarly, Thomas Jefferson’s opinion was “That till the age of about sixteen, we are best employed on languages: Latin, Greek, French, Spanish” (Letter to J. W. Eppes, July 28, 1787).

I began teaching in an elite private girl’s school almost 25 years ago, well before the age of the NCLB Act; though I recognize that the act represents an extension of the ESEA Act that was initiated during the Johnson administration. In my initial teaching position, my colleagues and I hoped to receive a letter that would invite you back to teach the following year, absent the protection of a continuing contract or a union. As a FL teacher, my livelihood depended first and foremost upon my AP (advanced placement) students scoring a minimum of three and my students at all levels scoring well on the National French Exam. All teachers at the high school level faced these pressures; namely if our students did not succeed, neither did we. In addition, competition existed for enrollment, as a position could become part-time if enrollment numbers dropped.

My experiences in more recent positions teaching French and Spanish, reflect that enrollment numbers are not as much of a concern. Instead the teachers fear elimination of entire programs. During my second year in an “Excellent with Distinction” district, the sixth-grade exploratory language program was eliminated. The elimination occurred in order that more resources could be dedicated to core subjects for which state tests are administered. No one protested, no one “batted an eyelid”. However, I have been told by an apparent reliable source, that the program could possibly have been saved. Building level administrators, in my district, reportedly yield a great deal of power in such
curriculum decisions. However, the administrators apparently did not attempt to save
the program, as the pressure for successful state tests seems to have overshadowed the
maintenance of FL education.

So a question emerges regarding what needs to occur for building administrators
to be passionate or at least lukewarm about FL. The myopic view that appears to have
defined the lack of American foreign language programs needs to be addressed if the
United States is going to produce high quality participants in the global economy.

Americans should not be the ones who need interpreters. They should be able “to stand
on their own two feet” in global discourse, whether linguistically or culturally. However,
the United States is not only the “land of the free, the home of the brave”, it appears to be
the monolingual capital of the world. So how does one eat an elephant; that is the
elephant representing the negative ramifications of monolingualism? You eat the
elephant one bite at a time. Learning from this study the perceptions of some of Ohio’s
elementary school administrators regarding FL and FLES education seems to represent a
“first bite”. The step will hopefully begin to provide a basis for an enhanced perspective
of the importance of increasing FL and FLES education; that is “causing the elephant to
flinch.”
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Appendix B: Permission to Use Previous Instrument.

"Heining-Boynton, Audrey L" <ahb@live.unc.edu> writes:

Dear Michelle,

Congratulations on pursuing your doctorate! You have my permission to modify the FPEI for Principals and Administrators. My one request is that you credit / cite my original instrument.

Best wishes and success to you. It is always wonderful to hear from colleagues from my home state of Ohio!

Warm regards,
Audrey Heining-Boynton

Audrey L. Heining-Boynton, Ph.D.
Clinical Professor
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

From: Michelle Garcia <michelle_garcia@olsd.us>
Sent: Sunday, August 11, 2013 7:30 PM
To: ahb@email.unc.edu
Subject: FLES Program Evaluation Inventory

Dear Dr. Heining-Boynton,
In addition to teaching middle school, I am a doctoral student at Ohio University in Education Administration. My dissertation topic concerns foreign language deficiency, specifically: What personal, professional, and contextual characteristics of Ohio elementary principals influence their view of FLES programming? I would like permission to modify the instrument created by you and your colleagues, the FLES Program Evaluation Inventory for Principals and Administrators for my dissertation work. I will be surveying Ohio elementary principals. Thank you for your consideration.

Michelle Lewis Garcia
French and Spanish Teacher Hyatts MS
Diversity Liaison
Winter Run Club OHMS
http://ohms.olentangy.k12.oh.us/teachers/michelle_garcia/
740-657-5400 Ext. 3463

A different language is a different vision of life. ~Federico Fellini
Appendix C: Permission to Use Previous Instrument.

From: Frank Chiachiere <frankchi@mac.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 16, 2016 7:47 PM
To: michelle_garcia
Subject: Re: Permission to use instrument

Granted.

On Jun 16, 2016, at 6:07 PM, michelle_garcia <michelle_garcia@olsd.us> wrote:

To Whom This May Concern:

My apologies as I am once again trying to reach Dr. Frank J. Chiachiere regarding use of the survey instrument he developed in 1995. You were kind enough to be sure he received my message almost three years ago; however, I am unable to locate the email that he sent to me granting permission to use his instrument. This instrument was created by Dr. Chiachiere and a colleague to measure Attitudes Toward and Achievement in Foreign Language Study. I will be surveying Ohio elementary principals.

In addition to teaching middle school, I am a doctoral student at Ohio University in Education Administration. My dissertation topic concerns foreign language deficiency, specifically: What Personal, Professional, and Contextual Characteristics of Ohio Elementary Principals Influence Their View of FLES (Foreign Language in Elementary School) Programming? The permission email is vital for responsible scholarship!

Once again, thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Michelle Lewis Garcia
French and Spanish Teacher
Hyatts Middle School 740-657-5400

A different language is a different vision of life. ~Federico Fellini
Appendix D: Email to Participants with Survey Link

${date://CurrentDate/DM}

Dear Principal ${m://LastName},

A request is being made for your participation in a study. You are being requested to complete a short survey related to Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs. The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

The data in this study is being collected for research purposes for my dissertation at Ohio University. Following this introductory message is the Ohio University Online Consent Form that fully explains the policies that apply to this study.

If you have any questions or concerns related to this study, please feel free to contact me at ml153105@ohio.edu or 740-657-5400.

Sincerely,
Michelle Lewis Garcia

Follow this link to the Survey:
Take the Survey

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
https://ohio.qualtrics.com/SE/?Q_DL=7QHkJ5OkSgPjgVv_3b0TZzmvybNTngN_MLRP_9ZhNj0r0paKu7e5&Q_CHL=email

Ohio University Adult Consent Form Without Signature

Title of Research: An Examination of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals Regarding Foreign Language Instruction and Learning.
Researcher: Michelle Lewis Garcia

You are being asked to participate in research, which is part of my dissertation study. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected.

Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You can give your consent by completing the study survey. Your signature will not be needed. You may also print a copy of this document to take with you.
Explanation of Study

If you agree to participate in this study, please exhibit your agreement by completing the short survey.

You as an elementary principal, will be requested to designate your perceptions of Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs.

The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits
You may not benefit, personally by participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Records

The information emerging from your participation in the study will be maintained in a confidential manner in accord with the approved procedures for this study.

No individual responses to the survey will be reported in the study results. The results will only be reported in an aggregated manner. After the study has been completed, your information will be destroyed.

For maximum confidentiality, please clear your browser history and close the browser before leaving the computer.

While every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;

Contact Information
If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator [Michelle Lewis Garcia, ml153105@ohio.edu, 750-657-5400] or the advisor [Dr. William Larson, larsonw@ohio.edu, 740-597-1324].

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.
By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
- you are 18 years of age or older;
- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
- you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

https://ohio.qualtrics.com/CP/Register.php?OptOut=true&RID=MLRP_9ZhNj0r0paKu7e5&LID=UR_bC6UVrTfaQUXMvV&BT=b2hpbw&_=1
Appendix E: Reminder Email #1

${date://CurrentDate/DM}

Dear Principal ${m://LastName},
Your time is valuable, as is your experience as an Ohio Elementary Principal. Please consider this request for your participation in a study. You are being asked to complete a short survey related to Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs. The survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete.

The data in this study is being collected for research purposes for my dissertation at Ohio University. Following this introductory message is the Ohio University Online Consent Form that fully explains the policies that apply to this study.

If you have any questions or concerns related to this study, please feel free to contact me at ml153105@ohio.edu or 740-657-5400.

Sincerely,
Michelle Lewis Garcia

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}
Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Ohio University Adult Consent Form Without Signature

Title of Research: An Examination of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals Regarding Foreign Language Instruction and Learning.
Researcher: Michelle Lewis Garcia

You are being asked to participate in research, which is part of my dissertation study. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected.

Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You can give your consent by completing the study survey. Your signature will not be needed. You may also print a copy of this document to take with you.

Explanation of Study

If you agree to participate in this study, please exhibit your agreement by completing the
short survey.

You as an elementary principal, will be requested to designate your perceptions of Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs.

The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits

You may not benefit, personally by participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Records

The information emerging from your participation in the study will be maintained in a confidential manner in accord with the approved procedures for this study.

No individual responses to the survey will be reported in the study results. The results will only be reported in an aggregated manner. After the study has been completed, your information will be destroyed.

For maximum confidentiality, please clear your browser history and close the browser before leaving the computer.

While every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;

Contact Information

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator [Michelle Lewis Garcia, ml153105@ohio.edu, 750-657-5400] or the advisor [Dr. William Larson, larsonw@ohio.edu, 740-597-1324].

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.

By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:

* you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
• you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
• you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
• you are 18 years of age or older;
• your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
• you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}$
Appendix F: Reminder Email #2

${date://CurrentDate/DM}

Dear Principal ${m://LastName},
Your time is valuable, as is your experience as an Ohio Elementary Principal. As you finish out the 2015-2016 school year, please consider this request for your participation in a study that will be ending shortly. You are being asked to complete a short survey related to Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs. The survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete.

The data in this study is being collected for research purposes for my dissertation at Ohio University. Following this introductory message is the Ohio University Online Consent Form that fully explains the policies that apply to this study.

If you have any questions or concerns related to this study, please feel free to contact me at ml153105@ohio.edu or 740-657-5400.

Sincerely,
Michelle Lewis Garcia

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}
Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Ohio University Adult Consent Form Without Signature

Title of Research: An Examination of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals Regarding Foreign Language Instruction and Learning.
Researcher: Michelle Lewis Garcia

You are being asked to participate in research, which is part of my dissertation study. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected.

Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You can give your consent by completing the study survey. Your signature will not be needed. You may also print a copy of this document to take with you.
Explanation of Study

If you agree to participate in this study, please exhibit your agreement by completing the short survey.

You as an elementary principal, will be requested to designate your perceptions of Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs.

The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits

You may not benefit, personally by participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Records

The information emerging from your participation in the study will be maintained in a confidential manner in accord with the approved procedures for this study.

No individual responses to the survey will be reported in the study results. The results will only be reported in an aggregated manner. After the study has been completed, your information will be destroyed.

For maximum confidentiality, please clear your browser history and close the browser before leaving the computer.

While every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;

Contact Information

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator [Michelle Lewis Garcia, ml153105@ohio.edu, 750-657-5400] or the advisor [Dr. William Larson, larsonw@ohio.edu, 740-597-1324].

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.
By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
- you are 18 years of age or older;
- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
- you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
${l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}$
Appendix G: Reminder Email #3

${date://CurrentDate/DM}

Dear Principal ${m://LastName},

Your time is valuable, as is your experience as an Ohio Elementary Principal. As you finish the 2015-2016 school year, please consider this request for your participation in a study that will be ending Thursday, June 23. You are being asked to complete a short survey related to Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs. The survey should take less than 5 minutes to complete.

The data in this study is being collected for research purposes for my dissertation at Ohio University. Following this introductory message is the Ohio University Online Consent Form that fully explains the policies that apply to this study.

If you have any questions or concerns related to this study, please feel free to contact me at ml153105@ohio.edu or 740-657-5400.

Sincerely,
Michelle Lewis Garcia

Follow this link to the Survey:
${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser:
${l://SurveyURL}

Ohio University Adult Consent Form Without Signature

Title of Research: An Examination of the Perceptions of Elementary Principals Regarding Foreign Language Instruction and Learning.
Researcher: Michelle Lewis Garcia

You are being asked to participate in research, which is part of my dissertation study. For you to be able to decide whether you want to participate in this project, you should understand what the project is about, as well as the possible risks and benefits in order to make an informed decision. This process is known as informed consent. This form describes the purpose, procedures, possible benefits, and risks. It also explains how your personal information will be used and protected.

Once you have read this form and your questions about the study are answered, you will be asked to participate in this study. You can give your consent by completing the study survey. Your signature will not be needed. You may also print a copy of this document to take with you.
Explanation of Study

If you agree to participate in this study, please exhibit your agreement by completing the short survey.

You as an elementary principal, will be requested to designate your perceptions of Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs.

The survey should take less than 10 minutes to complete.

Risks and Discomforts

No risks or discomforts are anticipated.

Benefits

You may not benefit, personally by participating in this study.

Confidentiality and Records

The information emerging from your participation in the study will be maintained in a confidential manner in accord with the approved procedures for this study.

No individual responses to the survey will be reported in the study results. The results will only be reported in an aggregated manner. After the study has been completed, your information will be destroyed.

For maximum confidentiality, please clear your browser history and close the browser before leaving the computer.

While every effort will be made to keep your study-related information confidential, there may be circumstances where this information must be shared with:

* Federal agencies, for example the Office of Human Research Protections, whose responsibility is to protect human subjects in research;
* Representatives of Ohio University (OU), including the Institutional Review Board, a committee that oversees the research at OU;

Contact Information

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact the investigator [Michelle Lewis Garcia, ml153105@ohio.edu, 750-657-5400] or the advisor [Dr. William Larson, larsonw@ohio.edu, 740-597-1324].

If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, please contact Dr. Chris Hayhow, Director of Research Compliance, Ohio University, (740)593-0664 or hayhow@ohio.edu.
By agreeing to participate in this study, you are agreeing that:

- you have read this consent form (or it has been read to you) and have been given the opportunity to ask questions and have them answered;
- you have been informed of potential risks and they have been explained to your satisfaction;
- you understand Ohio University has no funds set aside for any injuries you might receive as a result of participating in this study;
- you are 18 years of age or older;
- your participation in this research is completely voluntary;
- you may leave the study at any time; if you decide to stop participating in the study, there will be no penalty to you and you will not lose any benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Follow the link to opt out of future emails:
$\{l://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe\}$
I am currently an Ohio elementary principal.

Yes
No

Please select your gender:

Male
Female

Please choose the descriptor that best describes your national origin:

I was born in the United States.
I was born in a foreign country.

Please choose the descriptor that best describes your ethnicity:

African American
Asian
Hispanic
Other
White
How many years have you served as an administrator?

How many years did you serve as a classroom teacher?

Please choose the descriptor that best describes your teaching certification:

- ELA (English Language Arts)
- Foreign Language
- STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Math)
- Other
Are you bilingual or multilingual?

Yes

No

How many foreign languages have you studied?


Does your school have a Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) program?

Yes

No

Part II, Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) and Foreign Language (FL)
Please choose the answer that best describes your perceived value of Foreign Language in Elementary School (FLES) programs. Questions are worded to be applicable to those participants who work in schools that do and do not have FLES programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students participate / would participate enthusiastically in FLES.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents seem / would be pleased with FLES.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;At-risk&quot; students are performing / would perform well with FLES.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students seem / would be pleased with FLES.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLES is reinforcing / would reinforce other content areas in the curriculum.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support the notion that FLES is / would be important for all students.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please choose the answer that best describes your perceived value of the importance of Foreign Language (FL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I couldn’t really claim to be educated without knowing a FL.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning a FL certainly yields a better understanding of English.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The first step in achieving cross-cultural understanding is learning a FL.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying a FL was probably a significant part of my education.</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please choose the answer that best describes your perceived value of Foreign Language (FL) study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat disagree</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowing a FL is a valuable asset.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me, studying a FL is basically worthless.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can think of a dozen uses for a FL, both in the U.S. and abroad.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that studying a FL is a waste of time.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this country, knowing a FL is practically useless for anything more than an ornamental purpose.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The more FL I learn, the less I like the language and culture.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>