

**Lack of Appropriate Training to  
Support ELLs for Mainstream Teachers**

by

Amanda Tomchesson

July 30<sup>th</sup>, 2021

A capstone project submitted to the Department of Education and Human Development of  
The College at Brockport, State University of New York in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for MS. Ed. in TESOL

**Table of Contents**

Abstract.....	3
Chapter 1: Introduction .....	4
Chapter 2: Literature Review.....	6
Chapter 3: Description of the Product & Tools.....	22
Chapter 4: Conclusion.....	31
References.....	37
Appendices .....	41
Appendix A: Professional Development Presentation .....	41
Appendix B: SLA Article Anticipation Guide .....	42
Appendix C: Best Practices Resources .....	43
Appendix D: Note Catcher for Best Practices Resources.....	44
Appendix E: Student Profiles Note Catcher.....	45
Appendix F: Content Area Resources.....	46
Appendix G: Note Catcher for Content Area Resources.....	47
Appendix H: Unit of Study Google Document Planning Page.....	48
Appendix I: Curriculum Work Period Agenda .....	51
Appendix J: Session 2 Student Specific Feedback Meeting Agenda .....	52
Appendix K: Session 2 Student Specific Feedback Meeting Questionnaire.....	53
Appendix L: Session 3 Unit of Study Feedback Meeting Agenda.....	54
Appendix M: Session 3 Unit of Study Feedback Meeting Questionnaire.....	55
Appendix N: Mainstream Teacher Survey.....	56
Appendix O: ELL Teacher Survey.....	57

### **Abstract**

This capstone project aims to draw awareness to the lack of training that mainstream teachers receive to support English Language Learners (ELLs). The population of ELLs within the United State public school system continues to increase yearly, but many mainstream teachers are unaware of best practices to support these students within their content-area classrooms. The literature shows the effects of lack of education training that both pre-service and in-service teachers receive on ELL students. Such a lack of training can result in a feeling of low self-efficacy for both teachers and students, poor instructional choices, and a widening of the already prevalent achievement gap between ELLs and their non-ELL peers. In addition to raising awareness of this issue, this capstone project also aims to teach mainstream teachers and administrators best practices to support both the linguistic and content-area growth of ELLs in their classrooms. Through targeted and ongoing professional development for teachers and administrators, a culture of collaboration and shared knowledge of how to best support ELLs can be created. Future recommendations include a more rigorous ELL education curriculum for in-service teachers at a collegiate level, ongoing relevant ELL education training for in-service teachers and greater importance placed on the role of administrative involvement in ELL education.

*Keywords:* English Language Learners, mainstream teachers, self-efficacy, second language acquisition, professional development

## Chapter 1: Introduction

As the population of the United States grows increasingly more diverse, the number of English Language Learners (ELLs) enrolled in public schools grows with it. In 2020, the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2020) reported that in 2017 there were 5 million ELLs in our country's public schools. NCES also reported that out of all public school teachers in the United States, 64% of will have at least 1 English Language Learner in their classroom and out of that 64%, only 10% hold a major, minor, or certification in English as a Second Language (ESL)(NCES, 2020). Additionally, only 2% of all public school teachers in the United States have the assigned job to specifically support and educate ELLs (NCES, 2020). These figures show the problem lies in that the general education teachers often do not receive enough training to support the ELLs in their classroom independently (New York State Education Department, 2021; Song, 2016).

The effects of a lack of training on how to educate ELLs first relates to negative effects for general education teachers (Song, 2016). When educators do not receive the proper training necessary on how to best support ELLs in a general education classroom setting, a likely result is that said teachers will have limited efficacy in relation to their perceived ability to support and educate ELL Students (Hansen-Thomas et al, 2016; Jimenez-Silva et al., 2012; Johnson & Wells, 2017). A sense of limited efficacy will lead general education teachers to believe that they do not have the ability to educate their students, which can result in a lack of ownership of ELLs learning as compared to the general education students within their classroom (Giles & Yazan, 2020). In addition, general education teachers' lack of knowledge about how to best teach ELLs can also lead to misconceptions around best practices. As a result, general education

teachers may resort to instructional strategies that are not only not efficient for ELLS but can also cause academic, linguistic, and social-emotional harm (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016).

It should come to no surprise that the consequences listed above for lack of teacher training on how to properly educate English language learners will result in negative effects for said students. When ELLs are not receiving appropriate instruction to further their linguistic and academic growth, their underperformance likely will lead to the widening of achievement gaps (e.g., Johnson & Wells, 2017; Polat et al., 2016). Additionally, a lack of success and growth within a formal educational setting can have lasting social-emotional effects on the English language learner population (e.g., Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Soland & Sandilos, 2020). Poor education and school experiences can even culminate in an increased dropout rates for ELLs (e.g., Rodriguez et al., 2020; Sunha et al., 2018). For example, it was reported in 2016 that 62% of New York state's ELLs did not graduate from high school (Rodriguez et al., 2020).

The purpose of this capstone project is to provide general education teachers with the tools necessary to implement ELL strategies into their content specific instruction through targeted professional development, creating a positive work environment for both their ELLs and teachers. This professional development will create more opportunities for general education teachers to learn about and implement best practices for ELLs, which in turn should have lasting positive effects on the school's ELL population.

In Chapter 2, I will report on research that demonstrates the need more ELL training for general education teachers as well as some of the effects that come from a lack thereof. In Chapter 3, I will present the professional development and it's intended outcomes. In Chapter 4, I will conclude with a summary of my findings as well as recommendations for future research and practices.

## **Chapter 2: Literature Review**

This chapter reviews studies that explore the unpreparedness of general content educators to teach ELLs. Research shows a domino effect when educators do not receive the preparation, they need to support English language learners in their classrooms (Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Polat et al. 2014; Wissink & Starks 2019). The literature also shows the lack of appropriate collegiate level coursework for pre-service teachers (Gras & Kitson, 2021; Hansen-Thomas et al., 2014) and the lack of consistent and appropriate professional development for in-service teachers (O'Brien, 2011). If an educator receives a proper education in education English language learners, valuable instructional strategies would be available to them such as the use of transference and the importance of using a student's home language (Pacheco, 2018), implementing least-restrictive environments (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013; Fredricks & Warriner, 2016), and maintaining high expectations for English language learners (Nora & Echevarria, 2016).

This chapter shows that educators' lack of such knowledge ultimately leads to their unpreparedness to reach ELLs, the ineffective classroom environments that unpreparedness can create, and the lasting effect that those environments have on ELLs. In this chapter, therefore, I present the themes identified in the literature: reasons for general education teachers' unpreparedness to support ELLs, lack of training creates unfavorable learning environments for ELLs, unfavorable learning environments have lasting effects on ELLs, and possible solutions.

### **Self-Efficacy in the Classroom**

Psychologist Albert Bandura's (1977) theory of self-efficacy draws connections between an individual's perceived abilities to perform tasks in a specific domain and the actions the individual takes to perform said tasks. Bandura (1977) found that that feeling of low self-efficacy

will lead to less motivation and effort towards tasks, as well as avoidance of tasks altogether. For example, in relation to teaching, a teacher may know strategies to support ELLs gain academic vocabulary but if they perceive themselves as unequipped or unprepared to put these strategies into practice, it is likely they will not do so. Zee and Koomen (2016) argue a strong sense of self-efficacy can lead to teachers implementing new instructional methods to support their practices and teachers with high-self efficacy are more likely to implement the knowledge gained from professional development than their low self-efficacious peers. Thus, there is a great benefit of having a mainstream educator with high self-efficacy work with ELLs within their classroom.

Bandura's theory of self-efficacy does not only apply to teachers, but to students as well. High levels of self-efficacy are reflected in students' motivation to learn and their academic efforts (e.g., Kim et al. 2015; Sandilos et al., 2020).

### **Reasons for General Education Teachers' Unpreparedness to Support ELLs**

There is not enough coursework required at the collegiate level to prepare pre-service teachers to properly support English language learners. In O'Brien's (2011) survey study of 123 high school teachers, more than half reported that they did not feel their collegiate coursework in the field of social studies effectively prepared them to teach ELLs. These teachers completed a questionnaire regarding their perceived abilities to accommodate social studies content for ELLs, as well as their prior experience in ELL education. They had years of classroom experience ranging from one to forty-one years. Out of the respondents, only 20% claimed they had participated in collegiate-level coursework around best practices for educating ELLs. In another study, Jimenez-Silvia et al. (2012) explored how pre-service teacher's coursework affected their self-efficacy in regard to teaching ELLs. Their research called on 197 preservice teachers enrolled in an undergraduate structured English immersion program, where they asked

participants to complete pre-and post-surveys rating their perceived self-efficacy after completing a course around best practices for educating ELLs. While 79% of pre-service teachers found the instructional strategies taught during the course to have a positive influence on teachers' self-efficacy, they reported concern with the fact that the course at hand was the only course that was required of the preservice teachers (Jimenez-Silvia et al., 2012). Based on these findings, it is clear that many collegiate programs do not offer pre-service teachers the preparation they need to successfully teach ELLs.

In a literature review on the benefits of ELL coursework for pre-service teachers, researchers sought to describe the ways that specific undergraduate programs supported future mainstream teachers. During the process, the authors compiled 21 articles on said topic, 17 of which were published since the year 2009 (Villegas et al., 2018). While this information at first seems promising, as the researchers use these articles to show how pre-service teachers are receiving meaningful experiences and instruction on ELL education, the recency of this preparedness must be considered. The National Education Association (NEA, 2016) found that 39% of the 40,000 public school teachers polled reported having 10 to 20 years of teaching experience, and 22% of teachers having over 20 years of teaching experiences. This leads to the conclusion that 61% of the nation's public school teachers received their undergraduate and/or master's degree before 2005 and earlier; that is, it is highly likely that they did not receive the valuable pre-service training (Villegas et al. 2018). When examining the required coursework of teachers of ELLs, one should not forget the varying ESL teacher certification policies that exist in each state. In a report conducted in 2021, 49 states in the nation acknowledged add-on certifications as adequate pathways to become licensed in ESL education (Gras & Kitston, 2021). The additional credits needed for this certification vary by state, but notably, states with



large populations of ELLs such as Texas and California require fewer credit hours than others in comparison, requiring nine and 12 credit hours respectfully. Additionally, 16 of the 51 states offer a test-out option for certification, which requires educators simply the ESL Practice test to receive their ESL certification. These findings show how simple it is to require the license to become a certified educator in many states by taking few to no related collegiate courses. Each of these studies represents the shallow coursework that is provided to our nation's educators, which is intended to help them instruct one of the largest growing populations of students in the country.

Much of the coursework that is provided to support pre-service teachers to properly support English language learners are not adequate. In a case study by Coady et al. (2016), researchers analyzed the outcomes of an undergraduate program designed to prepare mainstream elementary teachers to support ELLs in an attempt to examine if and when graduates put their knowledge into practice. The study specifically focused on two teachers who graduated from the same program in Florida and both taught ELLs within their classrooms, in different school districts. The analyses of interviews and survey around the teacher's perceived abilities to support ELLs within the classroom show that both educators felt their teacher-preparation program provided them with the information they needed to best support ELLs and that they were highly confident in their abilities to do so (Coady et al., 2016). However, when researchers analyzed the 4 hours of recorded math and reading lessons that were gathered from each teacher, researchers observed many instances that proved otherwise. For example, though researchers observed both teachers' efforts for inclusive instruction for their ELL learners, there was little to no planning that accounted for the linguistic development of these students (Coady et al., 2016). This study represented how educators can have a false sense of self-efficacy when competing in

pre-service programs but lack the experiences and wherewithal to effectively use what they have learned. In a second case study involving five teachers who taught English at a bilingual school in Haiti, researchers sought to evaluate how well these individuals felt their undergraduate degree in elementary education supported their ability to teach ELLs. Each of the five teachers attended different undergraduate programs and of the five teachers, two teachers took college courses related to an ENL endorsement in addition to their elementary education coursework. During the study's survey and interviews, the teachers all expressed a greater need for college courses directed to content-specific instructional strategies for ELLs, such as how to teach reading skills (Wissink & Starks, 2019). Additionally, four out of the five teachers stated that they wish they would have received more specific instruction on how to teach ELLs. One teacher reported that during the ENL program, her coursework focused mainly on secondary ELL education. She expressed that she felt this didn't prepare her to teach younger students who were not literate in their home language, rendering many of her previously learned strategies for instruction useless. Another teacher reported that during her practicum experiences she became familiar with only the pull-out model of instruction, which she felt did not prepare her for the inclusive model and co-teaching that her current position required of her (Wissink & Starks, 2019).

While the previous data represent the lack of pre-service preparation, in-service teachers are not provided with appropriate and consistent professional development to meet the specific needs of their ELLs. In an examination of teacher's preparedness to teach ELLs in kindergarten, researchers found that while 85% of 20 teachers surveyed expressed that they were willing to participate in professional development geared toward supporting ELLs, only 59% of teachers actually did (Hegde et al., 2018). These findings show that though teachers see a need for further

training in regard to how to best support the English language learners in their classroom, the school districts they work in may not encourage teachers to seek out said events. Additionally, in O'Brien's (2011) study of the 123 teachers surveyed who reported working with ELLs in their classroom, only 60% of those teachers were provided training within their school district to support this diverse group of students. Additionally, one-on-one interviews that conducted with 8 of the surveyed individuals that were provided with professional development by the district. In these interviews, teachers stated that the training provided to them was hands-off and largely unhelpful, as it only provided them with surface-level information that did not help them support the specific needs of the ELLs within their classroom (O'Brien, 2011). These findings suggest that school districts are falling short of supporting their staff and thus setting them and their students up for failure. In both the cases of in-service and pre-service teachers, there is a lack of necessary learning and support that these educators need to provide appropriate instruction for the ELLs within their classroom. Thus, these individuals should receive more pre-service training and/or more relevant professional development around best practices for education ELLs, in order to create a more successful learning environment for their ELLs.

### **Lack of Training Creating Unfavorable Learning Environments for ELLs**

Teachers without adequate training around educating English language learners lack the knowledge around highly important pedagogical theories related to second language acquisition. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, there are facets of English as a second language that require at least a basic knowledge of theories related to second language acquisition such as the potential Silent Period. Ellis (2008) argues that "Some [second language] learners, especially children, undergo an often lengthy period during which they do not try to speak in the L2" (p. 978). In their mixed method study of in-service elementary teachers' self-efficacy for culturally

responsive instruction, Malo-Juvera et al. (2018) conducted interviews with in-service teachers after they completed the Culturally Responsive Teaching Self-Efficacy Scale (Siwatu, 2007) and found the amount of knowledge of second language acquisition that teachers working with ELLs have.. One teacher, in regard to a beginning ELL student who was a newcomer to her class, reported:

I really worked hard trying to draw him in, but he is very non-vocal and it is a struggle to get him to answer, talk. And anyway, I am still at the point where I just don't know if this is a language barrier or if you are low, or if this is a combination of both. (p. 152)

Additionally, in their case study of the collaboration of one language arts secondary teacher with a certified ELL teacher, when Giles and Yazan (2020) interviewed the general education teacher, she said that before beginning her collaboration with the ELL teacher she unintentionally implemented practices that she now sees did not help her ELL student learn the desired content and that she “shut ESL students out. Not giving them tools that they needed that [she] could have easily given them” (p. 6). In another study, which focused on recording how four mainstream teachers interact with and support their ELL students, researchers observed teachers utilizing an English-only policy, denying students the use of their home languages in both conversational and academic settings (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). When considering the known benefits of allowing students to use their home languages within the classroom (Pacheco, 2018; Rodriguez et al., 2020), the use of an English-only policy represents a lack of understanding around best practices for ELLs when acquiring content-based knowledge. Each of these studies represents mainstream teachers demonstrating a misunderstanding around relevant and beneficial teaching practices to best support their English language learners, as well as a lack of knowledge of second language acquisition theories.

Teachers who lack appropriate training may assume it is acceptable to have low expectations for ELLs and can provide them with a less rigorous curriculum as a result. Psychologist Jere Brophy's research (1983) on teacher expectations showed that teacher's displayed specific behaviors towards students they had higher expectations of, such as calling on them more frequently to answer academic questions and even smiling at them more. When mainstream teachers think of how to best support ELLs within their classroom, they may believe that avoiding difficult academic concepts and higher-order thinking demands is the best path. However, although based on good intentions, these practices are detrimental to student growth and aids in the widening of achievement gaps (Nora & Echevarria, 2016; Roy-Campbell, 2012). In one study surveying 94 in-service mainstream teachers pursuing master's degrees in either early childhood or secondary education, when asked to respond to the statement "Until students have learned to speak English, I shouldn't expect too much from them in my class" on a scale from 1 [completed disagree] to 7 [completely agree], the average score was 4.04 (Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013, p. 66). When responding to this statement, any score above one represents a lack of knowledge around best practices to support ELLs, as research has revealed that low expectations of learners can lead to a student's low expectation of their own abilities (Brophy, 1983). Similarly, Figueroa Murphy and Torff (2019)'s survey study of 205 educators on best instructional strategies to support ELLs found when educators were asked to rate the effectiveness of different instructional practices to support learners, they regarded tasks that required higher levels of critical thinking as more appropriate for general education students than ELLs. Again, when ELL students are denied the opportunity to participate in the same content-specific tasks as their non-ELL peers, they are being denied access to the curriculum needed for future academic success.

When teachers lack the appropriate training needed to support ELLs within their classroom, they often lack ownership of their ELL students' learning. As previously mentioned, mainstream teachers who lack appropriate training in education ELLs will often have low expectations of these learners within their classroom. As a result, these teachers begin to believe that they are not responsible for the language acquisition of ELLs and that it is instead mainly the responsibility of the schools TESOL teacher. Polat and Mahalingappa (2013) found compared to pre-service teachers, in-service teachers viewed themselves as less responsible for ELLs' language acquisition and instead viewed ELLS language development as the ESL teacher's responsibility instead. Additionally, Rodriguez et al. (2020) identified factors that contribute to ELL high school dropout rate in a questionnaire was given to a group of 65 teachers and administrators that posed the question "What services, if any should be provided to Els to improve academic and learning success." In their responses, 52% of the surveyed teachers cited a lack of adequate funding as one of the most significant factors affecting ELL academic achievement.

While researchers do not disprove this theory, they do make the observation that these parties may be implying that improvements cannot be made unless additional funding takes place, thus removing themselves from ownership over the ELLs' lack of success thus far rather than looking for ways they can improve. For example, Carley Rizzuto (2017) utilized a mix of semi-structured interviews, classroom artifacts, and classroom observations to analyze how teachers' perceptions of ELLs can shape their instruction. The results of these qualitative data tools showed that seven of the 10 teachers in the study identified their ELL's low literacy level as a factor that was "out of their control" (Carley Rizzuto, 2017, p. 192) and requested more pull-out programs as well as more time spent with the ESL teacher. This data shows an obvious

representation of the lack of ownership and negative perceptions of self-efficacy that mainstream teachers can hold about education ELLs. The idea that mainstream teachers do not see themselves as responsible for ELLs language development and academic success is clearly problematic when you consider the amount of time ELLs spend with their mainstream teachers. For example, in the state of New York, ELL students with the lowest proficiency level of ‘entering’ are only required 360 minutes of instruction from a certified TESOL educator. The National Center for Educational Statistics most updated data (2018) states that New York schools average a minimum of 5 instructional hours per school day. If the TESOL teacher is meeting the minimum requirements and is able to distribute the required minutes evenly throughout the five-day school week, beginning-level proficient ELLs will receive one hour of direct instruction meant to further their second language development. This leaves four hours of unaccounted for academic time with their mainstream teacher, who may or may not have an invested ownership in their learning. This equates to a massive waste of instructional time for ELLs, doing them an incredible disservice.

Teachers who are not adequately educated on best practices for ELLs may assume restrictive language environments do not promote second language acquisition. The idea of translanguaging pedagogy, or the allowance of bilingual individuals to use their native language within English-centric classrooms, is a practice that has long since been supported by researchers in ELL education (Cummins, 2007; García & Beardsmore, 2013) and promotes the use of multilingual activities across content areas (Coyoca & Lee, 2009; Lopez-Robertson, 2012; Zapata & Laman; 2016). An educator who is trained to work with ELLs within mainstream classrooms would be well aware of this valuable pedagogy and the benefits it can provide. Educators who are untrained in ELL education may develop approaches that negate this method,

as a common misconception is that target English-only policies are what is best for ELLs (Cummins, 2007). In a case study focused on four mainstream teachers, researchers used participant observation, field notes, in-depth interviewing, focus groups, and artifact collections to analyze the experience and perspectives of the participants. All four teachers were shown to hold English-only policies within their mainstream classrooms, silencing students who attempted to use their native language to support either themselves or their peers (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). In Carley Rizzuto's (2017) case study of elementary teachers who work with ELLs in their mainstream classroom, seven out of 10 teachers surveyed "expressed negative perceptions regarding ELL students, specifically concerning the use of their native language in their classrooms" (p. 190). One teacher interviewed stated having an English-only policy within her classroom and would not allow bilingual students to use their native languages to translate during instruction or any other time in the classroom (Carley Rizzuto, 2017). Additionally, when 94 content area teachers were asked to respond to the statement "ELLs should avoid using their native language while in my classroom" on a scale of 1 [completely disagree] to 7 [completely agree], the response was 3.65 (Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013, p. 66). These case studies represent how mainstream teachers are unaware of the benefits that translanguaging and bilingual education can have for the ELLs in their classroom, thus providing another example of their lack of adequate training and knowledge that is necessary to support this diverse group of students.

### **The Effects of Unfavorable Learning Environments on ELLs' Academic and Social-Emotional Growth**

When mainstream teachers do not follow best practices when working with ELLs in their mainstream classrooms, they create environments that form low self-efficacy for ELLs. Research has shown that the practices previously described such as English-only policies and setting low



expectations for ELLs negatively affect ELLs perceptions of their own academic abilities and self-worth (Cummins, 2007; Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). Fredricks and Warriner (2016) examined the perceptions and experiences of 12 ELLs through semi-structured interviews. The researchers found that the teachers created a language hierarchy with English-only policies, which students bought into, that devalued languages other than English. All 12 of the students interviewed expressed ideas of feeling less intelligent or less-adept than their native English-speaking peers (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). An audio-recorded conversation between two ELL students showed that they associated being in an English Language Development (ELD) class with academic failure. One native Kirundi speaker stated in an interview that she didn't think it was fair that teachers wouldn't allow her to speak her native language with her peers and wished she could do so without fear of being punished (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). When teachers set low expectations for ELLs, they send the message that they do not think ELLs are capable individuals, thus lowering those student's self-efficacy. Nora & Echevarria (2016) state that "decades of research demonstrates that teachers' expectations, attitudes, and behaviors toward certain students – typically students of color and those from disadvantaged backgrounds – have a direct and profound impact on the way these students see themselves as learners" (p. 10). When teachers do not see their ELLs as capable learners of rigorous academic content, their students could start to think similarly. Additionally, author Colin Seale suggests that when educators water down academic tasks in an attempt to save students from blows to self-confidence and frustration, they in fact are showing students that they do not view them as intelligent individuals (2018). As the section of this chapter titled *Self-Efficacy in the Classroom* states, a student's perception of their ability to learn can directly affect their academic growth. Clearly, the creation of low self-efficacious ELLs is problematic.

In addition to the harmful practices listed, teachers who are not educated in best practices will not be able to provide their ELL learners with the instructional strategies they need to build their own self-efficacy. In a case study surveying 198 adult language learners, data showed that ELLs felt positive about their abilities to learn English when they were able to use metacognition, social, and compensating strategies (Shi, 2018). Additionally, in group interviews conducted with 14, ELLs enrolled in an Entry Level 3 ESOL class, researchers found that participants gained confidence and viewed themselves as more capable when they were able to utilize strategies that allowed them to support themselves instead of relying on others (Court, 2020). These students cited that it was attending ESOL classes and the support of the instructors that lead to fewer feelings of anxiousness and increased self-confidence when speaking English. These studies show how valuable ELLs learned strategies to support second language acquisition can be, but those strategies will not be learned if their teachers do not know how to teach them.

When teachers do not follow best practices when working with ELLs in their mainstream classrooms, they create environments that widen achievement gaps. Data from NAEP around the academic growth trajectories for ELLs, researchers analyzed the results of fourth and eighth grade ELLs performance on national math and reading test in comparison to those of their English-speaking peers. The data showed that over the four years, the increase in the average math scores of fourth-grade non-ELLs was twice that of the ELL group (Polat et al., 2014). Additionally, the mean reading scores for both fourth and eighth-grade Non-ELLs were four times higher compared to the ELL groups. Researchers concluded that based on this data, the achievement gap between ELLs and Non ELLs in math and reading remains and is widening slightly (Polat et al., 2014).

While we discount the academic challenges that ELLs will naturally face when acquiring a second language, especially those that may have interrupted formal education and/or those who did not acquire literacy in their native language before learning English, it is also proven that some of the poor practices that were previously detailed are also responsible for the achievement gap between ELLs and their non-ELL peers. For example, in Fredricks and Warriner's (2016) case study, when students were kept out of the mainstream classroom due to their lack of perceived ability to participate in mainstream lessons, they missed out on the academic content they needed to be successful on achievement tests. All four teachers who participated in the study cited that when students exited the pull-out ELD program, they were "behind on content-specific academic skills" and "needed frequent remedial support" (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016, p. 316). Additionally, when educators placed a low expectation on their ELL learners, they provided them with a less rigorous curriculum which in turn did not prepare students for said achievement tests (Figueroa Murphy & Torff, 2019; Nora & Echevarria, 2016; Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013; Roy-Campbell, 2012).

### **Effective Solutions**

While the findings presented show a grim outlook on ELL education as a result of the actions of untrained educators, it is important to shift mindsets in order to focus on the changes that can be made. A large focus for improvement should be placed on pre-service teacher programs, to ensure that educators entering the field are knowledgeable around second language acquisition and prepared to support ELLs within the classroom. In a study on preparing pre-service mainstream teachers for linguistically diverse classrooms, Mills et al. (2020) found that teacher candidates enrolled in courses aimed towards understanding diverse students and engaging in reflective practices while working with ELLs expressed more confidence in their

ability to work with ELLs and subsequently felt more empathetic for them. These types of programs should be embedded in all collegiate pathways that lead to a certification in ELL education and should be required of all other education pathways as well. Just as more courses for ELL education should be added to degrees in education, the existing courses can be improved. Research has shown that in-service teachers who either received TESOL degrees or took courses related to an ESL endorsement have expressed the need for coursework that better supports their ability to teach ELLs the content knowledge they need to acquire (Soo Von Esch & Schneider Kavanagh, 2018; Wissink & Starks, 2019). With this in mind, a possible solution for improving pre-service ESL preparation courses would be to conduct surveys with graduates of these programs on what things they learned in said program that was helpful and areas that were lacking.

The use of appropriate and relevant in-service teacher professional development around supporting ELLs is the second area that should be improved in order to make the biggest change in ELL education today. While some studies showed that there are educators who believe that educating ELLs is a task they do not feel they need to improve upon (Carley Rizzuto, 2016), there is plenty that has shown teacher's desire for professional development to support the ELLs in their classrooms (Hansen-Thomas et al., 2014; Hegde et al., 2016; O'Brien, 2011). In a long-term study following 65 sixths through twelfth-grade teachers who participated in SIOP professional development workshops, teachers received monthly workshops that corresponded with academic and grade-specific activities as well as one-on-one coaching with instructional coaches in order to support the growth of the ELLs in their classrooms. This highly relevant and hands-on approach to professional development resulted in 90% of the teachers reported the confidence to take full responsibility in the academic and language growth of their ELLs as well

as all participants demonstrating the use of differentiation and scaffolding to better support the ELLs their mainstream classrooms (Hyunsook Song, 2016).

### **Chapter 3: Description of the Product and Tools**

As research reviewed in Chapter 2 shows, classroom teachers lack proper knowledge and training to support diverse learners within their classrooms (Gras & Kitston, 2021; Malo-Juvera et al., 2017; Wissink & Starks, 2019). As a result, these teachers can create unfavorable learning environments for ELLs through harmful practices which can have lasting negative effects on these students (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Polat et al., 2014). In this Chapter, I will describe the professional development (PD) that I have designed as a way to combat the problem described. The PD aims to support mainstream teachers teach ELLs within their classroom. I will raise mainstream teachers' awareness of relevant SLA theories and best practices to support the ELLs across all content areas, thus increasing their self-efficacy concerning ELL education and minimizing said unfavorable learning environments. Additionally, both the mainstream teachers and ELL teachers will have time to collaborate and plan together through all three sessions of the PD.

In the following sections, I will review the three sessions of the PD as well as the planned activities for each session. Lastly, I will discuss the intended outcomes of these activities.

#### **Description of the Professional Development**

This professional development will be held at the middle school level and will include fifth-grade mainstream teachers, ELL teachers, and administrators. The mainstream teachers, also known as the content area teachers, include the subjects of English language arts, mathematics, science, and social studies.

The school is organized into homeroom sections, where all fifth-grade students move from classroom to classroom to visit different content-area teachers. Teachers who see the same groups of students are referred to as "switch teachers," and there are three to four switch teachers

per homeroom section. There is also one ELL teacher assigned to each homeroom section that includes ELL students. There are three to four content-area teachers, in each subject, and these teachers work together frequently. All of the teachers who are present work with ELL students in their classrooms. Administrators will be present and participate in the presentation section of session one of the PD. It is important that they attend so that they too can understand best practices for ELL education so that they know what to expect from their mainstream teachers who service ELLs.

### *Session 1*

The first session will meet for a full day, from 8 am to 3:30 pm, during the teacher in-service learning that occurs each September before the start of the school year in the school's library. This session will be devoted to gathering and applying knowledge through collaboration and will involve the fifth-grade mainstream teachers, ELL teachers, and administrators. I will give the presentation, titled "Teach Every Student", using PowerPoint slides on a large projector for all participants to view. The presentation (See Appendix A) begins with an introduction which reviews the agenda for the day. In order to encourage engagement and ownership from mainstream teachers, the next three slides of the presentation will describe the shared responsibility between all participants to provide quality education for ELLs and how we will work together to do so. The last slide of the introduction lists the learning targets for the PD, so participants can clearly see the goals they are expected to meet. The rest of the presentation is divided into three sections, which involve a variety of activities that are explained below.

The first section of the presentation involves the participants learning about second language acquisition theories. Content teachers are lacking in knowledge around SLA theories relevant to the ELLs in their classroom (O'Brien, 2011). Misconceptions about how second

languages are acquired can lead to teachers making decisions that are harmful to their students (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Malo-Juvera et al., 2017). Therefore, I will ask participants to read, take notes, and have discourse about relevant SLA theories in order to ensure that teachers have the knowledge necessary to make decisions that are beneficial to students' acquisition of a second language. An anticipation guide (see Appendix B) will be completed as a pre-reading activity, in which participants will predict whether statements about SLA are true or false. Teachers will then read the article "Language Acquisition: An Overview" by Kristina Robertson and Karen Ford (2020). After reading the article independently, the participants will then answer if the statements are true or false based on the text. After reading and finishing the anticipation guide, I will guide the group in discourse around facts that were found to be surprising and relevant to the students at their school. I will record key findings from this conversation on a large chart paper that can be referred to throughout the rest of the training.

The second section of the presentation will focus on educating the mainstream teachers and administrators on best practices for teaching ELLs. When mainstream teachers have misconceptions about how ELL students should be taught, their actions as a result create unfavorable learning environments (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013). The purpose of this presentation is to outline some of the negative behaviors and instruction that mainstream teachers can unknowingly implement within the classroom and explain why these actions are harmful to ELL students. The presentation (see Appendix A) will be formatted so that the negative behaviors or the "don'ts" are presented on a slide, and the "do's" that are related to the previous slide will be presented on the next. On the slides that represent "don'ts", the I will explain the behavior, providing examples of different ways it can manifest within the classroom, and why this behavior is harmful to ELLs. On the slides that represent "do's", the I will explain



behaviors that should be done instead of the “don’ts”, explaining how these behaviors can manifest within the classroom and why they are beneficial for ELLs. Each slide will include links to articles and videos on each topic so that teachers and administrators can learn more on their own. The presentation will be shared digitally so that the links can be easily utilized at a later time, as well as printed on paper so that notes can be taken.

The third section of this presentation involves participants building their own knowledge of how to implement the best practices they learned in the previous section of the presentation. When teachers have a higher sense of self-efficacy, they will be more motivated and willing to try new strategies learned in professional development experiences (Bandura, 1977; Zee & Koomen, 2016). Additionally, when teachers are educated in best practices, they can teach their ELLs the instructional strategies that they need to build their self-efficacy (Shi, 2018). While the do’s and don’ts presentation made teachers aware of best practices, this activity is meant to build up their self-efficacy by introducing simple strategies for utilizing the best practices within their classroom. For this activity, I will ask teachers to get into groups with based on their content areas. Each group will also include an administrator. I will assign each teacher to a specific topic related to best practices and will be provided access to a digital folder, using Google Drive, that contains readings and videos related to the said topic (see Appendix C). The teacher will engage in this content and take notes about what the practice is, how it is beneficial, and ways it can be implemented in the classroom (see Appendix E). After all participants have completed this task, they will share out their findings with their fellow content area teachers. Afterward, all teachers in each of the content areas will learn 3 to 4 new strategies that they can use within their classrooms. This will conclude the presentation portion of this session.

The fourth activity that participants will complete during session 1 of the professional development involves reviewing ELL student data. Research shows that mainstream teachers often lack ownership of their ELLs' learning, placing the responsibility solely on the ELL teacher (Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Rodriguez et al., 2020). This activity is meant for teachers to develop shared ownership of student growth, by communicating with ELL teachers about specific student's academic and linguistic achievements thus far. Teachers will be grouped with their switch teachers and their designated ELL teacher, as well as the school's fourth-grade ELL teachers. During this time the fourth grade ELL teachers will share important data for each specific student the teachers will be servicing, such as English proficiency levels, reading levels, and scores on district and state-level assessments. Additionally, the teachers will be able to share about the student's language background and learning style. During this time, teachers will be able to ask clarifying questions and should take notes on student profiles using the note-catcher (see Appendix F).

For the next activity, the teachers will engage in research based best practices for teaching ELLs in their specific content areas. Mainstream teachers report a lack of understanding around how to teach ELL curriculum that is specific to their content area (O'Brien, 2011; Wissink & Starks, 2019). Based on this, this activity aims to build mainstream teachers' knowledge bases around best practices for instructing ELLs in their specific content area. During this time, teachers will have access to various articles and videos (see Appendix F) that they will use to build their knowledge of strategies to instruct ELLs within their specific content area. As they read, teachers will take notes using an organizer (see Appendix G) on their findings. Afterwards, the teachers will take turns sharing their findings with the content area teachers in their groups.

The last activity of this session one of this PD involves modifying existing curriculum to better support ELLs. Research shows that mainstream teachers do not always modify their instruction to meet the needs of their ELLs because they do not believe it is possible for these students to learn academic content, thus fostering low expectations (Figueroa Murphy & Torff, 2019). As a result, ELLs often miss out on content-area instruction needed for high-stakes testing, thus widening the achievement gap between themselves and their non-ELL peers (Nora & Echevarria, 2016; Roy-Campbell, 2012). The goal of this activity is to provide content-area teachers the opportunity to collaborate and the ELL teacher to modify a unit of study to meet the needs of their ELL learners, prioritizing their inclusion in the mainstream classroom and eliminating low expectations. Before attending, content-area team leaders were asked to choose one already prepared unit of study that they currently implement and bring all related curriculum to the session. As a group, the content-area teachers will analyze the most content standards within the unit of study that are most important for their students to master. The teachers should then identify what learning experiences they currently use that crucial for students to have in order to master these standards. One member of the group will record this information on an editable Google document that will be shared with the group and serve as a planning page (see Appendix H). Using their knowledge from the “Do’s and Don’ts” presentation (see Appendix A), the best practices jigsaw activity (see Appendix C & D), and their notes on student profiles (see Appendix E), the teachers will then work together to modify those learning experiences they identified as crucial to best meet the needs of the ELL students within their classroom. They will record this work using the previously mentioned planning page (see Appendix H). The teachers will follow an agenda (see Appendix I) during this three-hour work period to ensure that their time is managed wisely. This work period will end with teachers from each content area being

asked to share out what modifications they have made to their units of study. This will conclude the first session of the professional development.

### *Session 2*

The second session will occur in October, where partner teachers will meet with their designated ELL teacher and the professional development facilitator. This will be a one-hour session where participants will share what strategies and practices they have been utilizing within their classroom so far and to discuss any challenges they may be facing, in order to problem-solve as a team. The purpose of this meeting will be for switch teachers, the designated ELL teacher, and I to discuss the ELLs students' progress and learning profiles so far. I will utilize an agenda (see Appendix J) to guide the meeting so that time is being used wisely. Before attending the meeting, I will ask teachers to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix K) about how they believe their instruction has gone so far including what strategies from the previous professional development they have implemented, what strategies have worked well, what challenges they have faced, and what strategies they would like to try. The ELL teacher and I will review this information ahead of time, to be able to propose solutions and feedback to teachers as needed. All participants will engage in a round-table style discussion about their answers, which is meant to encourage the collaboration between ELL teachers and mainstream teachers, as well as further develop the mainstream teacher's ownership of ELL learning. Additionally, it should build mainstream teacher's self-efficacy by providing them with new strategies to implement within their classroom and the support they need to do so.

### *Session 3*

The third session will consist of content-area teachers, the designated ELL teacher, and I and will occur when said content-area teachers are in the middle of the unit of study they worked

on during the initial professional development, around January. The purpose of this one-hour session will be to reflect on the changes that have been made to the unit of study and the impact it has had on the instruction for ELLs. It will also be a time to discuss new challenges and problem-solve as a team.

Studies have shown that mainstream teachers want relevant, content-specific professional development that they can use productively within their classroom (O'Brien, 2011; Wissink & Starks, 2019). I will again utilize an agenda (see Appendix L) to ensure that time is used wisely. Before attending the meeting, I will ask teachers to complete a questionnaire (see Appendix M) about how implementing the new unit of study has gone so far such as what strategies from the professional development they have used, how they feel their instruction has changed so far, what results they have seen from their ELLs, and what challenges they have faced. The ELL teacher and the presenter will review this information ahead of time, to be able to propose solutions and feedback to teachers as needed. Teachers will also share their answers with the other participants and engage in discussion. This meeting again aims to foster collaboration between the ELL teacher and mainstream teacher, to build self-efficacy, and develop mainstream teacher ownership over ELLs' academic learning.

I will use a survey to measure how this professional development has changed the actions and perceptions of mainstream teachers. Before beginning the professional development, I will ask teachers to complete the survey (see Appendix N) which rates their perceived abilities and current beliefs concerning ELL education on a scale of one [strongly disagree] to five [strongly agree]. After completing the professional development, the teachers will take the same survey again and the differences will be compared to see how the professional development has either affected their instruction. Following the same format, the ELL teachers at the school will take a

survey (see Appendix O) where their perceptions about whether mainstream teacher's beliefs and actions have or have not changed can be measured.

### **Intended Outcomes**

There are several intended outcomes for the professional development described. The first is that teachers will be aware of critical SLA theories that are relevant to their students. Second, that teachers will understand what types of practices are harmful to ELLs and what practices are they should take part in instead. The third intended outcome is to develop mainstream teacher's ownership of ELLs learning through increased collaboration with the ELL teacher. Lastly, this professional development is intended to build teacher self-efficacy around their ability to instruct ELLs in their content area. Overall, the ELLs in this fifth-grade cohort will be receiving high-quality content-area instruction and be learning in environments that increase their self-efficacy, which will be highly beneficial to their motivation and academic efforts (Sandilos et al., 2020; Soland & Sandilos, 2021). The surveys previously mentioned, as well as presenter observations, will be used to determine the success of this professional development.

## **Chapter 4: Conclusion**

This capstone project has described the lack of mainstream teacher training to support the growing and diverse population of ELLs within their classrooms. Throughout my research, I also explored the negative effects of mainstream teachers' lack of training. In this Chapter, I will describe main takeaways from the literature review of this capstone. I will also detail the implications for teachers and students when completing the designing professional development presented in Chapter 3, as well as my recommendations for future research. The literature has identified mainstream teachers' unpreparedness to teach ELLs as a clear problem (e.g., Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Gras & Kitson, 2021). The literature has also shown that their unpreparedness had multiple negative effects on the ELLs in their classrooms (Nora & Echevarria, 2016; Polat et al. 2014; Wissink & Starks 2019). Based on these findings, I have detailed below three of my main takeaways. The first is that mainstream teachers vary in their perceptions of their abilities to educate ELLs. The second is that collaboration between mainstream and ELL teachers is crucial for ELL success. The third is that mainstream teachers have a great impact on ELLs.

### **Takeaways**

Just as my introduction stated in Chapter 1, and as is repeated multiple times throughout this capstone, mainstream teachers are indeed unprepared to teach the ELLs within their classrooms (e.g., Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; Gras & Kitson, 2021). A prevalent theme that I did not expect, however, was the variety of teacher's perspectives on their abilities to teach ELLs. In each study, the surveys and interviews conducted with mainstream teachers showed a wide range of results concerning teacher's self-efficacy in relation to instructing ELLs within their content-area classrooms. In some surveys, teachers lamented over the lack of training they were provided with and how they felt unprepared to teach their ELLs (Hansen-Thomas et al,

2016; O'Brien, 2011). In another survey, teachers claimed to not have participated in training or coursework to support ELLs, but they still felt confident in their abilities to teach ELLs (Hegde, 2016). In at least two cases, teachers who responded to surveys and interviews demonstrating high self-efficacy related to teaching ELLs also demonstrated harmful practices when teaching their ELLs such as English-only policies and a lack of opportunities to collaborate with non-ELL peers (Carley Rizzuto, 2017; Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). Thus, a lack of training does not always lead to low teacher self-efficacy. Instead, I argue that while a lack of training can impact low teacher self-efficacy in relation to teaching ELLs, a clearer predictor of self-efficacy could be determined through the individual personality of teachers and a school's professional culture.

The literature has revealed that many pre-service and in-service teachers are unaware of best practices to support ELLs within the classroom (Jiminez-Silvia et al., 2012; O'Brien, 2011). Additionally, many mainstream teachers cited that they were unsure of the responsibilities of their school's ELL teacher (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016; O'Brien, 2011). Should there be regular communication and collaboration between a school's ELL teacher and mainstream teachers, both of these instances could be avoided. When these two professionals work together, shared ownership of ELL's success is created (Giles & Yazan, 2020).

The mainstream teachers that ELLs work with can have a significant impact on their academic, linguistic, emotional, and social growth. This becomes a problem the mainstream teachers do not take part in best practices for supporting ELLs. A common mistake is for mainstream teacher's establish an English-only rule within the classroom. When teachers create English-only environments, they are demonstrating to students that English is the most important language and that other languages are invalid (Fredricks & Warriner, 2016). Another common mistake is for mainstream teachers to place low expectations on ELLs, which in turn lowers



student's feelings of self-efficacy that are so crucial to their success (Nora & Echevarría, 2016). Mainstream teachers also often shield ELLs from a rigorous curriculum for fear that the grade-level content is not an achievable goal for learners who are trying to learn a second language (Murphy & Torff, 2019; Polat & Mahalingappa, 2013). When this happens, ELLs are left without the content instruction that they need to perform on high-stakes tests, thus widening the achievement gap between them and their non-ELL peers (Polat et al., 2014). While all of these actions of mainstream teachers may be well-intended, they have harmful consequences on ELLs, nonetheless.

### **Implications from Professional Development**

I created this professional development to remedy the lack of appropriate and relevant training that is needed to support mainstream teachers in their instruction of ELLs. Each segment of the three sessions was purposefully designed to enlighten and support teachers and they modify their curriculum to better meet the needs of their ELLs. Next, I discuss the two main implications that are intended for this professional development.

Mainstream teachers will create positive learning environments for ELLs. If the teachers participating in the professional development are open-minded and willing to learn to self-improve, it will be a beneficial learning experience. The first session provides mainstream teachers to learn specific knowledge related to second language acquisition that will allow them to better understand their ELLs, as well as collaborate with their peers and ELL teacher to discuss student profiles. Additionally, they will learn best practices to support ELLs through content-area instruction and will receive ample time to work as a team to modify the existing curriculum to meet the needs of their diverse learners. These practices should build teacher's self-efficacy and create a solid foundation of knowledge to be built upon. Sessions two and three

of the professional development are tailored to meet the needs of the teachers and will be a time meant to collaborate and problem-solve as a team. When teachers implement what they have learned, they will be creating positive learning environments for the ELLs in their classrooms.

ELLs will be empowered and self-efficacious. When ELLs learn with the teachers who participated in this professional development, it will result in them feeling more empowered and self-efficacious. When students are taught how to help themselves to be successful, higher self-efficacy follows. When they are allowed to use their native language to support their English learning, their identities as learners will be validated and they will feel empowered in the classroom. When their teachers hold them to high expectations, the students will view themselves as capable learners. The positive learning environments created by the teachers will lead to success in student's academic, linguistic, emotional, and social growth.

### **Recommendations**

When conducting my research on how mainstream teachers' lack of training affects ELLs within the classroom, I found myself asking more questions about the inner workings of teachers' perceptions of ELLs and how that may influence their instruction. In particular, I argue for the need of more case studies of mainstream teachers working with ELLs. In many of the survey studies reviewed in Chapter 2, researchers used Likert scales as a way for teachers to rate their perceived abilities to teach ELLs. I began to consider how an individual's personality could influence how they rated themselves when completing these surveys. Would individuals who have humility rate themselves lower than their true abilities? Would individuals with confidence rate themselves higher than their true abilities? Additionally, in some studies, there were teachers who completed Likert scale surveys reporting that they implemented certain practices within their classrooms, but there was no way to prove those practices took place. In Carley Rizzuto's

(2017) case study, teachers were observed implementing practices that directly conflicted with their responses to the study's Likert survey. Therefore, I argue that while these surveys may be a good place to begin research in order to generate guiding questions, the use of case studies would be more beneficial for understanding the true abilities and practices of mainstream teachers.

In addition, the roles of administrators in ELL education must be heightened. Many studies have focused on the perspectives of teachers and students when related to ELL education. I believe that it would be beneficial to examine the roles that administrators take regarding the instruction of ELLs within their schools. When you consider the fact that administrators set the tone for a school's culture, it is reasonable to assume that an administrator who is knowledgeable in ELL education would encourage the same in their staff. An interesting study would be to examine the practices of teachers who have an administrator who is knowledgeable about ELL education, in comparison to those who have an administrator who is not knowledgeable about ELL education.

### References

- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191–215. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191>
- Brophy, J. E. (1983). Research on the self-fulfilling prophecy and teacher expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(5), 631–661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.75.5.631>
- Carley Rizzuto, K. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of ELL students: Do their attitudes shape their Instruction? *The Teacher Educator*, 52(3), 182–202. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2017.1296912>
- Coady, M. R., Harper, C., & de Jong, E. J. (2015). Aiming for equity: Preparing mainstream teachers for inclusion or inclusive classrooms? *TESOL Quarterly*, 50(2), 340–368. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.223>
- Court, J. (2020). 'I feel integrated when I help myself': ESOL learners' views and experiences of language learning and integration. *Education and Migration*, 28–53. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429057878-3>
- Coyoca, A. M., & Lee, J. S. (2009). A typology of language-brokering events in dual-language immersion classrooms. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 32(3), 260–279. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235880903372837>
- Cummins, J. (2007). Rethinking monolingual instructional strategies in multilingual classrooms: Multilingualism in Canadian schools. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221–240.
- Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford University Press.

- Fredricks, D. E., & S. Warriner, D. (2016). “We speak English in here and English only!”: Teacher and ELL youth perspectives on restrictive language education. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 39(3-4), 309–323. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2016.1230565>
- García O., & Beardsmore, H. B. (2013). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: A global perspective*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Giles, A., & Yazan, B. (2020). “You’re not an island”: A middle grades language arts teacher’s changed perceptions in ESL and content teachers’ collaboration. *RMLE Online*, 43(3), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19404476.2020.1724045>
- Gras, C., & Kitson, C. (2021). ESL teacher certification policy: Current trends and best practices. *Frontiers in Education*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.3389/educ.2021.591993>
- Hansen-Thomas, H., Grosso Richins, L., Kakkar, K., & Okeyo, C. (2014). I do not feel I am properly trained to help them! Rural teachers’ perceptions of challenges and needs with English-language learners. *Professional Development in Education*, 42(2), 308–324. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19415257.2014.973528>
- Hegde, A. V., Hewett, B., & Terrell, E. (2016). Examination of teachers’ preparedness and strategies used to teach English language learners in kindergarten. *Early Child Development and Care*, 188(6), 774–784. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03004430.2016.1237513>
- Jimenez-Silva, M., Olson, K., & Jimenez Hernandez, N. (2012). The confidence to teach English language learners: Exploring coursework’s role in developing preservice teachers’ efficacy. *The Teacher Educator*, 47(1), 9–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08878730.2011.632471>
- Lightbrown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2020). *How languages are learned*. Oxford University Press.

Lopez-Robertson, J. (2012). “Esta pagina me recuerdo”: Young Latinas using personal life stories as tools for meaning-making. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 35(2), 217–233.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2012.703634>

Malo-Juvera, V., Correll, P., & Cantrell, S. (2018). A mixed methods investigation of teachers' self-efficacy for culturally responsive instruction. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 74, 146–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2018.05.003>

Mills, T., Villegas, A., & Cochran-Smith, M. (2020). Research on preparing preservice mainstream teachers for linguistically diverse classrooms. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 47(4), 33-55.

Murphy, A. F., & Torff, B. (2018). Teachers’ beliefs about rigor of curriculum for English language learners. *The Educational Forum*, 83(1), 90–101.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1505991>

NCES. (2018). Table 4.6: Number of instructional days and hours in the school year, by state: 2018. [https://nces.ed.gov/programs/statereform/tab4\\_6.asp](https://nces.ed.gov/programs/statereform/tab4_6.asp)

Nora, J., & Echevarría, J. (2016). *No more low expectations for English learners*. Heinemann.

O’Brien, J. (2011). The system is broken and it’s failing these kids: High school social studies teachers’ attitudes towards training for ELLs. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), 22-38.

Pacheco, M. B. (2018). Spanish, Arabic, and “English-only”: Making meaning across languages in two classroom communities. *TESOL Quarterly*, 52(4), 995–1021.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesq.446>

Polat, N., & Mahalingappa, L. (2013). Pre- and in-service teachers' beliefs about ELLs in content area classes: a case for inclusion, responsibility, and instructional support.

*Teaching Education*, 24(1), 58–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10476210.2012.713930>

Robertson, K., & Ford, K. (2020, February 18). *Language acquisition: An overview*. Colorín Colorado. <https://www.colorincolorado.org/article/language-acquisition-overview#comment-form>.

Rodriguez, D., Carrasquillo, A., Garcia, E., & Howitt, D. (2020). Factors that challenge English learners and increase their dropout rates: Recommendations from the field. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 1–17.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2020.1722059>

Roy-Campbell, Z. (2012). Meeting the needs of English learners. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 56(3), 186–188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jaal.00125>

Seale, C. (2018, September 18). *When love is grounded in the soft bigotry of low expectations, it's the wrong kind of love*. Education Post. <https://educationpost.org/when-love-is-grounded-in-the-soft-bigotry-of-low-expectations-its-the-wrong-kind-of-love/>

Shi, H. (2018). English language learners' strategy use and self-efficacy beliefs in English language learning. *Journal of International Students*, 8(2), 724–741.

<https://doi.org/10.32674/jis.v8i2.101>

Song, K. H. (2016). Systematic professional development training and its impact on teachers' attitudes toward ELLs: SIOP and guided coaching. *TESOL Journal*, 7(4), 767–799.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.240>

Villegas, A. M., SaizdeLaMora, K., Martin, A. D., & Mills, T. (2018). Preparing future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical

literature. *The Educational Forum*, 82(2), 138–155.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2018.1420850>

Von Esch, K. S., & Kavanagh, S. S. (2017). Preparing mainstream classroom teachers of English learner students: Grounding practice-based designs for teacher learning in theories of adaptive expertise development. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 69(3), 239–251.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487117717467>

Wissink, B. & Starks, S. (2019). Elementary teachers' perceptions of preparedness to teach English language learners. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 14(10), 349-356.

<https://doi.org/10.5897/ERR2019-3734>

Zapata, A., & Laman, T. (2016). “I write to show how beautiful my languages are”: Translingual writing instruction in English-dominant classrooms. *Language Arts*, 93(5), 366–378.



**Appendix A**

**Google Slides Presentation**

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gGbZQM\\_UeNalI8S\\_iq0Dh-G50-IkgIx5/view?usp=sharing](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1gGbZQM_UeNalI8S_iq0Dh-G50-IkgIx5/view?usp=sharing)

Download the presentation as a PowerPoint to listen to the narration.

## Appendix B

## SLA Articles Anticipation Guide

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

# SLA Theories Anticipation Guide

Before Reading Predictions	Statements	After Reading Answers
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	The stages of second language are exact and occur the same way for every student.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	A student who presents as very fluent in English socially can still struggle using English academically.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	In a student's early production stage of SLA, they benefit from excessive error correction in order to form good habits.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	Cognates should avoid being used with ELLs as it can be confusing.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	It is normal for students to go through a silent period when beginning SLA.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	It takes 3 years for students to reach the last SLA stage of advanced fluency.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>
<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>	Use of visuals and peer interpretation are beneficial strategies for ELLs.	<b>TRUE or FALSE</b>

## Appendix C

## Best Practices Resources

<b>Utilizing Student's Home Language</b>	<b>Incorporating Support Systems</b>
<a href="#"><u>The Home Language: An English Language Learner's Most Valuable Resource</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>ESOL Teacher Sheila Majdi: Using Sentence Frames with ELLs</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Native Language and ELLs' Literacy Development   Colorín Colorado</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Differentiated Instruction for English Language Learners   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Using The Native Language as a Resource</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Visual Thinking Strategies for Improved Comprehension   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Response: ELL Students' Home Language Is an Asset, Not a 'Barrier' (Opinion)</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Using Graphic Organizers with ELLs   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Help or hindrance? Use of native language in the English classroom</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>5 Effective Modeling Strategies for K-12 English Learners</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>The Best Multilingual &amp; Bilingual Sites For Math, Social Studies, &amp; Science</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>4 ELL Comprehension Strategies</u></a>
<b>Strategic Grouping &amp; Collaborative Work</b>	<b>Teaching Academic Vocabulary</b>
<a href="#"><u>6 Strategies to Help ELLs Succeed in Peer Learning and Collaboration</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Teaching Key Academic Vocabulary to High School ELLs</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Peer Learning Groups</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Tips for Educators of ELLs: Teaching Vocabulary in Grades 4-12</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Cooperative Learning Strategies   Colorín Colorado</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Teaching Academic Vocabulary</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Using Pair and Group Work to Develop ELLs' Oral Language Skills</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Selecting Vocabulary Words to Teach English Language Learners</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>How Should ELLs Be Grouped for Instruction?</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Vocabulary Development   Colorín Colorado</u></a>

**Appendix D****Note Catcher for Best Practices Resources**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Best Practices Note Catcher**

Topic: \_\_\_\_\_

Describe the topic:	Why is it beneficial for ELLs?
What ways did you <u>observe</u> it being utilized in the classroom?	What are ideas that you have about how <u>YOU</u> could utilize this in your classroom?

**Appendix E**

**Student Profiles Note Catcher**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Student Profiles Note Catcher**

Student Name	English Proficiency	Language Background	Fourth Grade Data	Learning Style	Other Info.

## Appendix F

## Content Area Resources

<b>ELA</b>	<b>Math</b>
<a href="#"><u>Increasing ELL Student Reading Comprehension with Nonfiction Text</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Reading and Understanding Written Math Problems   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Finding the Main Idea   Colorín Colorado</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Math Instruction for English Language Learners   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Learning About Genre</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>ELL Ideas: Learning About the Environment   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Chapter Walk With Me!</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>How Vocabulary Can Get in the Way of Solving a Word Problem</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Reading in the Classroom</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Math Challenges for ELLs</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Literature Circles   Colorín Colorado</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>How to Improve Math Curriculum for English Language Learners</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Phonics Instruction for Middle and High School ELLs</u></a>	
<b>Science</b>	<b>Social Studies</b>
<a href="#"><u>Using Science to Develop ELLs' Language Skills</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Building Social Studies Background Knowledge</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Opportunities and Challenges for ELLs in the Science Inquiry Classroom (Part 1)</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Preparing an Engaging Social Studies Lesson for English Language Learners</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>Hands-on Science Fun with ELLs</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Teaching History to Support Diverse Learners   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
<a href="#"><u>ELLs Belong to All of Us: The Role of ESOL Specialists in Collaboration</u></a>	<a href="#"><u>Using Timelines to Enhance Comprehension   Colorín Colorado</u></a>
	<a href="#"><u>Differentiating Assignments in a Social Studies Lesson</u></a>

**Appendix G**

**Note Catcher for Content Area Resources**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Content Specific Strategies Note Catcher**

What advice and/or instructional strategies did you learn?

How do you envision using what you have learned in your instruction moving forward?

**Appendix H**

**Unit of Study Google Document Planning Page**

**Unit of Study Modification**

List top 5 standards students are expected to master:
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
List 10 crucial learning experiences for students.
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.



<p>Detail the modifications you will make to support the ELLs in your classroom for each of the ten lessons.</p>
<p><u>Lesson 1:</u></p>
<p><u>Lesson 2:</u></p>
<p><u>Lesson 3:</u></p>
<p><u>Lesson 4:</u></p>
<p><u>Lesson 5:</u></p>

Lesson 6:

Lesson 7:

Lesson 8:

Lesson 9:

Lesson 10:

**Appendix I**

**Curriculum Work Period Agenda**

**CURRICULUM  
WORK  
AGENDA**

1:00-1:30	Complete page 1 of planning as a group.
1:30-2:00	Divide and conquer pages 2 and 3 of the planning page, working independently or in partners.
2:00-3:00	Begin to create resources needed for each lesson, working either independently or in partners.

**Appendix J**

**Session 2 – Student Specific Feedback Meeting Agenda**

**SESSION 2 -  
STUDENT SPECIFIC  
FEEDBACK AGENDA**

2:30-2:35	Welcome!
2:35-3:00	Discuss findings from questionnaire - generate discussion around themes.
3:00-3:30	Collaborate to make plans for students that are consistent across content-area teachers.



**Appendix L**

**Session 3 – Unit of Study Feedback Meeting Agenda**

**SESSION 3 - UNIT  
OF STUDY FEEDBACK  
AGENDA**

2:30-2:35	Welcome!
2:35-3:00	Discuss findings from questionnaire - generate discussion around themes.
3:00-3:30	Collaborate to make plans adjustments to past lesson plans and add to future ones.



## Appendix N

## Mainstream Teacher Survey

**Mainstream Teacher Survey**

Below are several statements regarding your opinion towards teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). Please read each one and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

<b>Statements</b>	<b>1</b> Strongly Disagree	<b>2</b> Disagree	<b>3</b> No Opinion	<b>4</b> Agree	<b>5</b> Strongly Agree
It is appropriate for ELLs to use their first language in my classroom.					
I encourage ELLs to use their first language in my classroom.					
The ELLs in my classroom are able to access the content area curriculum.					
ELLs can succeed in my classroom.					
In my classroom, ELLs have the opportunity to collaborate with their non-ELL peers.					
ELLs benefit from the opportunity to work with non-ELL peers.					
I am responsible for ELL's language development.					
I am responsible for teaching ELL's academic content.					
I feel confident in my ability to differentiate classwork for the ELLs in my classroom.					
I provide the ELLs in my classroom with the supports they need to be successful.					
I feel confident in my abilities to help ELLs in my classroom reach their language acquisition goals.					



## Appendix O

## ELL Teacher Survey

**ELL Teacher Survey**

Below are several statements regarding your opinion towards your experiences observing and working with mainstream teachers. with Please read each one and indicate to what extent you agree or disagree with each statement.

<b>Statements</b>	<b>1</b> Strongly Disagree	<b>2</b> Disagree	<b>3</b> No Opinion	<b>4</b> Agree	<b>5</b> Strongly Agree
Mainstream teachers utilize ELL's first language in their classrooms.					
Mainstream teachers encourage ELLs to use their first language in their classrooms.					
Mainstream teachers provide ELLs with the supports they need to be successful.					
I share responsibility with mainstream teachers for ELL's language development.					
I collaborate with mainstream teachers to support ELL's language development.					
Mainstream teachers provide ELLs with opportunities to collaborate with non-ELL peers.					
Mainstream teachers differentiate their instruction to make the curriculum accessible for ELLs.					
Mainstream teachers provide support for ELLs to meet their language development goals.					