University of Denver
Digital Commons @ DU

Electronic Theses and Dissertations | Graduate Studies

1-1-2009

English Teachers and English Language Learners in Middle School Classrooms: Perspectives and Practices

Elmer Celso Manzanares
University of Denver

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd

Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Recommended Citation

Manzanares, Elmer Celso, "English Teachers and English Language Learners in Middle School Classrooms: Perspectives and Practices" (2009). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 867.
https://digitalcommons.du.edu/etd/867

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu,dig-commons@du.edu.

ENGLISH TEACHERS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL CLASSROOMS: PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Morgridge College of Education

University of Denver

In partial fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

---

by

Elmer C. Manzanares

June 2009

Advisor: Kent Seidel, Ph.D.

Author: Elmer C. Manzanares
Title: ENGLISH TEACHERS AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL CLASSROOMS: PERSPECTIVES AND PRACTICES
Advisor: Kent Seidel, Ph.D.
Degree Date: June 2008

ABSTRACT

Public school classrooms in the United States are composed of an increasingly diverse population of learners. The number of students with limited proficiency in English has grown exponentially across the United States, yet their level of academic achievement lags significantly behind that of their language-majority peers.

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes, opinions and practices of middle school language arts/reading teachers regarding the inclusion of ELL students and the support they receive in their classrooms. The researcher administered a survey to 171 language arts/reading middle school teachers and interviewed six teachers from fourteen schools in a school district in the Southwest United States.

Respondents welcomed the cultural diversity that ELL students bring to the classroom, but encouraged linguistic assimilation as a condition of student success. A significant percentage of teachers indicated some ELL training but felt inadequately prepared to the challenges of teaching ELL students. Native language resources and instructional materials were limited and not used. Teachers were willing to give students more time to complete their coursework, but not necessarily lessen the amount of student work.

Based on these findings and their relationship to the literature of the field, the author recommended that further research be conducted regarding the relationship between teachers' language attitude and student outcomes, and geographical areas and grade levels. Additional recommendations were made regarding specialized certification for teachers of ELL students, professional development programs, educational policy and state legislative action.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank everyone who helped make my dissertation possible. First, I am grateful to my dissertation committee whose expertise guided me through this process. Dr. Kent Siedel, my dissertation advisor, your extraordinary leadership, guidance and support provided me the knowledge and stamina needed to complete this endeavor. Dr's Maria Salazar and Virginia Moloney, thank you for your remarks during the oral examination and pushing me to think more deeply about my study. Dr. Frederique Chevillot, thank you for chairing my defense with the utmost professionalism. You are all amazing role models.

I also wish to thank Russell diBartolo, Ph.D., aka Bart. A professor, statistician, great writer, mentor, and now friend, whose help I could not have done without. Bart, you invested countless hours in my writing, analyzing the data and giving me your unvarnished advice and all you asked from me was to "Pay it Forward."

Thank you, Cheryl for the detailed, painstaking work that comes with formatting and proofreading a dissertation paper. I know of no other person in this district, that is a better editor than Cheryl King.

To my wife Sandy, thank you for believing in me and your support to start and complete this project. To my Isabella and Zachary Manzanares, you can now cross that last day off, on the kitchen calendar. "Daddy has finished his homework." I hope this work serves as an inspiration to you someday and that you follow your dreams and pursue every opportunity that life has to offer. Remember; always try to do your best.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT II
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS IV
LIST OF TABLES VII

CHAPTER ONE 1

Introduction and Literature Review *1*
Introduction 1
Definition of Terms 2
Statement of Problem 2
Purpose of the Study 3
Significance of the Study 5
Limitations of the Study 5
Research Question 6
Literature Review *6*
Introduction 6
History of Legislation with Regard to ELL Instruction 7
Policy Implementation in U.S. Schools 12
Programs Available for ELL students 13
Significance of Teachers' Attitudes and Practices 16
Summary 23

CHAPTER TWO: 24

Methods and Procedures *24*
Introduction 24
Research Question 24
Setting 25
Participants 26
Instrumentation *29*
Teacher Survey (Appendix B) 29
Structure of the survey 32
Teacher Interviews 34
Procedures *35*
Data Analysis *36*
Organization 36

CHAPTER THREE: 38

Findings and Analysis *38*
Introduction 38
Survey Responses *38*
Interview Participants *40*
Research Question and Four Categories *45*
District and Administrative Support *45*
Statistical Tests for Mean Differences in Items among Subgroups 47
Interview Results *49*
Findings Regarding General Opinions about ELL Students *50*
Survey Results *50*

Interview Results *58*
Opinions Regarding ELL Students in the Mainstream Classroom *59*
Survey Results *59*
Statistical Tests for mean Differences in Items Among Subgroups 60
Interview Results *61*
Classroom Practices Regarding ELL Students *63*
Survey Results *64*
Statistical Tests for mean Differences in Items among Subgroups..... 66
Interview Results *69*

CHAPTER FOUR: 71

Discussion *71*
Summary of the Research 71
Discussion of Findings..... 72
District and Administrative Support 73
General Opinions Regarding ELLs in Mainstream Classrooms..... *75*
Discussion. 78
Opinions Regarding Inclusion of ELL Students in a Mainstream Classroom *81*
Discussion 82
Classroom Practices with ELL Students *83*
Discussion 86
Conclusions *88*
Recommendations for Further Research..... *90*
Relationship between teachers' language attitude and student outcomes..... 90
Geographical Areas and Grade Levels *90*
Recommendations for Training, Policy, and Practice *91*
Professional Development..... *92*
Educational Policy *94*

BIBLIOGRAPHY 95

APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF TERMS 106
APPENDIX B: SURVEY OF TEACHERS..... 109
APPENDIX C: TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE..... 114
APPENDIX D: LETTER OF INVITATION TO PRINCIPAL OF QUALITATIVE STUDY SITE 115
APPENDIX E: TEACHER INVITATION FOR THE QUALITATIVE STUDY (INTERVIEW) 116
APPENDIX F: TEACHER INVITATION FOR THE STUDY (SURVEY)..... 117
APPENDIX G**:** INFORMED CONSENT 118
APPENDIX H: UNIVERSITY OF DENVER HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL LETTER..... 120
APPENDIX I: GREATEST BENEFITS OF ELL INCLUSION 121
APPENDIX J: GREATEST CHALLENGES OF ELL INCLUSION..... 122
APPENDIX K: SURVEY RESPONSES 123

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Number of ELL Students and LEP Level at 14 Participating Middle Schools..26

Table 2. Characteristics of Teacher Sample (n – 169)…….…….27

Table 3. Interview Participants...…...…….....……...…..28

Table 4. Survey Themes, Sections and Survey Items……..……..……...32

Table 5. Survey Return Rates for Each School Site…….……...….39

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

Public school classrooms in the United States are composed of an increasingly diverse population of learners. Diverse learners come from different ethnic, religious, socioeconomic, and language backgrounds and reflect the increasing diversity of the American population (Banks, 2001; Hardy, 2004; Howard, 2006). According to U.S. Census data gathered in the year 2000, 18.4% of the population of the United States between the ages of 5-17 (i.e., school-aged children) reported that they spoke a language other than English at home (U.S. Census, 2000). During the academic year 2003-2004, 5.5 million students in the U. S. were limited English proficient (LEP), and 80 percent of these ELL students spoke Spanish as their first language (U.S. Department of Education, 2004). Hispanics continue to be the largest and fastest-growing minority group in the U.S. (Bernstein, 2006).

The Survey of The States' Limited English Proficient Students & Available Educational Programs and Services 2000-2001 Summary Report indicates that 22.7% of LEP students nationwide were receiving instruction that incorporated the student's native

language (Kindler, 2002). English was the exclusive language of instruction for ELL students representing 53.9% of the national LEP enrollment. It is estimated that the number of public school teachers who instructed at least one ELL in K-12, during the 2001-2002 school year was 1,273,420. This represents 43% of all public school teachers nationally and is 3.5 times more than the number reported in 1991-1992 (Zehler, Fleischman, Hopstock, Stephenson, Pendzick, & Sapru, 2003). While the number of students with limited proficiency in English has grown exponentially across the United States, their level of academic achievement has lagged significantly behind that of their language-majority peers.

Definition of Terms

A list of acronyms and definitions is provided in Appendix A to assist the reader understanding the conventions and language used in the teaching of English Language Learners.

Statement of Problem

Currently, national attention is focused on the need to provide a "highly qualified" teacher in every classroom (Hyatt, 2007) and reduce the achievement gap for ELL students. Studies have shown that ELL students score below their classmates on standardized tests of reading and math and are judged by their teachers to have lower academic abilities (Moss & Puma, 1995). Given the national attention, it seems prudent to examine the attitudes of effective teachers for the growing population of ELLs in public schools. Nationally, an analysis of standardized test scores reveals that 48 percent of ELLs in fourth grade scored below basic, the lowest designation given for this

assessment, on the math and 73 percent scored below basic in reading. Even more disturbing, the rate of ELLs below basic on the math test in eighth grade climbs to 71 percent while scores below basic in reading remains high at 71 percent (Fry, 2007).

Only two studies of middle school teachers were found in the literature. Cheryl Youngs (1999) as part of her primarily qualitative dissertation surveyed middle school teachers on their degree of enthusiasm toward receiving more ELLs in their classroom. Schmidt (2000) found that middle school teachers felt that ELL students should be taught in self-contained classrooms until their English improved. While researchers have explored the perspective of ELL students in secondary level subject area classes, (Cummins, 2000; Fu, 1995; Harklau, 1994; Harklau, 2000; Mace-Matluck, Alexander-Kasparik, & Queen, 1998; Walqui, 2000), there are few studies from a teacher's perspective.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to examine middle school English teachers' attitudes and opinions about the presence of English language learners in their classrooms, and practices they report using with these students. An extensive search of the major research databases (Education: A Sage Full-Text Collection; ERIC (CSA); Pro Quest Social Science Journals; Ebsco Host EJS; and Academic Search Complete) revealed no studies of middle school language arts/reading teachers' attitudes' on the inclusion of English language learners. Of the more than 5.5 million ELL students in the K-12 setting for the 2003-2004 school year, 53% were taught solely in English (Zehler et al., 2003). Given these facts, it seems appropriate to endeavor to understand the attitudes that teachers have

towards mainstreamed ELL students in their English classrooms to see if there may be a relationship between teacher attitudes and classroom practices.

This study builds on the work of Reeves (2002) focusing on middle school English and reading teachers. In her unpublished doctoral dissertation, Reeves (2002) conducted a study that addressed the attitudes and perceptions of high school teachers (from a variety of disciplines) who had ELL students mainstreamed into their classrooms. Teachers in her study generally believed that immersion in an English-rich environment was the best way for students to learn English. This mirrors a common belief that placing an English learner in an "English only" environment aids in the rapid acquisition of English.

Participants in her study also felt negatively towards the utility of using a student's native language in the classroom, even though studies have shown that bilingual programs of this type can result in ELL students out-performing their English-only counterparts (Ramirez & Yuen, 1991; Oller & Eilers, 2000; Thomas & Collier, 2001; Kenner, 2007). Finally, a majority of Reeves' respondents did not provide instructional materials in the ELL student's native language, and a majority of teachers felt that they did not have adequate time to deal with the needs of ELL students in their mainstream classrooms.

In adapting Reeves methodology, English teachers' attitudes and classroom practices were examined through their self-reported responses. This study will potentially offer an in-depth understanding of the experiences of middle school English/reading teachers towards English language learners in mainstream classrooms.

Significance of the Study

This study of English teachers' attitudes and reported practices with ELL students is significant because it demonstrates the relationship between practices, preparation and attitudes toward language learning by ELLs. This study is especially relevant to the discussion of teacher preparation, especially given the research associating language attitudes with student achievement (Clair, 1995; Karabenick & Clemens Noda, 2004). "Teachers who value students as individuals with unique capabilities, are aware that language, be it spoken, written, or non-verbal, is a form of transaction that has a tremendous power in the learning-teaching process" (Carrasquillo & Rodriguez, 2005). Administrators may use this information to develop professional development activities that are research based thereby providing support for all teachers involved in the education of language minority students.

Limitations of the Study

Generalization and use of the findings of this study may be limited because of the characteristics of the school district and study participants and methodological considerations.

This study was limited to surveys and interviews of middle school language arts/reading teachers in a large urban school district in the southwestern United States. This is one of the most rapidly growing districts in the country, with over 40% of its students classified as English Language Learners. The teachers who were surveyed taught in the fourteen middle schools with the highest percentage of English language learners. Because of this selection process, this may have not been a representative

sample of middle school language arts/reading teachers in the school district. Finally, results from the middle school survey sample may not be generalizable to those from a group of high school or elementary school teachers or to those teachers in dissimilar school districts.

The survey instrument consisted of self-reported responses from participants, and no observations of the reported behaviors or practices were made. The follow-up interviews of six survey respondents provided additional information, but the opinions of these respondents may have been different from those of another group.

Research Question

One research question guided this inquiry: What are middle school English teachers' self-reported attitudes and opinions about the presence of English language learners in their mainstream classrooms, and what practices do they report using with these students?

Literature Review

Introduction

The purpose of this review is to examine current research on the experiences of mainstream teachers with ELL students enrolled in their classes. This section includes an overview of the history of legislation regarding ELL, policy implementation and programs available to ELL students. Lastly, the literature review discusses findings about teacher attitudes identified in previous research studies.

In an educational landscape marked by increased accountability, teachers are at the nexus of the reform movement seeking to raise standards in the classroom. To a large degree, the success of these ambitious accountability initiatives depends on the knowledge and skills of classroom teachers (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996). At the same time, an increasingly diverse student population presents challenges which have not previously been addressed (Guzman, 2001; National Center for Educational Statistics, 2005). The continual influx of linguistically and culturally diverse students to the American classroom provides a unique opportunity to examine the tension teachers may experience between the forces of unity and diversity and institutional representations of teachers' roles and teachers' own beliefs about their role as educators.

American classrooms have long been viewed as vehicles for the standardization of "American values" and "the American language" (Gonzales & Darling-Hammond, 1997; Olsen 1996; Tollefson, 1989). However, research in the area of teachers' opinions has been traditionally scarce due to two main causes: (a) teachers' thoughts are unobservable; therefore, they are not easily measured and evaluated as actions and their perceivable effects (Clark & Peterson, 1986); and (b) the distinction between knowledge and beliefs, two of the constructs that appear to have the greatest influence on teachers' thoughts and actions, was not clear despite several efforts aimed at defining them (Elbaz, 1983; Nisbett & Ross, 1980; Shulman, 1986). It was not until Pajares (1992) used Nespor's (1987) framework of "belief systems" that some light was shed on this issue.

History of Legislation with Regard to ELL Instruction

Since the latter part of the nineteenth century, the United States has opened its borders to millions of immigrants from nations all across the globe. One direct effect of this human migration is that many students who do not speak English attend elementary, middle, and high schools. An important facet of this investigation is to identify the historic legislation that has mandated how ELL students are to be educated in the nation's classrooms. How then do these policies affect the experience of both teachers and ELL students in the classroom?" The educational policies of today's schools with regard to ELL students trace their origins to the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VI of the act states:

"No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program of activity receiving federal financial assistance" (Berube, 2000, p. 16).

English language learners are protected under this act because their limited English proficiency is viewed as an extension of their national origin. Because of this legislation, in theory, all ELL students must be given equal educational access and opportunities as their English-speaking counterparts. In response to challenges in federal court that the Civil Rights Act was not adequately addressing the needs of ELL students, the federal government passed the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This Act enabled federally funded programs that were truly bilingual in nature, and whose goal was that students become bi-literate (Crawford, 1999). However, across different school districts in the United States

many court cases were initiated by groups who felt that ELL students in their respective school districts were not receiving adequate instruction to meet their needs as English learners and K-12 students.

In 1970, the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) issued an official memorandum to clarify the school districts' responsibility to provide equal educational opportunities to ELL students (English Language Learner Knowledge Base, 2004). The memorandum states:

"Where inability to speak and understand the English language excludes (ELL) children from effective participation in the educational program offered by the school…the district must take affirmative steps to rectify the language deficiency in order to open its instructional programs" (Pottinger, 1970, p. 1).

Despite this mandate by the federal government, many ELL students nationwide had not been given equal access to learn in U.S. schools. In 1974, in the case Lau v. Nichols, a group of Chinese immigrants challenged the San Francisco school district and maintained that their language minority children were not receiving equal educational treatment under the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act. At this time, the school district of San Francisco imposed a requirement that before students could participate in the educational programs of the schools, they must have already had basic proficiencies in English. The subsequent ruling by the Supreme Court is considered a landmark on the scale of Brown v. Board of Education in regard to its effect on educational policy. The Supreme Court stated "by [solely] providing students with the same facilities, textbooks, teachers, and curriculum…students who do not understand

English are effectively foreclosed from any meaningful education" (Lau v. Nichols, 1974). The Lau decision gave the OCR authority to regulate how schools must design meaningful instruction that was responsive to the needs of ELL students (Berube, 2000, p. 20). The OCR (the primary enforcing agent of Lau v. Nichols), however, has taken a reactive rather than proactive stance in dealing with violations of this decision (Berube, 2000). Instead of approving language programs before they are implemented, the OCR investigates complaints to see if a school district is taking "appropriate action" with regard to educating ELL students. This wording has proven especially problematic for the OCR because school districts are able to use the ambiguity of the term "appropriate" to their advantage. As a result, school districts are given much latitude to develop their own programs for ELL students. As Walqui states, "While school districts may have a general policy for the education of students learning English…this policy is usually cast in vague and imprecise terms" (Walqui, 2000, p. 17). The result of this is a great many inconsistencies among school districts in the United States.

In 1998, California voters passed Proposition 227 that mandated that:

"Whereas, the English language is the national public language of the United States; and young immigrant children can easily acquire full fluency in a new language if they are heavily exposed to that language…It is resolved that: all children in California public schools shall be taught English as rapidly and effectively as possible" (Proposition 227, Article I, 1998).

This legislation effectively banned bilingual education programs except under certain circumstances and established a "sheltered immersion" program, which could last

no more than one school year (Mora, 2005). "Sheltered immersion" was defined as an "English language acquisition process for young children in whom nearly all classroom instruction is in English but with the curriculum and presentation designed for children who are learning the language" (Proposition 227, Article II, 1998). Considering the research by Cummins regarding the length of time needed to acquire Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), this program seems to place unrealistic expectations on the time required for ELL students to acquire English.

Proposition 203, "English for the Children" was passed by voters in 2001 in Arizona and took effect at the beginning of the 2002-2003 school year. This legislation requires that ELL students "be taught English, by being taught in English" and that they be placed in "English language classrooms" (Arizona Revised Statutes §15-752 English Language Education, 2001). This program virtually ended all bilingual instruction in Arizona schools and requires that all ELL students in grades two through eleven be assessed annually in English on a norm-referenced test (Wright, 2005). The results of these standardized tests revealed serious achievement gaps between ELL students and their native-speaking counterparts. Furthermore, most gains in test scores were the result of excluding test scores of ELL students who had been in public school less than four years (Wright & Pu, 2005).

Across the United States, groups such as English First and U.S. English have lobbied to have English designated as the official language of the United States. These groups feel that the use of languages other than English in hospitals, social service agencies, schools, voting booths, and other public venues is anathema to our collective

unity and that for full integration into society, non-native speakers need to be taught English (Boulet, 2001). According to Jim Boulet, Executive Director of English First,

"Bilingual-education programs say to Hispanic parents: 'Your children aren't real Americans and never will be.' Bilingual education ensures Hispanic children will grow up to be second-class citizens because such programs keep Hispanic children from learning English when they are young and can do so most easily" (Boulet, 2001).

The above examples show that there exists a broad spectrum of attitudes towards language usage and language instruction in the nation's classrooms. Although much of the legislation mentioned has attempted to create a more equitable experience for ELL students, the primary determining factor of how these programs are implemented is their applicability to the respective school district.

Policy Implementation in U.S. Schools

When developing the policies for ELL students at the school district level, the most implemented, yet least effective, method is enrolling ELL students in language service classes (often called "ESOL" for "English Speakers of Other Languages") with mainstream subject area classes (Thomas & Collier, 1997). This method is commonly known as "mainstreaming" or "pull-out ESL" and it is the most frequently used form of language service in American schools (Moran, 2000). The term "pull-out" refers to the students spending a portion of their day in ESOL classes, but they are "pulled out" at specific times to increase the amount of time spent in contact with English-speaking classmates and teachers. For the proposed study, "mainstreaming" was defined as placing ELLs in classrooms in which the school curriculum is delivered through the

medium of English (Carrasquillo & Rodriguez, 2002). While the term mainstreaming is most commonly used in the field of special education, it is also used to describe the type of environment in which ELLs are placed with their native-speaking counterparts in content area classrooms (Ovando, Collier, & Combs, 2003). Reeves (2002) states that "pull-out ESL classes may be popular due to their emphasis on the rapid acquisition of English" (p. 17). This rapid acquisition model is based on the belief that immersion in the target language is the best way to learn it.

Many researchers, however, have conducted studies to disprove these claims. In his seminal work, Krashen (1985) pointed out that without "comprehensible input," this method can hamper students' ability to acquire English. In a classroom, the concept of comprehensible input refers to the teacher creating an environment in which material presented is supported by contextual clues and is presented in ways to maximize the ELL students' ability to "make sense" of what is being said. When these context clues are included in pedagogic practice, the student is better able to comprehend the meaning of specific words and phrases and thus acquire English (Krashen, 1985). Misconceptions about English language learning, such as the rapid acquisition model, may play an important part in the attitudes of teachers towards their ELL students in the mainstream classroom. If a teacher does not have the training necessary to understand the language acquisition process, he or she may be largely ineffective at teaching these students.

Programs Available for ELL students

A variety of bilingual education programs have been implemented across the United States in the past decades. Bilingual education programs are defined as

“educational programs that use two languages, one of which must be English, for teaching purposes” (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Bilingual education programs take many forms, but two goals are common to all: (1) to teach students the English language and (2) to provide instruction of the core curriculum in the home language while students are learning English proficiency (Lessow-Hurley, 2000). The following are brief descriptions of several of the most popular types of bilingual education programs.

Transitional Bilingual Education: These programs offer instruction in the primary language (non-English) for one to three years. The purpose is to build a foundation in literacy and academic content that will facilitate English language and academic development as students acquire English. The goal of this program is to develop English language proficiency as quickly as possible (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005).

Maintenance Bilingual Education: In this model, instruction is delivered in English and the minority language beginning in elementary school and often lasting into middle and high school. As the name implies, the goal of this type of program is to help language minority students develop and maintain their primary language, as well as become fully proficient in both oral and written English.

Immersion Education: Unlike the American “immersion” model, in which students are “immersed” in English medium classes, the first bilingual immersion programs were developed in Canada for different purposes. The goal of these programs is to teach a second language to language-majority students. Students in these programs receive instruction in their second language (e.g., Spanish) to develop second language proficiency while learning academic content. The goal of these programs is proficiency

in both the native and second language. Special pedagogical techniques are used in these classrooms to help students understand, learn, and participate in the new language (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). The success of these programs has been extensively studied and evaluated by the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (Genesee, 1984; Swain & Lapkin, 1989).

Two-Way Immersion Programs: These programs, also called "developmental bilingual education," are created to serve both language majority and language minority students. Equal numbers of native speakers of English and language minority speakers are grouped together in the same classrooms. In the early grades, instruction is delivered in the non-English language. This procedure provides second language development for English speakers as well as intensive primary language development for native speakers of the minority language (Christian, 1994). Instruction in English begins with about 20 minutes a day in kindergarten. Gradually English is increased as students move up in grades until approximately equal time is given for both languages (Reynolds, Dale, & Moore, 1989). As a result of this type of program, both groups develop and maintain their home languages. The effects of the two-way program have been evaluated throughout the United States with positive results (Lindholm, 1990; Lindholm & Gavlek, 1994; Peregoy, 1991; Peregoy & Boyle, 1990). It must be noted, however, that bilingual education programs serve only a small percentage of eligible students across the United States (Peregoy & Boyle, 2005). Much more commonly, students who arrive in this country are placed in educational settings in which the ultimate goal is for students to learn English, and scant attention is paid to the student's home language.

Teachers are one of the key components of these programs because they are responsible for providing the necessary instruction to their students. Therefore, investigating their opinions about the programs in which they are participating appears to be of the utmost importance. However, teachers have traditionally lacked representation in public forums and their points of view have often been overlooked in the research. Lemberger (1992) summarizes that " much of the literature on bilingual education focuses on its legal, political and methodological aspects. What is missing from the literature are the teachers' voices" (p1).

Significance of Teachers' Attitudes and Practices

Teachers' attitudes about ELL students can significantly affect the academic performance and opportunities of ELL students (Reeves, 2002). If teachers with mainstreamed ELLs overtly or covertly believe that these students are unwilling or unable to accomplish academic tasks as well as their English-speaking counterparts, this can have a significant impact on the academic achievement of these students.

According to a compilation of reports from 41 state education agencies, only 19% of students classified as limited English proficient met state norms for reading in English (Kindler, 2002). Students from language minority backgrounds also have higher dropout rates and often placed in lower ability groups than English-background students (Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000). English language learners do not exist as a homogenous group. Dropout rates and achievement rates vary by ethnic group. In the district in which the study took place, during the 2007-2008 school year 76% of Asian students graduated from high school in four years while only 52% of Hispanic students graduated during the

same time period. While not all of the discrepancy has a direct correlation with the inability to speak English, the differences between groups are significant and appear consistently across states. One probable factor is the impact of socioeconomic status (SES) on educational attainment.

Krashen and Brown (2005) found that high SES English language learners outperform low-SES fluent English speakers on academic tasks. The results indicate that SES can offset the effects of language proficiency on standardized tests. Another probable factor that influences student achievement and a major portion of the rationale for this study is the effect of teachers' attitudes on the English learners' experience while at school.

Teachers do not always recognize the power they hold over students in classrooms but, their power is keenly felt by their students (Delpit, 1995). In a study of teacher perceptions, Clair (1995) conducted interviews of three teachers with mainstreamed ELL students in their content area classrooms. She found that all three teachers felt unprepared to teach their ELL students, and furthermore that they believed that the professional development made available to them by their school districts was largely inappropriate. They were as Clair puts it, "learning to educate these students on the job" (Clair, p. 194). Another problematic aspect of Clair's findings was the beliefs of her participants that the simple solution for educating ELL students could be found in "goody bags" and bilingual textbooks for vocabulary words (p. 191). These findings point to a common fallacious notion that fails to recognize the complexities of the social and academic integration of ELL students in mainstream classroom settings.

These data mirror the findings of other studies (Harklau, 1994; Verplaetse, 1998) that teachers feel varying degrees of unpreparedness when teaching ELL students in subject area classrooms. If teachers who have these ELL students in their classrooms feel under-prepared to teach them effectively, this could have a significant effect on their attitudes and behavior towards these students.

Schmidt (2000) conducted a study on middle school teachers with ELL students mainstreamed in their content area classrooms and he discovered an erroneous belief by one teacher that the ELL students in his classroom were only pretending that they didn't understand English. This belief was a by-product of the assumption that ELL students' native language is a crutch that they use to receive "special breaks" that aren't available to their English-speaking counterparts (Schmidt, 2000, p. 125). Other teachers in this study felt that ELL students should be taught in a self-contained classroom with other non-English speaking students until their English improved and allowed them to be transferred into regular classes. Attitudes such as these can have negative impacts on the social environment that the teacher constructs with the student.

Youngs (1999) distributed a 13-item survey to middle school teachers who had mainstream ELL students in their subject area classrooms. This instrument was created to measure teachers' attitudes towards mainstreaming as either positive or negative. The results of her study were that overall, teachers' attitudes were found to be neutral to slightly positive towards mainstreaming practices. However, one teacher in the study remarked, "He [the ELL student] shouldn't even be in my class at this point" (Youngs, 1999, p. 84). This teacher believed that placing this ELL in his mainstream class created

too much of a demand on his time, when there were dozens of other students in his classroom who spoke English. In later research, Youngs and Youngs (2001) linked teachers' attitudes towards ELL inclusion with various predictor variables. This study found that the variables of ELL training, personal experience with other cultures, contact with ELL students, and gender were significantly correlated to positive attitudes towards ELL inclusion in classrooms. Youngs' research parallels findings of this researcher's study. The survey instrument used in the present study built on qualitative themes from the Youngs and Youngs (2001) research.

Reeves (2002) conducted a study that explored four categories of secondary teachers' attitudes, opinions, and practices related to inclusion of ELL students in a regular classroom. These included (a) ELL inclusion itself, (b) coursework modification for ELLS, (c) professional development for working with ELLs, and (d) perceptions of language and language learning. Reeves relied upon the small number of available research studies that explored the experiences of subject area teachers of ESL students directly. Findings from this study are particular to its location, yet they provide some insight into subject area teachers' attitudes toward ELL inclusion in mainstream classrooms in the nation at large.

The school district used in the study had an ELL student population of approximately 52,000 students and had experienced an increase in the enrollment of ELLs with 2.6% (1,378) of its population identified as non-English-language background students. The secondary subject area teachers in Reeves' study, like those in Youngs and Youngs' 2001 work, reported a neutral to slightly positive attitude toward the inclusion of

ELLs in their mainstream classrooms in general. Further analysis of teachers' attitudes toward specific aspects of inclusion, however, suggests that this self reported, welcoming attitude might mask or accompany a reluctance to work with particular ELLs (e.g., those with very limited English proficiency). Reeves found that on the general measures of teachers' attitudes about inclusion, survey respondents largely believed that inclusion created a positive education environment. Most teachers reported that they would welcome ELLs into their classroom.

In response to specific items probing particular aspects of inclusion, teachers revealed that they were reluctant to work with ELLs who lacked a minimum level of English proficiency and believed that they did not have enough time to meet the needs of ELLs. Furthermore, only slightly more than half of the teachers believed that ELL inclusion benefited all students, in contrast to the nearly three quarters who believed that ELL inclusion created a positive education environment.

Reeves (2006) reported that the discrepancy in general attitudes toward inclusion and attitudes toward specific inclusion aspects may be an indication of respondents' desire to give socially acceptable answers, or a desire to please the researcher. On the other hand, it could be an indication of the complexity of teachers' thinking concerning ELL inclusion.

In recapping the findings of the four major themes found in this study; they indicate a discrepancy in attitudes toward inclusion, equitability of coursework modification, ambivalence towards professional development, and misconceptions regarding second language acquisition. The combination of a school faculty unprepared

for ELLs and a school policy of immediate mainstreaming for all ELLs, even those with low English proficiency, set the stage for the frustration and failure of teachers and students. Perhaps equally troubling is the finding that nearly half of the teachers surveyed perceived that they lacked adequate training to work with ELLs and were uninterested in receiving additional training. Lastly, teacher perceptions that two years is sufficient for full language proficiency are not supported by research. This misconception could lead teachers to faulty conclusions concerning ELLs' language ability, intelligence, or motivation. The findings of Reeves' study suggest the importance of ELL teachers possessing a basic understanding of the second language acquisition processes.

Verplaetse (1998) found that English learners are often marginalized in mainstream classrooms and their opportunities to interact were minimized even when the classroom teachers had the best of intentions for their ELL students. If students are not allowed to exercise their "voices" in the classroom, and are precluded from learning the content knowledge that allows them to fully understand and participate in a democratic society, then their language instruction has not met their needs. Furthermore, Verplaetse found that the teachers in her study wanted to protect their ELL students from embarrassment, so they refrained from asking difficult questions and often completed the students' answers for them (Verplaetse, 1998).

Opportunities to interact with others are critical for ELL students because language interaction plays an important part in language development. Specifically, interaction gives ELL students an opportunity to create unique language output, and

forces them to manipulate components of the new language (Swain, 1985). Teachers who do not allow ELL students the opportunity to produce language in an effort to protect them from embarrassment are engaged in what Hatch (1992) calls a "benevolent conspiracy" (p.67). By attempting to create a comfortable environment without checking on or facilitating development of academic content knowledge, teachers effectively block access to content knowledge acquisition. All three teachers in Verplaetse's study believed they were acting in their mainstreamed students' best interests when they acted this way.

In a paper presented to the National Council of Teachers of English, Layzer (2000) reported the findings of a qualitative study she conducted by interviewing several content area teachers with ELL students mainstreamed in their classrooms. She consistently found that teachers perceived that ELL students were incapable of doing the same quality work as their native-speaking classmates. This belief led the teachers to lower their expectations for the students while completing academic tasks.

Anyon (1980) and Oakes (1985) have made it clear that this type of "low expectation" environment is one of the ways schools reproduce social inequalities. Collier and Thomas (1999) argue that instead of adjusting expectations downward for ELL students, teachers need to demand more of these students who have to learn roughly 50 percent more than their English speaking classmates just to be at grade level.

Multicultural education scholars are persistent in their arguments that teachers should become knowledgeable about cultural diversity and develop pedagogical skills that address teacher attitudes (Banks & Banks, 2004; Brown, 2002; Cochran-Smith,

2004; Dilworth, 1992; Irvine, 2003). Their core message is that race and culture count in significant ways in the teaching and learning process and should play a central role in the professional preparation of teachers (Gay, 2005). Cochran-Smith (2004), Irvine (2003), and Villegas and Lucas (2002) have spoken to this need, contending that effective teacher education programs for cultural diversity understandings require systemic change at the institutional level. By learning and utilizing instructional language teaching methods and best practices, mainstream teachers can make a significant contribution to the linguistic and academic growth of English learners. As the linguistic minority population increases, teacher education must give higher priority to include coursework in diversity issues and ESL methods for all teachers.

Summary

The research on teachers' attitudes about ELL students is limited. Only two studies that focused specifically on middle school English teachers were found. Because teachers can have such a significant impact on students' learning experiences, it seems noteworthy to study teachers' attitudes and practices. This chapter discussed the history of the legislation, policy implementation in U.S. schools, programs available for ELL students as well as the significance of teachers' attitudes as reported in other studies.

CHAPTER TWO:

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

This study used a mixed method "sequential exploratory model," in which quantitative survey data was analyzed first and interview data analyzed second (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). This model also uses the findings from the quantitative analysis of the large-scale survey to shape the interview portion of the data collection.

This study explored teachers' attitudes, opinions, and teaching practices regarding ELL students through a survey instrument adapted from one created by Reeves (2002) for an earlier study. A survey was given to 171 middle school English teachers. In addition, six teachers who had completed the survey volunteered to be interviewed to provided clarification and expansion of the survey data.

Research Question

One research question guided this inquiry:

What are middle school English teachers' self-reported attitudes towards, and opinions about, the presence of English language learners in their mainstream classrooms, and what practices do they report using with these students?

Setting

This study was conducted in a large southwestern school district, the fifth largest school district in the nation. During the year of the study (2008-2009), the district's total student population was 308,554, with 19% of the population classified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) (District School Accountability Report, 2008). The district currently employs 18,715 licensed personnel (teachers) who come from all over the country, including a small number from overseas employed on a work permit status. At the time of this study, there were fifty-seven middle schools in the district with ELL student populations ranging from as low as 2% to as high as 42% of the school population.

National indicators (www.edweek.org) used as a measurement of the effectiveness of K-12 education list this district among the worst performers. Class sizes are among the largest in the nation, and nearly 40% of its students qualify for Free and Reduced Lunch. Adding another difficult dimension to an already stressed district, one in five students is enrolled in the English Language Learners program.

This study included language arts/reading teachers from the 14 district middle schools (grades 6 to 8) with the highest percentages of ELL students. These schools were selected in order to ensure that all of the language arts/reading teachers participating in the study were likely to have experienced the inclusion of ELL students in their classes. Table 1, below, lists the participating schools, with the total number and percentages of ELL students enrolled in each school. The LEP level is an indicator of students' English language proficiency, with the highest level of language proficiency being LEP Level 5.

These scores are based on the administration of LAS-Links by the district's English Language Learners Department.

Table 1. Number of ELL Students and LEP Level at 14 Participating Middle Schools

SCHOOL	ELL Students		LEP LEVEL 1	LEP LEVEL 2	LEP LEVEL 3	LEP LEVEL 4	LEP LEVEL 5
A	426	43%	42 (10%)	51 (12%)	123 (28%)	200 (47%)	10 (2%)
B	457	38%	38 (8%)	34 (7%)	110 (24%)	257 (56%)	18 (4%)
C	397	38%	17 (4%)	31 (7%)	91 (23%)	248 (62%)	10 (3%)
D	491	35%	17 (3%)	52 (11%)	101 (21%)	295 (60%)	26 (5%)
E	347	35%	22 (6%)	26 (7%)	88 (25%)	201 (58%)	10 (3%)
F	306	33%	35 (11%)	46 (15%)	95 (31%)	125 (40%)	5 (2%)
G	345	30%	11 (3%)	28 (8%)	83 (24%)	211 (61%)	12 (3%)
H	340	30%	17 (5%)	30 (9%)	75 (22%)	205 (60%)	13 (4%)
I	226	27%	16 (7%)	18 (8%)	49 (21%)	137 (60%)	6 (3%)
J	316	27%	28 (9%)	25 (8%)	64 (20%)	189 (60%)	10 (3%)
K	374	25%	17 (4%)	32 (8%)	96 (25%)	211 (56%)	18 (5%)
L	291	23%	11 (4%)	31 (10%	78 (27%)	169 58%)	2 (07%)
M	222	19%	19 (8%)	12 (5%)	46 (21%)	134 (60%)	11 (5%)
N	297	19%	18 (6%)	19 (8%)	76 (25%)	172 (58%)	12 (4%)

Participants

A total of 171 middle school language arts/reading teachers from the 14 schools completed the survey. Six teachers from the three middle schools with the highest percentages of ELL consented to a follow-up interview designed to clarify and expand

upon their responses to the survey. Demographic characteristics of respondents are presented below, in Chapter 3, Findings.

For purposes of comparison and analysis, the sample was subdivided into five groups, based on years of teaching experience (five levels), gender (male/female), native English as a native speaker (yes/no), knowledge of a second language (yes/no), and race/ethnicity (five levels).

Table 2. Characteristics of Teacher Sample (n – 169)

Years of Experience	Number		Average Years Exp.	Native English Speaker	Second Language Speaker	Pre-Service Training
	Male	Female				
21 or More	5	20	29.7	25	8	9
16 - 20	3	10	18.2	12	5	7
11 - 15	3	18	13.3	21	9	6
6 - 10	8	29	8.1	33	13	17
1 - 5	13	55	2.9	63	31	33
Totals	32	134	10.8	154	66	72
%	20%	80%		91%	39%	43%

Table 2. Characteristics of Teacher Sample (n – 169) (continued)

Years of Experience	In-Service Training	White	African-American	Hispanic	Asian	Other
21 or More	19	18	2	1	0	2
16 - 20	12	10	1	0	0	2
11 - 15	17	16	3	0	0	2
6 - 10	29	20	8	4	1	6
1 - 5	51	52	2	3	1	9
Totals	128	116	16	8	2	21
%	76%	69%	9%	5%	1%	12%

Gender, years teaching experience, subject area and ELL training for all interviewees are summarized on Table 3 below.

Table 3: Interview Participants

Pseudonym	Gender	Years Teaching	Subject Area	ELL Training
Adella	Female	3	Reading	CCSD In-Service
Sandy	Female	6	English	SIOP Certification
Griselda	Female	8	English	College Courses
Laverne	Female	12	Reading	TESL Certification
Marie	Female	14	English	CCSD In-Service
Isabella	Female	20	Reading	Workshops

INSTRUMENTATION

Teacher Survey (Appendix B)

Rationale: The survey used in this study was adapted from an instrument created by Reeves (2002). Permission was granted to the researcher to use and adapt the survey by the author via email August 2008. While Reeves surveyed high school teachers in a small school district in the southeastern United States, the present study focused on middle school teachers in a large urban school district in the southwestern United States that has a high concentration of English language learners.

Themes used in the survey instrument: The survey instrument used in this study was divided into four sections representing four major themes, as adapted from Reeves (2002). While Reeves logically developed six themes, the present author determined that four themes were more descriptive and relevant for this sample of middle school teachers. The four themes are:

1. District and Administrative Support.

   This theme addressed the different types of training that teachers received that enabled them to work effectively with ELLs and the adequacy of support that the teachers felt they received from the school administration and the ELL program.

2. General Opinions Regarding ELL Students.

   This theme explored two categories of language attitudes and perceptions: attitudes towards second language acquisition processes and the role each language should play in the classroom

3. Opinions Regarding Inclusion of ELL Students in Mainstream Classrooms.

   This theme address teachers' perceptions and attitudes regarding the changes in the environment because of the inclusion of ELLs in the language arts/reading classroom and the general level of teachers' enthusiasm for the policy of mainstreaming ELLs into their mainstream classrooms.

4. Classroom Practices Regarding Inclusion of ELL Students.

This theme addressed the teachers' attitudes and actual practices when ELL students were included in their classrooms. This included grading practices, modification of coursework and other considerations regarding ELL students in their classroom.

Within these themes, the teachers were also able to comment on the benefits and challenges of inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms.

Validity and reliability of the survey: Both Reeves study and the present investigation have used an instrument which has been logically developed with regard to items and themes. That is, the items and themes were examined and grouped by theme according to their apparent links based on the research literature, rather than through

psychometric techniques. This practice is generally accepted in the educational field, especially regarding exploratory attitudinal, opinion, and similar surveys.

Since this is a second study using the basic structure of the instrument developed by Reeves, it is useful to subject the survey to a measure of reliability, in this case, Cronbach's Alpha. This statistical test assesses the reliability of an underlying factor on a psychometric test by correlating the items within that factor. According to Steiner and Norman (1989), alpha values for cognitive and achievement tests tend to be generally higher than for measures of attitude or opinion primarily because the former are more structured and deal with specific constructs or areas. Alpha values may be affected by the number of items and the degree of item redundancy, and high values may be artificially inflated. With too few or too many items in a scale, the alpha value may be artificially lowered or raised. While alpha values of .70 to .80 and above are considered acceptable for established scales, values in the .60 range may be acceptable for newly-developed instruments, with differing numbers of items in a subscale, such as the one used in the present study.

Cronbach's Alpha values for each of the four themes are included in Table 4, below. While these values may be considered somewhat low, they do show a degree of internal consistency that provides support for further development and use of this exploratory instrument.

Table 4. Survey Themes and Items

Themes	Cronbach's Alpha	Survey Items
District and Administrative Support	.68	A14, B31, B32
General Opinions Regarding ELL Students	.54	A2, A3, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9, A10, A11 A12, A16
Opinions Regarding Inclusion of ELL Students	.55	A1, A4, A15, A17
Classroom Practices with ELL Students	.61	B18, B19, B20, B21, B22, B23, B24, B25, B26, B27, B28

Structure of the survey

The survey instrument consists of 42 items including seven demographic questions, 31 answerable on a four-point Likert scale, and three open-ended items. The eight items in the demographic section were designed to elicit the respondents' demographic information, including years of teaching experience, native language, second-language proficiency, students enrolled in classroom throughout career, gender, and types of language minority training.

The three items in the district and administrative section were designed to probe the level of support that language arts/reading teachers receive when working with ELL students. Respondents were instructed to read each statement and circle the answer which most closely represented their level of agreement: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree.

The eleven items in the general opinions section were designed to elicit the general opinions of the respondents regarding policies and practices regarding mainstreaming of ELL students. The teachers were instructed to read each statement and circle the answer which most closely represented their opinion: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The four items in the opinions regarding inclusion section were designed to gain information about teacher opinions regarding the inclusion of ELL students in the classroom and the effects of inclusion. In this section, the respondents were instructed to read each statement and circle the answer which most closely represented their opinion: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, and Strongly Disagree.

The thirteen items in the classroom practices section were designed to learn about classroom practices used by teachers with ELL students. In this section, respondents were asked to read each statement and indicate the response which most closely represented the frequency of the practice: All of the Time, Some of the Time, Seldom or Never.

The last section of the survey consisted of three open ended questions:

Please list what you consider the greatest benefits of including ELL students in mainstream language arts/ reading classes?

Please list what you consider the greatest challenges of including ELL students in mainstream language arts/reading classes?

Please write additional comments you may have concerning the inclusion of ELL students in language arts/reading classes.

These open-ended items allowed the participants to expand or clarify their responses in the previous sections and to identify any attitudes or classroom practices that the previous sections did not address.

Teacher Interviews

The interview guide used in this study (see Appendix C) was adapted from one constructed by Reeves (2002), with two questions added. This type of interview is considered "structured" because the researcher asks specific questions that are predetermined before the interview takes place (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

The interview questions were designed to:

Obtain demographic and experiential information from the participants, including years of experience and the nature of training for working with ELL students. (A follow up question asked about important moments in teaching ELL students);

Determine respondents' attitudes and opinions regarding the first time an ELL student was enrolled in one of their classes;

Understand respondents' perceptions of the challenges and benefits of having ELL students in mainstream classrooms;

Determine the level of administrative support the teachers received when teaching ELL students;

Ascertain any changes in the attitudes of the respondents regarding inclusion of ELL students in their classroom; and

Gather information regarding successful practices and strategies used with ELL students in the teachers' language arts classroom.

PROCEDURES

Prior to distributing surveys or contacting participants for the study approval was gained from the Institutional Review Board at the University of Denver and the school district's Office of Research. The process of collecting the survey data required the researcher to email each of the fourteen middle school principals to request a departmental meeting with each of their language arts/reading departments. Once permission was granted the researcher drove to each of the fourteen school sites, met with each department and distributed the survey in person. To preserve the anonymity of the participants, surveys were returned to the researcher anonymously in an unmarked envelope.

The researcher gained permission from the principals of the three middle schools with the highest ELL populations to invite language arts/reading teachers to participate in the follow-up interviews (see Appendix D). Each interview lasted between 30 and 60 minutes. The researcher conducted the teachers' interviews, and each interview was audio taped to ensure accuracy of data collection. The teachers who agreed to be interviewed were sent an e-mail with their transcribed responses so that they could add or delete any comments, as they deemed necessary.

DATA ANALYSIS

Organization

Teacher Survey.

The options for each of the closed-end items were numerically coded as follows:

4 – Strongly Agree; All of the Time

3 – Agree; Some of the Time

2 – Disagree; Seldom
1 – Strongly Disagree; Never

Numerical codes were also provided for informational items.

The researcher entered all coded responses on a spreadsheet and obtained percentages and/or totals for each response. The narrative responses for the open-ended items were entered and grouped according to logical categories developed by the author. The researcher then developed narrative summaries that identified the patterns or preponderance of the responses for the items within each major theme of the survey.

Teacher Interviews: Each interview was audio taped and transcribed into a word processing document. The transcripts were imported into the qualitative software program, NUD*IST (Richards, 2002), to help the researcher create themes for the information. The information from each of the interviewees was then summarized by theme for each individual and for the interview group as a whole.

Analysis and Discussion: The researcher analyzed the survey data and information from the interviews for the teachers' perspectives, opinions, attitudes and practices regarding the inclusion of ELL students in their language arts classrooms. Comparing survey data with interview information is a method of triangulating the data, that is, "using multiple sources of evidence...to support a conclusion" (Eisner, 1991, p. 26; Tashakkori and Teddlie, 2003).

A second level of analysis involved comparing the means of the responses of the participants on each of the survey items, grouped for analysis by years of teaching experience; gender; English as a native language; knowledge of a second language; level of ELL training; and race/ethnicity. The characteristics of these groups are provided above in Table 2.

For dichotomous variables, t-tests for independent means were used to determine differences among the means. These variables included gender (male/female), English as a native language (yes/no), knowledge of a second language (yes/no), and participation in pre-service or in-service ELL training courses (yes/no).

For variables with more than two values, the item means were compared using analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests to determine pairwise differences. These variables included years of teaching experience (5 levels) and race/ethnicity (five categories).

CHAPTER THREE:

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter presents an analysis of the survey and interview data collected to address the research question of this study:

> "What are middle school English teachers' self-reported attitudes towards and opinions about the presence of English language learners in their mainstream classrooms, and what practices do they report using with these students?"

Prior to the analysis, survey return rates and background information on the study participants are presented. The remainder of the chapter provides the findings and analysis of the information collected through the survey and interviews.

SURVEY RESPONSES

Of the 213 total number of surveys distributed at language arts/reading department meetings, 174 (82%) were returned. Three of the returned surveys were completed by non-language arts teachers and were rejected. This left 171 respondents. Return rates for each school are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Survey Return Rates for Each School Site

School Site	Surveys Distributed	Surveys Returned	Surveys Rejected	Return Rate
A	12	11	0	92%
B	15	12	1	80%
C	20	18	0	90%
D	21	19	0	90%
E	10	9	0	90%
F	13	9	0	69%
G	19	14	1	74%
H	11	5	0	45%
I	5	3	0	60%
J	20	13	0	65%
K	19	19	1	100%
L	14	13	0	93%
M	13	13	0	100%
N	21	16	0	76%
Totals	213	174	3	82%

Participants' years of teaching experience ranged from .04 to 39 years with an average of 10.7 years. There were 130 female (76%) and 31 (18%) male respondents, with 10 (6%) unreported. The majority of the participants were native English speakers (87%) while 14 (8%) spoke a native language other than English. Fifty-eight (34%)

participants spoke a second language, 99 (58%) did not, and eight (5%) participants did not respond. Twenty-three respondents (40%) estimated that they had attained a beginning level of proficiency in their second language, 26 (45%) estimated an intermediate level of proficiency, and nine (16%) estimated an advanced level of proficiency.

A majority of participants 124 (73%) had received training to work with language minority /ELL students as in-service teachers; 37 (22%) had received no training; and seven (4%) did not respond. Of the 124 participants who had been trained, 40 had taken college coursework preparing them for teaching with language minorities, 37 had attended in-service workshops or seminars and 25 experienced both types of training. Sixty-one (37%) respondents disagreed that their training in college provided adequate preparation to effectively teach ELL students while 51 (31%) believed that their college courses did not prepare them adequately.

Sixty-nine percent of the sample described themselves as White; nine percent, African-American; five percent, Hispanic, one percent, Asian; and, 12% as other ethnicity.

Interview Participants

Six teachers participated in the interviews. All participants were native English speakers with one being fluent in Spanish at an intermediate proficiency level. Their teaching experience ranged from three to twenty years. One of the interviewees received a minor in college in ESL education while two of the other participants had received

extensive ELL training resulting in the acquisition of a TESL endorsement. The remaining three had different levels of training in teaching language minority students, acquired primarily through district teacher in-service staff development. To assure anonymity, the author used pseudonyms for the individual interviewees when describing their backgrounds.

Adella is a third year teacher who has taught reading and English at one school. She did not enroll in any ELL education classes in college but has received a lot of training by other teachers working with ELLs during professional development days. When she first started teaching ELL students, she felt undertrained and overwhelmed. The challenges she faces with ELL students are spelling, pronunciation, and not having the same history and background. She states, "They are different from the non-ELL students because they spell differently and they have less background and training which causes them to learn differently."

Sandy has taught for six years at two different schools. She has a lot of experience with ELL students because both schools had a high population (80% to 90%) of ELL students. She had a one week mini-session of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) training. The first time that ELL students enrolled in her class, she felt fear because she did not speak Spanish and they did not speak English. She had heard many negative statements from other teachers regarding the difficulty of teaching non-English speaking students who had been "popped" in their classes. Some of the challenges that she faces are finding meaningful activities that will help them build their language and improve their comprehension and understanding in reading. She says that

her attitudes have not changed over time. "A student is a student and it doesn't matter what the level is of a person's intelligence, race or language ability."

Griselda has been teaching for eight years, four at her current school and the other four at two other middle schools and two elementary schools. She enrolled in basic teacher education ELL classes in college and was trained in a district-specific language program named "Language Exclamation Program" for second language students. The first class that she taught with ELL students made her feel overwhelmed because she was not sure that she could guide them since she did not speak the language fluently. Challenges that she encountered were based on culture. "I had some Asian students and the cultural impact was that Asian kids are always expected to have a higher intellectual level and these kids really struggled with learning, and so we had to stop and backtrack and teach them the basics of reading." As far as attitude, she says not much has changed other than her comfort level. Griselda enjoys having ELL students in her class and recognizes that "if you start at their level and if you do not try to start at grade level and work your way back, then things are much easier."

Laverne has been teaching for twelve years. She has been at two elementary schools in addition to her current middle school. She holds TESL certification and is fluent in Spanish. Initially, although not a native Spanish speaker, she was comfortable teaching ELL students because she could speak Spanish. Then she received students who spoke Laotian and it made her consider that maybe she was in the wrong field. She "found it difficult to communicate in a comprehensible manner" for a language she did not speak. Laverne does not view the challenges much differently now. "Teaching is

good teaching and if you are meeting the needs of any students then you can meet the needs of ELL students." She is very comfortable working with ELL students, and says they bring a different culture to the classroom and a different dimension. She notes that different cultures seem to have different expectations concerning the teacher and the teacher's role, the student's role, and the parents' role. "It is just a matter of what the expectations are from the family and being able to work with each other."

Marie has been teaching for fourteen years. She taught fourth grade her first year and has spent the last thirteen years at her current middle school. She holds a Masters degree with 32 hours in Curriculum and Instruction, and has periodically taken courses in teaching English as a second language. She is halfway through receiving her TESL endorsement. Marie finds it most helpful when ELL students are paired with their non-ELL peers. She also finds that when students are in groups and working as partners they are extremely motivated to complete their projects. Using different methods of having students express themselves and different assessments have proved to be excellent strategies in helping ELL students. At the beginning of her career, she was a bit nervous about not having the skills to address all of the needs of the students. However, with a variety of strategies and methods, she says it seems to get easier. She believes that as she has become more familiar with how to address the achievement needs of these students, the students feel more comfortable in her class.

Isabella has been teaching for twenty years, and all of that time has been spent in classrooms with a great many ELL students. Until recently, ELL students were not separated. They were in the same room with a collaborating teacher who would come in,

work as a team partner, and help the ELL students. She has found that ELL students respond very well in a regular classroom as long as they are given peer tutoring and a little more guidance than the other students. Her feeling was one of great fright and she did not know what she was going to do when she got students who could not speak any English. She remembers a student who spoke absolutely no English at all. As an inexperienced teacher, she reached for her phonics books, flash cards, and tutoring books and placed him with a peer tutor. She started seeing results almost immediately so it was exciting as the year progressed. She believes that, as far as their native culture is concerned, students do not get parent support to have good attendance and to do their homework. In consideration of this, she does not give them a lot of homework. She believes this to be one of their greatest problems. Isabella is used to speaking to more accelerated students and sometimes she looks at their faces and recognizes that they did not understand a single word that she said. She has learned to "backtrack" so that they understand what she is teaching. She does not mind having ELL students in her classes. "They are sweet and I love them to pieces." Isabella does not go to her administration for support. She has a good friend who teaches ELL and she asks her when she is puzzled or needs extra support. The progress that students make has changed her attitude more than anything has. She sees them learning rather quickly. They appreciate the help so much and she sees them trying so hard. They ask help to read English, "So it is the students that have changed. It is the thrill of watching them grow in knowledge and intellect and excitement in relation to learning a new skill."

Research Question and Four Categories

The survey consists of four themes including:

- District and Administrative Support Regarding ELL Inclusion
- General Attitudes Regarding ELL Students
- Opinions Regarding ELL Students in the Classroom
- Classroom Practices Regarding ELL Students

Below are findings from the survey and follow-up interviews. These results are presented by theme. See Appendix L for specific information regarding responses to each survey item.

District and Administrative Support

This section reports findings from the survey and interviews related to 1) district training on second language acquisition strategies, 2) administrative support and 3) support from ELL specialists. The survey items employed a four-point Likert scale including the choices: "Strongly Agree," “Agree,” “Disagree,” and, "Strongly Disagree."

Survey Results

Survey participants were asked to respond to the following prompts related to district support: *My district offers effective training that would help me teach ELL students more effectively*; *I receive adequate support from school administrators when ELL students are in my classes*; and *I receive adequate support from the ELL staff when ELL students are in my classes.*

A majority (75%) of respondents (169) agreed or strongly agreed that the district offers effective training for teachers with (24%) of respondents disagreeing that effective training is available. Seventy-one percent (71%) of the respondents felt supported some or all of the time by their administration when ELL students were in their classes. Twenty-eight percent (28%) of the respondents felt they were seldom/never supported by the administration. Seventy-three percent, (73%) of the teachers' felt that they were supported all or some of the time and 26% felt that they seldom or never received such support.

One teacher made the comment that, "I think having training to encourage differentiated instruction and techniques to incorporate into the classroom will be helpful to improve ELL instruction."

When asked to state the greatest challenges that arise from inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms, a small minority of the respondents (7%) replied that there was a "lack of administrative resources and support." The following comments reflect the respondents' perceived challenges regarding administrative support:

- "Not adequate funding to purchase materials."
- "Visual curriculum not being user friendly to the ELL student."
- "Most districts do not have enough materials, staffs and programs that help ELL students."

Two respondents also commented that an "an ELL specialist should be in a classroom or students should be pulled out for special assistance," and, "the district needs help on handling ELL students."

Statistical Tests for Mean Differences in Items among Subgroups

Statistical tests for mean differences on each of the survey items (t-tests or ANOVA with Tukey Post-Hoc comparisons, as appropriate) were done for five groupings of the sample. These subgroups included

- years of teaching experience,
- gender,
- native English speaker,
- knowledge of a second language, and
- race/ethnicity.

Only those items where significant differences occurred within any of the subgroups are reported.

Non-native English speakers were more likely than native English speakers to state that the district ELL training is effective. This was also true for those who had received district training as compared to those who had not. Non-native English speakers were also more likely to feel that they receive adequate support from ELL specialists as compared to native English speakers.

Question A14: *My district offers effective training that would help me teach ELL students*

English Speaker Background	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Non-Native English Speaker	14	3.1	.57	.08	Non-native English speakers more likely to state that district ELL training is effective.
Native English Speaker	155	2.8	.69		
Training Background					
Not Trained in ELL	37	2.6	.77	.04	Persons who have received training in teaching ELL students more likely to state that district ELL training is effective.
Trained in ELL	130	2.9	.65		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

Question B32: *I receive adequate support from the ELL staff when ELL students are in my classes.*

English Speaker Background	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[2]	Decision
Non-Native English Speaker	14	3.2	.46	.03	Non-native English speakers more likely to feel that they receive adequate support from ELL staff.
Native English Speaker	155	2.9	.87		

[2]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

Interview Results

During the interviews, three of the six interviewees stated that adequate in-service training was made available to them, as was administrative support. However, they felt that they received minimal support from their ELL specialists.

Isabella, the teacher with the most experience, stated that she had no formal training in working with ELL students. She had had a "few workshops here and there that last a day, but as far as courses, I have not had any, I was actually signing up for one today. I find the field very interesting and very rewarding. I actually might consider going into it full time myself after I take a few more courses."

Laverne stated that, "at the elementary school there is more of an awareness of the support that is needed versus the middle school." She felt that schools do a good job with students that are identified as ELL and need support services. However, students who are mainstreamed do not get the extra support that is needed, when in actuality they need as much support and monitoring as the non-ELL students. She believes that more HQSI training (Highly Qualified Sheltered Instruction) is essential. Teachers need to be taught strategies that may ensure deeper learning occurs. Few know the difference between BICS (basic interpersonal communication skills), CALP (cognitive academic language proficiency) and their impacts on learning. Even fewer have the understanding to teach material at a higher level of Bloom's Taxonomy beyond the knowledge and comprehension level.

Griselda added that the school had a good support system. “They do Family Night once a month that is organized by ELL support staff to get more families involved with teaching students how to read.” She felt that the schedule could better accommodate “pulling groups” to do more intense reading and writing.

Adella felt that while administration was great at supporting her now, they could do better for new teachers like herself a few years ago. “Give more training, talk to us, have the ELL teacher check in with us more and be available more on a week or monthly basis.”

Griselda stated that as a new teacher, the training she received was “staff development day type training” but it was brief. She stated, “I would recommend that they give specific ELL training for each subject and work directly with those teachers.”

Findings Regarding General Opinions about ELL Students

This section reports findings from the survey and interviews and general perceptions related to 1) language proficiency, 2) coursework, 3) modification of assignments, 4) inclusion benefitting all students, 5) teacher time, 6) rewarding ELL students for effort and 7) the challenges of inclusion. The survey items employed a four-point Likert scale including the choices: "Strongly Agree," “Agree,” “Disagree,” and, "Strongly Disagree."

Survey Results

Survey participants were asked to respond to the following three items specific to language proficiency: *ELL students should not be included in language arts/reading*

classrooms until they have attained a minimum level of English proficiency; *ELL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools*; and *I would support legislation making English the official language of the U.S.*

Fifty-two percent of the respondents agreed and 27% strongly agreed that ELL students should not be included in language arts/reading classes until they had attained a minimum level of English proficiency. Slightly less than one-quarter (22%) of the respondents disagreed with that statement. A majority (57%) of respondents agreed that ELL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in school while 43% disagreed or strongly disagreed. An overwhelming majority (73%) of respondents agreed that English should be the official language of the U.S., and 27% disagreed with that statement.

Of the 143 teachers who wrote statements in this section, (29%) mentioned student exposure to English as one of the greatest benefits of inclusion. These participants were of the opinion that inclusion in an all-English class provides ELLs with an ideal language environment. Listed below are several statements that support this opinion:

- "ELL students learn English best by actually hearing and speaking English, not in a bubble with only other ELL students."
- "I believe immersion in English is much more effective."
- "They interact with students native language is English, therefore giving the ELL students a greater opportunity to practice English."
- "It increases their learning faster & other students benefit by helping them."

Twenty-five participants (17%) included ELL's lack of English language proficiency as one of the greatest challenges in inclusion. Listed below are several statements that support this view.

- "Communicating with their parents. The kids not having viable homework help at home because family may not be fluent. More parental support needed."
- "They don't understand and I have to deny regular students some of my time in order to help ELL students."
- "The students have inadequate mastery of the language."
- "When they speak no English at all, it slows down the rest of the class."
- "ELL students are placed in the regular classroom when they are problems for the ELL class."
- "I definitely believe ELL students should attain a level of proficiency before mainstreaming."

The following three items elicited participants' opinions on coursework for ELL students: *It is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students*; and *It is a good idea to assign less coursework to ELL students*; and *It is a good idea to allow ELL students more time to complete coursework*.

Fifty-six percent of the respondents agreed that it was a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students. In contrast, 42% disagreed with this statement. Over 70% of the participants disagreed with the statement that teachers should assign less coursework to ELL students, while 28% agreed that less course work is a good idea.

However, 90% of the respondents agreed it was a good idea to allow ELL students more time to complete coursework, while 9% disagreed.

Of the 143 teachers who wrote statements in this section, 10% listed positive aspects of inclusion as related to course work. Listed below are some of the responses to illustrate this belief:

- “Sheltered instruction simply encourages best practices for all students.”
- “Students access language in new ways, it forces me to be accommodating in ways that benefit all students;”

Twenty-five (17%) of the 143 respondents expressed opinions related to the negative aspects of ELL inclusion as related to coursework. Listed below are some responses to support this position.

- “The time spent on planning especially when they don't do the work.”
- “Without adequate training or proficiency in students' language planning and material creation is difficult as is teaching grade level standards.”
- “Time to prepare materials, visual curriculum not being user friendly to the ELL student.”

One teacher commented further:

> “I love ELL kids, but it seems unfair to put them in regular classes. It slows down the regular kids, and it must be frustrating to them to struggle (ELL). We use to have ELL B Classes for kids who could speak fine, but had little reading/writing. They were enrolled in my class as soon as they were proficient and it was great. They could keep up and my classes did

> much more work. Now half of my kids cannot write or read past second grade level. ELL: they try but the skills are not there. If someone took me to Japan and threw me in regular classes, I would fail too. The system seems unfair to ELL and regular kids. I want to grade fairly, but the transcript says Reading 6 not ELL 6—so I grade as if they are regular 6th grade students."

Two survey items in this section sought participants' opinions on modifying assignments for ELL students: *Teachers should not modify assignments for ELL students enrolled in language arts/reading classrooms*; and *The modification of coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to English- speaking students*. Eighty-one percent of the respondents disagreed with the statement that teachers should not modify assignments, and 82% did not feel that modification would be difficult to justify.

The following survey item measured participants' opinions on whether inclusion of ELL students in English classes benefited all students: *The inclusion of ELL students in language arts /reading classrooms benefits all students.* Sixty-four percent of the respondents agreed that the inclusion of ELL students in the classroom benefits all students.

The following survey item measured participants' opinions on teachers' time: *Language arts/reading teachers do not have enough time to deal with the needs of ELL students.* A majority (52%) of the respondents disagreed that they do not have enough time, while 47% agreed that there is enough time in the classroom to deal with the needs of ELL students.

The following survey item measured participants' opinions on rewarding ELL students for effort: *Teachers should not give ELL students a failing grade if the students display effort.* Sixty-one percent (61%) of the teachers agreed that effort should be rewarded.

Twenty-eight (20%) of the 143 respondents who listed challenges of ELL student inclusion mentioned the lack of time needed to help ELL students and the amount of time it took to prepare adequately to teach ELL students. Below are several comments to illustrate these concerns:

- "It takes a lot of time to be sure they understand directions, concepts."
- "The time spent on planning especially when they do not do the work."
- "Finding time to give extra help to ELL students with assignments they are struggling with."
- "They do not understand and I have to deny regular students some of my time in order to help ELL students."

Statistical Tests for mean Differences in Items Among Subgroups

Statistical tests for mean differences on each of the survey items (t-tests or ANOVA with Tukey Post-Hoc comparisons, as appropriate) were done for five groupings of the sample. These subgroups included years of teaching experience, gender, native English speaker, knowledge of a second language, and race/ethnicity. Only those items where significant differences occurred within any of the subgroups are reported. Significant differences were found on five items within the subgroups of years of experience, gender, English as a native language and knowledge of a second language.

Teachers with 21 or more years of experience were more likely than less experienced teachers to think that it is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students, believe that ELL students who display effort should not be failed, and to support legislation that would make English the official language of the United States. Support for such legislation was also higher for females than males. Teachers with one to five years experience were more likely than teachers with 21 or more years experience to feel that there is enough time to deal with the needs of ELL students.

As compared to native English speakers, non-native English speakers were more likely to think that it is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students and that more time should be allowed for ELL students to complete their work. Female teachers and those who speak a second language were also more likely than their counterparts to state that ELL students should be given more time to complete their assignments.

Question A6: *Language arts/reading teachers have enough time to deal with the needs of ELL students. (Wording reversed from original)*

Years of Teaching	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Teachers with **1-5** Years Experience	69	2.7	.79	.06	Teachers with 1 -5 years experience more likely than teachers with 21+ years experience to think that there is enough time to deal with the needs of ELL students.
Teachers with **21+** Years Experience	26	2.2	.77		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons; only significant differences between groups displayed.

Question A7: *It is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students*

English Speaker Background	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Non-Native English Speaker	14	2.9	.85	.07[2]	Non-native English speakers more likely to think that it is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students.
Native English Speaker	155	2.5	.73		
Years of Teaching					
Teachers with **1-5** Years Experience	69	2.5	.82	.03[3]	Teachers with 21+ years experience more likely than teachers with 1 – 5 years experience to think that it is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students.
Teachers with **21+** Years Experience	26	3.0	.60		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; only significant differences displayed.
[2]t-test for independent means for comparison of two groups
[3]ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons

Question A9: *It is a good idea to allow ELL students more time to complete coursework*

Gender	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Female	134	3.1	.54	.06	Females more likely to think that it is a good idea to provide more time for ELL students to complete coursework.
Male	32	2.9	.62		
English Speaker Background					
Non-Native English Speaker	14	3.4	.48	.07	Non-native English speakers more likely to think that it is a good idea to provide more time for ELL students to complete coursework.
Native English Speaker	155	3.1	.58		
Second Language Background					
Do **Not S**peak Second Language	103	3.0	.56	.07	Persons who speak a second language more likely to think that it is a good idea to provide more time for ELL students to complete coursework.
Speak Second Language	58	3.2	.59		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

Question A10: *Teachers should not give ELL students a failing grade if the students display effort.*

Years of Teaching	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Teachers with **1-5** Years Experience	69	2.5	.70	.04	Teachers with 21+ years experience more likely than teachers with 1 – 5 years experience to think that ELL students who display effort should not be failed.
Teachers with **21+** Years Experience	26	3.0	.74		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons; only significant differences between groups displayed.

Question A16: *I would support legislation making English the official language of the U.S.*

Gender	Number	Mean	s.d	p-level[1]	Decision
Female	134	3.1	.93	.09[2]	Females more likely to support legislation to make English official language of U.S.
Male	32	2.7	.96		
Years of Teaching					
Teachers with **1-5** Years Experience	69	2.8	1.04	.007[3]	Teachers with 21+ years experience more likely than teachers with 1 – 5 years experience and 16 - 20 years experience to support legislation to make English official language of U.S.
Teachers with **16-20** Years Experience	13	2.7	1.03	.07[3]	
Teachers with **21+** Years Experience	26	3.5	.77		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; only significant differences displayed.
[2]t-test for independent means for comparison of two groups
[3]ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons

INTERVIEW RESULTS

As a group, the interviewees did not feel that there was an overwhelming reason that ELL students should not be in mainstream English classes. All agreed that ELL inclusion benefits all students.

Adella chronicled her experience by stating that she went from being the "typical person in America" who thought ELL students did not belong in the classroom, to being a teacher who thinks that they should be included. She believes that students who struggle with English really do better working in a classroom with other English-speaking

students. “I think it is really important. Not only does it benefit them but it benefits the students who do not speak their native language whether it is Spanish or Tagalog, and it benefits teachers as well.”

Isabella stated that she assigns little or no homework to ELL students because it frustrates students. She found that because they cannot write, giving homework assignments is unproductive. She concludes by stating, “They neither know how to do it and/or have the support at home to be assisted with it.”

Griselda felt that small groups work best with these students. “Chunking the work, and smaller portions of work allow ELL students to feel positive about themselves. Modification of assignments is imperative if these students are to begin to feel success.”

Opinions Regarding ELL Students in the Mainstream Classroom

This section reports findings from the survey and interviews related to 1) the classroom environment created by ELL students in the classroom, 2) the use of native language other than English, 3) teacher’s attitude toward ELL students, and 4) academic expectations of these students. The survey items employed a four-point Likert scale including the choices: "Strongly Agree," “Agree,” “Disagree,” and, "Strongly Disagree."

Survey Results

Survey participants were asked to respond to the following prompts related to mainstreaming: *The inclusion of ELL students in my language arts/reading classroom creates a positive educational atmosphere; ELL students should avoid using their native language while in my classroom; I would welcome the inclusion of ELL students in my*

language arts/reading classes; and *Until students have learned to speak English, I should not expect too much from them in my class.*

Seventy-nine percent of participants agreed that ELL students help create a positive educational atmosphere. The majority (52%) of the participants agreed that students should avoid using their native languages while 48% disagreed and felt that native language usage in the classroom is appropriate.

Of the 60% who agreed with ELL inclusion, 24% strongly agreed that such inclusion was a positive contribution to a mainstream classroom. Only 15% of the participants felt that inclusion was a negative experience.

Fifty-five percent of the participants disagreed and 28% strongly disagreed with the statement that ELL students should not be held accountable for their learning in the classroom because they could not speak English. A small percentage (16%) agreed that teachers should not expect much from ELL students until students could speak English proficiently.

Statistical Tests for mean Differences in Items Among Subgroups

Statistical tests for mean differences on each of the survey items (t-tests or ANOVA with Tukey Post-Hoc comparisons, as appropriate) were done for five groupings of the sample. These subgroups included years of teaching experience, gender, native English speaker, knowledge of a second language, and race/ethnicity. Only significant differences within the subgroups that occurred on any of the items in this category are reported.

Significant differences were found on two items within the subgroups of years of experience and race. Teachers with 1 - 5years experience were more likely than teachers with 21+years experience to think that ELL students should use their native languages in the classroom and teachers of Hispanic ethnicity were less likely than Whites, African-Americans and those of other backgrounds to welcome the inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms.

Question A4: *ELL students should use their native language while in my classroom. (Wording reversed from original)*

Years of Teaching	Number	Mean	s.d	p-level[1]	Decision
Teachers with 1-5 Years Experience	69	2.7	.91	.04	Teachers with 1 - 5years experience more likely than teachers with 21+years experience to think that ELL students should use their native languages in the classroom.
Teachers with 21+ Years Experience	26	2.0	.72		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons; only significant differences between groups displayed.

Question A15: *I would welcome the inclusion of ELL students in my language arts/reading class.*

Race	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
White	117	3.1	.70	.09	Teachers of Hispanic ethnicity less likely than Whites, African-Americans and those of other backgrounds to welcome the inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms.
African-American	16	3.2	.40	.08	
Others	21	3.1	.73	.09	
Hispanic	9	2.6	.88		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons; only significant differences between groups displayed.

INTERVIEW RESULTS

Laverne stated that her perspective on ELL students has changed one hundred eighty degrees. When she arrived in the district, she believed ELL students should have been taught in their own rooms with teachers that understood the language. Now she sees the benefits of having everyone included. She has witnessed the different cultures be

successful in the classroom. She believes that it is the teacher who can make the difference and not where the student was born. Hers was a slow transition to this way of thinking, but she truly believes that mainstreaming students works best. Laverne initially felt effective working with ELL students because most of her students spoke Spanish as she does. Then, a Laotian student enrolled in her class and it made her reconsider whether she was in the right place. Her inability to speak to the student in a comprehensible manner frustrated her. Soon she learned that "good teaching is good teaching" and if you meet the needs of all students, then you can meet the needs of ELL students. She found that different cultures seem to have different expectations in regard to the teacher, student's and parent's role. "You cannot just expect for a family or culture to change and become what we would like them to become."

Isabella found that ELL students respond very well in regular classrooms as long as they are given peer tutoring and more guidance than regular students. She does feel that the lack of parental support for attendance and homework is a cause of their low academic achievement. She also found that she is used to speaking to more accelerated children and has to remind herself to change her vocabulary to a more limited style so that the ELL students understand her completely. She has had experiences where a student could barely speak English at the beginning of the year and ended the year reading very well. Isabella stated that she used flash cards, phonics, tapes and peer tutors to help students learn English quickly.

Griselda stated that one of the more important things to consider when inclusion occurs is student's background, cultural differences, and how that affects them. "ELL

students just need a little more time to process the information that they are receiving. As teachers, we need to remember that they are not necessarily fluent in reading in either language so it may be more difficult for them to learn as well." Griselda is a big believer of cultural and global awareness. She does not believe that our students in general and, particularly, our lower income students are aware of what is "out there," away from their neighborhood, much less out of their state. She believes that it benefits ELL students to be included in regular classrooms because it allows them to see how mainstream students behave.

Sandy's experience, the first time that an ELL student enrolled in her class, came with a bit of fear and anxiety because she did not speak Spanish and the student did not speak English. She had heard stories about "kids being popped into your classroom" and teachers having negative feelings about that. A teacher told her that soon she would find out how difficult it would be when a student who did not speak English and was placed in her classroom.

Classroom Practices Regarding ELL Students

This section reports findings from the survey and interviews related to 1) integration of language skills, 2) classroom accommodations, 3) scaffolding instruction, 4) higher order thinking skills, 5) native language use, 6) sheltered strategies, and 7) challenges of inclusion involving ELL students. Participants were asked to indicate the frequency of each statement as it applied in their classrooms. The survey items employed

a four-point scale including the choices: "All of the Time," "Some of the Time," "Seldom, and, "Never."

Survey Results

The survey asked the following questions regarding classroom practices: *I provide for activities that integrate all language skills (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking, in my language arts/reading classes); I allow ELL students more time to complete their coursework*; and *I give ELL students less coursework than other students*.

Almost three-quarters of the teachers (74%) stated that they provide for activities that integrate all language skills all of the time, and 24% stated that they do this some of the time. Only 33% of the teachers gave ELL students less coursework some or all of the time but 92% did give them more time to complete their assignments.

Regarding the question *I use a variety of techniques to make content concepts clear (e.g., modeling, visuals, hands-on activities, demonstrations, gestures, body language.)*, all but one of the respondents stated that they use a variety of techniques to make concepts clear to ELL students (77%, all of the time; 22%, some of the time).

For the prompt, *I scaffold instruction for ELL students to provide support when teaching a new concept*, fifty-one percent of the participants stated that they scaffold instruction in order to provide support all of the time, with 48% implementing this practice some of the time.

All of the teachers stated that they use a variety of higher-level questions to promote higher order thinking skills, with 60% responding "all of the time" and 40%

"some of the time" for the prompt *I use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking skills (e.g., literal, analytical, and interpretive questions).*

Of the 143 respondents who listed their greatest challenges in teaching ELL students in a mainstream classroom, 10% expressed a negative opinion as to how inclusion relates to best practices. Below are several responses that support this point of view:

- "Having to slow the pace of the class and simultaneously teach basic language and complex thoughts."
- "The pace, expectations, differentiating, and planning lessons, to reach all students preparing for state testing is extremely challenging."
- "Teaching concepts/higher level thinking, & increasing not only decoding, but meanings."

Two other teachers demonstrated a more positive point of view by stating that,

- "I have high expectations for them-and don't handicap by allowing native language always."
- "I provide many scaffolds & English expectations."
- "I allow an ELL student to use his/her native language in my class."
- "I provide materials for ELL students in their native language."
- "My speech is appropriate for students' proficiency level (e.g., slower rate, enunciation, and simple sentence structure, for beginners."

Almost half the teachers (49%) indicated that they would allow for the use of the student's native language some of the time in the classroom, 26% stated that they seldom

allow it, and 16% never allow the use of any other language in class. Only 9% allow students to use their native languages all of the time,

Regarding the provision of materials in their other languages, 60% of the respondents stated they never provide such materials, 24% stated they seldom allowed it, 18% indicated they do use these materials some of the time or all of the time.

Almost all of the respondents (95%) answered that their speech is appropriate for ELL students' proficiency levels. For example:

- "The inclusion of ELL students in my classes increases my workload."
- "I spend more time on ELL students than on other students."

Over three-quarters of the respondents (77%) felt that inclusion increases teacher workload some or all of the time and the same percentage answered that they spend more time with ELL students some or all of the time. One typical response was, "The inclusion of ELL students in my class slows the progress of the entire class." Fifty-eight percent of the respondents answered that ELL students slow the progress of a class some or all of the time.

Almost three-quarters (73%) of the teachers responded that effort is more important than achievement some or all of the time.

Statistical Tests for mean Differences in Items among Subgroups

Statistical tests for mean differences on each of the survey items (t-tests or ANOVA with Tukey Post-Hoc comparisons, as appropriate) were done for five groupings of the sample. These subgroups included years of teaching experience, gender,

native English speaker, knowledge of a second language, and race/ethnicity. Only those items where significant differences occurred within any of the subgroups are reported.

Significant differences were found on six items within the subgroups of years of experience, gender, English as a native language and training background.

Teachers with 21 or more years experience were more likely than those with one to five or six to ten years experience to give less coursework to ELL students. Non-native English speakers were more likely than native English speakers to feel that their speech is appropriate for their students' proficiency levels, and were more apt to scaffold instruction for ELL students when teaching a new concept. This appeared to contribute to their stronger feelings than the native speakers that their workload was increased with the inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms.

As compared to teachers who have received no training in teaching ELL students, those who have received training were more likely to scaffold instruction for ELL students when teaching a new concept (in agreement with non-native English speakers). In addition, teachers who have received training in teaching ELL students are more likely to use a variety of question types than those who have not received training. Female teachers are more likely than males to believe that inclusion of ELL students slows the progress of a class.

Question B19: *My speech is appropriate for students' proficiency level (e.g., slower rate, enunciation, and simple sentence structure, for beginners*

English Speaker Background	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Non-Native English Speaker	14	3.7	.48	.008	Non-native English speakers more likely to feel that their speech is appropriate for students' proficiency level.
Native English Speaker	155	3.3	.58		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90

Question B20: *I give ELL students less coursework than other students.*

Years of Teaching	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Teachers with **1-5** Years Experience	69	1.9	.87	.001	Teachers with 21+ years experience more likely than teachers with 1 - 10 years experience to give less coursework to ELL students.
Teachers with **6-10** Years Experience	39	1.9	.89	.01	
Teachers with **21+** Years Experience	26	2.6	.75		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; ANOVA for comparison of multiple groups, with Tukey HSD post-hoc tests for pairwise comparisons; only significant differences between groups displayed.

Question B26: *The inclusion of ELL students in my classes increases my workload.*

English Speaker Background	Number	Mean	s.d	p-level[1]	Decision
Non-Native English Speaker	14	3.7	.48	.008	Non-native English speakers more likely to feel that the inclusion of ELL students increases their workloads.
Native English Speaker	155	3.3	.58		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

Question B28: *I scaffold instruction for ELL students to provide support when teaching a new concept.*

English Speaker Background	Number	Mean	s.d	p-level[1]	Decision
Non-Native English Speaker	14	3.9	.45	.002	Non-native English speakers more likely to scaffold instruction for ELL students when teaching a new concept.
Native English Speaker	155	3.5	.54		
Training Background					
Not Trained in ELL	37	3.2	.60	.000	Persons who have received training in teaching ELL students more likely to scaffold instruction for ELL students when teaching a new concept.
Trained in ELL	130	3.6	.50		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

Question B29: *The inclusion of ELL students in my classes slows the progress of the entire class.*

Gender	Number	Mean	s.d	p-level[1]	Decision
Female	134	2.7	.81	.05	Females more likely to feel that inclusion of ELL students slows class progress.
Male	32	2.3	.84		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

Question B30: *I use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking skills (e.g., literal, analytical, and interpretive questions).*

Training Background	Number	Mean	s.d.	p-level[1]	Decision
Not Trained in ELL	37	3.4	.49	.001	Persons who have received training in teaching ELL students more likely to use a variety of question types.
Trained in ELL	130	3.7	.47		

[1]Significant if p<.10; confidence level >.90; t-test for independent means; only significant differences displayed.

INTERVIEW RESULTS

Sandy's story is the typical story of a teacher in this school district. The district has a high transiency rate. Many teachers are hired yearly from throughout the United States with little or no experience and training to teach ELL students. Now six years in

the district, she has taught at an elementary and a middle school, both with large populations of ELL students, approximately 90%. Her ELL education has consisted of weekly sessions of Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol training (SIOP). In her first years and with little training, Sandy relied on common sense. She paired students with English speaking students, tried to find activities in both languages, modeled and drew pictures for students. By the end of the year, she saw some of that work pay off. The ELL students assimilated and began to articulate phrases in English. Sandy believes that her verbal interaction, building up their self-esteem, and her attitude towards them also made a lot of difference in their learning.

To some degree, Laverne's story is atypical because of her educational background and experience. A twelve-year veteran fluent in Spanish, she has spent most of those years working with ELL students. She has her TESL endorsement (Teaching English as a Second Language) and has been an ESL teacher, reading strategist. In her opinion, there is a false believe that ELL students need to be taught at the lower level of Bloom's Taxonomy. Laverne has found that some of her best strategies have been vocabulary development, use of photographs, use of hands on activities, creating things, acting out and drawing pictures with all her students. With these strategies, she has seen a great improvement with both her regular students and the ELL students.

CHAPTER FOUR:

DISCUSSION

This chapter is divided into four sections including a summary, findings and discussion under each theme, conclusions, and recommendations for further research and educational policy and practices. The first section reviews the study's purpose and approach. The second section presents a summary and discussion of the findings under each theme. In this discussion, the author relates the findings of this study to previous research and provides interpretation of the results. The third section lists the major conclusions, and the last section is a discussion of the implications for further research and recommendations for educational policies and practices regarding ELL students in regular classrooms.

Summary of the Research

The purpose of this study was to examine the opinions, support and practices of middle school language arts/reading teachers' regarding the inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms. The researcher conducted a survey of 171 teachers in the language arts/reading departments, of fourteen middle schools, with high ELL populations in a school district in the southwest United States. The researcher then conducted in-depth interviews with six survey respondents in order to clarify and expand on the themes

addressed in the survey. All interviewed participants were female, Caucasian and native English speakers. One is fluent in Spanish at an intermediate proficiency level and two have their TESL endorsement. Among the total group, fifty-eight respondents had some degree of proficiency in other languages. One hundred thirty respondents indicated some level of training in teaching ELL students. Currently, in order for teachers to obtain a (TESL) endorsement, the teacher must complete twelve credits in language acquisition, ELL instructional methods, and assessment practices for ELL students (Nevada Department of Education, 2002).

The survey and interviews addressed four themes, including teacher attitudes and opinions regarding inclusion of ELL students in mainstream classrooms, administrative support and training, and classroom practices regarding ELL students. Using the survey and interview results for each of the four themes, the author presented the general findings for the entire group. The differences among the five sub-groups on each item where then compared to determine differences within groups. The author then presented an interpretive discussion under each theme and offered recommendations for further research and educational policies and practices.

Discussion of Findings

Findings in each of the four theme areas include a number of contrasting and sometimes contradictory data, perhaps indicating that teachers are concerned about "proper" responses as well as sharing aspects of their true views. Certainly, this is a very complicated issue for teachers and administrators to address in schools.

District and Administrative Support

Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents answered that the school district offers effective training to teach ELL students. Non-native English speakers were more likely to state that the district ELL training was more effective than native English speakers. Additionally, teachers who had more training in ELL pedagogy were more likely to state that the district ELL training was most effective. Most of these trainings occurred on professional staff development days, through TESL endorsement courses, and multicultural diversity training, not specific to language.

Comments from teachers during the interviews and in the open-ended survey questions stand in contrast to the above findings, however. Some teachers expressed a concern as to the continuity of the training and its "shotgun" approach. One of the teachers reported that, "teachers are asked to go out for one week and learn it and then re-teach it to teachers in the building. They taught us many good strategies but it was kind of fast paced." Another teacher reported that they would like to see their colleagues receive the strategies that can ensure that students comprehend the material by using higher-level thinking and questioning techniques. One teacher thought that there is a false belief that everything has to be on the knowledge and comprehension level. As an experienced former ELL teacher, she knows methods to reach higher levels of Blooms Taxonomy with everybody regardless of their first language. Yet another teacher commented that she had not received a lot of formal training as far as working with ELL students. "The training received was staff development type day training. It was brief, thorough, and informational, but I would recommend that they give specific ELL training

for each subject and work directly with those teachers." Of the one hundred forty three responses on the open-ended question, "What are the greatest challenges of inclusion?" eight percent (8%) of the teachers perceived the lack of training as their greatest challenge.

Seventy-three percent (73%) of teachers felt supported by their ELL specialists all or some of the time. Conversely, several of the interviewees indicated that they received less support from the ELL Specialist's and more from the administration. They faulted the specialists for not keeping teachers abreast of information on their ELL students and not providing lists of their students with their LAS scores. They also cited lack of test results of their students for placement purposes, and that they were not supported in receiving additional help on Highly Qualified Sheltered Instruction (HQSI). Non-native English speakers were more likely to feel they received adequate support from the ELL staff.

Discussion: Reeves (2002) found less than 18% of teachers reported that they were adequately trained for ESL inclusion and were evenly divided on their willingness to receive more training. Her teachers generally felt unsupported by their schools' administration and perceived slightly more support from their schools' ESL teachers, although these teachers seldom held conferences together. The survey responses in this study found that a majority (62%) of teachers perceived the district's training to be effective and stand in contrast to the findings from those of Reeves. The interviewees and open-ended answers, however, echoed similar negative findings to those of Reeves.

Laverne noted that elementary school teachers seemed to have more of an awareness of the support that is needed for ELL students versus middle school teachers.

> "ELL students, once mainstreamed in middle school do not get that extra support that is provided at the elementary level. For example, the (AC) or (BB) student who are now speaking a level of English. We assume that they no longer need to be monitored and that they do not need people that are trained to meet their needs."

It is possible that because middle school students rotate through six different classrooms throughout the day, the continuity that the one teacher, one classroom model, elementary schools provide can be lost and instructional support lessened.

A possible reason for the high survey response rate on the effectiveness of the district training could be the level of understanding that respondents have toward English language acquisition theory. With many of the respondents, being teachers with five years of experience or less, it could be concluded that collegiate teacher preparatory programs are doing a better job of teaching second language acquisition theory and multicultural courses.

General Opinions Regarding ELLs in Mainstream Classrooms

Teachers' perceptions on having enough time to deal with the needs of ELL students were evenly divided; with a slight majority (51%) of teachers disagreeing that they had enough time. Teachers with five years experience or less were more likely than teachers with twenty plus years of experience to feel like there was enough time to deal

with the needs of the ELL students. The frustration on the lack of time was more evident in the qualitative data. Marie stated that “they don't understand my instruction and I have to deny regular students some of my time in order to help ELL students.” She went on to say this makes her uneasy about the student interaction between the native English speaker and the ELL student. Finding time to give extra help to ELL students with their assignments that they struggle on was also a common frustration among teachers. More experienced teachers than those with five years or less of experience thought that ELL students who display effort should not be failed.

Seventy percent (70%) of the teachers believed that ELL students should not receive less coursework than their English-speaking classmates. Conversely, 90% of teachers believed that ELL students should be given more time to complete coursework. Non-native speakers, however, indicated it was a good idea to simplify course work as well as provide more time for them to complete their coursework. Generally, female respondents were more willing than male teachers to give additional time for ELL students to complete assignments in the classroom. Additionally, teachers who spoke a second language were more empathetic to ELL students having more time to complete their coursework.

Sixty-four percent (64%) of teachers felt that inclusion benefited all students and a higher percentage 79% of teachers perceived inclusion as having a positive effect on the educational environment. Respondents felt that ELL students bring their own unique experiences to the classroom, which only enhances the learning environment. Diversity was seen as a positive effect for all students. The teachers perceived that ELL students

gained linguistic and cultural benefits and that English speakers gained by exposure to English language learners' cultures, languages and diversity.

Ironically, 79% of teachers agreed that ELL students should not be in their classrooms until a level of English proficiency was reached. Survey respondents perceived that lack of English proficiency was the greatest challenge in their classes. Teacher's perceptions that English proficiency was essential for the success of ELLs were pervasive in the data. First, survey participants perceived that language was the greatest challenge in mainstream classes in which ELLs were enrolled. Second, the qualitative data indicated that the lack of a common language created a divide between participants and their ELLs, making communication, instruction, and assessment problematic. Participants in both the survey and qualitative inquiry appeared to perceive that the rapid acquisition of English was of the utmost importance for ELLs and that continued limited English proficiency stood as a barrier between ELLs and academic success. A majority (57%) thought ELL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in school. The interview data further indicated that the lack of a common language created a divide between teachers and ELLs, making communication, instruction and assessment problematic.

Teachers' perception that immersion of ELLs in an English-rich environment as ideal for English acquisition, stands in contrast to the research on language acquisition theory. Krashen (1985) stated that while sufficient language input is necessary, a language environment providing too much comprehensible input can overwhelm

language learners. Comprehensible input is messages in verbal, non-verbal or written forms presented in ways as to be understandable by the student.

The survey participants' attitudes toward English language legislation were negative and reflected a mono-linguistic perspective. Seventy-three (73%) percent would support making English the official language of the United States. Female teachers and those with twenty plus years experience were more likely than others to support English being the official language of the U.S.

Discussion.

In general, the findings on language acquisition paralleled those of Reeves (2002). Her findings indicated that 80% of the respondents were in favor of English only legislation. She stated that such support should not be perceived as an indication of monolingual ideology, but more as a general agreement among participants that English should be the dominant language in the U.S. today. While it could be problematic to interpret her data as causing participants to have negative attitudes towards using language other than English, any negative attitude towards English usage can have harmful consequences in the classroom.

In this study, older teachers as well as female respondents were more in favor of English being the official language of the U.S. than the other respondents. One could interpret this by stating that the older teachers are more conservative in their political views. However, the high response rate of female support for English as the official language, who traditionally are more liberal, could simply be that the overwhelming number 91% of respondents were female.

With the implementation of more rigorous standards and standardized achievement tests, subject-matter teachers in secondary schools are increasingly wondering how they can effectively teach students with limited English language skills. Research in second-language acquisition has shown that adapting classroom discussion, textbook reading, and written activities to the language proficiencies of English language learners triggers English language acquisition in subject-matter classrooms (Dong, 2002, 2004a, 2004b; Kidd, 1996; Swain, 1996). Much discussion has focused on making subject-matter teachers more aware of students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds, but little discussion has focused on strategies that teachers might use to integrate language and content in mainstream subject matter classes to facilitate English language acquisition (Swain, 1996).

Many individual factors affect the length of time an ELL student needs to learn English. The level of formal education is significant and varies widely among ELL students. Some have had consistent schooling in their native countries while others have attended school only intermittently. The parents' level of formal education and literacy in the native language can affect the student's performance. As with all students, there are great variations in intelligence and motivation. The most important factor is the student's economic status. Children of poverty tend to struggle more in school than children of affluence (Hakuta, Butler, and Witt, 2000; Garcia, 2000).

As most of the survey participants (87%) were English speakers, second language acquisition processes may be unfamiliar to them. The district's use of the book, *Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP model* by Echevarria, Vogt and

Short (2004), as the foundation for TESL training embeds a basic understanding of sheltered instruction techniques and a working knowledge of BICS and CALP. Cummins (1999) divides the acquisition of English into two registers: Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS) and Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). BICS are the skills that English Language learners acquire in order to survive in an English-speaking world. Sometimes referred to as survival language, BICS can be acquired within a timeframe of nine months to two years. Conversely, CALP, often referred to as academic language, is the language students need to acquire to be successful in a general education classroom. It is formal English used in textbooks. ELL students can take as much as five to seven years to develop CALP to the extent that they may able to compete effectively with a native English speaker. Short (1998) asserted that encouraging some communication in the home language when students work in pairs or cooperative learning groups not only benefits students cognitively, but can also support literacy in English.

Second-language researchers point out a number of issues that mainstream subject matter teachers would do well to tackle. Subject matter teachers should systematically teach discipline-specific language. They should also pay attention to the functional use of language in classroom discussions. Language in the classroom focuses on such elements as checking for understanding (as in “Do you follow?”), summarizing (as in “The main point here is. . . .”), and defining (as in “What does this mean?”). A language learner who is unfamiliar with the functional use of language in classroom discussions or

who has acquired a functional use of a different language in the classroom might have difficulty understanding, let alone participating in, the discussion.

The passage of Proposition 227 in California and subsequent attempts in other states to limit or eliminate bilingual education revealed a dismaying lack of understanding about the facts of second language learning and the nature of bilingual education. Similarly, the Ebonics controversy raised issues that most people were ill-prepared to discuss in an informed way. All of this reminds us that too few people know enough of the basics about language and literacy to engage in reasonable discussion and to make informed decisions (Fillmore and Snow, 2000).

Opinions Regarding Inclusion of ELL Students in a Mainstream Classroom

In spite of claiming to value ELL participation in the classroom because they bring cultural diversity to the group of learners, the respondents were evenly divided on ELLs' use of their native languages in the classroom. Fifty-two percent (52%) would not allow it but, almost as many thought it was a good idea for students to use their native language. Generally speaking responses to the open ended question on the greatest challenges of teaching ELL students indicated that ELLs native language was not used as a resource to help students learn English. Comments like the following exemplified the frustration that teachers seemed to feel about the usage of an ELL's native language. "I don't believe in including newcomers into a regular language arts classroom, but AB students (some level of English proficiency) do just fine. The benefits are that ELL students hear more English" or "ELL kids who are AA (no English proficiency) are

concerned about oral language production and development. It is a waste of their time to learn reading strategies when they don't know any of the words yet. Get real!”

Teachers with one to five years experience were more likely than teachers with twenty-one years or more to think that ELL students should use their native languages in the classroom. It is possible that younger teachers are receiving more second language acquisition in their teacher preparatory programs. Ironically, teachers of Hispanic ethnicity were less likely than Whites, African Americans and those of other backgrounds to welcome the inclusion of ELL students in their classrooms. One possible consideration for this result is that there were only nine teachers who indicated their ethnicity as Hispanic or they may have had some negative experiences of their own in an English classroom if they were ELL speakers. ELL students are often marginalized in mainstream classrooms because of their lack of proficiency.

The six interviewees allowed the use of the student’s native language but struggled to find material for instruction. They reported that students’ use of their native languages in the classroom most often occurred with ELL students being paired with other more fluently proficient ELL students that could help bridge the language gap.

Discussion

Survey participants’ perceptions of the use of ELLs’ native languages were negative. A slight majority of the respondents agreed that students should avoid using their native language as a basis for learning English, a finding similar to that of Reeves (2002). However, the interviewees’ responses were divided in their opinions in this area.

The following statements from the interviewees reflect two different perspectives to the use of a student's native language:

1) "I don't mind my ELL classes, but I don't agree that a student who does not speak English should be in a regular classroom."
2) "They should be allowed in the regular classroom only if they are literate in their native language then their skills will transfer."

Lastly, compared to less experienced teachers, more experienced teachers are more likely to feel that students should only speak English in class.

Teacher attitudes that English proficiency was the most important determining factor for student success were evident among many of the participants. Many teachers cited the "lack of understanding" or the "language barrier" as the single greatest challenge that faced them when teaching ELL students.

According to Lessow-Hurley (2003), allowing students to use their native language provides benefits to ELL students. Among these benefits are concepts that are learned in the native language that bolsters students' self-esteem. Kenner (2007) also conducted research in this area and found that allowing elementary aged students to complete schoolwork in both their native language and English deepened their understanding of the concepts and raised scores on national curriculum tests.

Classroom Practices with ELL Students

An overwhelming majority (93%) of the teachers were willing to grant more time for students to complete their coursework and one-third were willing to give less work to

ELL students. Teachers may have recognized that extra effort was necessary for ELLs to complete the same coursework as English proficient students, and they were willing to grant ELLs more time.

A slight majority (56%) of survey participants displayed a willingness to simplify coursework and (81%) of respondents agreed that assignments should be modified for ELL students. While a significant percentage of respondents felt justifying the modification of coursework to English-speaking students would not be a problem, a smaller percentage of teachers agreed that student effort alone should not keep students from receiving a failing grade. Approximately (39%) of survey respondents were willing to fail ELLs if they did not achieve, even if they displayed effort.

Teachers were equally as reasonable with ELL students who displayed effort. Eighty-three percent (83%) of the respondents perceived effort to be as important as achievement when assigning a grade. It could be concluded that teachers through their observations of ELL students, noticed the increase in efforts it requires to do tasks that English-speaking students can complete almost without effort.

Seemingly in contrast to these beliefs about classroom practices, 83% of the teachers agreed that ELL students should be held to the same academic standard as the non-ELL students. This is clearly indicated by the survey participant who stated that, "(ELL) students are put in the classroom too soon and far too little is expected of them. Don't baby them, sink or swim, they will learn how to swim." The common belief held by many was that having high expectations for ELL students and not "handicapping

them” by allowing the use of their native language, is the most effective way for students to learn English.

A frustration echoed by teachers was the difficulty in consistently scaffolding assignments appropriately for all students not just the ELL students. Scaffolding is a means of progressively having the student do more of the task independently. Using this technique, the teacher begins by demonstrating the task. Later, the student and the teacher complete the task together. Non-native English speakers were more likely to scaffold instruction for ELL students when teaching a new concept.

The teachers reported a variety of techniques that were used to clarify content concepts (e.g., modeling, visuals, and hands –on activities) and to promote higher order thinking skills (e.g., literal, analytical, and interpretive questions). Well over 60% of the teachers perceived that they used these practices and techniques effectively. Respondents who had received more training in teaching ELL students were more likely to use a variety of question types.

Seventy-four percent (64%) of the teachers reported that they consistently integrate all language skills (i.e., reading and writing, listening and speaking).

Fifty eight (58%) of the teachers allowed ELL students the use of their native language in their classrooms. In contrast, (84%) indicated that they seldom provided materials for ELL students in their native languages. A majority of the "sanctioned" native language use was done by pairing students who are not proficient in English with other students who are more fluent.

While a majority of teachers reported that they allow ELL students to use their native language in the mainstream classroom, this was not a universally accepted practice. A common theme reflected in the qualitative data and the open-ended questions was a belief that overuse of Spanish hinders learning of English. One participant commented that she does not allow native language use in her classroom and remarked that if students were allowed to use their native languages in the classroom, they were losing one of the few opportunities to speak English over the course of the day.

Seventy-seven percent (77%) of teachers felt that having ELL students in their language arts classroom increased their time on task with them and their overall workload.

Discussion

Reeves (2002) found that ELL students failing to perform at English-proficient student standards and completing the same amount and quality of coursework, were subject to a failing grade. This suggests the participants' believe in equal grading standards for students regardless of English language proficiency. She also found that 59% of her survey participants displayed a willingness to modify coursework. What is less clear is whether teachers feel that way because they are unwilling to modify coursework or their training has not equipped them to do so. The results of this study support Reeves findings. A significant percentage of teachers felt modification of assignments was appropriate but many agreed that student effort alone should not keep students from receiving a failing grade. Females were more willing to give additional time than males but oddly were more supportive of making English the official U.S.

language and felt that including ELL learners slowed the class down. Non-native English speakers seemed to be more empathetic to ELL learners. They were significantly more willing to simplify coursework for ELL learners, and to give them more time. They were more agreeable to tailoring their speech to the student's proficiency level and to scaffold instruction for them.

According to Yero (2002), Collinson (2000), and Hunzicker (2004), without a change in teacher beliefs about ELL students, a change in classroom practices cannot occur. Participant statements such as, "without adequate training or proficiency in students' language, planning and material creation is difficult, as is teaching grade level standards," reflect a level of frustration possibly, due to a lack of appropriate training.

Many of these techniques and practices as described by Echevarria, Vogt and Short (2004) are based on the concept of scaffolding which was first described by Vygotsky (1978). These strategies are designed to build higher order thinking skills through increasingly independent work and thought. The teacher must use a variety of questioning techniques to move student thinking to these levels. The levels were first described by Bloom (1984) using terms such as knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation to describe each level of thinking. The objective should be for teachers to move beyond the level of basic knowledge or memorization level towards higher levels of evaluating different sources and perspectives.

According to the results of the current study, teachers are often at a loss with regard to teaching strategy because some of their students have little or no English proficiency. The teachers are concerned about oral language production and

development in these students, and they see it as a waste of their time to teach reading strategies when the students do not know any of the words yet. Additionally, these students' writing levels are so low that it is difficult for them to produce coherent thoughts on paper. One teacher expressed an opinion that ELL students are very slow. She continued by saying, “Naturally-this is not a negative. I teach sixth grade. They may need a lower level text, but I teach sixth grade reading level. They struggle & often fail. They are set up to fail, when they cannot read or write at a basic level.”

Peregoy and Boyle (2000) argue that it is important that ELL students integrate the language modalities of reading, writing, speaking and listening. ELL students need to practice newly acquired vocabulary and structures in all modalities.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions emerged from this study:

- A significant percentage of teachers indicated that they perceived the district’s ELL training to be effective, but based on the qualitative data from the open-ended questions and the interviews, few felt adequately prepared to the challenges of teaching ELL students. Over ninety percent of the respondents were native English speakers and more than a third indicated they had some level of second language proficiency. Based on the respondents’ answers, however, and in stark contrast to second language acquisition research, many appeared to be unaware of basic second language acquisition processes.

- ELLs native languages were not considered a resource in the classroom. Frequently stated opinions were that the district does have enough materials, staff and programs, and that teachers were not prepared to teach ELL students unless they had at least a limited amount of English already. Native language resources and other instructional materials were limited and not used.
- Most respondents welcomed the cultural diversity that ELL students bring to the classroom. However, at the same time, they encouraged linguistic assimilation as a condition of student success.
- Teacher attitude toward language and common language between teachers and students are important factors in the education of linguistically diverse students. ELLs were expected to complete the same quantity and quality of coursework as English proficient students. Teachers were willing to give students more time to complete their coursework, but not necessarily lessen the amount of student work. Because English proficiency and the ability to work at grade-level in English were viewed as essential, granting ELLs concessions, i.e., giving less or simplified coursework would ultimately be seen as being harmful to ELLs.
- Even with specific training in working with ELL students, three out of four teachers still would rather the students not enter their classroom until they are proficient in English. This contradicts a recommendation by Reeves (2002) that the negative attitudes toward ELL inclusion may be ameliorated by more training.

Recommendations for Further Research

The academic achievement gap between linguistic minority students and their English-speaking counterparts presents a clear need for continued research and reflective practice aimed at improving educational outcomes for ELLs.

Relationship between teachers' language attitude and student outcomes

While there is a wealth of information linking excellent teaching practices to student outcomes, there is a dearth of research relating teacher language attitude to student outcomes. A study that measures the relationship between teachers' attitudes toward linguistic diversity and student academic outcomes could support the importance of this construct in addressing the achievement gap. Studies have found that the most successful teachers of ELL students have identifiable pedagogical and cultural skills and knowledge including the ability to communicate effectively with students and to engage their families. They also have extensive skills in teaching the mechanics of language and how it is used in different contexts and for different purposes. Students of teachers with specialized training and who speak the students' language showed greater academic gains than those with teachers who lacked such preparation. Fillmore and Snow (2000), argue that a thorough understanding in educational linguistics would support teachers' understanding of teaching literacy skills and working with English language learners.

Geographical Areas and Grade Levels

It would be interesting to survey teachers from different geographical locations to determine their attitudes and opinions regarding educational policies that are being

instituted in a number of states. Of particular interest would be the study of teachers in states that have banned bilingual education such as California and Arizona. Previous studies have demonstrated that teachers from varying geographical areas report different language attitudes (Brynes, Kiger, & Manning, 1997). Currently, language attitude information is available for four states, Arizona, Utah, Virginia, and Texas. It would be informative to determine teacher attitudes and practices in the other 46 states to develop a dataset to support the development of nationwide and region-specific training programs.

Future research would be valuable to determine the attitudes towards ELL students and practices of teachers at the elementary school level. This would assist policy makers and curriculum developers to ascertain any differences or special needs of teachers from all grade levels.

Recommendations for Training, Policy, and Practice

It is recommended that teachers of ELL students be required to earn their TESL endorsements. The techniques and strategies taught in the TESL curriculum benefit all students, ESL and non-ESL alike. An evaluation of the English Language Learner Program recommended that the school district in which this study was conducted consider new/modified means for engaging more teachers in TESL certification classes. Highly qualified teachers are crucial for the academic success of the growing Hispanic student population, especially in the area of reading and language arts.

Teacher certification programs would benefit from the incorporation of instruction that fosters an appreciation and respect for linguistic diversity. The

incorporation of pedagogical strategies for bilingual students at the teacher preparation level would increase the pool of teachers qualified to teach ELL students. Stipends for prospective teachers who become involved in such a program would provide a stimulus for participation.

Middle schools in this district with a high percentage of ELL students would be wise to invest in professional development courses for teachers, counselors, support staff and administrators. Reyes (2006) suggests that the role of the principal is to "lead and create conditions for effective teaching and learning while focusing on the classroom" (p. 147). A crucial part of creating these optimal conditions for linguistically diverse learners involves leading efforts to develop and maintain a school climate that is respectful of diversity in which teachers may relate collegially (Montecel & Cortez, 2002). Southworth (1998) asserted that this healthy teacher climate may be achieved through the interaction of staff development and an overall school culture that is marked by openness and trust.

Professional Development

A demographic comparison of the students in our nation's schools with the composition of its teaching force suggests an emerging "diversity gap" that must be addressed, if all students are to reach their potential (Orfield and Lee, 2004). Current teachers must continuously familiarize themselves with the diverse set of talents and issues brought into the classrooms by different groups of students. This must come from enhanced teacher training and from continued professional development activities. It

must also come from individual teachers who make a committed effort at becoming, remaining informed about, and aware of issues related to diversity in the classroom. Banks (1995) and Brookover and Lezotte (1997) found that students respond to teachers more readily when they believe that the teacher appreciates their culture and background, no matter how poor that background. Teachers who challenge failure are more successful in promoting academic achievement than teachers who blame lack of success on the youngster's culture and background.

It has become increasingly clear that a "crisis in qualifications" has emerged within too many American schools. One recent study indicated that more than one-fourth of newly hired teachers' nationwide lacked the qualifications for their job and almost the same proportion (23%) of all secondary teachers lacks even a minor in their main teaching fields. This crisis is particularly acute in urban schools serving high-poverty and predominantly minority students where urban students had less than a 50% chance of being taught by a mathematics or science teacher who was both licensed and had a degree in his/her field.

Current research on teaching has also pointed to a strong relationship between effective teachers and those who participated in mentoring, induction and activities, and collaboration and observation of experienced "master teachers" within their district and building. A school wide mentorship program, where experienced teachers of ELL students shared best practices with younger teachers, would also be beneficial. The research found that experienced teachers better implemented best teaching practices over

their less experienced counterparts. This will require a re-evaluation of what qualities and skills teachers should have, and a devoting of the time and resources to obtain them.

Educational Policy

In this state, class sizes are among the largest in the nation. The student population is becoming more challenging, resulting in overloaded teachers facing too many students who each need more individualized time and attention than ever before. Nearly one in five students is enrolled in the English language learners program. With the rapid growth that the district has experienced a high transiency rate has emerged. Only 47% of students graduating from this district were enrolled in this district as first graders. This district's graduation rates rank among the lowest in the nation and for the students who do graduate; the rate of those going to college is disturbingly low.

Therefore, the state legislature would be well advised to take action to empower school leaders by providing funding for educational programs tailored to the specific needs of the students within their schools, including struggling students to advanced students who need to be challenged. Further, the legislature may develop and fund a competitive teacher compensation plan linked to the completion of training courses specific to the needs of ELL students and other special groups and the academic achievement of these students. This would provide options for teachers to earn a competitive wage in recognition of their training and performance without leaving the classroom or leaving the profession.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anyon, J. (1980). *Social class and the hidden curriculum of work*, Journal of Education, 162(1), 67-92.

Arizona Revised Statutes §15-752 English Language Education. (2001). Retrieved August 13, 2008, from http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ Format Document.asp?inDoc=/ars/15/00752.htm&Title=15&DocType=A RS

Banks, J. A. & Banks, C. A. M. (Eds.). (2004). *Handbook of research on multicultural education (2nd ed.).* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Belfiore, P. J., Auld, R. & Lee, D. L. (2005). *The disconnect of poor-urban education*: *Equal access and a pedagogy of risk taking*. Psychology in Schools, 42(8), 855-863.

Bender, W., Vail, C. & Scott, K. (1995). *Teachers' attitudes to increased mainstreaming: Implementing effective instruction for students with learning disabilities*, Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28(1), 87-94.

Bernstein, R. (2006). *Nation's population one-third minority*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau News. Retrieved September 6, 2008 from www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/population/006808

Berube, B. (2000). Managing ESL programs in rural and small urban schools, Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Blackledge, A. (2006). *The magical frontier between the dominant and the dominated: Sociolinguistics and social justice in a multilingual world*, Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 27(1), 22-41.

Boulet, J. (2001). *Assimilation not amnesty: Treat Hispanics like Americans*, National Review Online. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-boulet082101.shtml.

Brown, D. F. (2002). *Becoming a successful urban teacher*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Carrasquillo, A. & Rodríguez, V. (2002). *Language minority students in the mainstream classroom (2nd ed.).* Clevedon, Great Britain: Cromwell Press Limited.

Christian, D. (1994) *Two-way bilingual education: Students learning through two languages. (Educational Practice Rep. No. 12).* Santa Cruz, CA, and Washington, D.C: National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning.

Clark County School District. (2007, August). District Accountability Report.

Clark County School District English Language Learner Program Department. (2001). English Language Learner Program Procedures Manual. Las Vegas, NV.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). *Walking the road: Race, diversity, and social justice in teacher education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Collier, V. & Thomas, W. (1999). Making U.S. schools effective for English Language Learners, Part 1, TESOL Matters, 9(1), 1-16.

Clair, N. (1995). Mainstream classroom teachers and ESL students, TESOL Quarterly, 29(1), 189-196.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice*. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services, Inc.

Cummins, J. (2000). "This place nurtures my spirit": Creating contexts of empowerment in linguistically-diverse schools. In R. Phillipson (Ed.), *Rights to language: Equity, power, and education* (pp. 249-258). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1990). *Teaching and knowledge: Policy issues posed by alternate certification for teachers*, Peabody Journal of Education, 67(3), 123-154.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom.* New York, NY: The New Press.

Dilworth, M. E. (Ed.). (1992). *Diversity in teacher education: New expectations*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Eisner, E. (1991). *The enlightened eye: Qualitative inquiry and the enhancement of educational practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

English Language Learner Knowledge Base. (2004). Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://www.helpforschools.com/ELLKBase/legal/OCR Memorandum_May25_1970.shtml

Fry, R. (2007). *How far behind in math and reading are English language learners?* Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center.

Fu, D. (1995). *My trouble is English: Asian students and the American dream*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Gandara, P. & Maxwell-Jolly, J. (2006). *Critical issues in developing the teacher corps for English learners*. In K. Tellez and H. C. Waxman (Eds). Preparing quality

educators for English language learners: Research policies, and practice (pp. 99-120). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Gay, G. (2005). *Politics of multicultural teacher education.*, Journal of Teacher Education, 56(3), 221-228.

Genesee, F. (1984). *Studies in immersion education*. Sacramento, CA: CA State, State Department of Education.

Harklau, L. (1994). *Tracking and linguistic minority students: Consequences of ability grouping for second language learners*. Linguistics and Education, 6(2), 217-244.

Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and language education*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Harklau, L. (2000). *From the 'good kids' to the 'worst': Representations of English language learners across educational settings*, TESOL Quarterly, 34, 35-67.

Houck, C. & Rogers, C. (1994). *The special/general education integration initiative for students with specific learning disabilities: A "snapshot" of program change*. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 27(7), 435-453.

Hyatt, K.J. (2007). *The new IDEA: Changes, concerns, and questions.* Intervention in School and Clinic, 42(3), 132-136.

Irvine, J. J. (2003). *Educating teachers for diversity: Seeing with a cultural eye*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Kenner, C. (2007). Bilingual classes raise results. BBC online. Retrieved April 7, 2007, from, http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/education/6447427.stm.

Kindler, A. (2002). *Survey of the states' limited English proficient students & available educational programs and services 1999-2000 summary report*. Written by the National Clearinghouse for English language Acquisition and Language instruction Educational Programs. May 2002, George Washington University (Contract No. ED-00-CO-113). Retrieved August 13, 2008, from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/policy/states/nevada/03_demo.htm.

Krashen, S. (1985). *The input hypothesis*. New York, NY: Longman.

Krashen, S. & Brown, C. (2005). *The Ameliorating Effects of High Socioeconomic Status: A Secondary Analysis*. Bilingual Research Journal, 29(1), 185-196.

Lau v. Nichols. (1974). 414 US 563

Layzer, C. (2000, March). Who's afraid of bilingual learners? The role of teacher's attitudes and beliefs. Paper presented at the Annual Spring Conference of the National Council of Teachers of English. New York, NY.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (2000). *The foundation of dual language instruction (2nd ed.).* New York, NY: Addison-Wesley Longman.

Lessow-Hurley, J. (2003). *Meeting the needs of second language learners: An educator's guide*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lindholm, K. (1990). *Bilingual immersion education: Criteria for program development*. In A. Padilla, H. Fairchild, & C. Valadez (Eds.), Bilingual Education: Issues and strategies (pp. 91-105). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindholm, K. & Gavlek, K. (1994). *California DBE projects: Project-wide evaluation report*, 1992-1993. San Jose, CA: Author.

Miles, M. & Huberman, A. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Minaya-Rowe, C. (1988). *A comparison of bilingual education policies and practices in Peru and the United States*. In H. S. Garcia & R. Chavez (Eds.). Ethnolinguistic issues in education (pp. 100-116). Lubbock, TX: Texas Tec University.

Mora, J. (2005). *Legal history of bilingual education*. San Diego State University. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://coe.sdsu.edu/people/jmora/ Pages/HistoryBE.htm.

Moran, R. F. (2000). Legal investment in multilingualism. In S.L. McKay & S.C. Wong (Eds.), *New immigrants in the United States* (pp. 241-252). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2005). *NAEP Data Explorer*. Retrieved online September 27, 2008 from http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/nde/view results.as

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *Public Elementary and Secondary Students, Staff, Schools, and School Districts: School Year 2003-04*, NCES 2006-307, Washington, D.C.: NCES

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *The Condition of Education 2007: Characteristics of full-time school teachers (NCES 2007-064).* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. Retrieved on October 10, 2007 from

http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/ Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. (1985). *Keeping track: How schools structure inequality*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. & Lipton, M. (2003). *Teaching to change the world. (2nd ed.).* Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Oller, D. & Eilers, R. (2000). An integrated approach to evaluating effects of bilingualism in Miami school children. In D. Oller & R. Eilers (Eds.), *Language and literacy of bilingual children* (pp. 12-21). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Ovando, C., Collier, V. & Combs, M. (2003). *Bilingual and ESL classrooms: Teaching in multicultural contexts*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishers.

Pacini-Ketchabaw, V. & Armstrong de Almeida, A. (2006). *Language discourses and ideologies at the heart of early childhood education*, International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9(3), 310-341.

Peregoy, S. & Boyle, O. (1990). *Reading and writing scaffolds: Supporting literacy for second language learners*. Educational Issues of Language Minority Students: The Journal, 6(1), 55-67.

Peregoy, S. (1991). *Environmental scaffolds and learner responses in a two-way Spanish immersion kindergarten*. Canadian Modern Language Review, 47(3), 463-476.

Peregoy, S. & Boyle, O. (2005). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL*: A resource book for K-12 teachers. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Pottinger, J. S. (1970, May 25). Identification of discrimination and denial of services on the basis of national origin [Memorandum]. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/docs/lau1970.html

Proposition 227 (1998). English language in public schools.

Proposition 227—Full text of the proposed law. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://www.ed.gov/primary98.ss.ca.gov/ VoterGuide/Propositions/227text.html

Ramirez, J. & Yuen, S. (1991, February). Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children. Report prepared for the United States Department of Education under Contract No. 300-87-0156. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://www.nabe.org/documents/research/Ramirez.pdf

Reeves, J. (2002). *Secondary teachers' attitudes and perceptions of the inclusion of ESL students in mainstream classes*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Reynolds, J., Dale, G. & Moore, J. (1989). *How to plan and implement a two-way Spanish immersion program*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Richards, T. (2002). *Non-numeric Unstructured Data by techniques of Indexing and theorizing (Version N6)* [Computer Software]. Cambridge, MA: QSR International.

Rogers, B. (1987). *A comparative study of the attitudes of regular educational personnel toward mainstreaming handicapped students and variables affecting those attitudes*. Paper presented at the Fourth Pan American Conference on Rehabilitation and Special Education, Acapulco, Mexico. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 196).

Sapsford, R. (1999). *Survey Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Schmidt, M. (2000). *Teachers' attitudes towards ESL students and programs*. In S. Wade (Ed.), Inclusive education: A casebook and readings for prospective and practicing teachers (pp. 121-128). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Short, D. (1998). *Social studies instruction and assessment: Meeting the needs of students learning English.* Retrieved October 16, 2008 from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/pubs/florida/workforce98/short/social.htm.

Short, D. (2002). *Language learning in sheltered social studies classes*, TESOL Journal 11(1), 18-24.

SPSS (2008). *Statistical Program for the Social Sciences (Version 18.0)* [Computer Software]. Chicago, Illinois: SPSS, Inc.

Swain, M. (1985). *Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development*. In S. Gass & C. Madden (Eds.), Input and second language acquisition (pp. 235-257). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Swain, M. & Lapkin, S. (1989). *Evaluating bilingual education: A Canadian case study*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Taskakkori, A. & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Major issues and controversies in the use of mixed methods in the social and behavioral sciences*. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research (pp.3-50). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness for language minority students.* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Thomas, W. & Collier, V. (2001). *A national study of school effectiveness for language minority students' long-term academic achievement final report: Project 1.1.* Center for Research on Education, Diversity, and Excellence. Retrieved September 8, 2008, from http://www.crede.org/research/llaa/1.1 final.html

U.S. Census. (2000). Available online at http://www.census.gov.

U.S. Census. (2000). Language Use, English Ability, and Linguistic Isolation for the Population 5 to 17 Years by State. Retrieved August 13, 2008, from http://www.census.gov/population/ cen2000/phc-t20/tab02.xls.

U.S. Department of Education. (Feb. 19, 2004). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Fact sheet: NCLB provisions ensure flexibility and accountability for limited English proficient students. Retrieved September 8, 2008 from http://www/ed/gov/nclb/accountability/ schools/factsheet-english.html

Verplaetse, L. (1998). How content teachers interact with English language learners, TESOL Journal, 7(1), 24-28.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002). Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach. *Buffalo: State University of New York Press.*

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society*. London, U.K.: Harvard University Press.

Walqui, A. (2000). Access and engagement: Program design and instructional approaches for immigrant students in secondary schools. McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wright, W. (2005). *The political spectacle of Arizona's Proposition 203*. Educational Policy, 19(4), 1-40.

Wright, W. & Pu, C. (2005). *Academic achievement of English language learners in post Proposition 203 Arizona*. Report prepared for the Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Language Policy Research Unit. Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University

Youngs, C. S. (1999). Mainstreaming the marginalized: Secondary mainstream teachers' perceptions of ESL students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks.

Youngs, C. S. & Youngs, A. Y., Jr. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes towards ESL students, TESOL Quarterly, 35(1),

Zehler, A. M., Fleischman, H. L., Hopstock, P. J., Stephenson, T. G., Pendzick, M. L. & Sapru, S. (2003). *Descriptive study of services to LEP students and LEP students with disabilities, Volume I.* Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement of Limited English Proficient Students (OELA).

Zhao, Y. (2002, August 5). *Wave of pupils lacking English strains schools*. The New York Times, p. A1.

APPENDIX A: DEFINITION OF TERMS

Accommodations. Accommodations are changes that can legally be made in the way a standardized test is administered for the benefit of students in a specialized category such as special education or ELL. Accommodations do not change the content of the test.

BICS. Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills is the language register used in everyday life. Most ELL students can master this register in less than three years. This term was first used by Cummins (1981).

CALP. Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency is the language register used for school. Most ELL students require 5 to 7 years to master this register. This term was first used by Cummins (1981).

Comprehensible Input. This term describes the level of language that a student can understand in oral or written form. This term was first used by Krashen (1985).

ELL Specialist. The person in a school who is responsible for ensuring the success of ELL students. Duties include completing all required documentation of ELL student progress and training of teachers.

ELL Students. English language learners are immigrants or refugees who are learning English as a new language.

LEP. Limited English Proficient is the term used in the No Child Left Behind Act and all federal programs to refer to ELL students.

Mainstream. This term refers to students, teachers, and classes designated for general education students. They are not designed for specific subgroups such as ELL, special education, or Gifted and Talented.

NEP. Non English Proficient is a term used to describe ELL students at the most beginning level of English.

No Child Left Behind Act. This is the federal law passed in 2002 which now governs public education. It is most notable for increases in accountability for schools, districts and states (U.S. Department of Education, 2002).

Proficiency Level. This term refers to the amount of English an ELL student knows or can use. Levels range from beginner to advanced.

Scaffolding. This is a method of instruction in which the teacher begins by demonstrating how to do something and offers progressively less assistance each time the task is done. Eventually the student will be able to complete the task independently. This term was first applied to education by Vygotsky (1978).

Sheltered Instruction. This is a series of teaching techniques used to help ELL students learn content area concepts and language skills simultaneously.

SIOP. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol is a list of techniques used for the instruction of ELL students. It was designed by Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2004). It is available in the form of a lesson plan template or checklist as well as a rubric to be used as an evaluation instrument.

TESL. Teaching English as a Second Language is the name of an endorsement that a teacher may add to an existing teaching license indicating the completion of twelve additional course credits in the areas of instructional methods and assessment of ELL students.

APPENDIX B: SURVEY OF TEACHERS

SECTION A

Your Background and Experience. Please answer the following questions about yourself. Your answers will assist in the categorization of the responses.

HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN A PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SCHOOLTEACHER? _____

1. Indicate your gender: _____ Male Female

IS ENGLISH YOUR NATIVE LANGUAGE? _____ YES NO

DO YOU SPEAK A SECOND LANGUAGE? _____ YES NO

2. *If yes, please estimate your highest ability level attained:*

Beginner: Intermediate: Advanced:

WHAT IS YOUR ETHNICITY? WHITE HISPANIC ASIAN AFRICAN AMERICAN OTHER

I HAVE HAD TRAINING IN COLLEGE COURSES AND OTHER VENUES IN TEACHING ELL STUDENTS.

Yes No

IF YOU ANSWERED 'YES', TO THE ABOVE QUESTION, WHAT TYPE OF TRAINING HAVE YOU RECEIVED IN TEACHING LANGUAGE MINORITY/ELL STUDENTS?

SECTION B

District support: please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

MY DISTRICT OFFERS EFFECTIVE TRAINING THAT HELPS ME TEACH ELL STUDENTS MORE EFFECTIVELY.

Strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

I RECEIVE ADEQUATE SUPPORT FROM SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS WHEN ELL STUDENTS ARE IN MY CLASSES.

Strongly agree agree disagree strongly disagree

I RECEIVE ADEQUATE SUPPORT FROM THE ELL STAFF WHEN ELL STUDENTS ARE IN MY CLASSES.

Strongly agree	agree	disagree	strongly disagree

SECTION C

General Opinions. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

THE INCLUSION OF ELL STUDENTS IN LANGUAGE ARTS/READING CLASSROOMS BENEFITS ALL STUDENTS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

ELL STUDENTS SHOULD NOT BE INCLUDED IN LANGUAGE ARTS/READING CLASSROOMS UNTIL THEY HAVE ATTAINED A MINIMUM LEVEL OF ENGLISH PROFICIENCY.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

LANGUAGE ARTS/READING TEACHERS DO NOT HAVE ENOUGH TIME TO DEAL WITH THE NEEDS OF ELL STUDENTS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

IT IS A GOOD IDEA TO SIMPLIFY COURSEWORK FOR ELL STUDENTS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

IT IS A GOOD IDEA TO ASSIGN LESS COURSEWORK TO ELL STUDENTS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

IT IS A GOOD IDEA TO ALLOW ELL STUDENTS MORE TIME TO COMPLETE COURSEWORK.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

TEACHERS SHOULD NOT GIVE ELL STUDENTS A FAILING GRADE IF THE STUDENTS DISPLAY EFFORT.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

TEACHERS SHOULD NOT MODIFY ASSIGNMENTS FOR ELL STUDENTS ENROLLED IN LANGUAGE ARTS/READING CLASSROOMS.

Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

THE MODIFICATION OF COURSEWORK FOR ELL STUDENTS WOULD BE DIFFICULT TO JUSTIFY TO ENGLISH SPEAKING STUDENTS.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

ELL STUDENTS SHOULD BE ABLE TO ACQUIRE ENGLISH WITHIN TWO YEARS OF ENROLLING IN U.S. SCHOOLS.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

I WOULD SUPPORT LEGISLATION MAKING ENGLISH THE OFFICIAL LANGUAGE OF THE U.S.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

SECTION D

Opinions Regarding My Classroom: Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements.

THE INCLUSION OF ELL STUDENTS IN MY LANGUAGE ARTS/READING CLASSROOM CREATES A POSITIVE EDUCATIONAL ATMOSPHERE.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

I WOULD WELCOME THE INCLUSION OF ELL STUDENTS IN MY LANGUAGE ARTS/READING CLASS.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

UNTIL STUDENTS HAVE LEARNED TO SPEAK ENGLISH, I SHOULD NOT EXPECT TOO MUCH FROM THEM IN MY CLASS.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

ELL STUDENTS SHOULD AVOID USING THEIR NATIVE LANGUAGE WHILE IN MY CLASSROOM.

Strongly Agree Agree Disagree Strongly Disagree

SECTION E

My Classroom Practices Regarding ELL Students: Please indicate the extent to which each of the following applies your classes.

I ALLOW ELL STUDENTS MORE TIME TO COMPLETE THEIR COURSEWORK.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

MY SPEECH IS APPROPRIATE FOR STUDENTS' PROFICIENCY LEVEL (E.G., SLOWER RATE, ENUNCIATION, AND SIMPLE SENTENCE STRUCTURE, FOR BEGINNERS.)

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

I GIVE ELL STUDENTS LESS COURSEWORK THAN OTHER STUDENTS.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

I ALLOW AN ELL STUDENT TO USE HIS/HER NATIVE LANGUAGE IN MY CLASS.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

I PROVIDE MATERIALS FOR ELL STUDENTS IN THEIR NATIVE LANGUAGE.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

I PROVIDE FOR ACTIVITIES THAT INTEGRATE ALL LANGUAGE SKILLS (I.E., READING, WRITING, LISTENING, AND SPEAKING, IN MY LANGUAGE ARTS/READING CLASSES.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

EFFORT IS MORE IMPORTANT TO ME THAN ACHIEVEMENT WHEN I ASSIGN GRADES TO ELL STUDENTS.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

I USE A VARIETY OF TECHNIQUES TO MAKE CONTENT CONCEPTS CLEAR (E.G., MODELING, VISUALS, HANDS-ON ACTIVITIES, DEMONSTRATIONS, GESTURES, BODY LANGUAGE).

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

THE INCLUSION OF ELL STUDENTS IN MY CLASSES INCREASES MY WORKLOAD.

Never Seldom Some of the Time All of the Time

I SPEND MORE TIME ON ELL STUDENTS THAN ON OTHER STUDENTS.

Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	All of the Time

I SCAFFOLD INSTRUCTION FOR ELL STUDENTS TO PROVIDE SUPPORT WHEN TEACHING A NEW CONCEPT.

Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	All of the Time

THE INCLUSION OF ELL STUDENTS IN MY CLASSES SLOWS THE PROGRESS OF THE ENTIRE CLASS.

Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	All of the Time

I USE A VARIETY OF QUESTION TYPES, INCLUDING THOSE THAT PROMOTE HIGHER ORDER THINKING SKILLS (E.G., LITERAL, ANALYTICAL, AND INTERPRETIVE QUESTIONS).

Never	Seldom	Some of the Time	All of the Time

SECTION F:

1. List what you consider to be, the *greatest benefits* of including ELL students in mainstream language arts or reading classes

2. List what you consider to be, the *greatest challenges* of including ELL students in mainstream language arts/reading classes:

3. Please write any additional comments you may have concerning the inclusion of ELL students in language arts/reading classes.

APPENDIX C: TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Tell me about your history as a teacher particularly in working with ELL students:
    A. How many years you have been teaching?
    B. How many different schools have you taught in?
    C. What training you have had for teaching ELL students and
    D. What you would consider some highlights or important moments in your teaching of these students.

2. What are the challenges of including ELL students in your classes?
    A. Are they different from the challenges you face in teaching non-Ell students?
    B. Describe your feelings the first time an ELL student enrolled in your one of your classes.
    C. What would your reaction be to receiving more ELL students in your classes?
    D. In what ways might students' native culture impact their performance as a student in your class?

3. What do you see are the benefits of including ELL students in your classes?

4. What kind/s of support are you receiving for your teaching of ELL students?
    A. What might your administration do to better support you?
    B. What might the ELL teacher at your school do to better support you?

5. Tell me about the training you have received for working with ELL students. Based on your experience, what training would you recommend for subject area teachers of ELL students?

6. How have your attitudes toward ELL inclusion changed over time?

7. What techniques or strategies have worked best for you in teaching ELL students?
    A. What worked least well?

APPENDIX D: LETTER OF INVITATION TO PRINCIPAL OF QUALITATIVE STUDY SITE

_____, Principal
_____ Middle School
Las Vegas, Nevada

Dear Principal _____,

My name is Elmer C. Manzanares, and I am a doctoral student in Educational Administration at the University of Denver. I am interested in conducting a research study on the experiences of middle school language arts teachers who enroll ELL students in their classes.

_____ Middle School, with its large population of ELL students is an ideal site for my study. Teachers who volunteer to participate in my study will sit for an interview with me from 30 to 60 minutes. The duration of this study is from November 1, 2008 to February 31, 2009. Enclosed you will find a letter of invitation I would like to send to _____ your middle school teacher whose classes contain ESL students.

With Clark County School District being the fifth largest school district in the country and ranks as the sixth state with the highest population of students whose English is their non-native language my study has the potential to benefit middle school mainstream language arts teachers.

The goal of my study is to understand the challenges and benefits of inclusion of these students in mainstream classes. I have already secured permission from Clark County's Office of Research and from the University of Denver and hope you will consider allowing me access to _____ your teacher.

You can contact me at (702) 371-6244, ecmanzanares@interact.ccsd.net or at the address above.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Elmer C. Manzanares
Ph.D. Candidate
Educational Administration

APPENDIX E: TEACHER INVITATION FOR THE QUALITATIVE STUDY (INTERVIEW)

August 6, 2008

_____
Middle School Language Arts teacher

Dear _____,

My name is Elmer C. Manzanares, a doctoral student in Education Administration at the University of Denver. I would like to conduct a research study at your middle school and I would like to ask for your participation.

With the large number of students whose first language is not English, middle school teachers are now working with ELL (English Language Learners) students. The purpose of my study is to examine the experiences of language arts, middle school teachers who teach these students.

To better understand your experience with ELL students, I would like to conduct an interview with you at your convenience. Participation in this study will help reveal the needs of Clark County School District's teachers whose classes enroll ELL students. I deeply appreciate your willingness to share your experience.

If you are interested in participating in this study, please contact me at ecmanzanares@interact.ccsd.net, or (702) 371-6244.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me for further information.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Elmer C. Manzanares
Ph.D. Candidate
Educational Administration

APPENDIX F: TEACHER INVITATION FOR THE STUDY (SURVEY)

August 6, 2008

_____
Middle School Language Arts teacher

Dear _____,

I would like to invite you to participate in the research study *ELL students in language arts classes: A survey of teachers*. This dissertation study is designed to explore the experiences of middle school teachers whose classes enroll or may someday enroll students who are learning English as a second language (ESL). Your input will provide valuable insight.

Whether you have no experience with ELL students or years of experience with ELL students, I would like to ask you to participate in this study by filling out the survey. The survey is anonymous and individual respondents will not be identified. Completion of this survey indicates your consent to participate.

This survey should take anywhere from 15 to 30 minutes of your time.

Please keep this letter for your records, and feel free to contact me with questions or comments at (702) 371-6244, or by e-mail at ecmanzanares@interact.ccsd.net

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

Elmer C. Manzanares
Ph.D. Candidate
Educational Administration

APPENDIX G: INFORMED CONSENT

What are middle school English teachers' self-reported attitudes towards, and opinions about, the presence of English language learners in their mainstream classrooms, and what practices do they report using with these students.

You are invited to participate in a study that will explore the affects that English language learners have on the attitudes of middle school language arts teachers in the mainstream classroom. In addition, this study is being conducted to fulfill the requirements of a class in doctoral research. The study is being conducted by Elmer C. Manzanares. Results will be used to increase the overall knowledge about the attitudes of language arts teachers who have English language learners enrolled in their mainstream classrooms and to receive a grade in the course. Elmer Manzanares can be reached at (702-371-6244 or online at ecmanzanares@interact.ccsd.net). The course instructor is, Dr. Kent Seidel, of the Porridge Education Department, University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208, (303) 871-2496 or online at <kent.seidel@du.edu)>, and he supervises this project.

Participation in this study should take about 30 minutes of your time. Participation will involve responding to 41 questions about teacher attitudes. Participation in this project is strictly voluntary. The risks associated with this project are minimal. If, however, you experience discomfort you may discontinue completing the survey. We respect your right to choose not to answer any questions that may make you feel uncomfortable. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

Your responses will be identified by code number only and will be kept separate from information that could identify you. This is done to protect the confidentiality of your responses. Only the researcher will have access to your individual data and any reports generated as a result of this study will use only group averages and paraphrased wording. However, should any information contained in this study be the subject of a court order or lawful subpoena, the University of Denver might not be able to avoid compliance with the order or subpoena.

If you have any concerns or complaints about how you were treated during the process, please contact Susan Sadler, Chair, Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects, at (303) 871-3454, or Sylk Sotto-Santiago, Office of Sponsored Programs at (303) 871-4052 or write to the University of Denver, Office of Sponsored Programs, 2199 S. University Blvd., Denver, CO 80208-2121.

You may keep this page for your records. Please sign the next page if you understand and agree to the above. If you do not understand any part of the above statement, please ask the researcher any questions you have.

I have read and understood the foregoing descriptions of the study called: *English Teachers and English Language Learners in Middle School Classrooms: Perspectives and Practices*.

I have asked for and received a satisfactory explanation of any language that I did not fully understand. I agree to participate in this study, and I understand that I may withdraw my consent at any time. I have received a copy of this consent form.

Signature _____ Date _____

___ I agree to be audio taped.

___ I do not agree to be audio taped.

Signature _____ Date _____

_____ I would like a summary of the results of this study to be mailed to me at the following postal or e-mail address:

APPENDIX H: UNIVERSITY OF DENVER HUMAN SUBJECTS APPROVAL LETTER

University of Denver

Sylk Sotto-Santiago, MBA
Manager, Regulatory Research Compliance Tel: 303-871-4052

Certification of Human Subjects Approval

October 23, 2008
To,
Elmer Manzanares, MA

Subject **Human Subject Review**

TITLE: HOW DO MIDDLE SCHOOL ENGLISH TEACHERS ATTITUDES TOWARDS ELL STUDENTS IN MAINSTREAM CLASSES AFFECT THEIR TEACHING AND STUDENT LEARNING

IRB# : 2008-0853

Dear Manzanares,

The Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects has reviewed the above named project. The project has been confirmed exempt under 45 CFR Secttion 46.101 (b)-(X) for the procedures and subjects described in the protocol effective 10/14/2008.

This approval is effective for a five-year period.

For the duration of your reserach study, any changes in:
1. experimental design
2. risk level
3. content of the study
4. materials attached to the original application
5. prinicipal investigator

must be reviewed and approved by the University of Denver IRB before implementation of those changes.

The University of Denver will terminate this project at the end of the five-year period unless otherwise instructed via correspondence with the Pirnicpal Investigator. Please submit a completion report if the study is completed before the expiration date or if you are no longer affiliated with the University of Denver. You must submit a new application at the end of the five-year period if you wish to continue this study.

NOTE: Please add the following information to any consent forms, surveys, questionnaires, invitation letters, etc you will use in your research as follows: This survey (consent, study, etc.) was approved by the University of Denver's Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research on 10/14/2008.

The Institutional Review Board appreciates your cooperation in protecting subjects and ensuring that each subject gives a meaningful consent to participate in research projects. If you have any questions regarding your obligations under the Assurance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely yours,

Susan Sadler, PhD
Chair, Institutional Review Board
for the Protection of Human Subjects

Approval Period: 10/14/2008 through 12/31/2999

APPENDIX I: GREATEST BENEFITS OF ELL INCLUSION

Table
Responses to Survey Item F-41 *Greatest Benefits of ELL Inclusion*

Category	Frequency	(%)
Increased Language Proficiency For ELL Students	57	(40.4)
Multicultural Benefits for ELL and English Speaking Students	32	(22.6)
Teacher use of Best Practices	23	(16.3)
ELL Student Achievement	14	(9.9)
No Benefits	5	(3.5)
Other	10	(7.0)

Note. Total Number of Responses = 141

APPENDIX J: GREATEST CHALLENGES OF ELL INCLUSION

Table

Responses to Survey Item F-41: *Greatest Challenges of ELL Inclusion*

Category	Frequency	(%)
Limited Language Proficiency	42	(29.3)
Low ELL Student Achievement	28	(19.5)
Lack of Teacher Planning Time	24	(16.7)
Lack of Training	12	(8.3)
Lack of Support at Home	10	(7.0)
Loss of Academic time for Non-ELL Students	10	(7.0)
Lack of Administrative Resources and Support	10	(6.9)
Other	7	(4.8)

Note. Total Number of Responses = 143

APPENDIX K: SURVEY RESPONSES

District Support

"My district offers effective training that would help me teach ELL students effectively."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-14	13% (n-22)	62% (n-105)	20% (n-34)	4% (n-7)

"I receive adequate support from school administrators when ELL students are in my classes."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-31	23% (n-39)	48% (n-81)	22% (n-37)	6% (n-11)

"I receive adequate support from the ELL staff when ELL students are in my classes."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B32	26% (n-45)	47% (n-81)	20% (34)	6% (n-11)

General Opinions

"ELL students should not be included in language arts/reading classrooms until they have attained a minimum level of English proficiency."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-3	27% (n-47)	52% (n-90)	14% (n-24)	7% (12)

"ELL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-5	8% (14)	49% (81)	33% (55)	10% (16)

"I would support legislation making English the official language of the U.S."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-16	36% (60)	37% (62)	18% (30)	9% (15)

"It is a good idea to simplify coursework for ELL students."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-7	9% (15)	47% (79)	36% (60)	7% (12)

"It is a good idea to assign less coursework to ELL students."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-8	2% (4)	26% (45)	58% (99)	12% (20)

"It *is a good idea to allow ELL students more time to complete coursework."*

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-9	20% (35)	70% (122)	7% (13)	2% (3)

"Teachers should not modify assignments for ELL students enrolled in language arts/reading classrooms."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-11	2% (3)	17% (29)	56% (96)	25% (43)

"The modification of coursework for ELL students would be difficult to justify to English speaking students."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-12	4% (7)	14% (24)	68% (117)	14% (24)

"The Inclusion of ELL students in language arts /reading classrooms benefits all students."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-2	19% (n-32)	45% (n-77)	33% (n-56)	3% (n-6)

"Language arts/reading teachers do not have enough time to deal with the needs of ELL students."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-6	10% (18)	37% (64)	43% (74)	9% (16)

"Teachers should not give ELL students a failing grade if the students display effort."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-10	11% (18)	50% (84)	35% (58)	4% (7)

Opinions Regarding Classroom

"*The inclusion of ELL students in my language arts/reading classroom creates a positive educational atmosphere."*

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-1	22% (37)	57% (97)	19% (32)	2% (3)

"ELL students should avoid using their native language while in my classroom."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-4	21% (35)	31% (53)	36% (60)	12% (20)

"I would welcome the inclusion of ELL students in my language arts/reading class."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A-15	24% (42)	60% (103)	12% (21)	3% (5)

"Until students have learned to speak English, I should not expect too much from them in class."

Survey Item	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

A-17	2% (4)	14% (24)	55% (95)	28% (49)

My Classroom Practices Regarding ELL students

"I allow ELL students more time to complete their coursework"

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-18	34% (58)	58% (99)	7% (12)	1% (1)

"My speech is appropriate for students' proficiency level (e.g., slower rate, enunciation, and simple sentence structure, for beginners?"

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-19	38% (65)	57% (97)	4% (7)	1% (1)

"I give ELL students less coursework than other students."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-20	3% (6)	30% (53)	33% (57)	33% (58)

"I allow an ELL student to use his/her native language in my class."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-21	9% (15)	49% (86)	26% (45)	16% (28)

"I provide materials for ELL students in their native language."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-22	1% (1)	16% (28)	24% (41)	60% (104)

"I provide for activities that integrate all language skills (i.e., reading, writing, listening, and speaking, in my language arts/reading classes."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-23	74% (129)	24% (42)	2% (3)	0% (0)

"Effort is more important to me than achievement when I assign grades to ELL students."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-24	17% (30)	56% (96)	21% (36)	6% (10)

"I use a variety of techniques to make content concepts clear (e.g., modeling, visuals, hands-on activities, demonstrations, gestures, body language.)"

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-25	77% (134)	22% (38)	1%) 1	0% (0)

"The inclusion of ELL students in my classes increases my workload."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-26	26% (45)	51% (88)	15% (26)	6% (11)

"I spend more time on ELL students than on other students."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-27	14% (25)	63% (109)	20% (35)	3% (5)

"I scaffold instruction for ELL students to provide support when teaching a new concept."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-28	51% (88)	48% (83)	0% (0)	1% (1)

"The inclusion of ELL students in my classes slows the progress of the entire class."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-29	12% (21)	46% (80)	30% (52)	12% (20)

"I use a variety of question types, including those that promote higher order thinking skills (e.g., literal, analytical, and interpretive questions)."

Survey Item	All of the Time	Some of the Time	Seldom	Never
B-30	60% (102)	40% (68)	0% (0)	0% (0)