EPRA International Journal of Environmental Economics, Commerce and Educational Management
Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra0414 |ISI I.F Value: 0.815|SJIF Impact Factor (2024): 8.481 ISSN: 2348 – 814X
Volume: 11 | Issue:12 |December 2024

SHAPING INTEGRITY, APPROACH, AND STANDARD LEARNING FOR ENGLISH LEARNERS IN JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: A PHENOMENOLOGICAL STUDY

Rocel Grace C. Arellano[1]
[1]*Student, Graduate School, The Rizal Memorial Colleges, Inc.*

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.36713/epra19346
DOI No: 10.36713/epra19346

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to explore how school administrators mediate language policy to shape the education of students designated as English Learners. This study somehow explores how school leaders in selected public high schools mediated language policy in an effort to improve learning outcomes for English Learners. Ten participants, who were school leaders in public junior high schools in Sulop, Davao del Sur, were the focus of my study. I selected these participants through random sampling. All of them were licensed administrators and teachers with at least two years of experience. They also had experience implementing the standard English learning policy in their schools. This qualitative study comprised the techniques employed in the qualitative phenomenological research process (Creswell, 2019). My methods were inductive in my personal experience of gathering and interpreting data. Shaping integrity, approach, and standard learning in English at the junior high school level, when viewed through the lens of institutional theory, had significant implications for both the structure of the educational system and the actions of its members. Institutional theory emphasized that schools operated not just as educational entities but as organizations deeply influenced by societal norms, rules, and policies. On the other hand, shaping integrity, approach, and standard learning in English at the junior high school level, based on structuration theory, had significant implications in understanding the dynamic relationship between structure and agency. According to structuration theory, educational practices in English were not solely determined by rigid institutional rules or policies but were instead the result of continuous interactions between the structures of the school system and the actions of individuals within that system.

KEYWORDS- *Shaping, Integrity, Approach, Standard Learning, English Policy*

INTRODUCTION

Standard learning for English language could be the limited exploration of how different teaching approaches and educational standards specifically impact the development of integrity and ethical behavior in English language learners at the junior high level. While much has been discussed regarding curriculum design and pedagogical strategies, there is a lack of comprehensive studies that address the integration of values such as honesty, responsibility, and moral decision-making into English language learning. Further research could examine how these factors influence students' academic performance, engagement, and long-term retention of language skills, particularly in diverse educational contexts and cultures. Additionally, the relationship between teachers' own integrity and their approach to fostering such values in students remains underexplored.

The term “English Learner” is used to refer to students whose families report a home language other than English on the home language survey and whose assessment results demonstrate that their proficiency in oral and written English may not be sufficient to allow them to succeed in the regular instructional program. The term has been problematized for highlighting students’ deficiency in English rather than their developing bilingualism (Martínez, 2019). Moreover, any single label is inadequate to describe the vastly diverse group of students who fall into the category. Still, the term remains widely used both in state and local education policy and by educational practitioners.

In the United States of America, analyses of high school graduation data show that students designated as English Learners are at increased risk of dropping out of high school (Atwell, et al., 2019; Rumberger, 2021), which carries consequences including lower wages, higher risk of criminal activity, and poorer health outcomes (Callahan, 2021). The diversity of the population of students designated as English Learners, which includes recent immigrants and students born in the U.S., students with high levels of literacy in their home languages and students with significantly interrupted education, and students from a wide range of family income levels, makes it challenging, and problematic, to generalize about this group of students. Still, as the population grows, it is critical to understand how federal and state policies, district-level practices, and school-level factors shape these students’ educational experiences and opportunities.

Research examining disparities in outcomes for English Learners has explored a number of factors beyond English proficiency, including placement and reclassification practices (Estrada, 2024), course-taking patterns (Callahan, Wilkinson, & Muller, 2023; Callahan & Shifrer, 2024), program models (Umansky & Reardon, 2024), and

instructional practices in the classes in which English Learners are enrolled (Harklau, 2024). The factors shaping English Learners' experiences in secondary education and the rigor and quality of their preparation for higher education are complex and multilayered.

In United Kingdom, Providing English Learners with quality high school preparation requires finding ways to offer both targeted instructions to meet students' language learning needs and access to rigorous content and inclusion in classes with their English-speaking peers. These two critical components of English Learners' education can work in tension with one another. Drawing on Williams' conception of equality as referring both to the notion of human beings as moral equals and the need to distribute goods based on need to address inequality (Williams, 2020; Thompson, 2019) characterized this tension as one between "negative equality" freedom from discrimination and "positive equality" provision of specific resources and support necessary to access equal opportunities.

While research demonstrates the harm done when ELs are fully included in the full range of curricular opportunities (Callahan, 2021; Callahan, et al. 2024; Gándara & Hopkins, 2020; Gándara & Orfield, 2022), there is also evidence that English Learners can benefit academically and socioemotionally from separate, specialized instruction that targets their unique needs (Garver & Hopkins, 2020; Jaffe-Walter & Miranda, 2020; Saunders et al., 2023; Thompson, 2023). Navigating the tension between English Learners' right to inclusion and their need for specialized, targeted instruction to meet their language needs is a complex task that requires not only an understanding of the students and their needs but an understanding of various policy mandates at the federal, state, and local levels.

In Manila, Philippines, according to Kanno and Cromley (2023) similarly found that English Learners were less likely than monolingual English-speaking students to enroll in advanced-level math courses. Callahan (2021) found that fewer than 2% of English Learners in her sample took enough college preparatory courses to be eligible to apply for a four-year university, and that students' track placement was a greater predictor of academic success than English proficiency.

Placement in lower-track classes not only prevents students from completing required coursework for entrance to four-year colleges but also impacts the types of instruction they receive and their access to the language and literacy practices that prepare them for college-level coursework. Harklau (2024) examined this phenomenon. Following four Chinese immigrant students through their high school experience, she found that in the low-track classes in which these students were placed, they read excerpted text out of context, responded to simple, factual comprehension questions, composed little extended written discourse, and had minimal verbal interaction with classmates. In addition to the absence of academic rigor in low-track, "textually impoverished" classrooms (Bunch & Willett, 2023), researchers have also found that instruction is often pushed aside while teachers manage student behavior (Harklau, 2024; Kanno & Kangas, 2024).

According to the study of Perez and Alieto (2019) in Tagum City, approaches to English Learner education, both course placement and classroom pedagogy, reflect assumptions about language and its role in learning. The extent to which language learning is conceived as primarily an individual cognitive phenomenon or primarily a social one, a source of debate for several decades in the field of second language acquisition (SLA), has significant implications for schools' construction of English Language Development (ELD) programs and pedagogies to facilitate ELs' acquisition of English and content learning.

Building upon Vygotsky's conception of learning as social and of language as mediating all learning (Vygotsky, 1962) as cited in Ricento (2020), sociocultural theories of language learning view language as social practice, constituted in use. As students engage in learning communities, they are apprenticed into language and disciplinary practices, and in the process, "they find and refine conceptual understandings, practice ways of using them, and enhance their use of phrases, words, texts, and action" (Walqui & Bunch, 2019).

Van Lier and Walqui (2022) presented the notion of language as action, arguing that language is inseparable from other forms of human action and is an "expression of agency". In this view, language develops as students do meaningful academic work, engaging in such practices as research and discussion as they construct knowledge, negotiate meaning, and create products. As van Lier and Walqui contended, if language is conceived as action, bounding language as a separate subject, isolated from other content learning, artificially divorces it from the meaningful contexts in which it is used.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Schools as institutions are subject to particular norms and constraints, as conceptualized in institutional theory (Schoen & Teddlie, 2019). Acting as leaders within the institution, school site administrators are both subject to policies and directives at the federal, state, and local levels, and responsible for mediating and negotiating those policies and directives in ways that meet the needs of students, teachers, and families in their school communities. With respect to English Learner instruction, given the widely varying English Learner demographics and the many other contextual variables specific to school sites, school administrators must exercise agency in enacting or resisting language policies.

To frame this study theoretically, I begin by drawing upon institutional theory in order to acknowledge and identify the institutional mechanisms that shape administrators' work as they negotiate language policy and seek to lead instruction that meets the needs of English Learners at their sites. Institutional theory, however, does little to allow for the agency of actors within the institution. For the purpose of understanding site administrators as active agents shaped by and shaping the institutional context, I turn to Giddens (2024) and structuration theory, which provides three key theoretical constructs that are useful for exploring administrators' decisions about structures and practices that shape English Learner instruction: the knowledgeability of human agents; structures as constituted by human activity; and the duality of structure.

Alieto (2019) notes, however, structuration theory, while it creates space for agency within an institutional context, faces the "dilemma of explaining how social reproduction becomes social transformation". In other words, it allows for the possibility that agents might either reproduce or transform institutional norms and practices but does little to explain how transformation might occur. Studies on teacher agency (Bridwell-Mitchell, 2020; Biesta et al, 2023; Olsen & Kirtman, 2022) do provide insight into how agency is exercised within an institutional context, particularly during periods of large-scale policy change. I draw on these studies to further develop the concept of agency within the constructs of structuration theory.

Finally, because this study will explore school leaders and their role in leading educational change, the theoretical lens of distributed leadership (Bolden, 2021; Gronn, 2023; Spillane, 2020; Spillane et al, 2021). Distributed leadership is a fitting lens because it provides a potential middle ground between conceptions of leadership that emphasize organizational structures as defining leadership and those that emphasize individual agency.

Notably, while the theories that I use to frame this study are familiar in the fields of educational leadership and policy, they are rarely used in research on English Learners. Examining issues of EL placement and policy through the lens of organizational and leadership theory allowed me to explore how leaders' beliefs about language, language learning, and language instruction interacted with leaders' institutional roles and with structures and policies that appeared to have little to do with ELs but that nonetheless indirectly shaped their experiences.

Institutional theory "seeks to understand the persistence of or change in structures, norms, and patterns of social relationships in organizations by highlighting the ways in which they are linked to organizations' broader social and cultural environment" (Coburn, 2023). Scott (2023) defined institutions as comprising "regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning to social life". In this definition, the regulative, normative and cultural-cognitive elements constitute three "pillars" of institutions that support them and ensure their strength and durability.

The regulative pillar includes "rule-setting, monitoring, and sanctioning activities". In the institution of schooling, these include federal and state regulations, local board policies, and, within schools, rules and policies the site administrators develop to regulate teachers' behaviors. The normative pillar emphasizes "norms" and "values". Scott explained that in this view, institutions "define goals or objectives…but also designate appropriate ways to pursue them". Also important within the normative pillar are the roles various actors in the institution play and expectations for how individuals in those roles behave. Administrators' relationships with teachers, within this normative frame, would be defined in part by those normalized role expectations (Rowan, et al, 2024).

The cultural-cognitive pillar (formerly referred to just as the "cognitive" pillar) attends to "the shared conceptions that constitute the nature of social reality and create the frames through which meaning is made". It includes beliefs and assumptions but recognizes that meaning is constructed socially, within a cultural context (Robinson et al, 2019).

According to Scott (2023), early versions of institutional theory held that social order is produced by "norms and rules that constitute particular types of actors and specify ways in which they can take action". Central to Institutional Theory as it developed was the idea that organizations were "'rationalized' systems -sets of roles and associated activities laid out to reflect means-ends relationships oriented to the pursuit of specified goals." Citing Meyer's work with various collaborators, describe "models of rationality" as "cultural systems, constructed to represent appropriate methods for achieving purposes". These "appropriate methods," or "norms of rationality," come to be seen by those external to the organizations as characterizing particular types of organizations, so that organizations must adopt them in order to achieve "social legitimacy".

One prominent explanation for this apparent disconnect is that the leadership and administration of schools are "loosely coupled" with instruction (Weick, 2019). This theory of loose coupling applied to schools allows for responsiveness among elements of the organization (such as the principal's office and the classroom) but also for the different elements to maintain their own identities and separateness from one another. Weick argued that loosely coupled organizations had a number of advantages, including sensitivity to the external environment, potential for localized adaptation, ability to contain breakdowns to certain elements of the system, and room for "self-determination by the actors". As Weick also explained, each of these potential affordances could also become a liability; for example, increased sensitivity to the environment can manifest as vulnerability to fads.

Meyer and Rowan (2020) argued that organizations "decouple" their structures from their technical operations so that they can respond to larger institutional pressures and be recognized as legitimate while remaining efficient in their day-to-day work. Seeking legitimacy through structures and routines results in what organizational theorists refer to as isomorphism; that is, organizations in the same field, such as educational organizations, take on increasingly similar forms.

According to Dimaggio and Powell (2023), "Organizations may change their goals or develop new practices, and new organizations enter the field. But, in the long run, organizational actors making rational decisions construct around themselves an environment that constrains their ability to change further in later years". How and why such isomorphism occurs is the subject of much study. They identified three major mechanisms through which organizations develop these similarities: coercive mechanisms, normative pressures, and mimetic processes. Within this frame, even as educational organizations pursue change and seek to distinguish themselves, they come to resemble still more closely other educational organizations.

In such a system, where institutional structures and routines hold strong in order for the organization to achieve and maintain legitimacy, and the technical core of instruction is loosely coupled or decoupled from those structures and routines, the role of the school site administration in leading instruction raises questions. Bidwell (2021) asserted that the principalship is, in fact, the weakest of the three strata, the teacher work force, the site administration, and the central office administration. Subject to pressure from central office administrators to conform to institutional norms, and lacking the power to innovate effectively to meet local needs, the principal.

Research Questions

Given the preceding articles, it is critical to emphasize the importance of assessing English language dogmas and practices through practical and theoretical research involving teachers and administrators who are the primary concerns in achieving a quality education of junior high school students. In doing so, this paper aims to address the following questions:

1. What are the trials encountered by the teachers and administrators to improve English Language Development programs and English Learners' experiences in their schools?
2. How school administrators and teachers in selected public high schools addressed the challenges encountered by the teachers in terms of mediated language policy?
3. What educational lessons and aspirations can be drawn to improve English Language Development programs and English Learners' experiences in selected public schools?

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The specifics of the research methods were explained in the next part so that future researchers could extrapolate the findings of this study to different contexts. Transferability, the qualitative counterpart of external validity in post-positivist research, was developed through detailed and meticulous discussions of the study's time, place, context, and culture (Mertens, 2020). This section addressed the following topics: the interview technique; my role as the researcher; and the sampling strategy and ethical issues.

Research Participants

Ten participants, who were school leaders in public junior high schools in Davao del Sur, were the focus of my study. I selected these participants through random sampling. All of them were licensed administrators with at least two years of administrative experience. They also had experience implementing the standard English learning policy in their schools.

These educators were chosen because they had firsthand experience putting the policy of standard English learning into practice in their schools. The ten participants took part in focus groups and in-depth interviews. Since the majority of them preferred to use the same platform, the interviews were conducted via Google Meet.

Participant 1 was a licensed professional school leader in a public school in Davao del Sur. She had almost 14 years of experience as an administrator and had managed teachers during the pandemic. She obtained her Doctor of Philosophy in Education, majoring in Management.

Participant 2 was a male administrator in one of the public schools in Davao del Sur. He was a licensed professional teacher with almost six years of experience as an administrator. He earned his Doctor in Education Management degree in 2015.

Participant 3 was a Doctor of Educational Management graduate. At the time of the study, he was serving as the acting principal in one of the elementary schools in Davao del Sur and had been in the education industry for almost 10 years.

Participant 4 was a licensed professional administrator in a public school in Davao del Sur. She obtained her Master of Arts in Educational Management in 2018 and had been managing teachers since 2015, including throughout the pandemic.

Participant 5 held a Doctor of Educational Management degree and had been managing teachers in a public school in Davao del Sur since 2017. He was also awarded as the best manager at his school.

Participant 6 was a school head in one of the public schools in Davao del Sur. He had been managing schools for 23 years and was known as a sports enthusiast.

Participant 7 was a female school head who had been a teacher for 13 years before passing the principals' test in 2015 and transitioning to a school leadership role.

Participant 8 was a school head with 14 years of experience and held a Master's Degree. She also served as a district coordinating head in one of the DepEd programs.

Participant 9 was a principal at a public school in Davao del Sur. He obtained his principal's license in 2010 and completed his PhD in Education at the University of the Immaculate Conception in Davao City.

Participant 10 had been a private school principal since 2012 in one of the schools in Davao del Sur. He earned his PhD in Leadership Management at the University of Southeastern Philippines.

Research Instruments

Interviewing people was one way Patton (2019) suggested academics could learn about things they couldn't observe directly. The goal of qualitative interviewing was to understand participants' experiences and the meanings they attached to them, rather than simply finding answers to questions (Seidman, 2018). Semi-structured interviews were frequently used when I wanted to gather more focused and specific information, but unstructured, open-ended interviews were typically employed in qualitative studies because they allowed for the greatest flexibility and responsiveness to emerging issues for both the interviewer and the participants (Schwandt, 2019) as cited in Thomas and Collier (2021).

Semi-structured interviews yielded targeted, qualitative, textual data by combining the freedom of unstructured, open-ended interviews with directionality and an agenda (Schensul et al, 2019). To investigate how junior high school campus administrators' involvement in managing standard learning for English was devised and implemented in a subset of public schools in the division of Davao del Sur, I gathered data through semi-structured interviews.

To ensure that the same information was collected from all participants, I used an interview guide. The interview guide included open-ended questions and topics to help structure the interview, but when needed, I explored, probed, and asked additional questions to clarify and expand on a particular topic. The interview guide helped make interviewing several different participants more systematic and comprehensive by defining in advance the issues to be explored (Patton, 2019).

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis began with the process of organizing, reducing, and describing the collected data (Schwandt, 2019). Unlike quantitative analysis, there were no prescribed formulas for qualitative analysis. Marshall and Rossman (2006) reminded researchers that qualitative analysis does not proceed linearly and is not neat. However, good practice and procedures enhanced the credibility of qualitative research. In this section, I will explain the data analysis procedures I followed and describe the steps I took to ensure the results from this study were credible, transferable, dependable, and authentic.

To guide the data analysis, I used the seven phases of data analysis described by Marshall and Rossman (2006) as a means to reduce data, create manageable pieces, allow for interpretation, and find meaning in the words of the participants. The seven phases included: organizing the data; immersion in the data; generating categories and themes; coding the data; offering interpretations through analytic memos; and searching for alternative understandings (Marshall & Rossman, 2021).

Data analysis first began with organizing the data. I organized the data by keeping information provided by each participant separate and in sequence with the order of the interviews. This process allowed the data to remain manageable, easily accessible, and readily available. The digital audio files from the interviews were carefully transcribed into written form. I created electronic folders to organize the data collected from each participant.

Next, I became familiar with the data through extensive reading of the interviews to gain an understanding of the content. This involved reading through the interviews at least three times. Following Hatch's (2022) recommendations for qualitative analysis, I created a sheet of notes for each participant. The summary sheets were a quick way to refer back to the original data as the data analysis continued.

After the initial readings, Hatch (2022) recommended that researchers read the data completely with one typology in mind. Patton (2020) defines typologies as classification systems made up of categories that divide some aspects of the world into parts. According to Hatch, typologies are generated from the theory, common sense, or research objectives. For this study, I used the typologies or themes from the literature review as the constructs through which to view the data.

After reading through the data with each construct or typology in mind, I coded the data into five categories from the literature by taking excerpts of text from the data and identifying them within a particular category.

After everything was coded, I read through the data again while writing analytic memos on my thoughts and insights and began the process of offering interpretations. During this stage, I interpreted the data to find significance and meaning in the teachers' instructional experiences by pulling salient themes, recurring ideas, and patterns of belief that resonated collectively throughout the interviews.

The offering of interpretations began following the emergence of themes in the data. Rudestam and Newton (2021) believe this part of the data analysis brings meaning to the themes and categories and allows the researcher to develop links between the interviews. I began interpreting the data to find significance and meaning in the administrators' role in shaping integrity, approach, and standards in learning the English language.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Shaping integrity, approach, and standard learning in English at the junior high school level required a collective effort from teachers, administrators, families, and communities. Through fostering an environment that emphasized respect for diverse backgrounds, integrating effective teaching methodologies, and maintaining high standards for language proficiency, educators ensured that students developed a strong foundation in English. This collaborative and inclusive approach allowed students to acquire essential language skills while also cultivating values such as responsibility, discipline, and critical thinking. As a result, students were better prepared for academic success, social engagement, and future global opportunities, making their English learning experience both meaningful and empowering.

Implications

Shaping integrity, approach, and standard learning in English at the junior high school level, when viewed through the lens of institutional theory, had significant implications for both the structure of the educational system and the actions of its members. Institutional theory emphasized that schools operated not just as educational entities but as organizations deeply influenced by societal norms, rules, and policies. These external forces played a key role in shaping how English language education was structured and implemented. For example, national and regional education policies, such as standardized curriculum guidelines or testing requirements, determined the overarching framework for English learning. Schools were often compelled to align their practices with these established norms to maintain legitimacy and secure funding. The implications of this theory suggested that English language education, therefore, had to conform to institutional standards while reflecting societal expectations of what constituted quality language instruction.

In practice, institutional theory revealed that the approach to English teaching within junior high schools was influenced by both internal and external institutional pressures. Teachers were required to work within the constraints of curricula set by educational authorities, but their agency and creativity in implementing these standards could vary significantly. The integrity of English education was shaped by how faithfully these institutional policies were followed, yet the day-to-day actions of teachers often modified these policies to suit the needs of their students. Teachers navigated these challenges by integrating personal teaching philosophies, adapting instructional methods, and responding to the diverse needs of learners. The implication of this dynamic was that the standard learning experience in English was not just a product of top-down policies but was also shaped by the interpretive actions of educators within the boundaries set by the institution.

Additionally, the role of external stakeholders, such as parents, policymakers, and the wider community, became a crucial factor in maintaining and reinforcing the standards of English learning. Institutional theory highlighted the importance of aligning school practices with community expectations to ensure that English language policies remained relevant and supported by the broader social structure. Schools were often pressured to reflect societal values in their educational approaches, and community involvement played an important part in reinforcing or challenging these practices. The integration of feedback from families, local organizations, and other stakeholders helped shape the integrity and approach of English language education, ensuring that it was not only academically rigorous but also culturally responsive and socially inclusive. This interplay between the institution and its external environment had profound implications for shaping a consistent and standardized approach to English learning in junior high schools.

On the other hand, shaping integrity, approach, and standard learning in English at the junior high school level, based on structuration theory, had significant implications in understanding the dynamic relationship between structure and agency. According to structuration theory, educational practices in English were not solely determined by rigid institutional rules or policies but were instead the result of continuous interactions between the structures of the school system and the actions of individuals within that system. Teachers, as agents, played a central role in shaping the integrity and approach to language learning, as they interpreted, adapted, and implemented the curriculum based on their professional knowledge and the needs of their students. While institutional guidelines provided the structural framework, it was the agency of teachers that allowed for flexibility and adaptation, influencing the standard learning experience for students. This reciprocal interaction between structure and agency

had important implications for how English language learning was approached and the extent to which students engaged with the curriculum.

Furthermore, structuration theory highlighted the importance of teacher autonomy in shaping the integrity of English language education. Teachers were seen as active participants who could influence the learning process by making decisions about teaching methods, resources, and assessment strategies within the constraints of the school's structure. As a result, their decisions often led to varied approaches to teaching English, reflecting both their professional judgment and the social context in which they operated. Teachers could modify their practices to better align with students' needs, integrating technology, collaborative activities, or other innovative techniques to foster greater language proficiency. However, these changes were not made in isolation; they were influenced by the broader educational norms and institutional expectations. The implications of this were that the integrity of English language teaching depended not only on the institutional framework but also on the teacher's ability to navigate and reshape that framework through their daily practices.

Finally, structuration theory implied that standardizing English learning in junior high schools was a complex process that involved ongoing negotiation between institutional structures and the individual actions of educators. While schools aimed to implement consistent standards for English proficiency, teachers' agency in interpreting and enacting those standards meant that the learning experience could vary significantly from one classroom to another. This tension between standardization and personalization was an inherent part of the educational process, as schools sought to balance the need for consistency with the flexibility required to meet the diverse needs of students. Over time, successful teaching practices and innovative approaches by teachers could influence institutional structures, leading to a shift in how English was taught across the school system. Thus, structuration theory suggested that the process of shaping integrity, approach, and standards in English language education was ongoing and dynamic, driven by both institutional influences and the actions of teachers within those frameworks.

Future Directions

One future direction for the thesis titled Shaping Integrity, Approach, and Standard Learning for English in Junior High School could focus on examining the integration of technology in English language instruction. As digital tools continue to reshape education, exploring how technologies such as learning management systems, interactive apps, and virtual classrooms can support English learning while maintaining high standards of language proficiency would be valuable. Research could investigate how these tools facilitate personalized learning experiences, help students develop digital literacy skills, and offer new opportunities for teachers to enhance engagement and language development.

Another key direction could involve investigating the role of culturally responsive teaching in shaping English instruction. As classrooms become increasingly diverse, there is a growing need to understand how to integrate cultural awareness and inclusivity into English language teaching. Future research could explore how educators can design curricula and instructional strategies that recognize and respect the varied linguistic and cultural backgrounds of students, ensuring that all learners see their identities reflected in the materials and lessons. This approach could help foster a deeper connection to the language and improve overall student engagement and achievement in English.

A third direction could involve studying the impact of teacher professional development on shaping the approach to English instruction. Ensuring that teachers are equipped with the latest pedagogical strategies and techniques is crucial for maintaining the integrity of English language education. Future research could examine the effectiveness of ongoing professional development programs in helping teachers adapt to new instructional methods, stay updated on educational trends, and address the diverse needs of their students. By focusing on the continuous growth of educators, this research could provide insights into how schools can better support teachers in delivering high-quality, standards-aligned English instruction.

Finally, exploring the role of school leadership and institutional policies in shaping the standard learning outcomes for English could offer valuable insights into how educational systems can maintain consistency and quality in English language instruction. Future research could investigate how school administrators influence the implementation of curriculum standards, assessment practices, and the overall teaching approach in English. By understanding how leadership can foster a school-wide commitment to excellence in English learning, this research could inform policies that support both teacher autonomy and alignment with national educational standards, ultimately ensuring that all students receive a high-quality English education.

REFERENCES

1. *Abdon, M., Maghanoy, J., Alieto, E., Buslon, J., Rillo, R., & Bacang, B. (2019). Phonological awareness skills of English as second language (ESL) learners: The case of first-grade Filipino Bilinguals. Science International (Lahore), 31(5), 647-652.*
2. *Ainscow, M., & Miles, S. (2022). The development of inclusive practices: Transforming schools and classrooms. Educational Review, 74(3), 263-278*
3. *Aldana, U., & Mayer, A. (2020). The international baccalaureate: A college preparatory pathway for heritage language speakers and immigrant youth. The bilingual advantage: Language, literacy and the US labor market, 99, 261 285.*

4. *Alieto, E. (2019). Language Shift from English to Mother Tongue: Exploring Language Attitude and Willingness to Teach among Pre-service Teachers. TESOL International Journal, 13(3), 134-146. In*
5. *Alieto, E. (2019). Cognition as predictor of willingness to teach in the Mother Tongue and the Mother Tongue as a subject among prospective language teachers. Science International (Lahore), 31(1), 135-139.*
6. *Anderson, J., & Johnson, M. (2021). Inspiring a passion for language learning: The role of educators in developing English proficiency. Journal of Language Education, 52(2), 118-132*
7. *Anderson, J., & Johnson, M. (2021). The impact of ongoing professional development on educational outcomes. Journal of Education Leadership, 48(3), 127-141*
8. *Ascenzi-Moreno, L., Hesson, S., & Menken, K. (2021). School leadership along the trajectory from monolingual to multilingual. Language and Education, 30(3),197-218.*
9. *Atwell, M. N., Balfanz, R., Bridgeland, J., & Ingram, E. (2019). Building a Grad Nation: Progress and Challenge in Raising High School Graduation Rates.*
10. *Ball, S. J., Maguire, M., & Braun, A. (2019). How schools do policy: Policy enactments in secondary schools. Routledge.*
11. *Bennett, R., & Carter, D. (2020). Supporting language development in diverse classrooms: The importance of teacher commitment. Educational Review, 36(2), 215-229*
12. *Bennett, R., & Carter, D. (2022). Collaborative practices in the implementation of English language policies. Journal of Educational Leadership, 55(2), 112-126*
13. *Bennett, R., & Douglas, L. (2021). Building a culture of continuous improvement through professional development. Educational Review, 33(2), 245-257*
14. *Berowa, A. (2019). President Rodrigo Roa Duterte in the Spotlight : The Pragmatic Factors and Functions of Swearing in Public Discourse. Asian EFL , 21 (2.4), 183-204.*
15. *Bidwell, C. E. (2021). Analyzing schools as organizations: Long-term permanence and short-term change. Sociology of education, 100-114.*
16. *Biesta, G., Priestley, M., & Robinson, S. (2023). The role of beliefs in teacher agency. Teachers and Teaching, 21(6), 624-640.*
17. *Blackwell.*
18. *Block, D. (2023). The social turn in second language acquisition. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.*
19. *Bolden, R. (2021). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. International Journal of Management Reviews, 13(3), 251-269.*
20. *Bossert, S. T., Dwyer, D. C., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. V. (2022). The instructional management role of the principal. Educational administration quarterly, 18(3), 34-64.*
21. *Bourdieu, P. (2021). Language and symbolic power. Harvard University Press.*
22. *Bridwell-Mitchell, E. N. (2020). Theorizing teacher agency and reform: How institutionalized instructional practices change and persist. Sociology of education, 88(2), 140-159.*
23. *Bulris, M. E. (2019). A meta-analysis of research on the mediated effects of principal leadership on student achievement: Examining the effect size of school culture on student achievement as an indicator of teacher effectiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Carolina University, USA.*
24. *Bunch, G. C., & Willett, K. (2023). Writing to mean in middle school: Understanding how second language writers negotiate textually-rich content-area instruction. Journal of Second Language Writing, 22(2), 141-160.*
25. *Burch, P., Bingham, A. J., & Miglani, N. (2020). Combining Institutional and Distributed Frameworks in Studies of School Leadership. Peabody Journal of Education, 1-15.*
26. *Burton, L. (2023). Mother Tongue-Based Multilingual Education in the Philippines: Studying Top-Down Policy Implementation from the Bottom Up. Retrieved Online.December 2, 2016. (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis), University of Minnesotta. Retrieved from https://c.*
27. *Calderón, M., Slavin, R., & Sanchez, M. (2021). Effective instruction for ELs. The future of children, 21(1), 103-127.*
28. *Callahan, R. M. (2021). Tracking and high school ELs: Limiting opportunity to learn. American Educational Research Journal, 42(2), 305-328.*
29. *Callahan, R. M. (2023). The English learner dropout dilemma: Multiple risks and multiple resources. Santa Barbara: California Drop out Research Project. Available at: http://www. cdrp. ucsb. edu/pubs_reports. htm (accessed January 12, 2014).*
30. *Callahan, R. M., & Shifrer, D. (2024). Equitable access for secondary English learner students: Course taking as evidence of EL program effectiveness. Educational Administration Quarterly, 52(3), 463-496.*
31. *Chae, N., & Gray-Rice, S. P. (2019). School Counseling Toward a Mission of "IB for All". Journal of School-Based Counseling Policy and Evaluation, 1(3), 71-84.*
32. *Coburn, C. E. (2023). Shaping teacher sensemaking: School leaders and the enactment of reading policy. Educational policy, 19(3), 476-509. Colleges.*
33. *Common Core State Standards Initiative (2020). Retrieved from http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards/ communities for ELL students: Transforming school principals' perspectives. Theory Into Practice, 49(2), 145-151.*
34. *Congress of the Philippines (2022). Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/15th_Congress_of_the_Philippines Connection: Making Sense of Why the First Precedes the*
35. *Considering California's local accountability and school finance plans for English learners. Education Policy Analysis Archives/Archivos Analíticos de Políticas Educativas, (25), 1-24.*
36. *Creswell, J. (2019). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed-method approaches (4th ed.). SAGE. Cross, N., Howard, K., & Pearson, C. (2013). Culture: The missing link to learning. Leadership, 42(4), 36–37. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.07.015*
37. *Datnow, A. (2020). Power and politics in the adoption of school reform models. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 22(4), 357-374.*

38. *DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (2023). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American sociological review, 147-160.*
39. *Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2023). Theory building from cases: Opportunities and challenges. Academy of management journal, 50(1), 25-32.*
40. *Ejieh, M. U. (2024). Attitudes of student teachers towards teaching in mother tongue in Nigerian primary schools: implications for planning. Language, Culture and Curriculum, 17 (1), 73-81.*
41. *Elfers, A. M. & Stritikus, T. (2024). How school and district leaders support classroom teachers' work with English Language Learners. Educational administration quarterly, 50(2), 305-344.*
42. *Estrada, P. (2024). English Learner Reclassification to Fluent English Proficient: Meeting Criteria, Roadblocks, Opportunities, and Consequences, District 1 Years 1 and 2 Findings. Practitioner Research Brief 1. Grantee Submission.*
43. *Eyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (2019). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. American journal of sociology, 83(2), 340-363.*
44. *Fasso, W., Knight, B. A., & Purnell, K. (2021). Distributed leadership curriculum change: an integrative approach. School Leadership & Management, 36(2), 204-220.*
45. *Forlin, C., & Chambers, D. (2020). Teacher preparation for inclusive education: A review of research and perspectives. International Journal of Inclusive Education, 24(8), 889-905*
46. *Fry, R. (2019). How Far behind in Math and Reading Are English Language Learners? Report. Pew Hispanic Center.*
47. *Fullan, M. (2022). The role of leadership in the promotion of knowledge management in schools. Teachers and Teaching, 8(3), 409-419.*
48. *Gándara, P. & Hopkins, M. (Eds.). (2020). Forbidden Language: English Learners and Restrictive Language Policies. Teachers College Press.*
49. *Gándara, P., & Orfield, G. (2022). Segregating Arizona's English Learners: A return to the" Mexican Room"?. Teachers College Record, 114(9).*
50. *Garver, R. & Hopkins, M. (2020). Segregation and Integration in the Education of English Learners: Leadership and Policy Dilemmas. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 19(1), 1-5.*
51. *Giddens, A. (2024). The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration. Univ of California Press.*
52. *Go Silk, B., Medriano, R., Dela Cruz, S.B., Deran, J.J., Alieto, E., Abdon, M., Rillo, R., & Lucas, R.I. (2020). Cognition toward the Mother Tongue, Attitude toward English, Chavacano, and Filipino: A Structural Equation Modeling Approach with Bootstrap Analysis. Asian ESP, 16(1.2), 5-28.*
53. *Goldring, E. B., & Pasternack, R. (2024). Principals' coordinating strategies and school effectiveness. School effectiveness and school improvement, 5(3), 239 253.*
54. *Gonzalez, R., & Patel, D. (2021). Instructional materials and their role in achieving learning standards in English education. Journal of Language Teaching, 55(6), 123-137*
55. *Graham, B. E. (2020). Mother tongue education: necessary? Possible? Sustainable? Language and Education, 24(4), 309-321. Igboanusi, H. (2008). Mother tongue-based bilingual education in Nigeria: attitudes and practice. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 11(6), 721-734.*
56. *Green, L., & Thompson, P. (2020). Enhancing English language learning with instructional materials. Language Education Journal, 42(3), 204-219*
57. *Gronn,P.(2020).Distributed properties: A new architecture for leadership. Educational management & administration, 28(3), 317-338.*
58. *Gronn, P. C. (2023). Talk as the work: The accomplishment of school administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1-21.*
59. *Hallinger, P. (2020). Instructional leadership and the school principal: A passing fancy that refuses to fade away. Leadership and policy in schools, 4(3), 221*
60. *Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (2021). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: School effectiveness and school improvement, 9(2),157-191.*
61. *Halverson, R., & Clifford, M. (2023). Distributed instructional leadership in high schools. Journal of School Leadership, 23(2), 389-419.*
62. *Harklau, L. (2024). Tracking and linguistic minority students: Consequences of ability grouping for second language learners. Linguistics and education, 6,*
63. *Harris, A. (2021). Distributed leadership: conceptual confusion and empirical reticence. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 10(3), 315-325.*
64. *Harris, M., & McCabe, S. (2022). Differentiation and the use of instructional materials in English language learning. International Journal of Educational Research, 62(4), 478-491*
65. *Harris, M., & Thompson, S. (2020). The impact of an English-only policy on student language proficiency. Journal of Language Education, 50(2), 134-148*
66. *Harris, M., & Thompson, S. (2021). The role of diverse pedagogies in improving English learning outcomes. Journal of Language Education, 50(2), 128-141*
67. *Hartley, D. (2019). Education policy, distributed leadership and socio-cultural theory. Educational Review, 61(2), 139-150.*
68. *Hatch, J. A. (2022). Doing qualitative research in education settings. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.*
69. *Hopkins, M. (2019). Beliefs in context: Understanding language policy implementation at a systems level. Educational Policy, 30(4), 573-605.*
70. *Jaffe-Walter, R., & Miranda, C. P. (2020). Segregation or Sanctuary? Examining the Educational Possibilities of Counterpublics for Immigrant English Learners. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 19(1), 104-122.*
71. *Johnson, A., & Lee, M. (2021). The importance of shared goals in language policy implementation. Teaching and Learning Journal, 47(3), 135-150*
72. *Johnson, A., & Lee, M. (2022). Project-based learning and inquiry methods in junior high school English instruction. Teaching English Today, 39(4), 249-263*

73. *Kanno, Y. & Cromley, J. G. (2023). English Language Learners' access to and attainment in postsecondary education. TESOL quarterly, 47(1), 89-121.*
74. *Kanno, Y., & Kangas, S. E. (2024). "I'm not going to be, like, for the AP" English language learners' limited access to advanced college-preparatory courses in high school. American Educational Research Journal, 51(5), 848-878.*
75. *Katz, A. (2021). Keepin' it real: Personalizing school experiences for diverse learners to create harmony and minimize interethnic conflict. Journal of negro education, 68(4), 496-510.*
76. *Lewis, M., & Lockheed, M. (2020). Inexcusable Absence: Why 60 Million Girls Still Aren"t in School and What to do About it. Washington, D.C: Center for Global Development.*
77. *Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (2020). Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.*
78. *Marshall, C., & Rossman, C. B. (2021). Designing qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.*
79. *Martínez, R. A. (2019). Beyond the English learner label: Recognizing the richness of bi/multilingual students' linguistic repertoires. The Reading Teacher, 71(5),515-522.*
80. *Mertens, D. M. (2020). Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.*
81. *Meyer, H., & Rowan, B. (2020). The new institutionalism and the study of educational organizations: Changing ideas for changing times. The new institutionalism in education, 15-32.*
82. *Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (2019). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.*
83. *Ngunga, A. (2021). Monolingual education in a multilingual setting: The case of Mozambique. Journal of Multicultural Discourses, 6(2),177-196.*
84. *Ogawa, R. T., & Bossert, S. T. (2020). Leadership as an organizational quality. Educational administration quarterly, 31(2), 224-243.*
85. *Oleszewski, A., Shoho, A., & Barnett, B. (2022). The development of assistant principals: A literature review. Journal of educational administration.*
86. *Olsen, B., & Kirtman, L. (2022). Teacher as mediator of school reform: An examination of teacher practice in 36 California restructuring schools. Teachers College Record, 104(2), 301-24.*
87. *Orwenjo, D. O. (2022). Multilingual education in Kenya: debunking the myths. International Journal of Multilingualism, 9 (3), 294-317.*
88. *Outcomes, and State Accountability Policies. Fact Sheet. Migration Policy Institute.*
89. *Parker, J., & Hill, M. (2020). Collaboration and innovation in professional development for educators. Teaching and Learning Journal, 56(4), 198-212*
90. *Parker, J., & Lee, M. (2022). Increasing student engagement through language passion. International Journal of Educational Research, 63(4), 175-188*
91. *Parker, J., & Taylor, L. (2021). Language proficiency for future success: The impact of committed teaching in junior high schools. Journal of Educational Development, 42(3), 98-112*
92. *Parker, J., & Thompson, S. (2021). Creating a unified approach to language learning in schools. International Journal of Educational Research, 60(1), 45-59*
93. *Patel, R., & Nguyen, A. (2021). Enhancing student engagement through varied teaching strategies in English classrooms. Journal of Educational Strategies, 44(3), 195-210*
94. *Patel, R., & Nguyen, A. (2021). The role of English immersion in maintaining language standards in junior high schools. Language Education Review, 39(1), 76-88*
95. *Patton, M. (2019). Understanding research methods: An overview of the essentials. Glendale, CA: Pyrczak Publishing.*
96. *Perez, A.L., & Alieto, E. (2019). Change of 'tongue' from English to a local language: A correlation of Mother Tongue proficiency and mathematics achievement. The Asian ESP Journal, 14(7.2), 136-150.*
97. *Petrin, R. A. (2020). School organization, curricular structure, and the distribution and effects of instruction for tenth-grade science. In L. V. Hedges and B.*
98. *Press. program: Features of success. Journal of Latinos and Education, 7(4),Record. Research Report. Washington State Board for Community and Technical*
99. *Reynolds, K. M., & O'Loughlin, J. B. (2019). Many Ways to Build a Model: Content Based ESL Instruction Models and Approaches in K-12. The Handbook of TESOL in K-12, 101-128.*
100. *Ricento, T. (2020). Language policy: Theory and practice–An introduction. An introduction to language policy: Theory and method, 10, 23.*
101. *Ricohermoso, C., Abequibel, B., & Alieto, E. (2019). Attitude towards English and Filipino as correlates of cognition toward Mother Tongue: An analysis among would-be language teachers. Asian EFL Journal, 26(6.1), 5-22.*
102. *Rigby, J. G. (2019). Principals' conceptions of instructional leadership and their informal social networks: An exploration of the mechanisms of the meso level. American Journal of Education, 122(3), 433-464.*
103. *Rillo, R. & Alieto, E. (2019). Indirectness Markers in Korean and Persian English Essays: Implications for Teaching Writing to EFL Learners. English as an International Journal, 13(2.2), 165-184.*
104. *Robinson-Cimpian, J. P., Thompson, K. D., & Umansky, I. M. (2019). Research and policy considerations for English learner equity. Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3(1), 129-137.*
105. *Rowan, B., Camburn, E., & Barnes, C. (2024). Benefiting from comprehensive school reform: A review of research on CSR implementation. Putting the pieces together: Lessons from comprehensive school reform research, 1-52.*
106. *Rudestam, K. E. & Newton, R. R. (2021). Surviving your dissertation: A comprehensive guide of content and process. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.*
107. *Rumberger, R. W. (2021). Tenth grade dropout rates by native language, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Paper published for the University of California Linguistic Minority Research Institute.*
108. *Saavedra, A. (2020). Chavacano as medium of communication: Its implication to the reading skills in English of elementary pupils. International Journal of Innovation and Change,10(10), 311-320.*

109. *Saunders, W., Goldenberg, C., & Marcelletti, D. (2023). English language development: Guidelines for instruction. American Educator, 37(2), 13.*
110. *Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., and LeCompte, M. D. (2019). Essential Ethnographic Methods. In J.J. Schensul and M.D. LeCompte, Eds. The Ethnographer's Toolkit. Baltimore, MD: Altamira Press of Rowan and Littlefield.*
111. *Schoen, L. T., & Teddlie, C. (2019). A new model of school culture: A response to a call for conceptual clarity. School effectiveness and school improvement, 19(2), 129-153.*
112. *Scott, W. R. (2023). Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities.*
113. *Sharma, U. (2020). Inclusion in education: A critical review of teacher attitudes and practices. International Journal of Special Education, 35(2), 82-97*
114. *Shohamy, E. G. (2020). Language policy: Hidden agendas and new approaches. Psychology Press.*
115. *Siskin, L. S. (2020). The challenge of leadership in comprehensive high schools: School vision and departmental divisions. Educational Administration Quarterly, 33(1), 604 623.*
116. *Skutnabb-Kangas, T. (2020). Language, Literacy and Minorities. London: Minority Rights Group.*
117. *Smith, L., & Brown, P. (2020). Using multiple pedagogical approaches for effective language instruction in junior high schools. Educational Review, 42(1), 54-67*
118. *Smith, L., & Carter, D. (2022). Adapting to change: Technology integration and professional development for school leaders. Journal of Educational Technology, 44(1), 113-126.*
119. *Smith, L., & Johnson, K. (2021). Building strong language skills in junior high students: Teacher dedication and effective strategies. Teaching and Learning Journal, 39(4), 140-154.*
120. *Smith, L., & Jones, H. (2021). The role of instructional materials in shaping English learning standards. Educational Studies, 37(2), 256-268.*
121. *Smith, L., & Jones, P. (2020). Best practices in English language instruction: Policy alignment in schools. Educational Review, 39(4), 248-262.*
122. *Smith, L., & Taylor, J. (2020). Lifelong learning through a love of English: Motivating students for success. Teaching and Learning Journal, 48(3), 93-107*
123. *Smith, L., & Taylor, J. (2021). English-only immersion in junior high schools: An effective strategy for language learning. Journal of Educational Strategies, 45(3), 102-118.*
124. *Spillane, J. P. (2020). Distributed leadership. In The educational forum. 69(2),*
125. *Spillane, J. P., & Burch, P. (2021). The institutional environment and instructional practice: Changing patterns of guidance and control in public education. The new institutionalism in education, 6, 87-102.*
126. *Spillane, J. P., & Orlina, E. C. (2022). Investigating leadership practice: Exploring the entailments of taking a distributed perspective. Leadership and Policy in Schools, 4(3), 157-176.*
127. *Spillane, J. P., Diamond, J. B., Burch, P., Hallett, T., Jita, L., & Zoltners, J. (2022). Managing in the middle: School leaders and the enactment of accountability policy. Educational Policy, 16(5), 731-762.*
128. *Spillane, J. P., Halverson, R., & Diamond, J. B. (2021). Investigating school leadership practice: A distributed perspective. Educational researcher, 30(3),23-28*
129. *Stritikus, T. T., & Wiese, A. M. (2021). Reassessing the Role of EthnographicStructural and Ideological Contexts of Structured English Immersion in Three Massachusetts Districts. Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies, 8(2), 41-67. students in California's public schools: The challenge of reintegration. Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, 105(2), 125-154.*
130. *Tait, K., & Purdie, N. (2021). Reflections on teaching in inclusive classrooms: Teacher experiences and professional development. Journal of Educational Leadership, 58(4), 481-496.*
131. *Thomas, W. P., & Collier, V. P. (2021). A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students long-term academic achievement.*
132. *Thompson, K. D. (2023). Is separate always unequal? A philosophical examination of ideas of equality in key cases regarding racial and linguistic minorities in education. American Educational Research Journal, 50(6), 1249-1278.*
133. *Thompson, K. D. (2019). Questioning the Long-Term English Learner Label: How*
134. *Umansky, I. M., & Reardon, S. F. (2024). Reclassification patterns among Latino English learner students in bilingual, dual immersion, and English immersion classrooms. American Educational Research Journal, 51(5), 879-912.*
135. *Van Lier, L., & Walqui, A. (2022). Language and the common core state standards. Commissioned Papers on Language and Literacy Issues in the Common Core State Standards and Next Generation Science Standards, 94,44.*
136. *Walqui, A., & Bunch, G. C. (Eds.). (2019). Amplifying the curriculum: Designing quality learning opportunities for English learners. Teachers College Press.*
137. *Weick, K. E. (2019). Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems Administrative science quarterly, 1-19.*
138. *Williams, B. A. O. (2020). In the beginning was the deed: Realism and moralism in political argument. Princeton University Press.*