

A NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACADEMY:
STORIED LIVES, STORIED MAGNET PROGRAM

A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Ethan D. Crowell

May, 2011

A NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACADEMY:
STORIED LIVES, STORIED MAGNET PROGRAM

A Dissertation for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Ethan D. Crowell

Approved by Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Cameron White, Chairperson

Dr. Cheryl Craig, Committee Member

Dr. Steve Busch, Committee Member

Dr. Anselm Yuping, Committee Member

Dr. Robert K. Wimpelberg, Dean
College of Education

May, 2011

A NARRATIVE INQUIRY INTO THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ACADEMY:
STORIED LIVES, STORIED MAGNET PROGRAM

An Abstract
A Doctoral Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of the College of Education
University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Ethan D. Crowell

May, 2011

Crowell, Ethan “A Narrative Inquiry into the Development of an Academy: Storied Lives, Storied Magnet Program.” Unpublished Doctor of Education Doctoral Thesis, University of Houston, April, 2011.

Abstract

The research in this thesis focuses on the experience of one administrator and two teachers in a magnet program with a global studies theme. The research methodology is narrative inquiry and strives to make meaning from the participants experiences in the program and in their classrooms. This experience is collected from storytelling, interviews, and journal writing over the course of a year. The focus of the research is the lived experience of the co-researchers and the “lessons learned” during the development and implementation of a new global studies program and the “re-development” of the same program in a three year window. Attention is paid to multiple stories within the storied flow of the co-researchers and the organizational narrative. The primary researcher is embedded in the research field, and addresses the special challenges of magnet program leadership. Four qualities of narrative inquiry are pursued, they are: (1)research on the boundaries of formalistic research (2) narrative truth (3) knowing through relationship (4) research in the storied midst. Reflection on the magnet school landscape, and the relational connections that affect perceptions of the magnet program both in the school and the broader community is the final piece of this research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
The Research Question	1
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
History of Magnet Schools	10
International Education in the United States	19
Teacher Experiences in Magnet Schools	38
III. METHODOLOGY	54
Definition	55
Exemplars	61
Threats to Validity	65
IV. RESULTS	75
Community	80
Curriculum	91
Change	96
V. CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY	104
REFERENCES	119

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page
1 Comparison Table of Magnet Program Curriculum	111

Chapter One

The self is not ready-made, but something in continuous formation through choice of action.

~John Dewey

It was a large closet, my first classroom. It was in an older part of the building. The high school much like a hospital added onto the original building as the school population grew and funds became available. Painted cinder block, neutral impersonal beige, scrawled with small profane messages written in hurried short strokes littered the wall. Another teacher in another time did not notice. To read these messages a less worldly teacher may have blushed, or even cried. To me they were reminiscent of things I had seen scrawled on the walls of bathrooms of soldiers in Iraq and Kuwait. In a way the classroom did not seem too far removed from that war zone. The floor was of tiles equally unimpressive beige as the walls. It was scarred by generations of students moving in their desks, anticipating when the bell would ring and they would no longer be subjected to the endless drone of uninteresting lectures on Napoleon, or Spanish, or Algebra. In retrospect, the fact that three of nine of the department teachers resigned in the middle of the year should have signaled to me that I needed to look for other work. But I did not. After eight months as a reservist activated for war and three months of finding no work other than restaurants and factories, it seemed that teaching would be a

relief. I soon found myself teaching seven classes a day with thirty or more low socioeconomic students who saw no value in their home language, let alone learning Spanish. Being a teacher was no relief. It was a trial every day; it was teacher boot camp every day (E.Crowell, research journal entry, November 12, 2010).

People all have stories. In many ways stories like the one I just told constitute who we are. They define us as people and they define us in what we do in life. My teacher stories define me. In their telling and retelling, they focus me on now, not just then. They show me how I have changed and grown as an educator, and how all experience is beneficial even if it is negative, if one learns from it. This doctoral thesis is about storied lives. There are three lives interwoven in this narrative. In particular, the goal of this doctoral thesis research is to use these narratives and ancillary data to provide a response to: What are the effective actions taken in the building of a magnet program? As the researcher, my story plays and weaves through the other narratives in the context we share. But my story in the present is not complete without the story of the past, which informs my future understanding and my current paradigm of thinking (Dewey, 1938). The context of this thesis is a magnet program that focuses on global languages. Like most magnet programs, students are accepted based on applications to the program. The teachers in the program represent several languages and decades of experience in world language instruction. The purpose of this research is to hear their experiential stories and to take the multiple perspectives shared and look for the common narrative threads and themes in order to make meaning of teachers' experiences in this new magnet program.

In addition to me, the embedded researcher and program leader, the two other participants will be two teachers. The two teachers will be an experienced teacher and a teacher new to the magnet program. By including these multiple perspectives, the common narratives that emerge will be richer and stronger. As a narrative inquiry, this thesis follows the research methodology pioneered by Clandinin and Connelly (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Clandinin and Connelly inform us that

With Dewey's foundational place in our thinking about narrative inquiry, our terms are *personal and social* (interaction); *past, present, and future* (continuity); combined with the notion of *place* (situation). This set of terms creates a metaphorical three dimensional narrative space, with temporality along one dimension, the personal and social along a second dimension, and place along a third. Using this set of terms, and particular inquiry is defined by its three dimensional space: studies have temporal dimension and address temporal matters; they focus on the personal and the social in a balance appropriate to the inquiry; and they occur in specific places or sequence of places (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 25).

The intention of the method is to flesh out the experience of the narrative, and to tie the narratives together into a comprehensible whole. By using a three dimensional space and understanding that narratives occur in different interactions, continuities, and situations, I will conduct this research of people's lived experiences in the magnet program as I demonstrate below when I reflect backwards on how I personally came to my Academy experience:

Seven years later: The walls are still cinder block. Scratched tile floors have been traded in for stained industrial carpet. The colors are the same, beige that bears the marks of decades of picture and poster hanging. The air smells moldy. Not the dangerous sort but the kind you smell in old buildings like churches, and government buildings. After a while, one no longer notices it. My classroom has been traded in for an office, the individual teacher to a group of teachers, and the personal classroom to a department of classrooms. After seven years in the classroom I was looking for a challenge. It is the, "move up or move out syndrome." This of course is not a real syndrome of any sort but the way it was framed in my mind. It has happened to me twice in life. The first time was as a soldier when my command asked me to attend officer candidate school. It was moving up or moving out; I chose to the move out option. I found myself in the same position as a teacher after seven years. I had taught several content areas, but knew that I was searching for something more. Recognizing this train of thought I had acquired a mid management certificate in the hopes of becoming an administrator, only to find that in my district at the time, it was difficult to acquire an administrator job. To add to the frustration was my constant internal argument over whether I really wanted to be a school administrator. So, I took an inventory of the things that I knew about myself. One, whatever I do in education must be campus-based because I have no desire to be a central administrator. Two, there must be an instructional element to what I do. Three, I must do something I can make my own, that I can point to and say I envisioned this and with the help and collaboration of others, made it happen. While it may seem that what is described

is what a school administrator does, I found this not to be the case in my year as an administrative intern. In knowing all these things about myself and thinking about whether a administrator job was really something I would want, I came across a job I had never even known existed. I encountered it completely by chance sitting in a graduate class one day reviewing board policy of a local district. I was, at the time, in the habit of checking job boards for many of the local districts. In keeping with habit, I did the same for the site we were on in class. To my surprise, I found this listing for a magnet coordinator. Not knowing or having any idea what this meant or what was involved, I naturally applied for it, and in the ensuing “busy-ness” of being a graduate student, forgot about it (E.Crowell, research journal entry, November 12, 2010).

The magnet program I lead is embedded in a large comprehensive high school in a suburban district of a large southwestern city. The student population is close to the three thousand student mark. Over thirty nationalities are represented in the student body, and there is a high graduation rate and college enrollment rate. The students that come into the magnet program enter through an application process. Any eighth grade student in the district is eligible to apply. The application process is selective, and there is approximately one seat for every two applicants. Students accepted to the magnet program agree to take a total of five courses of world language: two years in a secondary and three years in a primary language. These students are also required to complete a global studies course. This is the space in which the research for this thesis took place.

This research will occur in the context of the Academy within a comprehensive high school, but it does not fit a traditional framework. Clandinin and Connelly explain,

The [research] “framework” is a formalistic view; it is a view that things are never what they are but rather what our framework or point of view or perspective or outlook makes of them. Further, because nothing is as it seems, the only things worth noticing are the terms, the formal structures, by which things are perceived (Clandinin & Connelly, 2001, p 25).

In this statement we see a clear distinction in what the formalistic function of research is. It is to see what is being studied through the lens or the paradigm of the theory or the method of research. This is restrictive because it has an inevitable effect of limiting what can be learned. The formalistic, by definition, creates a theoretical hole in which data that fall within certain parameters fits. With narrative inquiry, the boundaries are very different. Clandinin and Connelly caution researchers such as me about the boundaries of narrative inquiry and how inquirers should think about formalistic and reductionist methodologies. They state:

We need to find ways of being aware of what those on either side of the reductionist or formalistic boundaries might think or say of our work, and we need to be alert and aware of questions about field texts and research texts from the point of view of the three dimensional narrative inquiry space. We call this awareness wakefulness (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 4).

To me, this wakefulness is an awareness of what is involved in the research, and how it is viewed by the formalistic community. In contrast to a formalistic investigation, the boundedness of a narrative inquiry is present within the context of the three-dimensional

inquiry space. The following example shows the distinction between the formalistic and the lived stories of teachers and what very practical use comes of them. Often, there is a divide between the theory and the application of research. This is often due to the fact that the research is based on formalistic assumptions. This does not mean that narrative inquiry is wholly phenomenological methodology with existential characteristics.

Narrative inquiry is a methodology of stories, lived and told, and relived and retold, and of the people who live and tell them. In the case of this narrative inquiry, the study centers on the experience of the three co-researchers, the administrator over the program, the experienced teacher, and the teacher new to the program. These stories constitute the basis of the research narrative developed in this study. Chapter two surveys the literature underpinnings of magnet programs and international education. Chapter three focuses on the methodology and the design of the project. Chapter four focuses on the narrative of the co-researchers. Finally, Chapter five's focus is the outcomes of the research study and what conclusions can be drawn about magnet program start up, and what application can be made to magnet school development and the teacher's experiences in those schools.

A note on the format of this thesis: the stories we tell in life do not happen in a sequential order or even a consistently chronological manner. Stories change in the re-telling, and in audience receptivity to them. Consistency is even less the case when thinking of stories far past and embedded in memories not often recalled. Stories come to us because of where we are in the context of our present situation, physically, emotionally, and socially. Our stories exist and continue to do so because we tell them. Hence, these stories will not be sequential and present historical truth. Rather, past,

present, and even proposed future experiences will be interwoven across research participants and time, reflecting the narrative truths of the co-researchers' lives.

Chapter Two

In thinking about the purpose of a literature review, it is important to remember that it presents the research that currently exist within academia and frames the topic being addressed in formalistic ways. The problem with the narrative inquiry methodology is that it is not always clear where the fluid form of inquiry will take the topic or the researcher for that matter. Nevertheless, the purpose of this chapter is to narrow the focus so that when the narrative threads develop, the base of literature has already been presented.

This review of the literature focuses on three main areas. These three work to create a clear picture of the research on the key areas that move this research forward. The temptation in research is to go too wide and to focus too broadly on a given area. These three areas of focus will create a better working picture. The first area of focus is the history of magnet schools. The reason for this is this thesis is about a magnet school and experiences and narratives within that particular magnet program. The focus in this section is a brief history of magnet schools because everything has a history and this perspective is important to understanding the role magnet schools play in the current educational landscape.

The second area of focus for this chapter will be what is happening in education both in the United States in the area of international education. The magnet program

being studied has an international focus both with the language requirement and in additional international focused curriculum and course offerings. This section will first look at what is happening in international education in the U.S. paying attention to two areas. The two areas are (1) magnet programs that have an international or global language focus and (2) associations and programs that exist to advance the growth of international education in the U.S. This will serve to create a better understanding of how common international education is in the U.S.

The third section of this literature review looks to narrow the scope. The first section of this chapter addresses the history of magnet programs. The second section deals more specifically with the topic of the program in this research, global languages and international studies. In this last section the focus narrows to the teachers in magnet programs and what their experiences are. Since this paper seeks to better understand the role and experience of teachers and leaders in magnet programs this allows for a paradigm to compare the experiences of teachers in well established magnet programs to those in the magnet program being researched in the paper. Special focus is placed on creation of community and teacher narratives and experiences. This section leads into chapter three and the focus on methodology.

A Brief History of Magnet Programs in the United States

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our

democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Currently, it is doubtful that any child may be reasonably expected to succeed in life if he/she is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is an opportunity which must be made to all on equal terms (Justice Warren in *Brown v. Board of Education*).

While the history of desegregation the U.S. public schools did not start with *Brown vs. Board of education*, it is this court case that set many urban school districts in the direction of desegregation of schools by creating magnet programs that would lead to voluntary desegregation of previously segregated populations. In Texas, magnet programs were created to accelerate the desegregation process by providing advanced educational programming in theme areas certain to attract the attention of white and urban minority parents and subsequently entice them to enroll their children in these “magnet schools,” which frequently were located in neighborhoods where desegregation had previously been achieved through forced busing of minority youth from their neighborhoods to majority white schools. School districts embraced this concept to access huge pools of federal funding and to address the devastating problems that segregation by busing had caused. While it is true that the birth of the magnet schools was as a way to avoid what could have been a much more complicated integration strategy, magnet schools, in effect, created lasting programs that have managed to serve students of every race and creed. While every major urban area’s story is a little different,

the patterns are very similar. One, the court order to desegregate originated at the federal level. In northern states, this was sufficient to start the process. However, in the southern states, this federal order was met with more resistance. Often in the south this meant further courts cases with oversight of particular districts by a federal judge. Often the judges were tasked with making sure that the districts met the court standard of desegregation. Frequently, this lasted for decades. The oversight of the Dallas Independent School District ended in 2003. The same is true for the Aldine Independent School District, which is one of the six largest school districts in the Greater Houston area. We often think of desegregation as something that happened in the recent past. But this has not been the case. Often, it is a matter of very recent memory. There were three primary methods that were used by districts to meet the desegregation order. The first way was by busing minority students to schools that were majority white. This swapping of students was forced and unpopular in both the white and the minority communities. The second way to desegregate schools was through creating magnet school programs that would voluntarily transport students to different locations. As mentioned earlier, magnet programs were often located in schools involving urban, mostly minority students as a way to address white flight to the suburbs. I once met a man that in the mid-seventies attending Skyline High School in Dallas ISD. Skyline fits the above description. It was a large minority high school in urban Dallas that had a magnet program for aviation maintenance, and is a campus that is still in operation. The man was white and attended the school just to be part of the magnet. He told me about how he would buy protection from a large African American fellow student. He claimed to be a walking target because he was the only white student in what was at the time a very small magnet program

attended solely by African American students. For a pack of cigarettes a week, he was guaranteed protection. This story seems to speak to the racial tokenism in some of the magnet programs. In addition to trying to attract whites to the inner city magnets, the programs placed in the inner city urban schools also showed that the district was making an attempt to offer equal educational opportunities for students of minority race. The third way that districts attempt to meet the standard for desegregation imposed by the judicial system is by creating better local schools. The obvious problem with this is that the court in *Brown v Board of Education* overruled the “separate but equal clause” set by *Plessey v. Ferguson*. So, even if schools improved, if they were largely one race campuses, desegregation was not happening. As mentioned before, every school district has a slightly different story and way they went about desegregating schools. Dallas ISD is a good example of the process that districts went through. Below is an excerpt from a piece recently published in the Dallas Morning News on the time-line of desegregation in Dallas:

09:56 AM CDT on Monday, August 9, 2010

Oct. 6, 1970: *Tasby vs. Estes* is filed in U.S. District Court by Sam Tasby of Dallas on behalf of his two sons. Nolan Estes was Dallas school superintendent at the time. The class-action lawsuit contended that the Dallas Independent School District was not racially integrated and white schools received more resources than black and “Chicano” schools.

July 16, 1971: U.S. District Judge William M. Taylor finds segregation exists and orders the Dallas school board to come up with a plan for integration. Taylor’s recommended plan includes linking two majority-white classrooms with one

minority classroom by television for at least one hour each day. Less than a month later, the U.S. 5th Circuit Court of Appeals throws out the TV plan.

Sept. 7, 1971: Busing to desegregate DISD schools begins. Several thousand black students are bused to predominantly white schools in North and East Dallas. Several hundred white students are reassigned to predominantly black schools, but the majority stays home the first day.

1975: White students are no longer the majority in DISD. Black students become the dominant group.

March 10, 1976: Taylor orders DISD to implement a desegregation plan designed by a task force of the Dallas Alliance, an organization of political, civic and business leaders. The plan includes establishing magnet schools, setting racial quotas for the district's administration and busing about 20,000 students in grades 4-8.

Aug. 23, 1976: DISD schools open without major incident under the desegregation plan, which includes busing 17,000 students.

March 1981: Taylor abruptly withdraws from the case in response to concerns about his former association with a law firm representing DISD. His successor is U.S. District Judge Harold Barefoot Sanders Jr.

Feb. 1, 1982: Sanders issues an order requiring improved programs for minority students and hiring goals for minority faculty and administration staff.

1985, 1986: Sanders drastically cuts the number of students bused through the creation of local learning centers, which provide minority children with better schools in their neighborhoods.

May 2, 1989: DISD files a motion seeking desegregated status. Sanders dismiss the request a few months later and say the district has failed to comply with a directive to respond to questions raised by plaintiffs.

July 26, 1994: Sanders declares DISD desegregated, which means the district has eliminated traces of past racial discrimination. However, the case remains open during a required three-year monitoring period, in which Sanders gives the district time to correct deficiencies, including a student transfer program and employee training.

Oct. 13, 1998: Sanders maintains court supervision over DISD after the district fails to correct deficiencies. He says the district needs to improve areas such as reading and bilingual education programs and funding for magnet schools.

Jan. 9, 2003: DISD requests a hearing to determine if it is in “substantial compliance” with Sanders’ order.

June 5, 2003: Sanders declares DISD in compliance and ends 32 years of federal court oversight.

(<http://www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/news/localnews/125th/newsevents/stories/080610dnmetdesegtimeline.2a683817.html>, September 26, 2010)

This is only one district’s time-line but it clearly shows what the trend in major urban areas was during the span of desegregation. Boston was another urban area that

worked to implement desegregation through magnet schools. According to McMillan in his book, *Magnet Education in Boston*,

Each of the 21 schools was given a distinctive learning and or teaching style, “theme”; many were paired with local colleges, universities, businesses, or cultural groups; and all were to be racially mixed according to citywide enrollment figures (McMillan, 1977, p.158).

Furthermore, the superintendent in Boston at the time of implementation stated that,

I feel very strongly that the magnet district is the heart and soul of the desegregation order. I see the district becoming a model not only for this school system but for the country (McMillan 1977, pg 159).

There were nine factors that were listed as reasons that the Boston school system was able to attract parents and student to the programs offered. They were:

- 1) Most magnet schools are safe and in safe schools
- 2) Most magnet schools provide a quality education
- 3) Many magnet schools have a aggressive and talented faculty and administration
- 4) Many magnet schools are paired with universities, cultural agencies, and businesses.
- 5) Many magnet schools are in new or renovated buildings with excellent facilities.
- 6) In some magnet schools parent involvement is encouraged

7) Magnet schools are integrated, and some Boston parents value an integrated education for their children.

8) Most magnet schools have attractive learning themes.

9) A few magnet schools have teaching style themes (McMillan 1977, p. 159).

All these reasons constitute the success of magnet school enrollment in many urban school districts not only Boston. One of the most interesting statements in the article on Boston magnets is, “After two years most of the magnet principals, especially at the elementary and middle school levels, will admit privately that their magnet theme is grossly underdeveloped” (McMillan, 1977, p. 160). This is such an interesting statement because one of the selling points of magnet school programs is the thematic curriculum or at least the thematic focus of the magnet. However, at least in the beginning, this seemed to have been largely a marketing ploy more than an educational innovation of real substance. This does seem to be in contrast to the experience in Houston which has often been touted as a prime example of how to start a system- wide magnet program. In *Quality Integrated Education in Houston’s Magnet Schools*, the authors explain the original plan in Houston as,

This order set forth several “areas of constraint for integration and provided for pairing certain schools. Twenty four schools were paired to conform to the order. (The number was reduced to 22 when one school was destroyed by fire.) It was intended that no school would have fewer than 10% of a minority groups. This was the original plan and from a quick reflection would require forced reassignment and busing to meet the racial quotas (Bransdetter & Foster, 1976, p. 502).

It was quickly determined that the paired school plan would not work out. It was going to require such a massive reassignment and busing program that Houston ISD opted to start a magnet school program to meet the desegregation order of the court it was issued. The magnet program in Houston allowed ample opportunities for many students to opt out of poor local schools and to attend schools that had specialties. According to Bransdettter and Foster,

A magnet approach such as Houston has developed is dependent on strong administrative leadership, substantial resources, and a good deal of time for planning and implementing at each stage in the developmental process (Bransdettter & Foster, 1976, p. 508).

In the throes of Houston Independent School District implementation the “Task Force for Quality Integrated Education” was directed to,

1) Stall or stop the flight of residents from urban schools by offering quality education 2) promote integration 3) offer more educational opportunities for students of the district, and 4) hopefully bring about an alternative to busing and other plans such as the pairing of schools that are no longer meeting needs of the district (Bransdettter & Foster, 1976, p. 508).

This task force was composed of twenty one members representing citizens, school district personnel, and multiple races. The task force approach was successful in Houston and used in several other urban districts successfully.

In the case of Houston and several other urban districts their magnets have changed over the years and new professional fields and the needs of the job market

change as the economy of the world changes. However, many of the programs in Houston started a generation ago are still intact and operating in their original format.

International Education in the United States

While international education is not a lost idea in U.S. education, it is now much more common than it has been in the past. The trends in education in general can be tied to overall social-political trends and international education is no exception. The reason this is an area of the literature review is to provide a research base to better inform the decisions on future curriculum changes in the magnet program. The idea being that the magnet program will move away from a singular focus on languages, and broaden to focus on global studies. Establishment of both stand alone schools and magnet schools with international and world languages as the focus are on the rise in much of the United States. The trend seems to be elementary magnet schools are setting the standard for world language instruction, and magnet high schools have a more comprehensive international studies focuses. This, of course, makes sense to anyone that has tried to explain geopolitics to an elementary student. This section of the chapter has two main sub focuses. They are (1) a sampling of current schools in the US that are magnet programs similar to the program in this dissertation, (2) a review of associations and organizations promoting the growth of international education in the US.

Profile of a Global Citizen

“My country is the world, my countrymen are mankind”

-William Lloyd Garrison

What is the profile of a global citizen? What are the attributes of a global citizen? And why is this important to this research? The first two queries will be answered in this sub-section of my survey of literature. As for the third, it is important to know this because the purpose of this paper to focus on international education, and magnet programs that focus on international education and global languages. The objectives of these programs are to create global citizens, as the mission statements for two sample comparative magnet programs will attest. The first magnet school's mission statement reads as follows:

At the dawn of a new century, we must respond to an exciting opportunity and challenge: to prepare students for life in a global age. As we become more interconnected, and technology creates instantaneous links across the globe, success in the 21st century requires knowledge and understanding of the world beyond our borders. The NCSIS is a unique program that integrates international content across core subject areas. Our program promotes interdisciplinary and cross cultural learning and research on global issues that pose urgent and complex challenges to our world today. (<http://www.nchsmagnet.com>, October 21, 2010)

Meanwhile, the second magnet mission statement states the following:

The Global Studies and World Languages Academy at Tallwood High School will prepare students to contribute to the world community through multicultural and international perspectives in languages, geography, history, politics, and economics. This world-class education will create the world-class citizens of tomorrow. (<http://www.tallwoodhs.vbschools.com/global.htm>, October 21, 2010))

The goals of both programs are the same: to create global citizens who are awake to the world. Why is the change happening? Campbell explains:

Citizenship used to mean carrying the passport of a given country, voting in national elections, paying taxes to its administration authorities and being prepared to serve that polity, potentially paying “the ultimate price”. These duties, and their related responsibilities, assumed a broadly homogeneous population, and more dense relations within state than across them. Neither of these assumptions holds true today (Cambell, 2006, p.211).

One of most powerful catalysts to the creation of the global citizen is the advent of communication technologies. Globalization is the realization that there are no local problems but global problems; there are no local solutions but global solutions. These qualities define a global citizen: connection, accepting of change, collaborative, and concern about the environment and the human population of the planet.

I now turn to the second sub-section of the second section of my literature review.

Comparative Programs

There are two magnet program in the US that are programs that are a good comparison base for the magnet program that is being researched in this doctoral thesis. It is useful to look at these other schools because they provide comparisons to see where the program in this doctoral thesis can go in the future. It helps to understand what works, what does not, and how different approaches will benefit the development of the magnet program being studied. The first program reviewed here is the North Cobb School for

International Studies. This is a program entering into its fifth year. The school is situated forty miles north of Atlanta, and has a clear international studies focus. The major distinction in this program and the one being studied in this doctoral thesis is the focus. In the magnet program at North Cobb, the focus is international studies while the program studied in this thesis is a program that focuses a lesser emphasis on international studies. The North Cobb program has very distinct theme. The theme constitutes the core of what makes it a magnet program. They are: global focused core curriculum, foreign language proficiency, service learning, a senior project, travel, and cultural exchange. A closer look is needed to understand each category. The curriculum focus is cross curricular global themes. Often with magnet programs students are in pure sections; that is, they do not have class with the general population but have their own focus. They may be in AP World History but the class will focus on a topic that has a global theme. The magnet places a strong emphasis on foreign language. Students are required to complete four years of foreign language and can choose from seven different options. Students can take three years of a primary and one year of a secondary, or they can complete four years of a primary language. Service learning is also a part of this magnet programs emphasis. Students must complete a minimum of 30 hours of community service every year. There are a host of different organizations in which they can volunteer with a host of different purposes. Students are part of an advisement period where they have the opportunity to bolster cultural instruction, planning for trips, and counseling for projects. The travel element of this program is tied to the area of study. Students are offered an opportunity to travel every year, in their 9th and 10th grade year the purpose of the trip is to tie into their social studies curricula, and in their junior senior year the emphasis is to focus on a

science related topic. The senior presentation for students in this program is accumulation of four years of research. Students start the research on their topic in their freshman year and develop it over the course of four years. The topic can be anything related to internationalism or globalism. The students are required to present their topics in a public forum in the fall or spring of their senior year. In conversation with the leaders of this magnet program the challenge has been to fit the desired curriculum into the graduation requirements for the state. Students in this particular magnet program must also agree to complete at least fifty percent of all their course work in AP level classes, this requirement of course adds to the rigorous of the program.

The second program with a similar purpose is the Global Studies and World Languages Academy located in Tallwood High School in Virginia Beach, Virginia. This program has a longer history than North Cobb and is well established. The Tallwood program looks very much like the North Cobb program. Students have pure sections, commit to community service, taking four years of foreign language and also have a culminating project. In the classes that students of this academy take they have many options to take classes that have very specific purposes. For example, a student can take course in Global Leadership, Global Issues, International Jobs, World Religions, Creative Writing for Global Society, Introduction to Asian Arts just to name a few. These very specific courses allow students to tailor a program for their individual areas of interest. In comparison to the program at North Cobb, the Tallwood program has many more options. Part of this is largely due to what the state curriculum allows a student to take to meet graduation requirements. In the state that the program being studied for this research is located, there is very little if any flexibility in a student schedule for any electives.

Even in the case of electives there are very limited options for students. Students in the Tallwood program must also commit to a total of one hundred and forty hours of community service and 16 cultural events over four years. As in the case of North Cobb, Tallwood students must complete advanced foreign language courses. In the case of Tallwood the total is six years of foreign language. This is a possibility for students at Tallwood because of lower state graduation requirements and block scheduling that allow students to complete eight courses a year. Culminating in the senior year, students must present a culminating senior project that relates to a global topic, community service, or culture.

There is a clear distinction here between these programs and the program that is being studied in this research. But there are also similarities. The greatest difference is the focus in the aforementioned schools' emphasis on internationalism first and language second, and the program studied in this doctoral thesis does the opposite. It is instructive here to look at the trend in magnet school language learning and the states that are leading in this area. There has been a trend of magnet schools that have a global or international studies theme to start at the elementary level in the last decade. Programs that have this elementary language focus tend to be largely on the eastern seaboard states. This makes perfect sense from the perspective of development of language since in the early elementary ages students are still very much in stages of developing cognitive language paths. These elementary magnets are generally stand alone magnets, with emphasis on three or fewer languages. Often, they are only through grade two or three and teach core subjects in the language, with an emphasis on world cultures. While this is

not particularly useful in understanding the topic of this particular paper, it does illustrate why there are so few high school magnets that focus on world languages exclusively.

Those that do research into the cognitive process of language acquisition understand the benefits of teaching language at an elementary level. There are also cultural barriers to the advancement of language magnets in the US. Namely that Americans have not had to learn other languages to get along in the world. Often business done in other countries is done in English, and within the U.S there is little need to speak any language other than English. For this reason there has never been a strong institutional or cultural push to become bi-lingual. We do see that changing in many of our larger urban areas.

There are dozens of organizations that work in the area of international education. This paper is not long enough and not all of them are pertinent enough organizations to include. What is most useful here is to highlight some of the organizations that are most recognized and focus specifically on the advancement of international education. The four organizations I have chosen to highlight here are the Longview Foundation, the World Affairs Council, The Center for Teaching International Relations, and NAFSA the International Association of Educators.

The first organization is the one that has the longest history. The Longview foundation has been operating since 1966. There are a few main areas where the Longview Foundation influences and supports international education within the United State. First, the organization provides great resources in many different content areas that advanced internationalism in education: examples of these grants are The National

Council for International Visitors and, The National Council for Social Studies. The purpose of granting to both of these organizations is to advance international education. Another way the Foundation benefits education is in tracking of state initiatives in international education. The ability to have a source of information on international education initiatives is very helpful in making determinations about programs that have been successful and emulating them. The last area the foundation focuses its attention on is in the area of pre-service teachers.

Teacher Preparation for the Global Age: The Imperative for Change, highlights promising practices identified during this meeting and subsequent discussions and suggests a framework for internationalizing the education of all pre-service teachers and increasing the number of world language teachers, especially in less commonly taught languages. (www.longviewfdn.org, October 30, 2010)

The next organization to promote internationalism in the U.S. is the World Affairs Council. This organization is likely the best known of any of the organizations presented here. The WAC has branches in many major cities in the United States. As an organization they are focused on bridging the gap between cultures. Some of the programs they offer are: community programs, Fellows program, International Visitor Program, and Young Professionals. WAC is an example of an organization that is acting in an enrichment capacity for schools. Schools do not have the resources to have foreign nationals visit, or send their students on international trips. WAC fills this gap. This is a very important element in international education, according to a recommendation made by the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad. The recommendation maintained that

“Study abroad is not and should not be just for Rhodes Scholars. Its value is too great to be restricted to student elite. These opportunities can and should be available to every American college student” (Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad, 2003). This is the role that WAC fills in the education community by providing these valuable experiences to students that would not otherwise have them.

The third organization I highlight which supports international education is the Center for Teaching International Relations. The Center for Teaching International Relations has a forty year of history of assisting and supporting k-12 education in teaching international topics. The Center is based at the University of Denver and is a branch of the Center of International Relations. The Center offers a network of K-12 school support implementing international education in their schools, and competitions at the high school and middle school level on international topics, and teacher training. There are many university funded programs like this one but few with such a long history.

The fourth sample organization promoting international education in the U.S. is the NAFSA. This is an association of international educators. NAFSA provides policy positions, study abroad programs, reports to law makers, professional development in international education and a network of resources for educators. While all of these organization have similar goals they all provide different services in the goal of creating greater emphasis on global and international education in the United States.

The International Baccalaureate program is a curriculum that is commonly used at international schools throughout the world. While it does hold the title international in the title the true purpose of the IB program is to standardize the quality on education in international schools throughout the world. The global component in the program is part of the core of the curriculum. While it does promote the international view of the world, this small emphasis within the curriculum is bolstered by the fact most students in the IB curriculum program are coming from international settings anyway.

These four organizations that promote international education in the U.S. are just a glimpse of the resources that public education has to support implementation of international themes and curriculum in their schools. This being the case the state, district, and schools must take the initiative to take advantage of the resources that already exist and it is often the case this is less a matter of desire to do so and more a matter of political imperative. We now move away from national organizations that support international education and shine the spotlight on state initiatives, which are equally if not more important, given that education is a state matter in the U.S.

State Initiatives in International Education

Because education in the US is such a fractured system based on state and the district decisions, there is a very broad representation of involvement in the advancement of international curriculum. The information provided here comes from the Longfellow Foundation and is evidence of the growing trend in international education at the state levels. As mentioned above the individual states make the decision on and associations

that they feel are best for their state. For this reason there are a variety of programs with global connections being made to several different countries to advance collaboration and connection with those countries, their culture and language. Below I include four examples of states that are advancing international communication from the state level in different ways.

Vermont

The Asian Studies Outreach Program (ASOP) at the University of Vermont (UVM) works with all public and private elementary and secondary schools in Vermont. Majority funding is provided by the Freeman Foundation. Recently, ASOP was successful in receiving a Fulbright-Hays grant to begin work in Korea. UVM provides supplemental funding. New initiatives include assisting school districts in more actively teaching about Asia in their classrooms.

ASOP works collaboratively with three school/district-based programs. First, the Journey East Performing Arts Exchange of Windham Central Supervisory Union, begun in 1999 as a collaboration with the Inner Mongolia University Performing Arts College, hosted a group of 16 performers in the fall of 2009, 26 performers/students, primarily from Leland and Gray High School (including students from surrounding public and private high schools), traveled to China for a month in the spring of 2010. They then took their performance ‘on the road,’ visiting elementary and secondary schools throughout Vermont. Second, the Windham Southeast and Southwest Supervisory Unions Asian American Cultural Exchange, collaborates with the Affiliated Experimental Secondary School of Yunnan Normal University. Students, teachers and administrators

hold annual exchange visits. Additionally, the two districts provide Chinese language instruction. The Asian Institutes (a three-credit UVM graduate course) for teachers are conducted annually - this summer there will be three institutes running concurrently; China (postponed from 2009), Japan (scheduled) and Korea (Fulbright Hays grant). Activities for these courses include seminars, planning sessions, readings, lectures, demonstrations, curriculum unit development and visiting various historical and cultural sites. The Governor's Institute on Asian Cultures (GIAC) is a two year program for Vermont high school students to study Asian cultures. The students in the first year GIAC Vermont program will visit China the following year. In 2009, the Governor's Institute engaged 16 Vermont high school students from throughout the state of Vermont. Formal instruction included lectures by UVM faculty, Taiko drumming workshop, Aikido workshop, Ikebana workshop, Chinese arts and crafts workshops, and Chinese language instruction. This spring, 11 students took part in the Asian Studies trip to China. The Program of Visiting Teachers from Asia continues to be extremely successful. This past year Vermont schools hosted eight Chinese teachers, four Thai teachers and one Japanese teacher. Combined, their impact has been significant. Collectively, they have made 49 school visits in 46 different schools. They have worked with 1,324 staff members (including administrators), 9,008 students and 1,532 community members. All of these numbers represent a significant increase over last year.

(<http://www.longviewfdn.org/24/258/Vermont.html>, October 30, 2011)

Arizona

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) offers support to 24 schools piloting international programs, Pre-k-12. The ADE continues to partner with the higher education entities within the state and private business groups to promote: student leadership, global community outreach programs, professional development for educators, foreign exchange programs and student trips abroad. In addition, ADE has formed a new partnership with the Arizona International Educators (AIE) and offers "hot" topic seminars on international education.

In Arizona, all State Standards have been updated to include global learning. We have also improved the foreign language teaching certification process. ADE continues to work on teacher recruitment from abroad, language immersion in our elementary, middle and high schools, and to provide international education resources to our schools.

(<http://www.longviewfdn.org/24/211/arizona.htm>, October 30, 2010)

North Carolina

Global education efforts in North Carolina have laid the groundwork for new and innovative Chinese language and culture partnership between schools in North Carolina and Jiangsu province. In addition to our work with policy leaders and educators to prepare for Confucius Classrooms, the Center for International Understanding (Center) has expanded international school partnership between North Carolina and Denmark and Mexico. And, finally, in support of programmatic growth, the Center's work with state legislators and business leaders has led to policy outcomes that should help decision-makers understand the link between international education and global jobs.

As in other states, budget pressures led the North Carolina legislature to make dramatic cuts in education. The Center lost 37% of its state funding in FY2010, including \$200,000 specifically for its K-12 global education efforts. The Center had received this \$200,000 appropriation for four years in a row. An unprecedented fund-raising blitz and a new contract with the Chinese Ministry of Education assured continuation of North Carolina's global programs for schools.

CONFUCIUS CLASSROOMS: North Carolina Confucius Classrooms. In partnership with the Chinese Education Ministry, the Center for International Understanding will develop the nation's first state network of Confucius Classrooms over the next three years. In April 2010, North Carolina Governor Beverly Perdue announced the launch of these Chinese culture and language programs as a major effort to provide students the skills they need to "compete effectively and work globally" in the 21st century.

In Year 1 (the 2010/2011 academic year) the Center is coordinating Confucius Classrooms in 16 North Carolina schools. These schools from both urban and rural areas represent geographic, economic and demographic diversity. Confucius Classrooms will provide students the opportunity to study Mandarin Chinese, learn about Chinese culture and history, and to share their own culture and history with Chinese students through school-to-school partnerships.

North Carolina schools selected to participate will:

- Host a qualified Chinese language teacher from China for three years with salary subsidies from the program
- Send school principals and teachers to China to learn about its culture, history, and education system

- Develop a partnership with a school in China, through which students in both countries will practice their language skills, collaborate on shared projects, and exchange teachers and possibly students in regular visits.
 - Engage teachers in yearly professional development opportunities, focused on improving language instruction.
 - Receive technical and academic support from the Center's team of education experts
- Participating schools will have a demonstrated commitment to global education. By “clustering” the programs within select school districts, students can progress from school to school with continued opportunities to advance their proficiency in Chinese.

DENMARK SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS:

Learning with – and not just about – students in other countries helps provide young people in North Carolina with important 21st Century skills like working in multinational teams across cultures. International School Partnerships help build global competence and broaden students' perspectives.

(<http://ciu.northcarolina.edu/what-we-do/future-leaders-2/denmark-school-partnerships/>, October 30, 2010)

MEXICO SCHOOL PARTNERSHIPS: The Center received a generous grant from a local foundation for international school partnerships between North Carolina and Mexico. The grant will help cover the cost of 16 educators from schools in central North Carolina traveling to Mexico in November 2010. The program will link their schools with schools in Guanajuato.

TECHNOLOGY: K-6 students are gaining first-hand knowledge of world areas through the Cultural Correspondents program, which uses technology to link classrooms with

students from North Carolina universities who are studying abroad. They present lessons on their host country, culture, and experiences that are aligned with the N.C. Standard Course of Study. This past year 30 study abroad students have worked with 40 North Carolina grade school classrooms through web conferencing and other technology.

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY: The Center's public policy work focuses on providing global experiences to help state legislators and other policy leaders to position North Carolina to take advantage of global opportunities. As a direct result of participating in the Center's Global Leaders program to Mexico, a bi-partisan International Business and Trade Caucus has formed in the N.C. General Assembly. The mission of the caucus is to better understand and enhance North Carolina's international business and education links. In addition, a legislative Joint Committee on Global Engagement has been established, in response to a recommendation that grew out of the Center's policy work. Legislators are currently taking testimony around the state to help them develop a statewide strategic plan for global engagement to coordinate global efforts in education (pre-K through higher education), government and business.

(<http://www.longviewfdn.org/24/78/North+Carolina.html>, October 30, 2010)

New Jersey

The NJ State Board of Education adopted standards in seven content areas: Visual and Performing Arts, Comprehensive Health and Physical Education, Science, Social Studies, World Languages, Technology and 21st Century Life and Careers in the summer of 2009. These revised standards were recognized for the integration of global perspectives and the incorporation of rigorous content and 21st century skills (Goldman

Sachs State Award for International Education; Partnership for 21st Century Skills State Award). The State Board is scheduled to adopt the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science and Technical Subjects and the Common Core standards for Mathematics on June 16, 2010.

In order to provide support for educators in implementing the standards, the department has developed a three-phase statewide professional development initiative and has designed and launched a new Academic Standards website (<http://www.njcccs.org/>). This website places the goal of Preparing New Jersey students to connect, collaborate and compete in a global society prominently on the homepage where users may access the standards in vertical, horizontal and learning progressions format and by a word search. The website also features links for professional learning and standards resources. Resources include: curriculum templates; a technology toolbox; Classroom Applications Documents that contain instructional guidance, sample assessments and resources for integrating technology, global perspectives, and interdisciplinary connections; exemplar units and lesson plans; and access to podcasts, video-casts, and professional articles that relate to the digital learner and teaching and learning in the 21st century.

New Jersey is engaged in several key projects and initiatives to support the development of global knowledge and skills in schools. The state is currently a partner with West Virginia and Washington in a three-state consortium grant from the Longview Foundation. Grant goals include: creating a multi-state collaboration to further develop resources utilizing the Global Competence Matrix created through EdSteps and providing professional development opportunities for educators; attracting teachers who have not

previously participated in workshops focusing on developing global competence through the Web 2.0 Presence; and providing teachers with opportunities to learn how to implement state assessments in ways that promote global understanding and global competence.

New Jersey has also created a model for high school reform in world languages *Building a Linguistically and Culturally Competent Workforce* that includes a 4-year pilot program with 10 participating districts, professional development, data Informed Instruction, self evaluation and incentives. This spring, the OPI/OPIc and the WPT was administered to 1000 New Jersey freshmen. Their proficiency growth will be charted during their four years of high school. *World Languages Standard in Action* documents were developed by a team of New Jersey world languages educators. The documents provide support for curriculum specialists and teachers in the design and implementation of curriculum that includes strong integration of global content and technology applications aligned to the 2009 New Jersey Core Curriculum Content Standard for World Languages. There are a total of 15 *World Languages Standard in Action* documents that target the Novice-Mid through Intermediate-High proficiency levels.

From the four state examples I have provided here, it is clear that there are a variety of approaches states are taking to implementation of international education. For some states such as New Jersey it is a multidisciplinary approach where standards and initiatives for both world language acquisition and awareness of globalization issues take a prominent place in the development of curriculum in the state. Some states such as

Arizona are very much at the starting stages of implementation of global-themed curriculum and are still piloting programs to make evaluations as to the effectiveness and if they are meeting the goals for the state. As a state education system, it is evident North Carolina has been at the forefront of developing international education. At the ISSA conference in North Carolina in 2005 Mr. Levine, the executive director for the National Campaign for International Education in Schools, stated, “Our (North Carolina’s) students have to have an awareness and acknowledgment of the world beyond the confines of their city, state, and country (Mazano & Diegmuller, 2005). To paraphrase, one of the greatest problems that states face in the move to infuse their state systems with international education is the restrictions from NCLB and other federal and state mandates that limit what courses can be offered and in which grade levels (Mazano & Diegmuller, 2005). In addition, the focus of the ISSA conference was to teach teachers how to internationalize their classrooms and infuse their lessons with a international approach (Mazano & Diegmuller, 2005). Because of the above mentioned NCLB and state testing standards, international education can be a hard sell in the US (Manzano, 2005). The reasons for this are many. However, the main reason in North Carolina is resistance at the state, and district level, and fear among the population about what global education means (Manzano, 2005). Manzano further explains:

Wary of touching a nerve in a state still smarting from the transfer of thousands of jobs overseas, or of being rebuffed by teachers struggling to cover required and tested content, a task force on international education took a decidedly subtle tack in releasing its recommendations last week for preparing North Carolina’s 1.3

million students “to be citizens, workers, and leaders in a global age of the 21st century” (Manzano, 2005, p. 1).

Often the case of international education in the U.S is like most matters of public policy are dependent on the current political climate. This in part due to the fact that international education has its roots in the peace movement of the late 19th and early 20th century, and even today is closely affiliated with human rights issues.

Often, in the U.S, the push for global education has been politically seen as an acceptance of non- American values. Current issues in the public eye even now with the establishment of an Islamic center near Ground Zero in New York show an ongoing distrust of those unlike us in portions of the U.S population. The strides made in international education in the U.S must be accomplished with all expediency: waiting only creates another generation that does not understand the need for multilingualism and international cooperation on global issues. The world dependence on English as the primary language of business communication has created an attitude of dominance and indifference to learning other languages in the U.S educational system. This aversion will soon limit opportunities of American students in a world that is increasingly dependent on workers with multilingual skills, and a global awareness.

Community and Teachers in Schools

In narrowing the focus of this review of literature, a look at the experiences of teachers and community building is needed. The focus of this doctoral thesis is a magnet program that focuses on world languages and international studies. So far in this review

of literature we have encountered the history of magnet schools in the U.S, and the state of international education in the U.S. This final section of the dissertation literature survey will address the concept of experiences of teachers in magnet programs. First, readers need to be reminded of the definition of a magnet school. A magnet school has “a thematic curriculum or unique method of instruction, admission criteria to facilitate voluntary desegregation, a choice of school by families, and access to pupils beyond neighborhood attendance zones” (Hausman, 2000, p. 1).

There are two main veins of literature to follow in this section: one, what does community look like in a magnet school? And two, what does the research say about teachers in magnet schools and their relationships to the curriculum, the program or school, and other teachers, and students? First, I address what the literature has to say on the concept of sense of community in magnet schools.

I begin with this excerpt from my field notes that reflects what I have found to be the case in this vein of literature.

There is no sense of community here. Not in the magnet program. Students in the academy don't even know each other, the curriculum is underdeveloped and the teachers do not even talk to each other in the same language groups let alone amongst the different languages. They have lunch, they get along but there is no collaboration. This first week I told them that it was wrong, the way that the magnet had been forced on them without any committee or discussion or conversation or asking for their input into the implementation. They just implemented it and said by the way you are a magnet teacher. What does that

mean I am a magnet teacher? All I can say is not much, not much at all
(E.Crowell, Research Journal Excerpt, February 13, 2010).

This experience from my field notes seems to agree with the statement that many programs are only magnets in name and do not really implement any sort of rigor and relevance specific to their unique programs (McMillan 1977, p. 160). This insinuates that the program portrayed in this research was implemented in the same way: overnight without a proper base or involvement of the community and the teachers. This is mentioned here as a note of explanation concerning the attitudes of my research participants presented later in this research study. While school choice is not synonymous with magnet programs since it can also apply to charter schools, it is helpful to look at the benefits of school choice on community within a school since they do apply. Hausman and Goldring share several characteristics that constitute strong communal organizations:

1. Shared values among organizational members that contain the “norms of schooling” (Bird & Warren-Little, 1986; Segiovanni, 1994)
2. A common set of events that promotes face to face interactions and social connections between school participants (Driscoll, 1995)
3. Enhanced collegiality and collaborations among stakeholders in the school (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Sergiovanni, 1994)
4. A greater commitment to the school and its decisions.

(Hausman & Goldring, 2000, p. 83)

These common goals are evidenced strongly in magnet programs and schools to even a greater degree than in traditional schools (Hausman & Goldring, 2000, p. 83). Similar

attributes can be found in schools with smaller populations and with similar religious underpinnings in the purpose and curriculum of the school. To Metz (2003) “Collective commitment and shared values are also crucial for school improvement efforts and have been found to be more prevalent in schools of choice.” (Metz, 2003, p. 86). Magnet schools are schools of choice and common commitment is crucial to success. Also integral to magnet success is the broader community support for the local magnet school (Rule & Kyle, 2008).

With these overriding ideas of what the elements of a community are, we move forward to examine some of the specifics of community in a magnet program; we focus on the value of shared vision and problems that are specific to the creation of community in a magnet program. An important factor in understand the concept of school community is culture: What is culture and how does it affect the creation of community? Here is a useful definition that informs educational notions of culture:

Culture is not a systematic set of logically interrelated propositions about values, norms, and the nature of the empirical world, but a broad, diffuse, and potentially contradictory body of shared understanding about both what is and what ought to be (Metz, 2003, p. 59).

In short, culture is very much the lens, the paradigm, through which stakeholders in a community look at the school community they are in. It does not have to be logical and is loaded with humanity and contradiction in experience and perception. It does not follow straight lines but follows the web that is the social connectivity network of a school through parents, teachers, and students. This is to be kept in mind in dealing with this

issue of community because it is not a clean cut hierarchy associated with titles and job descriptions but a broad diffuse emotional environmental sense that feeds on the affective and perceptive, be it positive or negative.

The case for shared vision is a common enough theme in educational research but in the case of magnet programs, it is an even more important element. Often times in magnet programs the students travel long distances. The parents and students do not live in the local community and the teachers may or may not be in the school by choice. This last element, of course, creates a very difference culture and perception amongst the faculty and students at a school. In some cases the teachers are recruited and very much want to be part of a program, In other cases they are moved by a district to a school because they need a particular skill set in a magnet program, and more often than not teachers ask for transfers to magnet schools to escape the conditions of their difficult urban schools. In *Different by Design*, a book that is a case study of three different magnet schools the author states,

Persons within an organization generally develop a socially shared interpretation of the meaning of their work. In organizations like schools, where work activities cannot be closely constrained by rules, supervision, or predetermined technological routines, this shared perspective can have a significant impact on the way organization members actually carry out their work (Metz, 2003, p. 53).

In this explanation, we can see that all organizations develop a shared interpretation of the meaning of work. In the case of schools, it seems that this would be to teach, to advance student academic and life skills. In the specific case of a magnet schools, it

would be to advance the learning in a particular theme or topic. The fact is that in schooling there is so much independence in that teachers are often not monitored, observed, or coached institutionally in any way that it affects the sense of community. Meaning as refined in context (community/culture), the base purpose of existence and operation in an organization sits at the core of what a sense of community is. Meaning is much like communication. It cannot ‘not happen.’ Meaning in organizations develops innately in the interactions and messages created by the individuals and groups within an organization. This is alluded to by Metz who explained “Recently organizational analysts have paid attentions to the importance of common meaning in maintaining a coordinated effort in an organization” (Metz, 2003, p. 56). This common meaning is what drives culture, communication, and ultimately community in a magnet program. Culture creating community is also bolstered and created by the agency and sense of belonging fostered by the students of a magnet school (Gore, 2005). In the case of the magnet program under study in this doctoral thesis, I, the primary researcher, stated in my field notes that:

They have so little unity as a department. They see each other at lunch but what does one language have to do with another? They spend their time in their own language content areas, and if there is only one teacher in a language group, then they do not even communicate about pedagogy or methodology at all. In learning from the research I see things in a different way. Their personal differences and any dislike they may have of each other are set aside in the lunch room. They have a very strong unspoken rule that no “work” will be done during the lunch period. They discuss many things except school. Instructionally they are in their

own “bubbles” and do not venture out of them. There is no vertical teaming.

Community is a casual relationship, not a common meaning for the teachers of the magnet program (E.Crowell, research journal entry, March 18, 2011).

Despite this observation, faculties that interact regularly develop a common perspective (Metz, 2003, p. 56) whether or not it is instructionally focused. This is interesting since there is no real indication of what kind of interaction Metz is pointing to. It just stipulated “interaction.” This seems to call for further delineation. A recent experience in the magnet program provides a good example of this. The issue was the giving of participation grades as a major grade. Teachers with a great deal of time in the department had been giving participation grades in class as a major grade. The issue was that, other than being a poor practice instructionally, it was against the district grading policy. The teachers became divided into two groups where the issue was concerned. The teachers that had been doing this practice for years and thought it was unfair to them to stop the practice, and the teachers who were not using the practice and thought nothing of the implementation of the policy since they did not follow the practice anyway. Lack of community showed in a meeting where the teachers who wanted to keep the practice and the teachers who did not follow the practice were all in the same room. The teachers who wanted to keep the practice were very vocal in making the case they could not teach without the option of giving a participation grade as a major grade; the teachers that were not already following this practice were silent and had nothing to say in the meeting. And the teachers that had used this particular participation grade method had been very vocal about not doing away with it. These were, in fact, sub-communities. Closer observation showed that the teachers advocating for the keeping of the participation grade as a major

grade method were all in only two of the several languages, had been teaching together for a minimum of ten years, and often spoke to each other outside of the school day. This case is interesting because, while it might not make the case for all issues leading to a common perspective it does make the case that common perspectives are created by those that interact often in the same content area. It is also interesting because it at least alludes to the fact that with some different content areas in one magnet program, community amongst teachers is harder to achieve because there is less of a content or even thematic bond for instruction. In secondary magnet schools, the tendency toward teacher isolation is the greatest due to heightened forms of specialization. "Secondary school teachers work in isolation not only from their supervisors, but also from their peers, which limits their knowledge of school activities outside their own classroom" (Lee, Derick, & Smith, 1991, p. 192). This can be and often is an impediment to the creation of strong community.

There are a set of more specific problems to the creation of community in a magnet program. These are universal to magnet schools because of the way they are structured. Often magnets are in large districts where the school that is the magnet or host the magnet is far away. Because it is not a neighborhood school and most students in a magnet do not live in the community contact, distance, are always a issue with these schools. I had this experience in setting up a parent volunteer organization.

The parent volunteer organization is having problems getting off the ground. The parent who volunteered to be the president is not zoned to this high school. She does not have any connections here and her daughter is a freshman. I did not

foresee this being a problem. I need a parent that knows the people on this campus so that we can get the volunteers we need to take field trips and do other programs. (E.Crowell, research journal entry, September 15, 2011)

This connectedness to the community of the school is more difficult in magnet school situations where the parent may work and live an hour away from the school, and does not have an existing connection to the broader local community. But yet we know that connectedness to the broader community is beneficial to students (Jose & Pryor, 2010) according to, teachers in magnet schools, “are significantly more likely than non-magnet teachers to indicate that distance and travel are barriers to parental involvement” (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999, p. 60). This is juxtaposed against the backdrop that parents want to be more involved in the child's education, “”The findings suggest that there is more parent involvement in magnet than non magnet schools” (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999, p.60). Despite the greater desire to be involved in their child’s organization and be part of community building, “enhanced collegiality and collaboration among stakeholders in the school (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Sergiovanni, 1994), teachers in magnet schools are just as likely as teachers in non magnet schools, “in the extent to which they contact parents about such issues such as volunteering in the classroom, assisting on field trips, and attending school meetings and conferences” (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999, p. 60). This in large part could be due to a feeling on the part of teachers that the parents may be less willing to do community building activities such as volunteering due to distance. Despite the distance barrier to parental involvement and stakeholder involvement teachers do not strive to use other technology based strategies to reach out to parents on issues related to

their magnet program/school. The face to face meeting is unlikely given the distance but teachers are not replacing the face to face with other options (Smrekar and Goldring, 1999, p. 60). A good example of the difficulty in community building between teacher school and parents is evidenced in the frustration of a magnet school parent.

This is one of the drawbacks of a magnet school system. You are not in the community itself. I know from my own personal experience at Overbrook it seems so far away. It is an extra 20 minutes to drive out there. A lot of times it isn't worth the time because by the time I drive out there the activity is half over (Smrekar & Goldring, 1999, p. 60).

This likely represents the frustration of many parents and teachers in magnet school programs. The good news is that with the advent of new technologies it is now more possible than ever to create community by using resources not available before. We no longer deal with community only in the physical sense, but in the virtual sense as well. Community is crucial to a successful magnet program, and from the information here presented that can be done if, information is readily available, event planning, parent meeting times are planned and published well in advance, teachers reach out to parents through various and non-traditional ways, and students are given voice in how the things that happen in the magnet program. The partnership of community and school raises the reputation of the school in the broader community. This should be the goal of the school leadership (Hands, 2009).

In this third and final section of the literature review, we further narrow the scope of research. Here we focus on the reflections and experiences of teachers in magnet

programs. After all, while all stakeholders are crucial to the success of a magnet program, teachers are the foundation. To begin this section on teachers in magnet programs it is useful to look at the broader field of teaching and see what sort of practices prove to be useful in the improving of individual teachers. There is a large body of literature on teacher reflection. About one hundred year ago John Dewey said that to learn one must do, observe the doing, and reflect on the doing. This of course seems oversimplified but the truth of this method of learning has been proven by time and experience (Dewey, 1916). In the same way teacher reflection is an important element of improving teachers' classroom instruction. Teachers that continually reflect and modify their strategies of instruction serve students better (Swain, 1998). This seems logical but it does not seem to happen in any sort of consistent manner in most schools or magnet schools. In fact proper reflection is a way of enhancing a teacher's self image in a positive way (Swain, 1998). The premise that is important to remember in the reflection process for teachers is that teachers are storytellers and they are learners as well. Community, experience, and meaning for teachers are, in large part, tied to their storied learning in their positions as teachers, concerning how to become "better." How to make improvements to their instruction, and also how they tell stories to other teachers and students affects the way in which they are viewed and view others and ultimately create meaning in their school organizations. In the Swain article, great attention was paid to how, reflective journal entries can provide teachers with information they would not otherwise have (Swain, 1998). This is why the participants in this research are keeping journal entries as co-researchers because they can learn a great deal from reflection that will not only fuel this doctoral thesis, but enrich and fuel the teachers' personal practices. In furthering the case

for the use of reflection in teaching and teacher education, I turn now to Connelly and Clandinin who claim that, “the main reason for the use of narrative in educational research is that humans are storytelling organisms who, individually and socially, lead storied lives” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The central value in narrative inquiry is that its focus is on the very things that makes us human and that is our ability to communicate and create “truths” and meaning in our context (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). We can see that there is a case for the value of reflection but now let us look at some sub-categories that teacher reflection has some bearing on. These areas are teacher efficacy and perceptions in a magnet program, and teacher perceptions of students. First the topic of teacher sense of efficacy.

In an article on social organization of schools (Lee , Derick, & Smith, 1991) the authors explored the links between the social elements of an organization and teacher sense of efficacy in the classroom. This is interesting for two reasons. It allows us an idea of what makes a teacher feel they are effective in that classroom and what bearing that may have on the broader organization. The authors limit their inquiry as they explain in the following statement, “We narrow our inquiry to the social dimensions of schools as organizations and to teachers' expressions of satisfaction with their work and perceptions” (Lee et al., 1991). The methodology used in the aforementioned authors’ research was hierarchical linear modeling. It included survey data from teachers and administrators from public, and private schools. The results of the research showed that teacher efficacy is based on their perceived ability to affect students’ learning (Ashton & Webb, 1986). They also made the point that in secondary schools, “efficacy and

satisfaction reflect general perceptions of the classroom environment” (Lee et al., 1991). In this, it seems that one of the greatest factors of teacher efficacy is teachers’ own sense of self efficacy and self perception of competence in the classroom. In fact, this goes hand- in- hand with the old adage that nothing breeds success like success. This case is made by Brofenbrenner (1976) who reported the two most important factors in teacher sense of self efficacy are (1) the types of students in the classroom and (2) the amount of control the teacher has in determining the classroom environment. Control of students and behavior and independence in determining the classroom environment are key to a teachers’ sense of efficacy. In this doctoral thesis, it is useful in spotting the theme in the co-researchers journals that indicate that they feel a sense of efficacy due to the type of student and control of the classroom environment. Other factors that play into a teachers’ sense of self efficacy include curriculum, freedom and flexibility in controlling the classroom environment, selecting materials, planning the daily agenda, and exercising classroom discipline (Cooper, Burger, & Seymore, 1979).

As mentioned in the earlier section about the factors that affect a teachers’ sense of efficacy is the type of student that teachers have in their classrooms. This in turn affects their control of the classroom, and the curriculum they use to reach students. The overall impression teachers have in magnet schools are measured against the backdrop of the neighborhood school that the teachers came from prior to being in the magnet school (Metz, 2003). This is important to note since it creates an experience comparison for teachers. Now this is not always the case. There are different scenarios. Teachers could have only ever taught in a magnet school. They could have taught in the same high

school and then moved to the magnet program. But in looking at the narrative threads that come out of the researcher and co-researchers' journals, inevitably areas of comparison will emerge. It is also the case that teachers in magnets have the perception that parents are more interested in their child's education. A teacher at an urban magnet school said, "I think that because parents have to sign up their kids, they have to want them to go there. They just don't send them off to school because they have to send them to school. So, I think you have more committed parents" (Metz, 2003, p. 69). While it does seem that this might be the case parents could be interested to send their kid "anywhere else" but the local school and not be involved any more than that. A teacher quote in the Metz book on magnet schools stated that, "parents sign a social contract with the school," when they send their student to a magnet school. But the question is: Do they? They certainly do not have a legal obligation to be involved in the community of the school. As mentioned before in this section, the distance between magnet school parents and the school can be too great to overcome in the goal of building community. This is the perception that is often held by teachers of student and parental involvement in the school and even the classroom. They are too far and that as a teacher they must "hold their own." This is, however, a common theme in education circles that strongest predictor of teacher efficacy is community (Lee et al., 1991). Community is harder to create in environments where the traditional classroom is in the structural organization of the school.

One of the factors that lead to a teacher's feeling of efficacy is control over curriculum (Cooper, Burger & Seymore, 1979). Teachers in the Metz study felt that, "If parents were made to sign a contract or something saying that they were willing to

cooperate with the teachers in the school...it would be much better” (Metz, 2003, p. 69). This is coming from a teacher who has dealt with parents that have been overly involved to the point of questioning assignments and curriculum. But in the case of magnet schools, “Magnet teachers are more likely than non magnet teachers to report that they have flexibility in their curriculum to meet the needs of students (Metz, 2003, p. 86). This taken in tandem with the finding that teachers who control their curriculum have a greater sense of efficacy would lead to the conclusion that magnet school teachers already have a advantage in efficacy in the classroom. Part of this control over curriculum should come from connection with other schools that do similar themes in their magnet programs. There are two sources of specialized knowledge in magnet school programs, they are, “teachers expertise and experience in the specialized themes of their school and the development of networks with other specialized schools” (Metz, 2003, p. 87). So when talking about the value of community to teachers in addition to curriculum the broader community of like schools also play a role in development of shared community. Teachers are capable of even greater roles of instructional leadership in magnet schools; magnet schools employ teachers who have expertise around the same special theme, these teachers are more capable of instructional leadership (Hausman, 2000). In wrapping up this theme of teacher’s efficacy and role in curriculum control, it is important that in deciding the curriculum and implementing the curriculum there are often great differences in teacher’s perspectives and motivations. In an article on the development and creation of a magnet school for the fine arts in Canada, Gaskell brings the teachers' role to the forefront of the conversation. She states: “Teachers’ views of examinations and curriculum, decisions about admission and public relations policies, and

interpretations of the collective agreement with teachers were key issues” (Gaskell, 2002, p. 39). The teachers in Gaskell’s case study broke into two camps that the author describes as the academics and the revolutionaries. The academics wanted a strict academic emphasis on core subjects with the fine arts in a supplemental role whereas the revolutionaries wanted a school that put the arts at the heart of the curriculum and build the core subjects around them. The differences can be summed up in the following,

One of the academically oriented teachers described the fine arts teachers as saying “To hell with the academics.” A fine arts teacher said the others thought she was “an alien.” One self-described “faction” wanted to “transform” the curriculum with fine arts while the other wanted to “enrich” the curriculum with fine arts (Gaskell, 2002, pg. 43).

These clear battle lines demonstrate the importance that control over curriculum has on a teacher sense of efficacy. It is likely that at least some of the animosity in this particular situation was due to academic teacher reliance on a “business as usual” approach to the core subjects in the fine arts magnet.

In conclusion, I have covered a very wide swath of the literature in Chapter 2: (1) The advent and brief history of magnet programs in the United States; (2) The current development of international magnet programs in the United States with two sample schools presented, (3) The case for teacher reflection, factors in community building in magnet programs, teachers sense of efficacy and the factors that affect it. Keeping these strands of the literature in mind, we are now ready to embark on Chapter 3. Chapter 3 will focus on the research methodology, the details of how the study is conducted, and

the researcher's role, all of which will launch this narrative inquiry into a magnet program's narrative and the storied experiences of those whose lives unfold with this particular magnet program.

Chapter Three

Thought or reflection, as we have already seen virtually if not explicitly, is the discernment between the relation between what we try to do and what happens in consequence. (John Dewey, 1916, p. 169)

In Chapter one of this doctoral thesis, the ground work was laid out to understand what the researcher seeks to accomplish. The purpose was to understand the way a magnet program re-brands itself and the way that it becomes a success in the eyes of the students, teachers and community. This groundwork consists of a description of the above mentioned purpose and the description of the context in its place/time, and the people involved in the research endeavor.

Chapter two of this thesis addresses three areas in an effort to use literature to focus in on the topic of this paper: (1) the history of magnet programs in the United States, (2) the development of community in magnet programs, and (3) the development of international education in the United States. The purpose of this review is to provide a background for the development of a magnet program, and an understanding of the many elements of building a successful magnet program.

As noted in the previous chapters of this doctoral thesis, the methodology for this research is narrative inquiry. Here it is useful to take the time to provide a thumbnail sketch of what narrative inquiry is. Narrative inquiry is a methodology based on the

work of John Dewey and his belief that life is education (Dewey, 1938) before moving into the specifics of the methodology and its validity, the structure of the data gathering and interpretive analysis.

Narrative Inquiry Definitions

The reason that this section is titled as such is because there are many definitions of what a narrative inquiry is. In reference to the place of the personal narrative in social sciences research, the authors of *Telling Stories* assert that,

Personal narrative analysis demonstrates that human agency and individual social action is best understood in connection with construction of self hood in and through specific social relationships and institutions (Maynes, Pierce, & Laslett, 2008, p. 2).

They go on to detail the specifics of moving narrative from personal to analysis and from analysis to audience. The individual narrative produces a different form of subjective knowledge that is unique to the narrative process of meaning creation (Maynes, Pierce & Laslett, 2008). This development of the narrative as a legitimate form of research is also evident in Polkinghorne's *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences*. Polkinghorne (1988) writes that "narrative is a fundamental scheme for linking individual actions and events into interrelated aspects of understandable composite." In other words, individual human experience is the building block of organizational experience, culture and, ultimately, outcomes. In all of these examples, there are common themes. The most common of these is addressed in Clandinin and Connelly's (2000) *Narrative Inquiry*

Experience and Story in Qualitative Research. The common thread is the influence of John Dewey and the nature of experience. Clandinin and Connelly observe:

Our work is strongly influenced by the work of John Dewey, the preeminent thinker in education. Dewey addresses matters that we saw as central in our work, matters to which we continually return...Experience is the key term in these diverse inquiries. For us Dewey transforms a common place term, experience, in our educators' language, into an inquiry term, and gives us a term that permits better understanding of educational life. (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 2)

In this we can see that the central theme of the research of education using Dewey's influential concept of experience is a common thread to all narrative inquiry (Conle, 2000). "Narrative is the study of experience, and experience as John Dewey taught, is a matter of people in relation contextually and temporally" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 189). There is a quality to experience absent from strictly quantitative research. "Experience has a wholeness and an integrity about it that is neither left in the field nor on the pages of a field text but is alive at the end just as it is in the beginning" (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 189). Experience has value, beyond the simple telling and re-telling of it, but in what we can learn from the experience of others. The main claim narrative inquiry has to legitimacy is that humans are storytelling organisms (Clandinin & Connelly, 1990, p. 2). This legitimacy or purpose is firmly grounded in our humanness; that is, what makes us in our own individual self-hood, and in a broader cultural sense. In this sense teachers and students are also storytellers (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). What must be remembered is that storytelling is not just the telling of a story. The hearer of the story or the co-participants of a story, take away from it as well, it affects others'

outlooks, in present and future experience. In this way, story is both “phenomenon and method” (Connelly, Clandinin, 1990). Narrative inquiry also frees up scholars to tell their stories (Conle, 2000) because it is “collaboration involving mutual storytelling and re-storying as the research proceeds” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990, p. 6). The process of narrative inquiry is not neatly kept within a traditional box of research but looks to expand and create meaning from experience. This meaning is held and expressed in the stories. As Clandinin and Huber (2002) state, “stories to live by are shaped in places and lives in places. They live in actions, in relationship with others, in language.”

Consequently, narrative inquiry is both product and process (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). In this regard, it differs from the traditional research methodology in that from the outset it is a “quest” (Conle, 2000). One does not begin with the end in mind, and one does not begin with the intention of creating knowledge. The end becomes clear as the research proceeds; the end goal is that advancement of meaning, of understanding that there are “stories to live by,” in short, changes in people’s identities (Clandinin & Huber, 2002, p. 162). In this way the proceeding of the research aims to develop meaning based on the experiences of one administrator and two teachers in the process of developing a magnet program in its first three years. These experiences are crucial to the understanding of both future magnet programs that will start up but also to the existing programs that will re-brand to become more competitive in an educational market place with increasingly more options for consumers. The understanding of the experience is the key to improving the experience, and learning from what has worked and how stories within the program and the campus affect the perception and outcomes of the magnet program. To do this study the “boundaries” of the space in which the research is done must be

clearly labeled to better understand the outcome of the narrative inquiry while understanding that the boundaries of a narrative inquiry fluctuate with the development of research.

Methodology

According to Conle (2000), “methods of narrative inquiry, rather than being externally defined, emerge out of the inquiry activities. They are not as much means to an end as they are part of the ends achieved.” (Conle, 2000, p. 201) While it is true that narrative inquiry is not a methodology that existed in clearly defined traditional frameworks, that does not mean that there are not parameters in which it operates. The general standard for narrative inquiry is laid out by its most visible proponents. Connelly and Clandinin state:

With this sense of Dewey's foundational place in our thinking about narrative inquiry, our terms are personal and social (interaction); past, present, and future (continuity), combined with the notion of place (situation). This set of terms creates a metaphorical three dimensional narrative inquiry space, with temporality along one dimension, the personal and social along a second dimension, and place along a third (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000, p. 50).

Following this pattern of three- dimensional narrative space is useful in researching the magnet program. There are both personal and social elements to the teachers and the administrator's experience, and social elements to their interaction with each other and with the other members of the faculty, students, and others in the organization. In the second dimension of continuity it is especially relevant to this particular magnet program

since it was started just three years ago but is in the process of changing its curriculum focus for the future. The place in time which it currently occupies is informed by its past and informs the future changes that will occur as the magnet program re-brands itself into a broader focused theme. As for the third dimension of place all narrative occurs in context. This context is both physical and emotional. In the case of this research the places are the classrooms of the teachers and the hallway dedicated to the magnet program, and the broader campus in which the magnet program is embedded. As the teachers and the administrator that are co-researchers in this project go about the process of telling their narratives, it is important to note that they are working in the three dimensional narrative space since they bring their past point of view to the present, and they will move back and forth between the personal and the social (Connelly& Clandinin, 2000, p. 70). In summarizing what narrative inquirers do, Clandinin and Connelly state, “They make themselves as aware as possible of the many, layered narratives at work in their narrative inquiry space” (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000, p.70). In being aware of the space the co-researchers of this study occupy, it is important to remember the social space because they exist outside of the personal and in the social space the researchers in their narrative are not only linked to each other but to others in the program, the school, and the broader community. This is important to remember because,

There is a paradox if the inquiry space is viewed as being boxlike rather than infinitely open, as more current notions of space suggest. Our hope is that on balance the idea of a three-dimensional space will open up imaginative possibilities for inquiries, possibilities that might not as easily have been seen without ideas (Connelly& Clandinin, 2000, p. 89).

This openness to creativity is the objective of this narrative inquiry. To seek out and listen to the stories that come from the co-researchers, to understand the narrative threads that emerge from the narratives and to see how those threads play into the broader organizational threads. The process, to borrow Conle's word once again, is a quest (Conle, 2000) that gives a research quality to narrative inquiry. It is what drives the data generation" (Conle, 2000, pg. 1). As the lead researcher and the administrator of the program, I hold a unique perspective, one that only I can hold, a perspective of the organizational and thematic changes in the program from a position of seeing all of the pieces. This place will no doubt play into the way in which my perspective is presented, the way I weave my narratives and push the boundaries (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000) of formalistic research developing the narrative of the magnet program along with my own narrative as the leader of the magnet program. As the leader the way that I interact with the members of the magnet program, parents, teachers, and students is different from the way others have the experience of being part of the magnet program.

The "framework" is a formalistic view; it is a view that those things are never what they are but are rather what our framework or point of view or perspective or outlook makes of them. Further, because nothing is as it seems, the only things worth noticing are the terms, the formal structures, by which things are produced (Connelly & Clandinin, 2000, p. 39).

This is the formalistic boundary outside of which the narrative inquiry works. Meaning is created through experience and the translation of that experience means for other practitioners. The tendency in academia to make human experience fit a quantitative scientific model limits the "humanness" of research and limits learning from it. The

purpose of narrative inquiry at its core is to use one's life as a "reflexive and recursive life story as a resource" (Plummner, 2001, p. 398).

Exemplars

In *Narrative Inquiry Experience and Story in Qualitative Research*, Clandinin and Connelly model the way that narrative inquiry is done, not by outlining a step-by-step process in how to do it. The reason for this is simply that to show is easier than to explain, and because as discussed in the previous section on definitions of narrative inquiry there is no, "one" definition. There are two clear reasons exemplars are useful in narrative inquiry research. While our experience is unique to the individual that has it there are many that are similar. By looking to exemplars that are similar it is helpful in building a broader understanding of meaning. The second use of exemplars is that they provide examples of research that has been done and the experience of the researchers in those particular exemplars. That research experience is a guide to roadblocks and successes that other researchers may encounter in research using the narrative inquiry methodology.

At the core, exemplars center on intentional, reflective human actions, socially and contextually situated, in which teachers with their students, other colleagues, or researchers, interrogate their teaching practices to construct the meaning and interpretation of some compelling or puzzling aspect of teaching and learning through the production of narratives that lead to understanding (Lyons & LaBoskey, 2002, p. 21).

In this, we can see that narrative exemplars not only provide the benefit of reflective practice but a way to share experience in a universal way.

Two exemplars have been chosen to illustrate this point. One is drawn from the Appleseed writing project (Moss, Springer & Karol, 2008); the other is taken from a study by Craig (2010).

Exemplar #1:

This exemplar was selected because it focuses on teacher reflection. It provides an example of the experiences teachers had in their own process of reflecting on teaching.

Guided reflection protocol as narrative inquiry and teacher professional development

(Moss, Springer & Karol, 2008) studied the Appleseed writing project for elementary writing and literacy. The main objective of the project was the use of reflective processes both for students and teachers in the development of writing and literacy skills. The project focused on the experiences of the individuals in the program and their development as teachers. For teachers the act of self reflection was the purpose of the workshop. The teachers were required to reflect on two different narratives and draw conclusions about their own practices from it. The teachers then came back to workshop after a predetermined time of implementation to reflect on their experience and the benefit of the Appleseed project. The researchers, Moss, Springer, and Karol, state that “our use of narrative inquiry methods for professional development was rooted in our understanding of reflective thinking as a process of slowing down one's tacit knowing, and rethinking that knowing through an interactive questioning process” (Moss, Springer, Karol, 2008, p. 503) The outcome of this study was an understanding of how writing

teachers create meaning in their classroom both for their students and themselves as teachers.

Exemplar #2

This exemplar was chosen because it is the narrative of a teacher and a campus over time and their experience of change as different literacy programs were implemented. In the same way, the magnet program in this research focuses on a time of transition for the magnet program being researched and the broader campus.

Coming full circle: From teacher reflection to classroom action and places in-between (Craig, 2010) is a study of one literacy teacher's experience as he navigates four major initiatives on literacy on one campus over the course of ten years. The author, Craig, breaks the ten years into the four initiatives or phases of the teacher's experience. In each of the four phases the researcher records the teacher's experience, the things resented and the things appreciated, the things implemented and those initiatives and professional development left to die a quiet death in ambiguity. In the reflective analysis section of the article, the researcher breaks down the strengths and weaknesses of the four phases. The analysis is multilayered (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). The researcher looks to the human relationships on campus, with the administrative team, the relationship of the teacher to the curriculum, and to the professional developer. All of the subtle nuances of the narrative exemplar play into understanding the perspective of the teacher in many different ways.

“Wakefulness”

One concept that adds genuine richness to the narrative inquiry method is the creation of a language to represent possible particular human experiences. There is not a reduction of language to make the explication clearer but a broadening of the language to better describe phenomenon that occurs in human interactions. One of the terms often used in narrative inquiries is “wakefulness.” Wakefulness, in its simplest form, is an awareness of one’s surrounding at a deeper level than simple physical presence, and the realization that we must be aware of the questions about our research our research text and our methodology (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In the education environment, it is a keen awareness of the interactions that occur between teachers, students, administrators, parents, and others that are part of the school community. “Wakefulness” is a process that requires a constant intentional acknowledgment of one’s place in the research, not only in a physical sense, but also in a emotional, and relational sense. In, *Shifting teacher identities through inquiry into “stories to live by”* (Nelson, 2008), the authors tell the story of a unique set of teacher experiences where western teachers were providing professional development to native teachers in eastern Africa. The article goes into the individual stories of the western teachers and the shift in their identities and the way that their experience in Africa as professional developers changed the way they saw themselves and their teaching practice. This “*shifting*” they experience is a broader awareness beyond their own boundaries. In this concept, there is a connection with a predecessor to this “*shifting*” introduced by the philosopher Heidegger. Heidegger introduced the concept of *seinsvergessenheit*. This concept is that of “forgetfulness of being” (Conle, 2000, p. 206), which concept is defined as follows,

We live in *seinsvergessenheit* when ideas are merely placed abstractly in front of us (Gadamer, 1986, p. 502); when for the sake of intellectual and technical control, we “think away” the context reverberating in ordinary language and make words merely function as signs. There is the danger that relationships to things and people become merely instrumental. We become strangers in our own world (Conle, 2000, p. 206).

As researchers, this is a concept and a danger that must always be at the forefront of thought. The effort to be “wakeful” in one’s research is necessary to avoid falling into a pattern of *seinsvergessenheit*. In the case of this research, all three co-researchers are embedded in the three dimensional narrative space, and remained aware of the effect of that embeddedness. All three are living a storied flow (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Researchers using narrative inquiry do so in the midst of their own storied flow. Stories are streams that come together at some point to form a river. Narrative inquirers are represented by their own streams as are co-researchers, and research sites, are represented by their own. When the research begins, researchers cannot avoid the merging of streams. My story blends with their stories to become our story. In the case of this research study, the co-researchers are embedded in the three dimensional space as an administrator, and two teachers in the magnet program. Watchfulness to avoid *seinsvergessenheit* is needed, to maintain awareness of the multiple layers that go into narrative.

Threats to Validity

As in any other academic methodologies, narrative inquiry is not exempt from the need for rigorous scrutiny and approval from the broader academic community regardless

of discipline. This is even more so with narrative inquiry, given that it is a more recently developed methodology and its objective of increasing meaning, and in that way producing knowledge or better said “truths”. It is not that it is in any way counter empirical but that is supra-empirical. That is to say it is not only the five senses but the experience created by those five senses and the meaning constructed from those experiences. Narrative inquiry seeks to move beyond the boundaries of “formalistic” (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) research to the phenomenon of human experience. This, for some, constitutes the category of the metaphysical and for that reason may be perceived as non-rigorous research. For others, it constitutes a new world of opportunities to understand humanity and the place of narrative in the construction of our personhoods. It gives academic validity to the practice of self reflection in professional development (Kim & Latta, 2010). There has been much questioning both from inside and outside of the narrative inquiry field as to what constitutes narrative research and what the limits, boundaries, and standards are for such research. In this, we see the radical departure of research philosophy and the postmodern influence in the modern forms of narrative inquiry. Because narrative inquiry does not fall into the scientific based research methodology category, it is in a largely frowned upon category of research within the current political climate of educational research in the U.S, but not in other parts of the world such as Australia, Canada, China, Finland, and New Zealand. There is a human richness that is not possible within the formalistic boundedness of quantitative based research.

There are three common objections to narrative inquiry from the academic community. One, narrative inquiry is too vague (Varaki, 2007). This seems legitimate in comparison to a well developed framework. Narrative inquiry is by its very nature unbounded by its methodology. It seeks to study multiple layers of happening at the same time and tie the commonalities of the meta-narrative together. In this process it is inevitable that language is manipulated and used to better explain and clarify the researcher's point. So, the standard of definition is the issue not the definition itself. Clandinin and Connelly allude to the fact that it is not easy to define narrative inquiry and that is why they use exemplars in their own writing. This is an objection that can be overcome as the methodology gets new researchers and self regulates its systems of inquiry.

The second objection is that as researchers we cannot remove ourselves from the story, the narrative (Varaki, 2007). This is correct: we cannot. And in fact this awareness is what makes an even stronger case for narrative inquiry. In other research methodologies the researchers often assume that their role and place in the inquiry space, the storied flow, and being in the mist (Craig, 2010) is of no effect on the research. Nothing could be more false. As researchers we embed ourselves in a storied flow. This fact is a strength of narrative inquiry, even though it does hold its own set of dangers. There is a danger of the primary researcher becoming narcissistic in the telling of one's own perspective at the loss of the other researchers' stories (Kim, 2008). There is also the danger of the research becoming a subjective self-reflection under the false premise of providing voice to multiple layers and multiple voices. To counter this criticism, the work

of Kuhn (1962) claims the impossibility of objectivity in scientific research and the effect of “paradigm shifts” in research. The paradigm shift here is the realization that the objective in research is to increase knowing and that in the process one cannot exclude one’s influence in the knowledge making process. Simply put, objectivity is not humanly possible, and one is engaged in self-deception if one thinks otherwise.

The third common objection to narrative inquiry is the boundless nature of the research. The view that because narrative is not contained in a traditional empirical framework it lacks legitimacy because it is not constrained in the same way more traditional frameworks of research are. The objection is to the nature of this openness. The fact is that the methodology does not start from square one and proceed through ten but that it may start on two and go back to one. The flow and topic of research is open to change as the research proceeds and new and rich opportunities for narrative exploration present themselves. Clandinin and Connelly explain that:

It is important not to squeeze the language of narrative criteria into language created from other forms of research. The language and criteria for the conduct of narrative inquiry are under development in the research community.

(Clandinin & Connelly, 2000, p. 184)

This very flexibility is what gives narrative inquiry its strengths. In the case of this doctoral thesis study, the objective is to develop a understanding of the narrative that will benefit the creation and re-creation of a magnet program from the perspectives of the leader and two of the teachers in the program.

In a review of *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*, Freema Elbaz-Luwisch takes issue with the history of narrative inquiry as presented by Clandinin and Connelly. She notes, “Clandinin and Connelly's story reveals choices made and paths not taken. One cannot help but noticing the absence in their account of researchers, who prior to the appearance of *Narrative Inquiry*, developed and theorized various modes of narrative research in the social sciences. (Elbaz, 2010, p. 264) This criticism is not, of course, related to validity only to the fact that the modern representatives of narrative inquiry have limited a presentation of the roots of the methodology that could lend to its validity.

What is beneficial here is an understanding of narrative as universal. Narrative is not exclusively the domain of the humanities or the poet but is included in all research and knowledge creation. This is because narrative is as human as breathing. Hendry (2010) observes:

If inquiry (research) is understood to be meaning making, then all inquiry is narrative. Re-situating all inquiry as narrative, as opposed to characterizing narrative as one particular form of inquiry, provides a critical space for rethinking research beyond current dualism and bifurcations. The current typology of research in which science (positivist) and narrative (interpretative) are understood as two incommensurate modes of inquiry in the Kuhindian sense functions to create boundaries that limit the capacity for dialogue (Hendry, 2010, p. 72).

In this splitting of epistemologies we observe the opportunity to include multiple epistemologies in the same research. One is not seen as a predecessor to the other but as a

compliment. Particular types of knowledge can only be created in certain ways. At its core narrative inquiry is the study of experience, and this in turn is the nature of relationships; experience (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). It is experience and its human wholeness that is not bound by a framework which gives narrative inquiry its legitimacy. Because experience, lived experience in the classroom, in the faculty meeting, in the curriculum meeting, in the decision making process about the creating and development of a magnet program will create new meanings that will advance the creation, development and operating of new magnet programs in the future. So, the contribution of the co-researchers in this doctoral thesis is to advance their truths as a reflection of the joys and downfalls of their particular experience contained in their own three dimensional narrative space.

Research Description

The setting for this research is a magnet program embedded in a comprehensive high school in a large metropolitan city in the southwestern United States. The particular magnet program has been in existence for less than three years and is still in the process of developing identity and purpose. The co-researchers are all connected to the program through roles as instructional or administrative staff. The theme of the program is world languages and the focus of the students in the program is the acquisition of two foreign languages over the course of four years. As the primary researcher, I am the director of the program and hold an administrative role that is specific to the leadership of the program and the development of the program. The co-researchers are both teachers in the program and teach subjects that fall within the foreign language content area. The term

co-researcher is used here because their contributions as research participants are as integral to the advancement of meaning as that of the primary researcher.

The researchers were asked to answer the following prompts in a written format.

Week 1:

Prompt one: Reflect on how you came into the teaching profession, and how your expectations of what it would be like matched or did not match your first year of teaching.

Prompt Two: How is the language you teach tied into your personal identity? What emotional connection do you have to your content?

Week 2:

Prompt One: Reflect on how the magnet program has benefited or not benefited your content area.

Prompt Two: Reflect on how you first felt when you knew you would be a magnet program teacher.

Week 3:

Prompt One: What changes if any have you seen in the department as a result of the incorporation of the magnet program and how were the teachers informed and included in the development process? Do you feel that being labeled a magnet program teacher is any different?

Prompt Two: What characteristics do you associate with leading the magnet program, and how should decisions concerning the magnet program be decided and carried out?

As the primary researcher, I am contributing the experience of leading the program in a time of transition, and of leading the teachers in the program to improve

instructional methods in the classroom. The teachers are contributing the experience they have lived as teachers in the program through two ways. The first way the co-researchers are contributing to the research is through the process of intentional journaling. The co-researchers write journal entries in the process of day- to- day happenings of the role of being a teacher in the program, also, included in the journaling will be prompts provided by the primary researcher to tie together previous experiences, attitudes and feelings about “teacherness” and feelings toward the profession of education, and the program being studied in this doctoral thesis research. The journals were kept by the teachers over the course of three weeks. The second contribution of the co-researchers is in the form of open non-structured interviews. The interviews are a way to allow the co-researchers to contribute to the body of meaning in a way that does not restrict the topics that arise in conversations. No audio recording or video recording took place; rather notes were taken by the primary researcher. The two co-researchers chosen represent very different points of view. The first co-researcher is Alan Hess. Alan has taught at the comprehensive high school where the program operates for fifteen years. He had a very well established program in his content area prior to the establishment of the magnet program. However, the magnet's establishment has been very helpful in continuing to grow his particular language program. Alan brings with him the perspective of a veteran teacher with years of experience in the school hosting the program and has also been a part of the committee developing the program from its inception. The second co-researcher, Ashley Johnson is a teacher of five years who has recently moved to the campus. She is considered a magnet program teacher but she also teaches non-magnet students in the comprehensive high school. These are the three participants that will contribute to this research. Since

each brings different perspectives to the same contextual situation and the same inquiry table, narrative trends and threads can be explicated from the field texts collected to form research texts shared with a broader academic audience. Other conversations about the teachers' experiences can also act as catalyst to develop the themes that will emerge in the research study. In addition ancillary survey data will be used throughout the research to tie together the themes that emerge in the journaling, interviews, and conversations as a consequence of this narrative inquiry. The source of the ancillary archival data is two board mandated reports that were produced to show the effectiveness of the magnet program in its first two years.

The side narratives may be personal reflections, stories about curriculum, classroom experiences, and campus perceptions about the broader magnet program. The prompted journals will also be followed by three non-structured interviews with the co-researchers where the themes and side narratives developed out of the writing will be discussed in person. To further elaborate on the narratives told in the writing, and to allow the co-researchers to add more fully to their story. It is important to keep in mind that pushing the boundaries of formalistic research (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Craig, 2010), I as the primary researcher have worked in the research site as a program administrator in the magnet program for a year and in that time have had countless conversations with the teachers acting as co-researchers. These conversations will inevitably lead to narratives and themes that are powerful in creating a better understanding and meaning about how to develop and implement a magnet program. Co-researchers narratives emerge through interviews, reflective writing, and the countless

snippets of conversations that happen in the hallways, classrooms, and on duty provide the paint used in creating pictures of meaning in this research.

Chapter Four

Education is a social process. -John Dewey

All experience has potential educational value (Dewey, 1938). The value is different for each experience depending on the context of the situation, the time when it happens, and the individuals involved. The experiences of the administrator and two teachers in this magnet program are valuable in understanding, and creating meaning in how to develop and enact a new magnet program. While all magnet programs have themes or pedagogical models, this research seeks to address the query of the relationship of the administrator to the program, as well as the experience and relationship of the teachers to the program. The reason for this is the need to understanding the connection between the various stakeholders in the magnet program will clarify the importance of the roles people play. How they feel supported or not, and how they perform in their jobs. The benefit for research is that future magnet programs can benefit from the research done on this campus.

Road map

It is useful here to review the context of the magnet program, the methodology, and background and context of the participants. This will allow for a broader understanding of what will be accomplished in this chapter. The purpose in this chapter is a presentation of, the conversations, the journals, the ancillary data, and the personal narratives. This chapter will incorporate the methodological three dimensional narrative

inquiry space (Connelly& Clandinin, 2000). This chapter is presented in three sections: community, curriculum, and change. Each section incorporates all three participants and acknowledges their place in the storied flow of the program and with each individual participant's personal narrative.

Research Site

The research site is a magnet program embedded within a large comprehensive high school in a populous suburban area in the southwestern United States. To provide a backdrop it is useful to provide information on the campus in which the program is embedded. The host campus is an academically exemplary campus with a population of twenty nine hundred students. On average, the campus administers over two thousand Advanced Placement (AP) tests. The population is diverse including many different cultures. Over 35 different nationalities are represented on campus. When students choose to come to the magnet program they enter into a very competitive academic environment. This leads to a challenging environment for many students that may not be accustomed to the level of academic rigor. Often, students that are removed from the program are removed for falling below standard for a class that is not a language class.

Storied Lives

All educators come to their school at a point in their story as educators. It may be a first job, it may be the last job, it may be a new content area, or department, but there is a story that precedes the entrance into the classroom. Often times these stories are not given the attention they deserve in research. But they are as important as the curriculum

because they are the making of a teacher and in that sense the making of a broader community of teachers and teacher experiences. For that reason a brief narrative of the stories of the individuals involved in the research is important here to understand where they are coming from. The three co-researchers are me, the primary researcher who is the author of this doctoral thesis and program leader, and two of the teachers in the program, Alan Hess and Ashley Johnson. Let us begin this research narrative with the story of the primary researcher, my story.

I never intended to be a teacher. It just happened. In fact it happened almost against my will. I had just returned from war, literally. I had been stationed in the Middle East in 2003 with my National Guard unit. Upon returning I found that my sales job was not paying the bills. So, I took a temporary job in a factory, a restaurant, and substitute taught all at the same time. Then through a series of circumstances I found out that district south of Dallas needed a Spanish teacher. Actually they needed three Spanish teachers. That should have been the first clue. I started in mid year with thirty plus kids in Spanish level one who were not passing English, let alone did they hold any interest in Spanish. I had actually received a job offer from a large financial firm at the same time I was offered a teaching job. I missed my first day as a teacher to go to the other job. All I could think was I needed to teach. I don't know even today why I felt the urge but I needed to teach (E.Crowell, research journal entry, February 4, 2011).

My first three years of teaching were very much trial and error. There was little support from the administration, and the mentor that was assigned to me was a career teacher who was counting the days until retirement, with nothing positive to say about the profession

or the students. The classroom environment and the campus were combative and overcrowded. Things improved for me when I moved to a suburban district south of a large southwestern city. I had the opportunity to develop as a teacher by teaching different content areas.

In asking the co-researchers to reflect on how they came into the profession, Alan Hess replied that he also did not set out to be a teacher. Alan said, “I did not think much about being a teacher in high school, but in college it did cross my mind.” As an undergraduate, he developed two four year tracks for himself, one for education and one for pre-law. He decided on the pre-law option because, “Fairly early on, though, I decided that there was not enough money in teaching.” After completing his undergraduate years and his acceptance into law school, Alan spent the first year in law school being miserable. At this point, he acknowledge that “I knew I had to do something I liked and that I felt was worthy/important, because I saw that no amount of money could sweeten the deal of being in a profession I did not want to be in.” That was the point when Alan quit law school to attend an alternative certification course. He was soon hired on at an inner city school and two years later he was employed in his current position teaching a high school world language. Currently, Alan has been teaching for fifteen years and has built a very successful language program for his content area. He is the only teacher in his specific language content area and has a great deal of latitude in the development of the curriculum and the success of the program.

In contrast to Alan and me, Ashley Johnson has been in the teaching profession for five years and has taught on two campuses. She has always taught the same content area. Ashley described her journey into the teaching profession this way:

I came into the teaching profession because I wanted a decent paycheck, weekends off and job security. It was always meant to be a temporary thing. And five years later I am still here. I thought I was going to come up with wonderful lessons that all the kids would love and that all students would be intrinsically motivated. After all their parents know the value of an education right? I was hit with a harsh dose of reality, unsupportable administration, state assessments, paper trails, ARD meetings, and students that were never taught the value of education... the list goes on. It was a real adjustment. My first year was nothing like I expected. The only thing that matched my expectations were the weekends off, when I slept because I was exhausted from educating America's youth and their parents (A.Johnson, personal communication, February 16, 2011).

Ashley's narrative is one that many in the field of education share. The long hours, the disconnection from one's own expectations and what the reality of teaching is. Unlike Alan Hess and myself, Ashley is new to the program this year.

While it may seem time consuming to explain the background and reasons the co-researchers entered into the teaching field. It is helpful in understanding their perspectives expressed later on in this chapter. What is interesting is that all three teachers came into education through alternative means, meaning they did not intend to

be teachers. It was never a lifelong dream or a goal, but yet between the three, they have accumulated almost twenty five years of experience.

Community

In addressing the element of community it is necessary to define sub-communities. The first sub-community is made up of the teachers that are categorized as teachers in the magnet program. The second is the sub-community of the program as a whole. This includes parents, students, and teachers. The third sub-community is that of the broader campus in which the program is embedded. The four shared characteristics of community as defined by Hausman and Goldring will be used as the standard of comparison.

1. Shared values among organizational members that contain the “norms of schooling” (Bird & Warren-Little, 1986; Sergiovanni, 1994).
2. A common set of events that promotes face to face interactions and social connections between school participants (Driscoll, 1995).
3. Enhanced collegiality and collaborations among stakeholders in the school (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Sergiovanni, 1994).
4. A greater commitment to the school and its decisions (Hausman & Goldring, 2000, p. 83).

The first sub group is the teachers in the program. When the program was initially launched, it was done in a very rapid manner. The campus received notification in the late spring that they were to launch the program in the fall. This gave the newly hired coordinator, Alan Hess, very little time to recruit students to the new program. It

provided even less time to include the teachers that would be part of the program to develop any sense of community or to develop any professional development. Some of the languages in the department already had a reputation for teaching in a, by the textbook method, preceding the implementation of the program. This seemed to be evidenced in the first year teacher survey when a teacher wrote, “so far there seems to be a resistance to do anything extra beyond what they have always done.” Alan noted, “Teachers have not been well integrated into the development of the magnet program. They were not consulted at all regarding the implementation of the program that decision came from the district” (A.Hess, research journal entry, February 16, 2011). I came to this realization myself in the week after I started the magnet program coordinator job. I even told the teachers that I realized that they had not been included in the development process in a very substantial way. The first coordinator, Alan, and the department chair for the foreign language department were included in a campus committee in the beginning but the timeline for launch of the program was still short, really just a matter of months. In the first year survey of teachers there was evidence that the teachers felt left out of the development. Because the surveys were anonymous I am unable to pinpoint the teacher being surveyed, but one teacher stated that, “there is a lack of teacher buy-in”, another stated, “Teachers are very loaded with teaching and other teaching related activities.” The last statement could indicate that the teacher felt that any additional work for the magnet program was not possible at the time of the survey, or that given more time it would be possible. It does indicate to me there was a sense in the first year that the magnet program was in some way put onto the teachers. Alan explained that, “being a teacher in the magnet program does not make me feel any different, positive or

negative, I am going to do my best to teach all students...if the question goes is there any prestige in being a magnet program teacher the answer is, no, I don't think so" (A. Hess, personal communication, March 11, 2011). In a journal entry very early on in my leadership of the magnet program I wrote,

I used to have a boss when I was in the customer service business of corporate aviation that said, "perception is reality." I have to agree with him it is in the eyes of the beholder. The perception of the GLA is not what I would categorize as a positive one. Within the first week of taking the job I realized I was in an unstable situation, well maybe unstable is the wrong word. I was in a situation that had not been properly planned, or implemented. The first problem is that magnet should not even have been established at here without teacher buy in. The reason it was is because of the existing language offerings on this campus, and the fact they had teachers that can teach more than one subject. They share one of the teachers but the rest are on campus all the time. This was the reason, not because they wanted to actually have it on their campus but because it seemed like a good location to hold it. The second problem is that the campus implemented the program in three months instead of giving the program a year to be implemented, recruited for, and set up at this school. This created not only bitterness but a lack of buy in by the teachers. (E. Crowell, research journal entry, August 30, 2011).

In this journal excerpt, we can see my experience in taking over the coordinator position and summing up in an observation what I experienced in the first month on the job. There was no true sense of community. This is further evidenced in the ancillary archival data as mentioned before. In one anonymous teacher survey in the first year of

implementation, the teacher declared that “there has been a lack of teacher buy-in up to this point.” That same teacher went on to say, “We have to have more teachers buy-in into the magnet program.” It is important to note here that the program teachers were the teachers of foreign language in the larger comprehensive high school in which the program was based. They were in no way selected and there was no discussion of their enrollment as teachers in the program. The implementation of the magnet program did not add to their duties, or work load. With the exception of new teachers for new languages none of them had to produce any new curriculum. And while it was strongly encouraged that languages take field trips it was not in any way mandated. So in the first year only one language took a field trip. The members of the world language department were by default magnet program teachers. In answer to the writing prompt, what changes if any have you seen in the department as a result of the incorporation of the magnet program and how were the teachers informed and included in the development process? Alan concurred with this sentiment when he wrote:

There was little or no bottom-up input. Some of that was due to my work style , which is singleton and not collaborative, and some of it had to do with my perception that teachers were indifferent if not hostile toward the magnet program, and I did not really expect much input from them (A. Hess, research journal entry, February 11, 2011).

Ashley, as a new teacher to the program, was aware of the reputation of the foreign language department at the large comprehensive high school where the magnet program was based. She was assigned from another high school in the third year of the magnet program. She came fully expecting to take a “duck and cover” approach to dealing with

the other members of the department. She thought that the best course of action was to agree with what the more senior members of her language group and to not participate in any ongoing planning of the curriculum in any substantial way. Her reply to the aforementioned question was,

Since I am a magnet program teacher I feel like the opportunity is present to do enrichment activities that are outside the box, and the students and administration are more receptive to these things. As a magnet program teacher I believe you have a responsibility to go beyond the worksheet and really impart the students with culture and issues that make them think critically and begin to embrace the language. Due to personal reasons, I initially could have cared less about being magnet program teacher. Now I think it is an honor and a huge responsibility.

You in essence have to sell the language, the program and yourself (A. Johnson, research journal entry, March 11, 2011).

As mentioned before Ashley was reassigned to the magnet program campus. The first day at the new campus she was several hours late. At the time the claim was that she had gotten lost. She later admitted that she was driving around trying to decide if she was going to resign to avoid having to work at the magnet program high school.

From the beginning of the program, we see apathy by the teachers at the departmental level or at the very least an apathy that was perceived by the two co-researchers, an attitude that may very well have preceded the implementation of the magnet program.

The second sub-community is the magnet program itself. In conversations with parents, I have experienced much gratitude in the form of comments about how the

program has improved, how there is more going on for the students of the program, and how students have more opportunities. From the beginning, I took the initiative to speak to parents and students about what they wanted and what they hoped the program would do for them. I set up focus groups of parents and students. I established a student government for the program so the students would have voice, and organized parents to form a booster club to raise funds for the organization and to act as a sounding board for changes in the program. In addition, in partnership with the after school program, magnet program students volunteer to teach elementary age children their target language, and incoming students to the magnet program are provided with upperclassmen mentors. One of the main desires of the parents and the students that came from the initial focus group was the desire to change the requirements for the students in the program. Students were required to complete three years of one language and two years of a secondary language. There were two reasons parents and students did not like the plan. One it is a GPA disadvantage for students to take five years of language with only the third year of the primary language being in an advanced level course. The second reason was that under the requirement that the parents and students wanted four years of a primary language and one year of a secondary language students could go for mastery in one language. I championed this change and suggested the option be up to the individual students and their parents. The following is a journal entry by me after the proposal was turned down by the district office.

I did it by the book. I talked to all the stakeholders I let them all know what I was thinking and how it would work and what they would get out of it. I communicated every step of the way with my campus leadership. It made it to the

top and it got shot down. I had asked to change the magnet option to a four-by-one for students that wanted to be focused on one language. But to no avail. It was decided they should not give up the second year of the secondary language.

I have to stick with a 3x2 and maybe push a 4x2 next year. It is frustrating when students and parents are overruled by bureaucracy (E.Crowell, research journal entry, March 29, 2010).

Even though the decision was made at the district level not to allow the change, there were benefits from the experience for the sense of community. For the first time, it included parents and students in the development of the magnet program, it gave them voice, and it showed that their input was important enough to the coordinator and the campus administration to advocate it at the district level. The outcome has been a strong relationship between the campus administration, program coordinator, and the students and parents involved in the magnet program in the student government and in the program booster club.

The third sub- community is the broader campus community and the perception of the magnet program on the campus in which it is embedded. According to the first year survey by the district, one student wrote, “I still feel that GLA is not really important in school, I do not have that strong feeling from others either.” This feeling was echoed by a teacher in the first year teacher survey, “The magnet program does not really feel important on campus...I think it is because most people think is just a set of electives with some restrictions”. The suggestions made by the students in the first year survey to improve the sense of community included: “More activities and events...field trips...have

some more volunteering opportunities around the city...have meetings for all the students.” It is impossible to separate the campus from the program since it is the site for the program, and the students of the magnet program attend school at the high school but the perception of the magnet program and the students that come into the program is important to the success of the program on the campus. This is mostly a reflection of mine from my journal. As the coordinator for the program I often act as a liaison between teachers, students, departments, administration, parents, and the campus. This dynamic allows me the unique opportunity to see what the perception of the magnet program is on campus. There are two events that best sum up the campus perception of the program. In a meeting, a department chair asked the question “is it possible to not allow the students coming from outside of the feeder pattern to take the Pre-AP courses here? They are not well prepared for it in their zoned middle schools.” (E.Crowell, personal communication, February 11, 2011) This statement alludes to a certain amount of elitism that exists in the host campus, and may be indicative of an overall attitude toward students that are program students the reason for this is the academic rigor of the host campus. As mentioned before it is a very challenging school, with a high number of students enrolled in advanced classes. However, this was one isolated comment uttered by one teacher. The program students are easy to identify, because they come from other feeder patterns and in their 9th grade year may clearly stand out as outsiders. And as such receive more scrutiny from teachers. In another conversation with a counselor very early on, I was informed that the program is simply a “back door” into the larger comprehensive high school. This is not an unusual claim to be made in good academic schools that host magnet programs. This is an issue that I struggle with as the person primarily responsible

for recruiting for the magnet program. I often have counselors that suggest to parents that they contact me to see if they can get their student into the magnet program. While this may seem like a positive, it is often not because the student or parents have no real interest in learning global languages but they are interested in having their student attend the larger comprehensive high school. For this reason I try to be very thorough in the recruiting process, even requiring an interview process for admission. The perception of the magnet program within its own host campus is the issue. This is beginning to change in many ways. This change will be addressed later in the section on change.

In looking back at the characteristics of community there are some but not all of these elements in these three sub-communities. The first characteristic is shared values among organizational members that contain the “norms of schooling” (Bird & Warren-Little, 1986; Segiovanni, 1994) inside the department and among the campus teaching staff this is the case. This is not because the program has itself created an identity or that the teachers identify with the magnet program but because the magnet program has borrowed the “norms of schooling” from its host campus. There is a rubbing of the “norms of schooling” in some areas though. This is manifested by the radically different instructional practices between content areas in the foreign language department. The reason for this is that with so many different languages from so many different backgrounds there are natural differences in the way that a language is taught. For example Asian languages are very graphic based in writing, and have many tones. A Latin based language will have very emotional language and vocabulary, and a language like Arabic will be heavily dependent on cultural connections it has to religion. This leads

to a unique set of experiences to the language that the teacher is teaching. That being said, the objectives are similar for the content areas the method is not. The second characteristic is, “A common set of events that promotes face to face interactions and social connections between school participants” (Driscoll, 1995). With the creation of a booster club, a student government, and an advisory board made up of teachers, counselors, and administrators, this piece is now solidly in place. Students organize their own social events, and the booster club shows gratitude to teachers at the campus level through hosting meals for teachers, and events for students.

The third characteristic is “Enhanced collegiality and collaborations among stakeholders in the school” (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Sergiovanni, 1994). One of the characteristics of the program that has made collegiality and collaboration more difficult has been the fact that there are several languages, and most of them are languages that have only one teacher. Hence, there is not much chance to interact, observe or share with teachers outside of one’s content area focus. According to the first year survey by the district, one suggestion made in an anonymous teacher survey given by the district in the first year was that “teachers need an extra planning period.” The collaboration piece has grown as mentioned in the last point through the student government, and parent organization. It has improved at the magnet program level as new content areas are being incorporated into the curriculum of the magnet program. In investigating other magnet programs, such as Tallwood High School in Virginia, it is clear to me that magnet program teachers, just like the students, must have time dedicated to community building

and planning. This sadly due to fiscal limitations has not been the case in this magnet program.

The fourth characteristic is, “a greater commitment to the school and its decisions” (Hausman & Goldring, 2000, p. 83). In the last four months there has been encouragement from the district level to re-brand the program from a focus on world languages to a focus on global studies. Alan Hess, myself, and the campus administration since the inception of the magnet program have thought very much in this vein. Even coming into the program as a new coordinator I thought that this made more sense than a standalone language magnet. The reason being that language is a tool, not an end in itself. So, with the new curriculum the push was to create a comprehensive global studies experience. This move has been supported by current students, parents, and the teachers that will be incorporated into the magnet program ranks as the curriculum is broadened. It is clear to me from seeing these changes over the last year that the students and the parents were very excited about being included in the program growing process. Approximately 37% of the current students have volunteered to mentor incoming students. The program is developing a sense of identity and students are likely to self-identify as program students. In the first year it was a after thought to mention that you were in the magnet program if a teacher asked you. Now it is common and a source of pride to state you are in the program if you are a student.

Much has been done in a short time to advance the sense of community in the magnet program. Perceptions often are reality and as such require a certain amount of

political finesse to change. The students and the parents involved in the program feel they have voice and that they are vested in not only the immediate day to day of the magnet program but also in the long range success of the program. At a recent meeting of the booster club, a parent commented that, "I have a younger child I want to come through this program I am interested in what is going on" (E.Crowell, personal communication, January 6, 2011). Much is made of community in education circles, and, more often than not, good leadership is the willingness to listen and seek diverse opinions.

Curriculum

Often magnet programs have curriculum that is based on a theme, or a particular pedagogy. In the case of this magnet program the theme is global languages. This created a very unique situation in tracking, observing, and developing curriculum. There is one main reason for this. With eight languages and five of the languages taught by only one teacher, there is little opportunity for collaboration. Teachers are often on their own and do not have the chance to plan with anyone else. This leads to much more isolation among the teachers and less of a feeling of being a cadre with the same goals and objectives for students. If a teacher were teaching in a digital media magnet the teacher may teach three classes that are in a sequence. She may also teach the same class as another teacher and they may alternate the courses in a sequence. So, she works closely with another teacher. In a math magnet, teachers all teach math of some sort. The content builds on previously mastered content. In the case of a foreign language magnet there are many content areas and none of them build on each other. While the instructional methods may be the same the content is different for every language. This is why

teachers are not close and cannot plan together, at least on content. In the second year survey only 33% of 10th graders and 42% of 9th grader agreed that that magnet courses offered challenging curriculum. In the same survey only 35% of 9th grader and 37% of 10th graders agreed that that the magnet program course met their learning expectations. In the first year survey one student stated, “I would hire some new teachers” another student said “perhaps better teachers”. There were also many positives. From Alan’s classes one student replied that he had received, “a better understanding of foreign language and culture. The two teachers that are co-researchers in this project also have very different perspectives on their experiences with their curriculum. The reason for this is that one is a singleton who writes one’s own curriculum and the other is a teacher who is involved in group planning. When both co-researchers were presented with the following prompt: How is the content tied into your personal identity? What emotional connection do you have to your content? Alan replied,

Teaching my content is my life. There is nothing in my content that makes this true: it just happened to be the language I know because I took it on a lark my sophomore year, and then did study abroad. It is a great language, but I suspect that if I were to teach another language I would be just as passionate (A.Hess, personal communication, March 11, 2011).

In conversation with Alan about his curriculum he stated, “It is my preference to work alone and develop my curriculum. The book we have is not very good, and the students learn a lot through various activities that are not depended on a text book.” (E.Crowell, personal communication, February 9, 2011)

Ashley answered,

I teach in my content and it is tied to my identity because that is where my entire family is from. I am emotionally tied to it because it is the only way I can be certain my family's traditions are passed down since I married a very American man. I love the language (A. Johnson, personal communication, March 11, 2011).

In both cases the teachers have strong emotional and personal family ties to the languages they teach. These ties make a difference in the classroom experience of the students. The students can feel that the teacher is passionate about the material they are presenting, that their work is not a paycheck or just another job, but a passion. In the case of Alan, it is clear that he prefers to make his own curriculum and to provide his students with a variety of experiences. In a conversation with a student, I asked what the difference in experience was between Alan's class and another class. The student astutely replied it was the teacher enthusiasm that was different and distinctive, it was not that the material was more interesting but how it was presented and how successful the student felt in the process. In the case of Ashley, she is part of a district level revamping in her content area. She is in the largest planning group in the department, made up of six teachers. She has struggled throughout the year to organize with the teachers in her level and content. According to her, this in large part seems to be due to a complete lack of experience in collaborative planning on the part of the teachers that have been in the department, some having held positions for decades. Below is a dialogue I had with Ashley shortly after the second semester started.

Me: So, how is the level planning going?

Ashley: Why do you even ask me? You know how it is going.

Me: Ok, well let me ask you this? If you had to pin point the single largest problem, what would it be?

Ashley: The teachers in this level are so accustomed to doing whatever they want without any oversight or any planning that they cannot break out of the habit. They are unable to work in a collaborative manner.

This dialogue is exactly what I have experienced through the year as I try to organize that particular group of teachers. I have assigned duties for planning only to have the teachers decide to do their own thing. I have had teacher's outright refuse to work together, and I have had teachers writing different lesson plans for the same period of time. This has been the biggest issue with the new curriculum. The fact is that the senior teachers refuse to truly implement the new curriculum and instead are subversive to its implementation in a very passive manner. This has led to further fracturing in the content in Ashley's area. When I asked her to reflect on how she felt when she knew she would become a magnet program teacher, she replied, "Do you really want me to answer this?"

(E.Crowell, research journal entry, February 16, 2011) What has resulted are smaller groups of teachers in the content who are comfortable with each other, in groups of two, planning without responding or committing time and resources to the large content area group. The result has been an inconsistent and lop-sided planning process that leads to an inconsistent and lop-sided classroom experiences. I say this based on reviewing the lesson plans, and visiting the classrooms. In addition the magnet program students often share their opinions on classroom instruction with me. When I am in the same set of classrooms on the same day and they are "planning together" but I see very different

things happening in the classroom, I can only conclude that there is a disconnect among the teachers in that level.

The curriculum itself is a shift from teaching from a textbook to teaching backwards. That is, there is the creation of a theme and then the working backward from an authentic assessment. The outcome of this has been the fragmenting of the six teachers that are supposed to plan together in groups of two or three. The outcome has been more of the “duck and cover” mentality that has permeated a particular language in the foreign language department. In other words, take care of your own business and do not depend on anyone else, mentality. In addition, the district level curriculum was rolled out on short notice to teachers who had little or no say in the development of the new curriculum. This of course may be due to an existing apathy on the part of the language teachers and the perception by the school district curriculum development office that teachers are indifferent. However, the direct effect on the magnet program has been confused teachers that are reverting to a default setting of not planning together or carrying out curriculum in a unified manner. The curriculum experiences of students vary based on their language of study and ultimately the teacher they have in the class. One student in the first year survey administered by the district stated that “They could separate classes for the magnet program students so that they receive a more rigorous work load, while another student added that, “The magnet program classes are not different enough from the regular courses. Also, make sure that teachers are dedicated to their job and are able to control their class.”

Because of the variety of languages, consistency in curriculum has been a difficult element to manage in the magnet program. In the languages with single teachers, this is not so much the case but in the larger language groups and in the new languages where no curriculum exist it is an ever developing process.

Change

Much change has been enacted in the program since its inception, and most of the change has occurred in the last year of the program. I became the leader of the program after a series of interviews during a time of leadership transition on the campus. When I came to the program, as the magnet program coordinator, it was little more than a series of contractual requirements. There was no venue for students and parents to voice opinions or to be part of problem solving. The new school leader came from a middle school campus that also had an embedded magnet program. With him, the new school leader brought the experience necessary to make a magnet program work. From the start as the new program leader, I understood the need to expand the scope of the curriculum of the magnet program. There has been one change since the start. The first year of students were required only to complete level one through four of one language, and students in subsequent years were required to complete three years of a primary language and two years of a secondary language. In modeling the program after two magnet programs in other states, I, with the endorsement of my campus leadership pushed for the change to four years of a primary language and one year of a secondary language. The rationale was that students would be better served by achieving mastery of one language rather than familiarity of two. This as mentioned earlier did not meet district level

approval. At this point, I started to closely evaluate the programs in other states to better understand their objectives and purposes. Both programs have several similarities. They both required above and beyond the required language for graduation in their respective states. They both incorporated global studies into their core English and social studies courses, and they both have developed global specific courses just for their programs. In this third year of the magnet program in this research study, the district made a decision that the scope of the program was too narrow and that it did need to be expanded to have a global focus. Language would continue to be a cornerstone but it would have a practical purpose in a global studies focused magnet program. This had been the original intention even if it was only implemented in a small way. The objective when setting out to re-develop the program was the broadening of the program from world languages to global studies, the change is easily justified in today's global economy and global cultural.

When I first arrived I had a conversation with Alan the outgoing coordinator.

Me: So tell me, doesn't a language only focus seem a little narrow to you?

Alan: It does but we were following direction from the district. And we did include a course requirement that incorporated global studies.

Me: What course is that?

Alan: We require that students take AP Human Geography.

Me: And you did that to...

Alan: To have something global in the requirements.

So, from the start the global studies piece was there. Alan knew changes in communication technologies and mutual global problems have lead to a greater global interdependence. The example that the magnet program used in their very short

development cycle was Tallwood High School in Virginia Beach, Virginia. This magnet program spends much of the curriculum with a focus on global studies. Language is a tool, but developing students as global thinkers should have been the objective from the start, not just an advancement of global languages.

To develop the plan of action, I traveled to two global studies magnets. They were Tallwood High School in Virginia, and North Cobb High School in Georgia. The magnet in Virginia is named the Global Studies and World Languages Academy and the program in Georgia is named the International Studies Program. Both of the programs placed very high value on academics, and special emphasis on language, in both of the schools, the English and social studies courses had been re-developed to include more global topics. One of the first assignments in one of the schools was to develop an identity as a global citizen. This theme is carried throughout the four years. At one of the schools I had the opportunity to direct a focus group with a class of seniors in their research class. Students were working on a whole host of topics. When asked, "How do you feel this program has benefited you?" The consensus seemed to be that students were much more aware of the world around them, that they understood all problems were local, even if they were on the other side of the world, and that they were well rounded individuals for their experience. The program challenged their most deep seated convictions about why they believed what they believed. In looking at graduation they all felt they had benefited not just in the education they had received but in the ability to think they had developed, the ability to think globally. One student went as far as to say she felt in conversation with her family and friends that they were sometimes ignorant in their statements. What was

most impressive, and the main element in the restructuring of the magnet program in this doctoral thesis is the development of the senior project. Both programs required a senior project. This project was made up of four steps. The proposal, paper, project, and presentation, these four elements are all student driven. Students select a topic and enlist the help of a mentor, an individual outside of the campus. They then write a proposal paper on the topic. A panel of teachers approves the topic, and then the student writes the paper. The project phase is where a student will do a community service project or an awareness event to tie together the academic with the human. The presentation is made in the spring and allows students to showcase their work.

Several of the elements in the observed schools were included in the plan of action to re-brand the magnet program. Conversations were held with students and parents, as well as the on campus advisory committee to ensure the validity and the buy in for such a shift. Under the new program contract students will be required to complete four years of one language, two semester long courses in global topics, and a senior research class that included the above listed senior research project. Students will also be cohorted into the same English and social studies classes. The district approved the changes and they will be implemented with the next incoming class. The guiding model on the development of the new contract was provided by the programs and state initiatives that were reviewed in chapter two.

A large part of the change in curriculum is because as the leader of the program I have been a catalyst for change. And the campus leader understands the dynamic of

making a magnet successful. A long term vision is necessary to foresee over time what a program is capable of and what it can accomplish. Alan Hess said,

“I think the magnet program coordinator needs to be visionary and a detail person, which is a rare bird. I had the details in hand, the vision, not so much. I knew there needed to be value added to the magnet experience for the students, but was not in the job long enough to work on that vision to the extent I knew I needed. The coordinator also needs to be creative in finding ways to connect with students, since he does not interact with most of them on any given day. (A.Hess, research journal entry, March 20, 2011)

What Alan says here has proven to be true in my own experience as the coordinator. I recognize in myself that I am a big picture guy. I know that I am the one who looks four years down the road and sees what can become of the program. But to look at every detail to know every name, and language a student is taking is a task for me. I have been able to connect with student through events, and the student government.

On the topic of leadership Alan stated,

I think decisions about the magnet program should be made primarily by the coordinator, working directly and closely with the principal. Too many cooks spoil the broth. The advisory board is a good for providing an occasional check and balance but it should not be the main vehicle of decision making. Likewise, it is good to gather input from student and the parents, and avenues now exist for that input to occur (A.Hess, research journal entry, March 20, 2011).

The relationship between Alan and myself has been a good professional relationship. It is through this relationship that I have had the greatest sounding board for the development and re-visualization of the magnet program. The decision to broaden the scope of the magnet program was made at the district level but carried out entirely at the campus level. The magnet program has changed in the last year in its presence on campus, and student self-association. The presence of the magnet program has been more obvious on campus. This is not only due to an increase in numbers but in the fact that in this third year of the program we have 11th graders. As upperclassmen that have started to take on leadership roles on campus, be it student council, or leadership in athletics. This has made the program a more visible part of the campus through the students. Tying in with this is the second point. Students self-identifying with pride that they are magnet program students, now that the program has student leadership there is a venue to give voice to the magnet program students.

Conclusion

In Chapter 4, we have experienced the boundaries of narrative inquiry. The interaction between the researcher and the broader community, the continuity of the narrative as the magnet program was started, developed, re-developed, and the situations of the connections between the co-researchers and the campus, the co-researchers and the curriculum, the co-researchers and the department and the campus. A better understanding of how the course offering at the comprehensive high school are affected by the magnet program are relevant and presented in the next chapter. These relationships push the boundaries of formalistic research because this research is made up of

experience that is not quantifiable, but lived and relived. As the primary researcher I also understand that I do not take myself out of the equation because I am embedded and I am a catalyst for change in a leadership position. The narratives in this research are only theirs and hold unique qualities that are not reproducible in a lab, a database, or in real life. That does not limit the power of their usefulness in creating narrative truth. It develops a verbal picture of what works and what does not. A picture of not what will hold true every time in a magnet program is started, but what may hold true, and what has worked in other context and situations. The relationships the researchers hold with each other informs their perspectives, and their perspectives agree. This agreement strengthens the validity of the claims to narrative knowledge that are made here. All three of the co-researchers were in different places during this research. I came into the storied flow when Alan was removing himself as the program leader, and Ashley was not teaching on the campus at that point in time. The co-researchers were at different career points. For Ashley it was moving to a new campus and learning a new department and curriculum. For Alan it was moving back to the classroom where he really wanted to be and, for me, it was a move into an administrative position where I wanted to make a difference.

Having presented the story in chapter four I now proceed to chapter five where I will draw implications in the categories of community, curriculum, and change, discuss the storied flow of the research, reflect on the research methodology, and speak to the effect of this research on myself, Alan, and Ashley, as well as the magnet program as a whole. In conclusion I will discuss what future research in this field and research site hold for me

Chapter Five

Follow effective action with quiet reflection. From the quiet reflection will come even more effective action. Peter F. Drucker

This doctoral thesis has been a journey through the short life of a new magnet program. On this journey many different narratives, experiences, and issues related to the development and re-development of the magnet program have been the topic of scrutiny. In addition, the three main elements of chapter four delved deeper into the issues that have both hindered and helped the growth and continued development of the magnet program. The three elements were community, curriculum, and change. Here, in chapter five, we will once again look at these three elements to determine what narrative truth can be gleaned from the experiences and narratives of the co-researchers embedded in the magnet program and research site.

The end in mind when writing this thesis was to produce useful knowledge on how to best approach the development of a magnet program from the very start, this is emphasized by the fact that this program has re-developed its structure and curriculum in such a short period of time from the beginning.

Review

In chapter one the context and researchers were presented. In chapter two a literature review was completed to provide a historical backdrop for the magnet program, the curriculum, and the experience of teachers and leaders in other magnet programs. Chapter three presented the methodology used for this research. In chapter four the results of the research were presented. Three elements of the magnet program are presented in chapter four. The three elements are community, curriculum, and change.

Implications

In providing consistency with the information presented in chapter four the three elements reviewed in chapter four provide the best framework for drawing knowledge claims that can be useful in future development of magnet programs. When using community, curriculum, and change as the lenses for magnet program development a starting program can better plan for and implement a successful program.

Community

One of the most difficult things to do in the process of creating a magnet program is building community. There are some very clear and common disadvantages working against the creation of community in a magnet school program. The first disadvantage is distance. Most of the students in a magnet program live outside of the attendance zone for the schools they are attending. This creates problems in the process of creating community because parents are not able to make events as often, or because a student lives so far away their only option is to ride the bus after school because they have no way of getting home otherwise. I experienced this fact in the establishment of the parent

volunteer organization. The parent that volunteered to run the program was not from the feeder pattern even though most of the parents present were. This led to some confusion in the development of the parent organization since in the majority of cases in a feeder pattern the parents know each other from the elementary school on up. The second common disadvantage is that students coming from other zoned middle schools do not know the students that have been together for most of their educational careers in the feeder pattern. In the first year survey administered by the district a student noted, "I think it would be best if all magnet students could be together in one class, and have one class dedicated to them." Another student said, "We should have magnet only classes." This suggestion has been implemented with the next incoming class. A mentor program has been established to facilitate the move to a new school. The advantage of this is that all incoming magnet program students will know each other, and know they are outsiders in their first year and have a common bond because of it. These factors also affect parents. Parents that are members of the parent support group often do not know each other since they do not come from the same areas of the district. These are things that can be overcome with good communication but do require parents to be aware of the opportunities to volunteer on campus. The core of the parent volunteer group is made up of parents that are zoned to the high school and do know each other. To create community, students, parents, and teachers must be included. In the case of the magnet program in this thesis, this was done in three ways. The students created community by creating their own student government. One student in the first year survey, before the implementation of the student government stated, "The program should work on their relationship with the students in the program, so that students could let them know what

to change. The purpose of the organization was to provide social opportunities, volunteer opportunities, and public outreach to the magnet program students. In this way, students not only have a voice but the responsibility of leading their own committees in the larger magnet program. Community was built with parents by the creation of a parent volunteer organization. The purpose of the organization being twofold, first, the organization provides the magnet program with volunteers for all social and school related events. Second, the parent volunteer organization raises funds for magnet program events. Unofficially the program also acts as a parent focus group for the magnet program. One parent told me, "I am so glad you are part of this program you have done so much in the time you have been here." (E.Crowell, personal communication, September 24, 2010)

The third way community is created is in the involvement of the teachers and the broader campus. This is an ongoing relationship that involves communication between the leadership and the advisory board on a continual basis. The advisory board in the course of the magnet program in this thesis has been instrumental in the decision making and re-branding process. The advisory board meets once a quarter, and I always have items I need feedback from them on. Recently, it has been the re-branding of the curriculum. They have been instrumental in decision making. Alan stated, "Under your leadership there has been teacher input through my membership in the advisory committee and through our many informal conversations." (A.Hess, research journal entry, February 16, 2011) In a nutshell, each of these three groups is crucial to the development of a sound and integrated community.

The second element addressed is curriculum. There are two different topics in the case of curriculum; there are the individual co-researchers experiences and the case of the re-branding of the entire curriculum for the magnet program. In the case of the first example the two teachers that acted as researchers have had very different experiences with their curriculum. Let's address the first case. Alan Hess writes and enacts his own curriculum. He does this because in his content area he is a single teacher and does not have to plan with any other teachers. This of course allows him a great deal of creativity in how he implements his curriculum, and what and how he decides to teach. Alan has expressed in his journals and in person that this is his preference, and that he would not like the responsibility of planning with other teachers. The result in his particular program has been a very good one. He has a high participation rate in his program and many students go beyond the two years of required foreign language. Ashley Johnson teaches curriculum that has not been well received by teachers who believe focus on speaking and real life scenarios are less important than grammar and rote memorization. Added to this difficulty is the fact that Ashley is working with a group of teachers that represent near six decades of combined experience, and a "we don't do it that way here" mentality prevails. This has made the process of assimilation into a new department and curriculum even more difficult for Ashley. This has led to a 'mind you own business mentality' in the department. It is common knowledge in the broader context of the campus and the community that the teachers in the content Ashley teaches in could be described as less-than-flexible, and less-than-willing to teach outside of the lecture/textbook format. The implication of this outcome is that things must change in planning for Ashley's level in order to improve the quality of teacher cohesion and

instruction. The truth is as the leader of the department and as the “outsider,” meaning I do not run their planning meetings, I do not see much hope for change with the teachers that are in the content that Ashley is in. They have no desire to change and are convinced that their way of instruction, that is really just a series of exercises out of the text book, is the best possible instructional method. One of the teachers from the team actually made the statement, “These kids are so smart that if you throw them in a room with a dictionary they will come out speaking the language in a year.” This, of course, begs the question, why do we need you then? The solution is to have new teachers that want to teach in the magnet program that don’t come with pre-conceived notions that language has to be taught in only one way. The magnet program needs to be able to select the teachers for the program, not just incorporate the teachers that are assigned to the campus. The solution is change. The program needs more teachers like Ashley and Alan. But due to redistribution of teachers this year, Ashley sadly will not even be a magnet teacher next year. She will be moved to another campus. This will be the second year in a row that she has been transferred. She will never be the same. What she has invested of herself in the program must feel like a loss to her. The friendships she has built are changed forever when she moves away, even if she returns once again. Every time she is moved to another campus she learns to give a little less of herself to her work. She learns to care a little less about her work, after all she thinks, “They will just move me again next year.” This saddens me greatly as the leader of the program. I see a good teacher transferred and my campus administration and I are powerless to stop it. The district limits me from doing what is in the best interest of the students, and what is best for the teacher and in the process de-humanizes the teacher. Ashley will be moved from one school to another

based on a draft system. She has no voice and was given no option of where she would like to go; she was drafted, as if she were a nineteen year old during the height of the Vietnam War. Her name with many other teachers was drawn from a pool, and then assigned to that campus. She was excluded from making her own campus decision and presented generically, reduced to a name in a bowl.

The change in curriculum was based on the two existing magnet programs in other states that currently teach a global studies focus and not just a world language focus. It was also in part based on my own personal experience growing up in a foreign country and realizing that the curriculum in the high schools I have taught in have little or no global themes. Growing up across the street from an ancient Inca burial ground will open one's eyes to more than U.S History and economics. The first change in the curriculum was the cohort of students. This is a theme that has repeatedly been brought up by the students. In the first year survey one student stated, "It is a good idea to have magnet program students in a class together." Another student in the same survey suggested, "You could separate the magnet program students so they can get a more rigorous work load". In the Tallwood and North Cobb programs students attend English and social studies courses together. This cohorting provides two distinct benefits. First, it creates community. Students that are currently in the magnet program do not even know other students in the program because they have never had to be in the same classes together. In the first year survey administered by the district, "Only half of the magnet program students (50%) and about half of the parents (54.5%) agreed with the statement that the magnet program fosters a closer personal connection among magnet program

students.” By the second year survey that number had dropped to 28% for 10th graders and only came in at 42% for the 9th graders. By putting program students together they will know each other, and the added benefit of competition will be evident. Many of the students in the magnet program are labeled as gifted and talented students. The in class competition and mutual academic support will be beneficial for the magnet program students. The second benefit is placing student together in the English and social studies classes will allow for the teachers and the leadership to develop global topics and projects within the existing core classes. An example of this would be the book, *To Kill a Mocking Bird*, this book is taught in freshman English. Instead of using the book to only focus on social justice in the place/time it occurred it can be used as a springboard to topics that are current social justice topics. The second change in the curriculum is students will be required two, semester courses in their sophomore year. These classes will both be global topics courses developed on campus. The focus of the first semester course will be the global economics, conglomerates, professions, expatriation, career paths, and colleges focused on the career paths students show interest in. The course in the second semester will be AP Human Geography, a course that focuses on human migration up to present day. In the senior year students will take a senior research course. This course will focus on a topic of the student's choosing that has a global connection. Students will write and present on the topic they select. Every class students take in the program moves them toward their final paper, and the culmination of their academic experience in high school. Table one below is a comparison chart for the current course requirements and the new curriculum requirements.

Table One:

Graduating Year	2012	2013	2014	2015
World Language Requirement	Four years of one language	Three years of a primary language and two years of a secondary language	Three years of a primary language and two years of a secondary language	Four years of one language
Global Course Requirement	AP Human Geography	AP Human Geography or Global Business	AP Human Geography or Global Business	AP Human Geography, Global Topics, Global Research Capstone, Magnet Program, ELA, and Social studies all four years.

Curriculum is one of the keys to a successful magnet program. Parents and students can get the four core classes and a selection of electives at any school; they can participate in a whole slate of extracurricular activities without having to leave their local schools.

What a magnet offers is a better option. Magnet programs offer, better instruction, specialized curriculum, and better overall academics and options that the local school may not have.

Change

The third element is change. Many magnet programs as a matter of public knowledge function as a way to get into a particular high school. They function to meet court ordered desegregation acts that date back many years. They act as a way for a district to claim they are offering option to students, but they do not often act as they were envisioned. As Alan mentioned to me early on, “This program was started too

quickly, without teacher input.” (E.Crowell, personal communication, January 22, 2010)

Much of the literature on educational leadership is applicable at the magnet program level. There are many similarities between the school leadership and magnet program leadership.

In many cases, they are one in the same if the magnet program is the school. But even in cases where the magnet program is embedded in a school the program leader shoulders a similar responsibility in leadership. And it is often the case that turnaround, the restructuring, the re-branding, or the simple re-naming is an act if not carried out by at least instigated by the program leadership, either alone or in conjunction with the campus leadership will not happen. Schools that are low performing simply do not change. They do not from one year to the next simply improve dramatically. Their reputation in the community is not suddenly a good one, and their test scores do not improve from one year to the next, at least not in any dramatic fashion. The change is gradual and if it is to be permanent must include the stakeholders. In every case where there has been school improvement, there has been a leader that has set things in motion. By leader I do not mean exclusively an administrator but an individual inside or outside of the school. Leadership in a magnet program must act as a catalyst for improvement, and empowerment. The magnet program described in this doctoral thesis was started on a short timeline, with little faculty input, and no community consensus. What is happening with the fourth class entering in fall 2011 is what should have started from the start of the program, a curriculum that is relevant, and rigorous. A faculty that is empowered and excited about what doors the magnet program will allow them to open as teachers. In the

case of this program I in conjunction with campus leadership, and the program advisory board formulated and are carrying out a new curriculum. Much like the teacher setting the tone in the classroom the leadership of the campus and the program set the tone and the focus of the magnet program.

I think a note about my own leadership style is helpful in understating the way this program has developed over the course of the last year. At the time I took the coordinator job I happened to be enrolled in a course for education leadership. As part of the course I took a leadership styles test. I scored very high on the collaborative leader measure. I think in retrospect that this was a sign of how I envision the role of a leader. I also think that my instructional methods were also very collaborative. As a teacher I spent a great deal of time teaching my students how to work in groups, and do presentation to the whole class. Looking even farther back in my own history I have always performed better in environments where others depend on me. This was the case in my military service, and in several of my teaching roles, and it is definitely the case in my current role. With the student government, the parent volunteer group, and the campus advisory board, I have strived to include all of the stakeholders in the conversation on how to improve the magnet program. This is so important to the development process, the sense of community, and the overall organizational health of a magnet program. What people feel ownership in they support, what they feel excluded from they often do not support. I have been pleased with the outcome. When you include more voices in decision making it is always inevitably a messier process, it is also a more

productive process. In my experience, when you give everyone a voice and they feel heard then you are able to create ownership among many more people.

In conclusion, it is possible to glean three main points from the experience of Alan, Ashley and myself in the Global Languages Magnet Program. These points involve narrative truths, truths that have been arrived at through knowing through relationships, fully aware of the formalistic boundaries, but also aware of the truth of lived experience and the value it holds beyond statistics, and formalistic frameworks. Truth is what one knows objectively something that is always the case. Narrative truth is truth through life. It is truth that is formed by the awareness of individual and corporate stories. A narrative truth arrived at in this doctoral thesis is that teacher ownership of curriculum makes a difference in a teacher's sense of efficacy. In comparing Alan and Ashley we can see that Alan is much happier with his curriculum and lesson planning process than Ashley. This is a truth because it is true for Ashley but it is not true in all cases at all times.

First, community is key. This takes on many forms the relationship between individuals and other individuals, the individual to the campus, and individuals to the program. It also, takes on the relationship between the program and the campus. All of these elements and relational configurations hold an important piece of the puzzle that make the magnet program work. Students must have voice and ownership, parents must have the same. Teachers must be part of ongoing development. In the case of a magnet program that focuses on global studies the development is ongoing since the topics continue to change.

Second, curriculum is crucial. Parents and students can go anywhere for an education. Why should they want to be in any particular program? Beyond the host campus what does a magnet program have to offer students? Curriculum is the main answer. It gives students the chance to focus on a particular topic, or area of interest, but it has to be more than that. It has to include the liberty and flexibility for students to pursue their particular areas of interest. In the case of this magnet program students create their own areas of research interest and follow through on them in their final year senior paper.

Third, change is necessary and ongoing. In today's society and global age the days of colonialism are over. Students must continually be prepared for career fields that may not even exist. The world changes on a daily basis and the global studies programs that want to stay relevant must focus on constant change, and adaptation of the subject matter. Change must also be carried out not only in what is taught but how it is taught. Creative technology can be used to erase borders and oceans, and software can assist in removing language barriers. Students must understand they are responsible not just as citizens of a nation but of a globe, and the problems that exist in the world today will be solved by their generation.

These claims of truth are not exclusive or exhaustive. The nature of narrative truth (Spence, 1982) is that it is just that, subjective to the individual or corporate narrative from which it is derived. In the case of this thesis the truth is derived from observation,

conversation, and journals. Often times the information and observations are carried out and collected outside of a formalistic framework. It is always carried out with awareness of the social, temporal, and contextual boundaries of the environment being studied.

What can be useful to policy makers, teachers, and school and program leaders is the experience in the case of this one magnet program. The contribution of this doctoral thesis is that by using the community, curriculum, change framework developing programs will be better able to develop to be successful from the inception of the program. The lesson in the magnet is that if you do not start it with attention to this framework it will not self correct. You have to have community, and curriculum, and you must always be willing and ready to embrace change. There is no guarantee that this will be the experience of every magnet program or even most magnet programs, but many who have had the experiences in this thesis will agree with it, and many that follow in the development and establishment of magnet programs will also agree with these conclusions.

The implication for future research is to focus on the effects of bureaucracy on magnet schools, the constraints on hiring decisions, curriculum creation, and overall development. In the current fiscal environment in education nationwide it is a fair question to ask, why do we need magnet schools? As the literature review noted magnets were a way to implement desegregation. To some degree this has been magnet programs purpose up until the current day. But given the lack of district and financial support they receive in many districts; are they just a cover so districts can claim they are offering specialized educational opportunities? Are magnets just political

pawns in the policy of states and the nation? Should schools focus on a strong global curriculum for all students, and not just the students in magnet program with that theme? I would answer a resounding yes. The trend today is charter schools. Magnet programs may someday become a thing of the educational past. They have served, for the most part, the desegregation mission. This is the research implication. It is necessary to take a broader look and to compare magnets and charters that have specific comparable themes. It is also necessary to understand from a policy perspective why charters are preferred over magnets, and what are the distinctions between the two? Instructionally the research points to the question, what is happening in a charter that is not happening in a magnet? Or what advantage does a charter have instructionally?

This research has been the most productive exercise in my career as an educator. Never before have I gone through the steps to think so deeply about the interconnectedness of people on a campus to each other and their students. It has led me to realize the power of relationships. One of the greatest struggles I had was in resisting the need to evaluate teachers with a critical eye but to let them tell where they saw themselves in the story of the magnet program. I had to turn off my inclination to assign them a role, or an experience but to listen to them instead with an objective ear. Without the three or four strong relationships that Ashley has forged in her first year as a teaching in the magnet program she would have had a very different reaction to the department planning and curriculum issues. If Alan had not been so open to share with me the shortcomings of the program when I first started the job I would have spent much more time in gathering information I needed to move the program forward. The methodology

of this research has changed my epistemological view of Truth, to an acceptance of truths that can co-exist in the muddy water of human relationships. In the future I will revisit this research, as the new curriculum is implemented, and new students have a different experience from their predecessors. I want to know if the objective of providing a global education is met, and what the students choose to do with it, how it affects their outlook on life, if they in turn see value in referring others to the program. My hope is that this research can act as a guide to other global studies programs that look to develop in the future, and that those programs will be able to integrate community, curriculum, and change into their focus. As for Alan, Ashley, and me, we are in it for the students and for the love of making a difference in each of our students' lives.

References

- North Cobb School for International Studies. (n.d.). *North Cobb School for International Studies*. Retrieved November 7, 2010, from <http://www.nchsmagnet.com/>
- Atkinson, B. (2010). Teachers responding to narrative inquiry: an approach to a narrative inquiry criticism. *Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 91-102.
- Campbell, W. J., Baikaloff, N., & Power, C. (2006). *Towards a global community educating for tomorrow's world: global strategic directions for the Asia-Pacific region*. Dordrecht : Springer.
- Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Clandinin, J., Murphy, S., Huber, J., & Orr, A. (2010). Negotiating Narrative Inquiries: Living in a Tension-Filled Midst. *The Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 81-90.
- Clandinin, J., & Janice, H. (2002). Narrative inquiry: Toward understanding life's artistry. *Curriculum Inquiry, 32*(2), 162-169.
- Conle, C. (2000). Thesis as narrative or "What is the Inquiry in Narrative Inquiry?". *Curriculum Inquiry, 30*, 190-214.
- Connelly, M., & Clandinin, J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *American Educational Research Association, 19*(5), 2-14.
- Costandi, S. (2010). Meandering through my epistemological patchwork quilt: A narrative inquiry of my landscape of learning. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education, 60*, 86-99.

- Craig, C. (2010). Research on the boundaries: Narrative inquiry in the midst of organized school reform. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 123-136.
- Craig, C. (2009). Learning about reflection through exploring narrative inquiry. *Reflective Practice*, 10(1), 105-116.
- Desegregation in Dallas Schools. (n.d.). *Dallas Morning News*. Retrieved November 7, 2010, from www.dallasnews.com/sharedcontent/dws/news/localnews/125th/newsevents/stories/080610dnmetdesegtimeline.2a683817.html
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*, . New York: Minton, Balch & Company.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education* . New York: McMillian.
- Dewey, J. (2009/1930). *Democracy and education: an introduction to the philosophy of education..* Charleston, SC,: Forgotten Books.
- Diaz, C. F., Massialas, B. G., & Xanthopoulos, J. (1999). *Global perspectives for educators* . Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eisenhart, M. (2001). Educational ethnography past, present, and future: ideas to think with . *Educational Researcher*, 30(8), 16-27.
- Estes, N., Levine, D. U., & Waldrup, D. R. (1990). *Magnet schools: recent developments and perspectives*. Austin, Tex.: Morgan Print. & Pub..
- Freiberg, H. J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Universal teaching strategies* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson/A & B.
- Friedman, L. (2004). *Brown v. Board: the landmark oral argument before the Supreme Court*. New York: New Press :.

- Gaskell, J. (2002). Creating school choice: The politics of curriculum, equity and teachers' Work. *Canadian Public Policy*, 28(1), 41-50.
- Global Studies Academy at Tallwood High School. (n.d.). *Welcome - Tallwood High School, Virginia Beach, Virginia*. Retrieved November 7, 2010, from <http://www.tallwoodhs.vbschools.com/global.htm>
- Gomora, A. (1996). Student achievement in public magnet, public comprehensive, and private city high schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 18(1), 1-18.
- Gore, E. (2005). A place to belong: student agency in the social capital of a magnet high School. *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 20(4), 271-297.
- Hands, C. (2010). Why collaborate? The differing reasons for secondary school educators'. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(2), 187-207.
- Hausman, C. (2000). Principal role in magnet schools: transformed or entrenched. *Journal of Education Administration*, 38(1), 25-39.
- Hausman, C., & Goldring, E. (2000). School community in different magnet program structures. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 11(1), 80-102.
- Hendry, P. (2010). Narrative as inquiry. *Journal of Educational Research*, 103, 72-80.
- Jose, P., & Pryor, J. (2010). New Zealand youth benefit from being connected to their family, school, peer group and community. *Youth Studies Australia*, 29(29), 30-37.
- Kim, J. (2008). A Romance with narrative inquiry. *Curriculum and Teaching Dialogue*, 10, 251-267.

- Kim, J., & Latta, M. (2010). Narrative inquiry: seeking relations as modes of interactions. *Journal of Educational Research, 103*, 69-71.
- Kuhn, T. S., & Kuhn, T. S. (1996). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (3. ed.). Chicago: The University Of Chicago Press.
- Lee, V., Derick, R., & Smith, J. (1991). The effect of the social organization of schools on teachers' efficacy and satisfaction. *Sociology in Education, 64*(2), 190-208.
- Lyons, N., & LaBoskey, V. K. (2002). *Narrative inquiry in practice: Advancing the knowledge of teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Mazano, Kathleen (2005), N.C to open four international studies school. *Education Week, 24*(43), 12-13.
- Mazano, K., Diegmueller, K. (2005) Groups promote global studies in curriculum. *Education Week, 25*(25) 5.
- Maynes, M. J., Pierce, J. L., & Laslett, B. (2008). *Telling stories: the use of personal narratives in the social sciences and history*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Metz, M. H. (2003). *Different by design: the context and character of three magnet schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Moss, G., Springer, T., & Dehr, K. (2008). Guided reflection protocol as narrative inquiry and teacher professional development. *Reflective Practice, 9*(4), 497-508.
- NASFA. (2003). Securing americas future: global education for a global age. *Report of the Strategic Task Force on Education Abroad, 1*(1), 1-18.
- Rule, A., & Kyle, P. (2009). Community-building in a diverse setting. *Early Childhood Education, 36*, 291-295.

Smrekar, C., & Goldring, E. B. (1999). *School choice in urban America: magnet schools and the pursuit of equity*. New York: Teachers College Press.

State Initiatives | Longview Foundation. (n.d.). *Longview Foundation*. Retrieved November 7, 2010, from <http://www.longviewfdn.org/120/state-initiatives.html>

Swain, S. S. (1998). Studying teachers' transformations: reflection as methodology. *The Clearing House*, 1(Sep-Oct), 28-34.

Varaki, B. (2007). Narrative inquiry in educational research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 8(1), Art 4. .

World Affairs Council. (n.d.). *World Affairs Council*. Retrieved November 7, 2010, from <http://www.world-affairs.org/>