

Instruction of Diverse Students in Mainstream Classrooms

Sau Hou Chang

Indiana University Southeast

Citation: Chang, S. H. (2013). Instruction of diverse students in mainstream classrooms. In S. Abebe (Ed.), *Diversity in the classroom: Integrated framework beyond chalk and talk* (pp. 223-246). Ronkonkoma, NY: Linus Books.

Abstract

This chapter focuses on the instruction of diverse students in mainstream classrooms. The first part summarizes academic achievement of diverse students from different ethnicity, gender, language and social class. The second part discusses the characteristics of different diverse instruction. The third part suggests specific instructional strategies for diverse students.

Keywords: diverse students, instructional strategies

Instruction of Diverse Students in Mainstream Classrooms

A Short Thesis

Traditional instruction adopts the philosophy of “one-size-fits-all.” However, the academic achievements of diverse students suggest that traditional instruction does not work for all students.

Introduction

School has a tremendous influence on students’ perception of diversity. The administration, curriculum, instruction, and assessment of schools reflect how schools make decisions on diversity issues, how schools respond to challenges of diversity, how schools improve the learning of diverse students, and how schools accommodate the needs of diverse students. The manner in which the school enacts its values about diversity through administration, curriculum, instruction, and assessment shapes the students’ perceptions about diversity.

With an increasing diverse population in today’s classroom, this chapter focuses on the instruction of diverse students in mainstream classrooms. There are four types of diverse students which in the last twenty years have attracted more attention from the National Center for Educational Statistics (Aud et al., 2010). First, between 1988 and 2008, the percentage of U.S. public school students who were White decreased from 68 to 55%, but the percentage of Hispanic students doubled from 11 to 22%. Second, in 2008, there was a higher percentage of males than females dropouts (10 vs. 8%). Third, between 1979 and 2008, the number of U.S. school-age children (aged 5-17) who spoke a language other than English at home increased from 9 to 21% of the population in this age range. Fourth, in 2007-2008, approximately 20% of elementary and 6% of secondary school students attended high-poverty public schools where

75% or more of the students are eligible for free or reduced-price meals. Therefore, this chapter focuses on diverse students from different ethnicity groups, gender, language, and social class.

The first part summarizes the academic achievements of these diverse students. The second part discusses the characteristics of diverse instructions. The last part suggests specific instructional strategies for these diverse students.

The Academic Achievements of Diverse Students

Ethnicity

According to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), there were achievement gaps among different ethnicity groups in both 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics in 2009 in U.S. schools (Aud et al., 2010, see Table 1). Asian/Pacific Islander students scored higher on average than White, Black, Hispanic, and American Indian/Alaska Native students at grade 4 and grade 8 reading and mathematics. The academic achievements of students of color, African American and Latino Americans, were below those of Asian/Pacific Islander and White.

Table 1

The Average Reading and Mathematics Scale Scores of 4th- and 8th-Grade Students by Ethnicity

Ethnicity	Reading		Mathematics	
	4 th Grade	8 th Grade	4 th Grade	8 th Grade
White	230	273	248	293
Black	205	246	222	261
Hispanic	205	249	227	266
Asian/Pacific Islander	235	274	255	301
American Indian/Alaska Native	204	251	225	266

Gender

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), in the school year 2007-2008, the average high-school dropout rate for U. S. students in 49 States was 4.1%, but

the rate for males was one percentage point higher than for females (Stillwell, 2010; see Table 2). Swanson (2008) examined the 2003-2004 high-school graduation rates in the school districts serving the nation's 50 most-populous cities as well as the larger metropolitan areas in which they were situated. He found that the average high-school graduation rate was 69.9%, but the rate for males was eight percentage points lower than for females (see Table 2). The scores of males on specific abilities tend to be more variable in general, so there are more males than females with very high and very low scores on tests (Halpern et al., 2007; Willingham & Cole, 1997). Boys seemed to struggle more at schools than their female counterparts.

Table 2

The High-School Dropout and Graduation Rates by Gender

Gender	Dropout Rate	Graduation Rate
All Students	4.1%	69.9%
Male	4.6%	66.0%
Female	3.5%	73.6%

Language

According to Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) coordinated by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), an intergovernmental organization of industrialized countries, U.S. 15-year-old students who spoke another language at home scored lower in reading, mathematics, and science literacy in 2009 than those students who spoke English at home (Fleischman, Hopstock, Pelczar, & Shelley, 2010; see Table 3). English language learners (ELLs) scored below the overall OECD and U.S. average, whereas students who spoke English at home scored above the overall OECD and U.S. average.

Table 3

The Average Scores of Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) by Language

	Reading	Mathematics	Science
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)	493	496	501
U.S.	500	487	502
Students speaking English at home	506	493	508
English Language Learners (ELLs)	471	460	469

Social Class

The Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) also showed that U.S. 15-year-old students in schools with 75% or more eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (FRPL) scored lower in reading, mathematics, and science literacy in 2009 than those students in schools with less than 10% eligible for FRPL (Fleischman, Hopstock, Pelczar, & Shelley, 2010; see Table 4). Students in schools with 75% or more eligible for FRPL scored below the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and U.S. average, whereas students in schools with less than 10% eligible for FRPL scored above the overall OECD and U.S. average.

Table 4

The Average Scores of Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) by Social Class

	Reading	Mathematics	Science
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD)	493	496	501
U.S.	500	487	502
Schools with less than 10% free or reduced-price lunch	551	545	557
Schools with at least 75% free or reduced-price lunch	446	434	442

One Size Does Not Fit All

The academic achievements of diverse students debunk the assumption that effective instruction for mainstream students will benefit all students. In fact, the “one-size-fits-all” approach was found to be ineffective in delivering science education for African American students (Mutegi, 2011), solving subtraction problems for girls (Timmermans, Van Lieshout, & Verhoeven, 2007), guiding literacy instruction for linguistically different students (Reyes, 1992), and learning algebra for students of lower socioeconomic status (Hill, 2010). Au and Kawakami (1994) suggested that ineffective practices are those that devalue the home language or dialect, rely too heavily on classroom recitation, fail to recognize community variations in styles of narration and questioning, and ignore peer group dynamics. Gay (2000) proposed that when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, they are more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and are learned more easily and thoroughly.

Students of diverse backgrounds will have better learning opportunities if classroom instruction is conducted in a manner congruent with the culture of their homes. Next, I will discuss three instructional approaches designed to provide support for students who may not succeed in mainstream classrooms. Cultural Relevant Pedagogy (CRP) and Culturally Responsive Teaching (CRT) are a collection of best teaching practices to enhance the academic success of students who are culturally different in classroom settings (Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2009). Differentiated instruction (DI) is academic instruction provided to children with mixed ability in general education classrooms (Tomlinson, 2001).

Cultural Relevant Pedagogy

After studying the best practices of teaching African American students, Ladson-Billings developed her ideas of culturally relevant pedagogy (CRP). Ladson-Billings (2009, p. 20) defined culturally relevant pedagogy as “a pedagogy that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes.” To explain what cultural referents meant, she gave an example of how a fifth-grade teacher taught the U.S. Constitution. The teacher might discuss the bylaws and articles of incorporation that were used to organize a local church so that students learned the significance of such documents in forming institutions, and learned that their own people were institution-builders.

There are three propositions of CRP (Ladson-Billings, 1995). First, students must experience academic success. Students must develop their academic skills, such as literacy, numeracy, technological, social, and political skills. Culturally relevant teachers attend to students’ academic needs, challenge students to demonstrate academic power, and assist students to achieve academic excellence. One example provided by Ladson-Billings was about a teacher who recognized the social power of African American boys and challenged the boys to demonstrate academic power by drawing on issues and ideas they found meaningful.

Second, students must develop and/or maintain cultural competence. Culturally relevant teachers use students’ culture as a vehicle for learning. Ladson-Billings (1995) provided two examples. One example was about a teacher who allowed her second grade students to bring in samples of lyrics from rap songs and discussed literal and figurative meanings as well as technical aspects of poetry such as rhyme scheme, alliteration, and onomatopoeia. Another example was about a teacher who invited a parent to teach students how to make sweet potato

pies and then apprenticed the students in becoming entrepreneurs by requiring students to devise a marketing plan for selling pies.

Third, students must develop a critical consciousness through which they challenge the status quo of the current social order. One example provided by Ladson-Billings (1995) was about a teacher whose students wrote letters to the editor of the local newspaper to inform the community of the situation that their textbooks were out of date and the system of inequitable funding allowed middle-class students to have newer textbooks.

From a meta-analysis of 45 classroom-based research on the implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy, Morrison, Robbins and Rose (2008) were able to synthesize what teachers could do to put the three propositions into practice in classrooms. There are five actions teachers can use to assist students to achieve the first proposition of academic success: offering intensive modeling, scaffolding, and clarification of the challenging curriculum; using students' strengths as instructional starting points; investing in and taking personal responsibility for students' successes; creating and nurturing cooperative environments; and having high behavioral expectations. There are three actions teachers can use to encourage the second proposition of cultural competence: reshaping the prescribed curriculum, building on students' knowledge, and encouraging relationships between school and communities. Finally, teachers can cultivate the third proposition or students' critical consciousness using three actions: developing critical literacy through questioning, examining, and disputing the power relations between writers and readers; engaging students in social justice work, making explicit the power dynamics of mainstream society; and sharing power in the classroom.

Culturally Responsive Teaching

From her studies on underachieving African, Asian, Latino and Native American students, Geneva Gay (2000, p. 29) developed and defined culturally responsive teaching (CRT) as “using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them.” Students are encouraged to learn by building on the experiences, knowledge, and skills they bring to the classroom. Teachers are encouraged to acknowledge students’ cultural heritages; build bridges of meaningfulness between home and school experiences; use a wide variety of instructional strategies that are connected to different learning styles; teach students to know and praise their own and others cultural heritages; and incorporate multicultural information in all the subjects.

There are five essential elements of culturally responsive teaching. The first element is developing a knowledge base about cultural diversity (Gay, 2002). It includes learning about ethnic groups’ cultural values, traditions, communication, learning styles, contributions, and relational patterns; acquiring the knowledge of detailed factual information about the cultural particularities of specific ethnic groups; and acquiring more knowledge about the contributions of different ethnic groups to a wide variety of disciplines; and developing a deeper understanding of multicultural education theory, research, and scholarship.

The second element is including ethnic and cultural diversity content in the curriculum (Gay, 2002). It includes thorough and critical analyses of how ethnic groups and experiences are presented in mass media and popular culture. Culturally responsive teachers deal directly with controversy; study a wide range of ethnic individuals and groups; contextualize issues within race, class, ethnicity, and gender; and include multiple kinds of knowledge and perspectives.

They ensure that the images displayed in classrooms represent a wide variety of age, gender, time, place, social class, and positional diversity within and across ethnic groups and that they are accurate extensions of what is taught through the formal curriculum.

The third element is demonstrating caring and building learning communities (Gay, 2002). Culturally responsive teachers expect high-level success and diligent work from diverse students, and use students' culture and experiences to expand their intellectual horizons and academic achievement. In addition to the academic caring, culturally responsive teachers understand how conflicts between different work styles may interfere with academic efforts and outcomes, and they understand how to design more communal learning environments. Personal, moral, social, political, cultural, and academic knowledge and skills are taught simultaneously.

The fourth element is communicating with ethnically diverse students (Gay, 2002). The communication styles of different ethnic groups reflect cultural values and shape learning behaviors. Culturally responsive teachers should understand different ethnic groups' patterns of task engagement and organizing ideas so that they are able to modify classroom interactions to better accommodate them.

The fifth element is responding to ethnic diversity in the delivery of instruction (Gay, 2002). Culturally responsive teachers modify instructional strategies, and match instructional techniques to the learning styles of diverse students. They also integrate ethnic and cultural diversity into the most fundamental and high-status aspects of the instructional process on a habitual basis.

Differentiated Instruction

Tomlinson (2001, p.7) described a differentiated classroom as a place where "the teacher proactively plans and carries out varied approaches to content, process, and product in

anticipation of and response to student differences in readiness, interest, and learning needs.”

Teachers use assessment data to support modification of curriculum and instruction as a response to students’ entry points relative to a particular understanding or skill; students’ affinity, curiosity, or passion for a particular topic or skill; and how students learn.

Content refers to materials used to support instructional subject matter. Examples of differentiated instruction strategies for content are: varying reading materials, reorganizing content (describing similarities, categorizing into groups, developing abstract thought), allowing proficient students to skip the acquisition phase and move to the application phase, and varying content according to student interest (Ernest, Heckaman, Thompson, Hull, & Carter, 2011).

Process refers to the ways in which the students engage with the content. Examples of differentiating by process include: varying how much support provided to each child according to his/her need; using graphic organizers, concept maps or charts; using tiered activities centered around the same skills; using centers to allow multi-faceted (using multiple intelligence) learning of content; using student-specific task sheets (agendas) written both for the whole class and for individuals; using manipulatives and hands-on activities; presenting learning through different means and/or mediums (audio-visual, vary text size, color contrasts); and varying time and support for specific tasks (Ernest et al., 2011).

Product refers to the ways in which students demonstrate their understanding of the concepts being learned. Differentiating by product involves the teacher in designing a variety of assessments that allow for the wide range of student ability levels in the classroom. Examples are: allowing students to work alone or in small groups on different products; such as writing a paper, giving a speech, presenting a skit, designing a model, and creating a flyer; that would demonstrate the students’ understanding of the concept being learned; encouraging the creation

of individual products that contain aspects of the assignment; and providing expectations that allow for varying degrees of difficulty, meaning and procedures (Ernest et al., 2011).

To provide a more practical application of differentiated instruction, Tomlinson (2001) identified five guidelines for general education classroom teachers to attain. First, key concepts and generalizations should be focused and presented in such a way that all students have access to engage with, explore, and make meaning of the powerful foundational concepts of academic materials. Second, students should be assessed at the outset of a unit or along the way in the unit so that teachers can adjust their teaching based on the current understandings of the students. Third, critical and creative thinking are emphasized in lesson design so that students at all levels can apply the information to solve problems. Fourth, all students are engaged in a variety of learning tasks so that they can master basic information and use the information to solve problems. This means that tasks must be open-ended with multiple entry points. Fifth, there is a balance between teacher-assigned and student-selected tasks and working arrangements so that students are matched with tasks compatible with their individual learner profile.

Comparison of Traditional Instruction and Diverse Instruction

The above three instructional approaches for diverse learners differ from traditional instruction in a variety of ways. Ford and Whiting (2010, p. 321) compared some structural aspects of traditional, often called colorblind, teaching strategies and culturally responsive/relevant teaching strategies (see Table 5). The teacher-centered traditional structures include: lecture, homogeneous groupings, and individual work. The student-centered culturally responsive/relevant teaching structures include: lecture, debates, discussion, activity, flexible grouping, cooperative learning, and the use of examples, stories, visuals/graphic organizers.

Table 5

Comparison of Traditional/Colorblind Teaching Strategies and Culturally Responsive/Relevant Teaching Strategies

Traditional/Colorblind Teaching Structures and Strategies	Culturally Responsive/Relevant Teaching Structures and Strategies
1. Teaching style dominates; teacher-centered instruction	1. Learning styles dominate; student-centered instruction
2. Lecture is the instructional norm	2. Debates and discussion are an integral part of instruction
3. Lecture then test/assess	3. Lecture, discussion, activity, then assessment
4. Homogeneous grouping prevails based on students' skills	4. Flexible grouping prevails based on students' skills and interests
5. Independence and competition are valued and encouraged among students; individual work and autonomy are promoted	5. Interdependence and cooperative learning are valued and encouraged among students; family-like atmosphere promoted
6. Abstract to concrete instructional style in the teaching process	6. Concrete to abstract instructional style, with examples, stories, visuals/graphic organizers, used to make learning relevant
7. Teacher is the authority; teaching is one way-from teacher to students	7. Teachers have expertise; yet, students can and do learn from each other; teaching is bidirectional-teachers can and must also learn from students; students also learn from each other
8. Student success is student's and/or caregiver's responsibility	8. Student success is shared (e.g., teacher's responsibility, student's responsibility, and caregiver's responsibility); collaboration is essential for students' success

Note. From *Best practices for the inclusive classroom: Scientifically based strategies for success* (p.321), by R. T. Boon and V. G. Spencer (Eds.), 2010, Waco, TX: Prufrock Press. Copyright [2010] by Prufrock. Reprinted with permission.

Tomlinson (1999, p.16) compared the traditional classroom and the differentiated classroom (see Table 6). Teaching in traditional classrooms usually utilizes whole-class instruction to have students memorize the facts and skills of a single text and one type of assessment at the end of learning. Teaching in differentiated classrooms makes use of multiple

materials, various instructional arrangements, and utilizes ongoing, formative assessment that focuses on the whole-class as well as the individual students.

Table 6

Comparison of Traditional Classroom and Differentiated Classroom

Traditional Classroom Structures and Strategies	Differentiated Classroom Structures and Strategies
1. Student differences are masked or acted upon when problematic.	1. Student differences are studied as a basis for planning.
2. Assessment is most common at the end of learning to see “who got it.”	2. Assessment is ongoing and diagnostic to understand how to make instruction more responsive to learner need.
3. A relatively narrow sense of intelligence prevails.	3. Focus on multiple forms of intelligences is evident.
4. A single definition of excellence exists.	4. Excellence is defined in large measure by individual growth from a starting point.
5. Student interest is infrequently tapped.	5. Students are frequently guided in making interest-based learning choices.
6. Relatively few learning profile options are taken into account.	6. Many learning profile options are provided for.
7. Whole-class instruction dominates.	7. Many instructional arrangements are used.
8. Coverage of texts and curriculum guides drives instruction.	8. Student readiness, interest, and learning profile shape instruction.
9. Mastery of facts and skills out-of-context are the focus of learning.	9. Use of essential skills to make sense of and understand key concepts and principles is the focus of learning.
10. Single option assignments are the norm.	10. Multi-option assignments are frequently used.
11. Time is relatively inflexible.	11. Time is used flexibly in accordance with student need.
12. A single text prevails.	12. Multiple materials are provided.
13. Single interpretations of ideas and events may be sought.	13. Multiple perspectives on ideas and events are routinely sought.
14. The teacher directs student behavior.	14. The teacher facilitates students’ skills at becoming more self-reliant learners.
15. The teacher solves problems.	15. Students help other students and the teacher solve problems.
16. The teacher provides whole-class standards for grading.	16. Students work with the teacher to establish both whole-class and individual learning goals.
17. A single form of assessment is often used.	17. Students are assessed in multiple ways.

Note. From *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners* (p.16), by C. A. Tomlinson, 1999, Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum

Development. Copyright [1999] by Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Reprinted with permission.

Specific Instructional Strategies for Diverse Learners

These three instructional approaches provide a framework for teachers to work with diverse students who may not succeed in mainstream classrooms. Some researches have also offered more specific instructional models and strategies for teaching students from different ethnicity groups, gender, language, and social class. Next we offer a glimpse at some of these.

Ethnicity

From his algebra teaching experience at a low-income comprehensive urban high school, Rajagopal (2011) developed the CREATE model of instruction for closing achievement gaps of urban students of color, especially African Americans and Latino Americans (see Table 7). The CREATE model was grounded in three fundamental principles. The first is the belief that classroom teachers command the single greatest impact on student achievement. The second is the conviction that a teacher's race or gender has no bearing on his or her ability to foster success with urban students of color. The final is the belief that all students should be held accountable for their success and that most students can be expected to succeed or show significant progress on standardized exams. Rajagopal's study found that when low-income and mostly African American and Latino urban students were taught using the CREATE model of instruction, they outscored the state averages for high-income and White students on standardized tests of algebra.

Table 7

The CREATE Model of Instruction for Students of Color

CREATE	Strategies
Culturally responsive instruction.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Relationships: Learn about your students' individual cultures; adapt your teaching to the way your students learn; develop a connection with the most challenging students. 2. Curriculum: Teach in a way students can understand; use student-centered stories, vocabulary, and examples; incorporate relatable

	<p>aspects of students' lives.</p> <p>3. Delivery: Establish an interactive dialogue to engage all students; stay within your comfort zone and don't come off as fake; continually interact with students and provide frequent feedback; use frequent questioning as a vehicle to keep students involved.</p>
Rigorous expectations and rewards.	<p>4. Teachers: Take personal responsibility for your students' success; use assessment data to evaluate your own teaching effectiveness; differentiate instruction to raise student achievement.</p> <p>5. Students: Help students establish and internalize measurable goals; create a positive learning environment with few distractions; promote a relationship of trust; develop individual learning contracts with challenging students.</p> <p>6. Rewarding expectations: Create a class culture that rewards student learning; foster a culture of positive feedback; enforce penalties and consequences; reward student success.</p>
Essentials-focused planning.	<p>7. Students' needs: Target and exclusively focus on mastery of essential concepts; create an individualized pacing guide for your students; integrate prerequisite skills into instruction of essential concepts.</p> <p>8. Be flexible: Be prepared to adjust your pacing guide according to your students' needs; provide adequate time for students to demonstrate ability with high-stakes tests.</p>
Assessing for mastery during class.	<p>9. Scaffold instruction: To meet students on familiar academic ground.</p> <p>10. Establish specific measurable, and workable learning objectives.</p> <p>11. Have students teach back important concepts to demonstrate understanding.</p> <p>12. Assign independent exit price assignments to maintain student accountability.</p> <p>13. Ensure independent mastery with exit price assignments.</p> <p>14. Reteach and spiral essential concepts to enforce accountability.</p>
Test models.	<p>15. Avoid the inherent biases of standardized tests with exposure and practice.</p> <p>16. Frequent expose students to test models in the classroom.</p> <p>17. Practice test-taking strategies.</p> <p>18. Help students feel prepared for and comfortable with standardized tests.</p>
Extra one-on-one tutoring for struggling students.	<p>19. Provide additional, individualized tutoring both in and out of class.</p> <p>20. Integrate cooperative work to the classroom with peer-tutoring activities.</p> <p>21. Ensure that students who need help actually receive it.</p> <p>22. Use additional tutoring as a consequence for unacceptable behavior.</p>

The CREATE model was designed to target African American and Latino American students. Feng (1994) also suggested ways for teachers to work with Asian-American students.

First, teachers should familiarize themselves with the values, traditions, and customs of various cultures and learn the migratory conditions specific to each of their students' families. Second, teachers should learn at least a few words of their Asian students' native languages. Third, teachers should encourage parents to help children maintain their native language at home, while the school helps the child attain proficiency in English. Fourth, teachers should base academic expectations on individual ability rather than on stereotypical beliefs. Fifth, teachers should alleviate the disconnections Asian children may experience between school and home. Sixth, teachers should consider peer teaching. Seventh, teachers should utilize the student's natural support system, including family, friends, and the community. Eighth, teachers should avoid assumptions about what the children know when they plan instruction and activities. Ninth, teachers should learn about the Asian population that abides within their school district, and encourage parents to assist one another.

Instructional strategies for students of color focus on incorporating students' cultural background into the curriculum. African-American students may find the lecture or task more interesting if it is related to music or sports. Latino-American students may try harder if teachers show care by providing scaffolding or cognitive input to support their learning. Asian-American students may not be as actively participative as their fellow students, and may need more encouragement to participate in the classroom.

Gender

Combining findings from four large-scale studies about how boys learn best with insights about factors affecting learning in the classroom and anecdotes from teachers, Cleveland (2011) provided a framework to move underachieving boys from a position of perceived weakness toward strength. The purpose of the Pathways to Re-Engagement model (see Table 8) is to:

replace underachieving boys' negative attitudes about learning; reconnect boys to school, learning, and believing in being a competent learner; rebuild learning skills that lead to success in school and in life; and reduce the need for unproductive and distracting behaviors as a means of self-protection. There are three components in this model: pathways, access points and tools. The pathways identify general initial approaches to meeting the needs of underachieving boys. The access points involve choosing more specific, related approaches that might be most effective. The tools provide classroom-based interventions and strategies that address specific problems of underachieving boys. Together, the pathways, access points, and tools may help to re-engage boys in every aspect of the learning experience.

Table 8

The Pathways to Re-Engagement Model for Underachieving Boys

Pathways	Access Points	Tools
Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trusting relationships A nonthreatening learning environment 	<p>The leader coach model. A climate of safety. Shared principles. Guidelines of classroom policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Involve boys in creating the policies; Limit the number of policies to five or fewer; State policies positively; Make sure policies are fully understood before enforcing them; Be consistent; Enforce policies in a matter-of-fact way; Forgive and forget. No grudges allowed; Acknowledge effort.
Guide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clear expectations Informational feedback Positive reinforcement 	<p>Basic requests about communicating.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Give me a way out; Help me know my strengths; Help me relax into learning; Help me save face; Inspire me; Keep it private; Let me know I matter; Make it real; Notice when I try; Speak to me with respect. <p>Effective directions in a nutshell.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change state; Explain relevance; Be crystal clear; Engage multiple modalities; Check for understanding; Announce duration; Pair verbal commands with auditory start/stop signals; Provide backup; Give fair warning; Acknowledge effort.
Reinforce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools for communicating 	<p>Pragmatic communication skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining appropriate conversational distance;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tools for collaborating 	<p>Maintaining eye contact; Linking gestures with ideas or emotions; Using facial expression effectively; Attending to time and place; Turn taking; Voice modulation; Giving compliments; Greetings and farewells; Detecting emotions in others; Perceiving and expressing humor; Knowing how to make conversational transitions; Anticipating other people's reactions.</p> <p>Roles, gambits, & structures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pick a specific problem during group work; Identify the collaboration skill needed; Develop a role; Develop gambits for the role; Model, demonstrate, & practice the skill's role & gambits without content; Apply multiple skills in context using structures.
Adjust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Zones of comfort 	<p>Increase physical movement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moving time; Standing time; Errands; Energizer monitor. <p>Increase social interaction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Study buddies. <p>Reduced distraction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> One of four; Traffic lanes; Testing circle. <p>Physical comfort.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Niggle busters; Do-it-yourself modality zones; Design-a-room.
Ignite	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active learning 	<p>Principles of active learning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active involvement; Compelling situations; Direct experience; Enjoyable setting; Frequent feedback; Informal learning; Patterns & connections; Reflection.
Empower	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engaging literacy-building activities 	<p>Graphic novels, Enactments, Talking cards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High personal interest; Rapid success; Evidence of growth, Choice & control.

Reichert and Hawley (2010) investigated the instructional pedagogies and best practices used by teachers who were effectively teaching and reaching boys in Grades 6 through 12 from 18 schools representing the United States, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, and South Africa. Teachers were invited to provide a written description of a “best” lesson that they felt truly engaged and heightened learning for boys whereas students were invited to describe a memorable lesson.

There were three overarching findings from this global study (Reichert & Hawley, 2010). First, effective lessons have a transitive factor. There are some elements, such as motor activity, a competition, and a dramatic surprise, that tend to arouse and hold the students' attention in a way that leads to understanding and mastery. Second, boys tend to elicit the pedagogy they need. If teachers present materials with substance or conveyance not right for boys, boys will disengage and engage in either passive inattention or diverting disruption. A committed teacher will adjust content, manner of presentation, or relational style to better engage boys. The boys' positive responses in turn reinforce the better pedagogy. Third, boys are relational learners. In the presence of attentive teachers and their refined lessons, boys seemed to find it difficult to resist engaging in learning. They will respond productively to a highly structure, demanding, no-nonsense teacher, especially when they found that teacher to be fair.

Common characteristics of effective lessons for boys were found from this study (Reichert & Hawley, 2010). Lessons should produce products, be structured as games, require vigorous motor activity, require boys to assume a role or responsibility for promoting the learning of others, require boy to address unsolved problems, require a combination of teamwork and competition, focus on boys' personal realization (their masculinity, their values, their present and future social roles), and introduce dramatic novelties and surprises.

Instructional strategies for struggling boys focus on incorporating a variety of vigorous activities into a highly-structured curriculum. Vigorous activities involve physical movement, motor activity, multiple modalities, games, dramatic surprise, competition, direct experience, and active involvement. A highly-structured curriculum involves modeling, demonstration, practices, feedback, and problem-solving.

Language

To address the academic needs of English language learners (ELLs), Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2008) developed the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model (see Table 9). The goal is for ELLs to meet grade-level core curriculum content standards and develop their English language skills. Using 30 instructional strategies connected to each of the eight components, teachers are able to design and deliver lessons to ELLs in mainstream classrooms or in sheltered English class. According to this model, teachers are expected to prepare the lessons in advance, link the skill to previously taught information, scaffold the activity with review, use pictures and graphic organizers, provide students with opportunities to work in pairs, provide opportunities for practicing language and concepts, use explicit instruction to deliver the lesson, and assess students in a meaningful way.

Table 9

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model for English Language Learners

Components	Strategies
Lesson Preparation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clearly defined content objectives & reviewed with students. 2. Clearly defined language objectives & reviewed with students. 3. Choose content concepts appropriate for the age & educational background of students. 4. Use supplementary materials to make lessons clear and meaningful. 5. Adapt content to all levels of student proficiency. 6. Provide meaningful and authentic activities that integrate lesson concepts with language practice opportunities.
Building Background	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Link concepts directly to students' background experiences. 8. Link explicitly students' past learning and new concepts. 9. Emphasize key vocabulary.
Comprehensible Input	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Use speech appropriate for students' language proficiency. 11. Clearly explain academic tasks. 12. Use a variety of techniques to make content concepts clear.
Strategies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 13. Provide ample opportunities for students to use learning strategies. 14. Consistently use scaffolding throughout lesson. 15. Employ a variety of question types to promote higher-order thinking.
Interaction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Provide frequent opportunities for interaction and discussion. 17. Group students to support language and content objectives.

	18. Give ample wait time for responses. 19. Provide ample opportunities for clarification for concepts in native language.
Practice/Application	20. Supply lots of hands-on materials. 21. Provide activities for students to apply content/language knowledge. 22. Integrate all language skills (listening, speaking, reading, writing) into each lesson.
Lesson Delivery	23. Clearly support content objectives. 24. Clearly support language objectives. 25. Engage students 90% to 100% of the lesson. 26. Appropriately pace the lesson to students' ability level.
Review/Assessment	27. Provide comprehensive review of key vocabulary. 28. Supply comprehensive review of key content concepts. 29. Regularly give feedback to students on their output. 30. Conduct assessment of student comprehension and learning.

Another model to improve the education of ELLs is the Five Standards for Effective Pedagogy and Learning established by the Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) at University of California, Berkeley (CREDE, 2012). The first standard is joint productive activity (JPA). Teachers and ELLs work together for a common product or goal so as to create a common context of experience within school. The second standard is language development. The goal of all educational activity is to develop literacy competence through purposeful and deliberate conversation between teacher and ELLs even though the ways of asking and answering questions may be unfamiliar to ELLs. The third standard is contextualization. Lessons are connected to experience and skills of the home and community of ELLs. The fourth standard is challenging activities. High academic standards and meaningful assessment are needed for ELLs who are often forgiven any academic challenges on the assumption that they are of limited ability, and forgiven any genuine assessment of progress because the assessment tools are inadequate. The fifth standard is instructional conversation (IC). Teachers listen carefully, make guesses about intended meaning, and adjust responses to

assist the efforts of ELLs, so as to relate formal school knowledge to the individual knowledge of ELLs.

In addition, Fu (2004) suggested strategies to teach ELL students in regular classrooms at the secondary level. First, forget the grade-level curriculum and just teach from where they are. Second, collaborate with ELL teachers. Third, diversify the instruction by using multiple books, having small-group instruction, and giving different assignments. Fourth, take advantage of the self-learning skills of most ELL middle school students by asking them to preview a reading text as homework, practicing reading fluency, referring to a dictionary, and preparing a reading response. Fifth, recognize that oral language development is essential for developing listening, reading, and writing. Sixth, pair students purposefully to orient, help, guide, and translate for ELL students. Seventh, teach ELLs to write in English so that they can express themselves. Eighth, understand parental involvement from a cultural perspective.

After studying the instructional styles used by six regular classroom teachers while teaching recently mainstreamed ELL students in urban middle school in Texas, Curtin (2005) concluded that teachers with an interactive teaching style are more at ease with the teaching of ELL students. There are seven characteristics of interactive teaching styles. First, teachers are personalized because they know all students by name, greet students at door, empathize with students, incorporate students' cultural backgrounds, know backgrounds of students well, communicate with families, and use humor well and incorporate classroom interruptions humorously. Second, teachers use cooperative groups in which students work in pair or groups regularly. Third, teachers are child-centered as they use individualized instructional and assessment strategies to accommodate for different learning styles and provide opportunities for all students to interact and contribute. Fourth, teachers focus on the process of teaching, such as

how to teach, and they work to improve delivery. Fifth, teachers show intuition and empathy as they utilize non-verbal communication and classroom wittiness and make exceptions to rules for students. Sixth, teachers constantly interact with students. Seventh, teachers use a democratic classroom discipline style that places less emphasis on silence and behaviors and more emphasis on inclusivity.

Hite and Evans (2006) used surveys and interviews to investigate the strategies of first-grade teachers used with ELLs in their classes. Their findings offer six categories of successful strategies. First, teachers adjusted their teaching approach to make lessons more comprehensible. This included: the use of visuals, manipulatives, repetition, and simplification of speech; the need to watch their own use of idioms or to be aware of figurative language; the importance of modeling concepts; the attention to the cultural backgrounds; the adjustment of their approach to assessment; and the avoidance of making assumptions about what students know about a given topic. Second, teachers modified instructional materials either by changing them in some way to make them more appropriate or by creating original materials, and they also paid attention to the reaction of students to such modification. Third, teachers interacted with parents to help them understand the requirements of the classroom and the demands on the student. Fourth, teachers used classroom peers to assist the ELLs. Fifth, teachers reflected a student-centered, rather than teacher-centered, philosophy of learning. Sixth, teachers used another child with some proficiency in both English and the ELL's first language to provide assistance.

Instructional strategies for English language learners (ELLs) focus on incorporating a variety of visuals, such as pictures and graphic organizers, and hands-on activities, often involving manipulatives, into an adapted curriculum. The curriculum is adapted to make lessons

more comprehensible, to incorporate the use of small-group instruction, to have students work in pairs or groups, to provide multiple opportunities and formats in which to engage students in making meaning of important concepts, to use simplification of speech, and to create original and supplemental materials.

Social Class

Although chronic exposure to poverty can result in detrimental changes to the brain, Jensen (2009) argued that the brain's ability to adapt from experience means that poor children can also experience emotional, social, and academic success. Drawing from research, experience, and real school success stories, he proposed a SHARE model with five classroom-level factors to teach economically disadvantaged students (see Table 10).

Table 10

The SMART Model for Economically Disadvantaged Students

SHARE	Strategies
Standards-Based Curriculum & Instruction	<p>Break down the overall standards into daily objectives & translate into meaningful teaching units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify core concepts, skills, & essential questions; Chunk similar objectives together within units; Help students see the patterns within the content; Create questions as a guide through the objectives & units; Include a challenging verb of action to specific content of the objectives. <p>Use pre-assessment to determine students' background knowledge.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combine fill-in-the-blank, short answer, & multiple-choice questions; Ensure that the questions represent the key concepts & skills that will be taught; Write out a half-dozen questions for each objective; Add a few teaser questions that prime students' interest in the upcoming unit; Administer the pre-test one week before starting the unit. <p>Adjust the daily lesson plan according to the pre-assessment results.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Know where to begin the lesson; Note student misconceptions before the unit; Know how long you need to spend on a concept; Know how to group students; Know how to prime the students' brains for what is coming up in the unit; Show students the conceptual chunks in the unit; Know which students need to work on more challenging projects; Be able to find experts in the classroom; Compare students' knowledge before & after the lesson.
Hope Building	Find out the level of hope or hopelessness of students & staff by creating and administering a simple survey.

	<p>Implement hopefulness by</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using daily affirmations; Asking to hear students' hopes and offering reinforcement of those hopes; Telling students specifically why they can succeed; Providing needed academic resources; Helping students to set goals and building goal-getting skills; Telling true stories of hope; Offering help, encouragement, and caring; Teaching students life skills in small daily chunks; Avoiding complaining about students' deficits; Treating all kids as potentially gifted; Building academic, emotional, and social assets in students. <p>Monitor results after implementing hopefulness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Take informal walks around campus & make short visits to classrooms; Look for a spirit of volunteerism because optimistic kids volunteer for services; Ask staff to keep track of random acts of kindness & hopeful activities.
Arts, Athletics, & Advanced Placement	<p>Implement a strong arts program.</p> <p>Step up the activity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use recess or physical education to engage kids; Get kids who struggle with reading & math into sensory motor labs to engage in sequencing, attentional, and processing tasks; Make recess or physical education classes mandatory; Offer a variety of choices of gross motor activities to engage in. <p>Implement an advanced placement curriculum.</p>
Retooling of the Operating System	<p>Use a comprehensive assessment to determine students' strengths & weaknesses. Develop and implement a targeted plan to rebuild students' operating systems three to five days a week with 30-90 minutes per day.</p> <p>Enrich students' operating systems of champion's mind-set, hopeful effort, attentional skills, memory, processing skills, and sequencing skills.</p> <p>Monitor results and modify skill-building activities as needed.</p>
Engaging Instruction	<p>Find, recruit, & train the best staff.</p> <p>Gather information from students.</p> <p>Communicate the evidence & make a plan.</p> <p>Add a strategy each week and monitor progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Switch up social groups; Incorporate movement through learning stations, class switching, & assemblies; Ask more compelling questions; avoiding unanswerable rhetorical questions; Appreciate and acknowledging every response; Use energizers, games, drama, simulations, and other demonstration strategies; Keep the content alive with call-backs, hand raisers, stretching and unfinished sentences and review questions; Be passionate about teaching so that students are drawn into the emotional drama of the content.

Tileston (2010) provided the best practices to help teachers of students from poverty to help their students reach greater success rates. First, teachers should have high expectations for students so that they are more likely to provide a rich and rigorous curriculum. Second, teachers can enhance the students' self-system in learning by telling them up front why the learning is

important and building a connection between what the students are about to learn and what they already know; by providing a basis for students to monitor and adjust their work to succeed; and by exhibiting understanding and warmth and making connections with various resources to enhance the students' lives. Third, teachers can promote quality goals by being explicit about learning objectives and by asking students to set and monitor personal learning goals.

Instructional strategies for economically disadvantaged students focus on incorporating an attitude of high expectation into a rigorous curriculum. Teachers who have high expectation for students explain why students have to learn the materials, and why learning is important. The rigorous curriculum involves breaking down the overall standards into daily objectives and translating into meaningful teaching units. Teachers would also build a connection between what the students are about to learn and what they already know.

Summary

The achievement gap between students from different ethnicity groups, gender, language, and social class has been a heated topic to study for years. With an increasing number of diverse students in mainstream classrooms, educators are eager to adopt models and instructional strategies that can support these diverse students to reach their academic potential.

This chapter introduced Ladson-Billings' (2009) Cultural Relevant Pedagogy, Gay's (2000) Culturally Responsive Teaching, and Tomlinson's (2001) Differentiated Instruction to accommodate diverse students who may not succeed in mainstream classrooms. Specific instructional strategies were also provided for classroom teachers to work with students of color, struggling boys, English language learners, and economically disadvantaged students.

Although educators may enjoy success in accommodating diverse students through these instructional models and strategies, instruction alone is insufficient to improve the academic

achievement of diverse students. The systematic design of the structure and function of schooling, including administration, curriculum, instruction, and assessment/evaluation, constitute critical institutional influences on diverse students. The administrative decisions, the curriculum design, the instructional strategies, and the assessment methods must work together to respond to the needs of diverse students and the culture of a diverse community.

References

- Au, K. H., & Kawakami, A. J. (1994). Cultural congruence in instruction. In E. R. Hollins, J. E. King, & W. C. Hayman (Eds.). *Teaching diverse populations: Formulating a knowledge base* (pp. 5-23). New York: State University of New York Press.
- Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Bianco, K., Fox, M., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., Drake, L. (2010). *The condition of education 2010* (NCES 2010-028). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence (CREDE) (2012). *The CREDE five standards for effective pedagogy and learning*. Retrieved from <http://crede.berkeley.edu/research/crede/standards.html>
- Cleveland, K. P. (2011). *Teaching boys who struggle in school: Strategies that turn underachievers into successful learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.
- Curtin, E. A. (2005). Instructional styles used by regular classroom teachers while teaching recently mainstreamed ESL students: Six urban middle school teachers in Texas share their experiences and perceptions. *Multicultural Education, Summer*, 36-42.

- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston, Allyn and Bacon.
- Ernest, J. M., Heckaman, K. A., Thompson, S. E., Hull, K. M., & Carter, S. W. (2011). Increasing the teaching efficacy of a beginning special education teacher using differentiated instruction: A case study. *International Journal of Special Education*, 26, 191-201.
- Feng, J. (1994). *Asian-American children: What teachers should know*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED369577).
- Ford, D. Y., & Whiting, G. W. (2010). Culturally responsive teaching practices. In R. T. Boon, & V. G. Spencer (Eds.), *Best practices for the inclusive classroom: Scientifically based strategies for success* (pp. 313-328). Waco, TX: Prufrock Press.
- Fleischman, H.L., Hopstock, P.J., Pelczar, M.P., and Shelley, B.E. (2010). *Highlights from PISA 2009: Performance of U.S. 15-year-old students in reading, mathematics, and science literacy in an international context* (NCES 2011-004). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Fu, D. (2004). Teaching ELL students in regular classrooms at the secondary level. *Voices From the Middle*, 11, 8-15.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 106-116. doi: 10.1177/0022487102053002003

Halpern, D. F., Benbow, C. P., Geary, D. C., Gur, R. C., Hyde, J. S., & Gernsbacher, M. A.

(2007), The science of sex differences in science and mathematics. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 8, 1-51.

Hill, C. (2010). When traditional won't do: Experiences from a "Lower-Level" mathematics classroom. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas*, 82, 239-243. doi: 10.1080/00098655.2010.484439

Hite, C. E., & Evans, L. S. (2006). Mainstream first-grade teachers' understanding of strategies for accommodating the needs of English language learners. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, Spring, 89-110.

Jensen, E. (2009). *Teaching with poverty in mind: What being poor does to kids' brains and what schools can do about it*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). But that is just good teaching! The case for culturally relevant pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice*, 34, 159-165.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. (2nd ed.) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Morrison, K. A., Robbins, H. H., & Rose, D. G. (2008). Operationalizing culturally relevant pedagogy: A synthesis of classroom-based research. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 41, 433-452. doi: 10.1080/10665680802400006

Mutegi, J. W. (2011). The inadequacies of "Science for All" and the necessity and nature of a socially transformative curriculum approach for African American Science Education. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 248, 301-316. doi: 10.1002/tea.20410

Rajagopal, K. (2011). *Create success! Unlocking the potential of urban students*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Reichert, M., & Hawley, R. (2010). *Reaching boys, teaching boys: Strategies that work-and why*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Reyes, M. (1992). Challenging venerable assumptions: Literacy instruction for linguistically different students. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62, 427-446.

Stillwell, R. (2010). *Public school graduates and dropouts from the common core of data: School year 2007–08* (NCES 2010-341). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010341>

Swanson, C. B. (2008) *Cities in crisis: A special analytic report on high school graduation*. Bethesda, MD: Editorial Projects in Education.

Tileston, D. W. (2010). *What every teacher should know about diverse learners*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Timmermans, R. E., Van Lieshout, E. C. D. M., & Verhoeven, L. (2007). Gender-related effects of contemporary math instruction for low performers on problem-solving behavior. *Learning and Instruction*, 17, 42-54. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2006.11.005

Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. [Ebrary Reader version]. Retrieved from <http://site.ebrary.com.oberon.ius.edu/lib/iuse/docDetail.action?docID=10115178>

Tomlinson, C. A. (2001). *How to differentiate instruction in mixed-ability classrooms*. (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Willingham, W. W., & Cole, N. S. (1997). *Gender and fair assessment*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.