

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER KNOWLEDGE
OF
SHELTERED INSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY
IN SERVICE TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS:
A MULTI-CASE STUDY

A Dissertation

Presented to

the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

by

Uzziel Hernandez Pecina

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dissertation Supervisor

DECEMBER 2010

© Copyright by Uzziel Hernandez Pecina 2010

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER KNOWLEDGE
OF
SHELTERED INSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY
IN SERVICE TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS:
A MULTI-CASE STUDY

Presented by Mr. Uzziel Hernandez Pecina,

a candidate for the degree of doctor of education,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson

Dr. Doug Thomas

Dr. Matt Thomas

Dr. Yuankun Yao

Dr. Cliff Mohn

First and foremost I would like to thank God for the peace, strength, and guidance throughout these years of education and investigation. I would also like to thank my former teachers and mentors in the Kansas City Missouri Public School District. You believed in me and gave me a good foundation that led me to where I am today. Thank you, Gilbert Guerrero and Bernardo Ramirez, for encouraging me to be involved in the “Academia del Pueblo Program” as a high school tutor. I need to also thank Mr. David Sullivan for hiring me as the Spanish/Cultural Arts teacher in December of 1991 at DeLaSalle/Guadalupe Center Inc’s Alta Vista Alternative High School and for guiding me as a young 26 year old principal. Thank you Guadalupe Center’s Alta Vista Alternative/Charter High School for building my professional foundation as a young teacher and novice principal. Thank you Alta Vista students, faculty, and staff from 1992 to 2002. We learned much from each other during those wonderful, groundbreaking, and insightful years.

Because I stand on the shoulders of giants, I want to thank my paternal grandparents, Antonio Vargas Pecina (deceased) and Luisa Carreon Pecina (deceased) for having fallen in love in Kansas City, Missouri in 1923, and for laying down roots in Parras de la Fuente, Coahuila, Mexico, our hometown. I need to also thank my maternal grandparents, Raquel Gloria Hernandez (deceased) and Florentino Hernandez (deceased) for showing me strength, compassion, and understanding. I thank my parents, Antonio Carreon Pecina (deceased) and Graciela Hernandez Pecina for life, support, love, prayers, and the high level of educational expectations. I want to thank the extended Pecina family and my siblings: Cynthia, Victor, Elda, and Antonio jr.; and my in-laws: Tim, Mary, Katie, and Braulio, for all of the love, support, and prayers over the years. Thank you,

Tomas and Alicia Melgoza, for assisting our family during times of stress; comforting and guiding their daughter and grandchildren when necessary. A big thank you goes out to the extended Melgoza family and my in-laws: Alicia, Tony, Tomas, Melissa, Ana, Ruben, Hugo, Sarah, Danny, and Jackie for supporting Adriana and the kids whenever needed to step in during my absence. A special thank you goes to Manuel and Amelia Martinez for the wonderful childcare given to all of the Pecina children. My greatest thank you must go to my love and my wife, Adriana Melgoza Pecina, for the patience, support, and motivation during these many years of study and research; especially after two summers and many nights alone, guiding and parenting the children during my absence. I want to dedicate this doctorate to my children, Ximena (14), Uziel jr. (12), Alejandra (8), and Luis Enrique (4) for being the greatest children a father could ever have. You are my greatest gift. I love you and thank you for believing in “papi” all of these years. You were my strength!

I would like to recognize and thank my nephews and nieces for supporting and playing with their cousins during my studies and research. Thank you, Joseph (deceased), Luisa, Anthony, Catalina, Diego, Anabelle, Sophia, Izabelle, Tomas jr., Lorenzo, Victor jr., Antonio III/“LT,” Vincent “Vinny,” Valencia, Carmen, and Claudia.

Thank you to my favorite Mexican-American rock band, Los Lobos, for the continuous years of great music and inspiration while I pressed on with all of my educational endeavors. Your music played in my head from high school graduation to the earning of this doctorate. Thank you to the exceptional musicians of Trio Aztlan: Jose Sustaita, Luis Portillo, Kevin Sweet and Andres Ramirez for the many years of

encouragement, support, and patience. We have made many years of music together and there are still many more to come. Our third CD is a go for sure!

Finally, I would like to thank both the University of Central Missouri (UCM) and the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) for allowing me to learn from and serve with some of the greatest professors in the region. The Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I-UCM), and the Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education (ULAPSIE-UMKC) both provided me opportunities to grow and serve to best of my ability as a junior faculty member. My academic journey has only just begun. Thank you, Dr. Mary Snyder, Dr. Sharon Lamson, and Dr. Dianne Smith, my former chairs.

Spanish Translation

En primer lugar me gustaría dar las gracias a Dios por la paz, la fuerza, y orientación a lo largo de estos años de la educación y la investigación. También me gustaría dar las gracias a mis antiguos profesores y tutores en Kansas City Missouri School District. Ustedes creyeron en mí y me dieron una buena base que me llevó a donde estoy ahora. Gracias, Gilberto Guerrero y Bernardo Ramírez, por haberme animado a participar en la "Academia del Pueblo Program" como tutor. Tengo que darle las gracias también al Sr. David Sullivan por haberme empleado como maestro de Español/Cultura en 1991 para la escuela Alta Vista Alternative High School de DeLaSalle/Guadalupe Center Inc., y por haberme guiado como director novato de 26 años. Gracias a al Alta Vista/Charter High School y Guadalupe Centers, por la construcción de mi fundación profesional como profesor y director. Gracias a los estudiantes, asistentes, y profesores de Alta Vista entre los años 1992 a 2002.

Aprendimos mucho unos de otros durante esos años maravillosos, innovadores, e intuitivos.

Porque estoy sobre los hombros de gigantes, quiero dar las gracias a mis abuelos paternos, Antonio Vargas Pecina (fallecido) y Luis Carreón de Pecina (fallecido) por haberse enamorado en Kansas City, Missouri en 1923, y por haber establecido raíces en Parras de la Fuente, Coahuila, México, nuestra ciudad natal. Tengo que dar las gracias también a mis abuelos maternos, Raquel Gloria de Hernández (fallecido) y Florentino Hernández (fallecido) por haberme mostrado la fuerza, compasión y comprensión. Doy las gracias a mis padres, Antonio Carreón Pecina (fallecido) y Graciela Hernández de Pecina por la vida, apoyo, amor, oraciones, y el alto nivel de expectativas educativas. Quiero dar las gracias a la familia Pecina y a mis hermanos: Cynthia, Victor, Elda, y Antonio jr.; a mis cuñados: Tim, Mary, Katie, y Braulio, por todo el amor, apoyo y oraciones durante estos años. Gracias, Tomás y Alicia Melgoza, por el apoyo a nuestra familia en momentos de estrés; reconfortaron y guiaron a su hija y nietos cuando fue necesario. Un gran agradecimiento a la familia Melgoza y a mis cuñados: Alicia, Tony, Tomás, Melissa, Ana, Rubén, Hugo, Sarah, Danny, y Jackie por el apoyo a Adriana y a los niños siempre que se fue necesario para intervenir durante mi ausencia. Un agradecimiento especial a Manuel y Amelia Martínez por el cuidado especial dado a todos los niños Pecina. El agradecimiento mas especial debe ir a mi amor y esposa, Adriana Melgoza Pecina, por la paciencia, apoyo, y motivación durante todos estos años de estudio e investigación; sobre todo después de dos veranos y muchas noches sola, guiando a los niños durante mi ausencia. Quiero dedicar este doctorado a mis hijos, Ximena (14), Uziel jr. (12), Alejandra (8), y Luis Enrique (4) por son los hijos más

especiales que un padre jamás podría tener. Ustedes son mi mejor regalo. Los amo mucho y gracias por creer en "papi" entre todos estos años. Fueron mi fuerza!

Me gustaría reconocer y agradecer a mis sobrinos y sobrinas por el apoyo y compañerismo que tuvieron con sus primos durante mis estudios y la investigación. Gracias, José (fallecido), Luisa, Anthony, Catalina, Diego, Anabelle, Sofía, Isabelle, Tomás jr., Lorenzo, Víctor jr., Antonio III/"LT," Vincent "Vinny," Valencia, Carmen, y Claudia.

Gracias a mi banda favorita de rock mexicano-americano, Los Lobos, por los años continuos de la buena música y la inspiración, especialmente durante mis esfuerzos educativos. Su música se ha reproducido en mi cabeza desde la graduación de la escuela secundaria hasta la obtención de este doctorado. Gracias a los músicos excepcionales de Trío Aztlán: José Sustaita, Luis Portillo, Sweet Kevin y Andrés Ramírez por los muchos años de aliento, apoyo, y paciencia. Hemos hecho muchos años de música juntos y todavía hay muchos más por venir. Nuestro tercer disco es seguro!

Por último, me gustaría dar las gracias a University of Central Missouri (UCM) y a University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) porque me permitieron aprender y servir con algunos de los mejores profesores en la región. El Departamento de Currículo e Instrucción (C&I-UCM), y la División de Liderazgo Urbano y Estudios de Políticas en la Educación (ULAPSIE-UMKC) tanto me dieron la oportunidad de crecer y servir a lo mejor de mi capacidad como profesor junior. Mi trayectoria académica oficialmente ha empezado. Gracias, Dra. Mary Snyder, Dra. Sharon Lamson, y Dra. Dianne Smith, mi ex-presidentes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First of all, I would like to thank Dr. Sandy Hutchinson for the many years of leadership, guidance, and mentorship that lead me to the culmination of this doctorate, my greatest educational endeavor. I also want to thank Dr. Doug Thomas, Dr. Matt Thomas, Dr. Yuankun Yao, and Dr. Cliff Mohn for their initial support, guidance and final review of this dissertation. I give a special thanks to Laura Lukens and Renee Cooper for initially guiding me with possible research ideas and insight into meaningful sheltered instruction to diverse linguistic communities within their school district. I want to thank the building and district level administrators, teachers, faculty, and staff in mid-central western Missouri for welcoming me into their buildings and classrooms to conduct this vital research. Finally, I would like to thank those professional, culturally competent, caring, and qualified teachers that serve diverse linguistic communities tirelessly, everyday. You *are* making a difference in the academic endeavors of our multilingual communities in the U.S. Si se puede, adelante!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	vi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....	1
Background on Teacher Preparation and <i>No Child Left Behind</i> Academic Expectations for English Language Learners in the United States of America.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	4
Purpose of the Study.....	7
Significance of the Study.....	10
Research Questions.....	10
Conceptual Design.....	11
Theoretical Sensitivity.....	11
Theoretical Framework.....	12
Limitations of the Study.....	16
Assumptions of the Study.....	17
Parameters of the Study.....	17
Definition of Terms.....	18
Organization of the Study.....	21
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	22
Demographic Changes.....	23
No Child Left Behind Accountability.....	24
Language Acquisition.....	26

Academic Achievement for English Language Learners.....	29
The Role of Leadership in English Language Instruction.....	32
Teacher Preparation and Certification in Service of ELLs.....	36
Summary.....	40
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	43
Purpose of the Study.....	44
Rationale for Mixed Design Study.....	45
Methodology.....	46
Summary.....	49
4. DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.....	51
Quantitative Data Presentation and Analysis.....	52
Validity of the Instrument.....	52
Reliability of the Instrument.....	52
Quantitative Data Presentation and Analysis.....	55
Survey Responses Dealing with SIOP.....	59
Qualitative Data Presentation and Analysis.....	68
Summary.....	92
5. FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, CONCLUSION.....	95
Findings: Quantitative Data.....	96
Findings: Qualitative Data.....	99
Research Questions.....	100
Theoretical Underpinnings.....	102
Implications for Practice.....	103

Discussions.....	104
Suggestions for Future Research.....	106
Conclusions.....	106
REFERENCES.....	109
APPENDICES.....	129
Appendix A.....	129
Appendix B.....	135
Appendix C.....	136
Appendix D.....	138
VITA.....	140

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TEACHER KNOWLEDGE
OF
SHELTERED INSTRUCTION METHODOLOGY
IN SERVICE TO ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS:
A MULTI-CASE STUDY

Uzziel Hernandez Pecina

Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Dissertation Supervisor

ABSTRACT

This study examines self reported survey evaluations and interviews of full-time elementary school teachers in regards to their use of sheltered instruction techniques when serving the English Language Learner (ELL) population in the Midwest. Many teachers are not equipped with adequate information about ELLs and about what comprises effective instruction for the ELLs. This study surveyed 161 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers from urban, suburban, and rural school districts, and interviews were also conducted with 11 Missouri certified teachers located within the western mid-central region of the State of Missouri. Teachers were provided with self reported evaluations as to their use of sheltered techniques, as described by the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria, et al., 2008), in their regular classroom environments.

Research Question 1 asks, “How do practicing elementary school teachers perceive their level of preparation in sheltered instruction methods/strategies?,” results indicate that the representative sample of Missouri certified, K-6, elementary public school teachers perceive their preparation in sheltered instruction methodology/strategies to be inadequate at all levels of professional development and training when in fact many teachers are actually prepared with “good teaching strategies” to teach ELLs, but they are just now aware that they already possess the necessary skills to serve ELLs with their academic growth.

Research Question 2 asks, “How do practicing elementary school teachers use sheltered instruction techniques in mainstream classrooms?” teacher surveys demonstrated a very good knowledge base of sheltered instruction techniques based upon the SIOP Model (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria, et al., 2008) of teacher evaluation in sheltered instruction to ELLs. Most of the teachers surveyed used the sheltered instruction techniques necessary for advancing ELLs academically. Teachers have the basic requisite skills that can be nurtured by professional development in sheltered instruction techniques in service to ELLs and improving academic success among Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs), but for some reason were never informed as to the valuable use of the those good teaching skills in service to ELLs in their classrooms.

The researcher believes more must be done at all levels of teacher preparation, to include university teacher preparation, graduate teaching programs, and school districts to provide quality, research based instructional sheltered instructional techniques in service to the academic advancement of DLCs in the U.S.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Successful academic progress, specifically those skills related to English proficiency of English Language Learners (ELL) in public schools in the United States of America (U.S.), is dependent upon parents, school district teachers, instructional leaders, and principals' utilization of effective instructional practices that address the needs of all students (Dong, 2004; Echevarria, 2006; MODESE, 2006; NCLB, 2007; SREB, 2001). Opportunities for learning English and content related material decreases if instruction is not made accessible and comprehensible to ELLs by quality certified teachers trained in ELL methodology (August & Hakuta, 1997; Cummins, 1981; Dong, 2004; MODESE, 2006; NCLB, 2007). For many districts in the U.S., the enrollment of ELLs has made a significant impact on local communities, school culture and climate, staffing, staff development, academic achievement, and most of all, funding (Morse & Ludovina, 1999). School districts in the U.S. have had major challenges in addressing the needs of ELLs in learning English at a proficient level (August & Hakuta, 1997; Garcia & Cuellar, 2006). Teachers are inadequately trained and ill prepared to serve linguistic and academic needs of ELLs in the U.S. Teachers have self disclosed the need for training in ELL methodologies and strategies that can best serve ELLs and make connections with their families and communities (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Cartiera, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Jones, 2006; NCES, 2002; Zehr, 2007).

The 2000 U.S. Census reported that there are approximately 47 million (46,951,595) individuals 5 years of age and older, who speak a language other than English in the home. Of those 47 million, 10 million (approximately 22%) speak English

well (U.S. Census, 2006) compared to English Language Learners that do not speak English in their home environment, which number 3 million or approximately 7.2% (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006; U.S. Census, 2006). Garcia and Cuellar (2006) also noted that, “This is a significant 47% change from 1990 levels,” a change that was experienced in 47 out of the 50 states, especially California, Arizona, and Texas (p. 3). Garcia and Cuellar (2006) also mention the surprising growth that occurred in the southeastern states of the U.S. which experienced over a 100% increase in their population of ELLs. According to Crawford (1999) and Garcia (2001b) the linguistic diversity in the U.S. will more than likely continue to grow within the next 10 years.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2003) there were close to 4 million students nationwide that were classified as ELLs in the school year 2001-2002, a 30 percent increase within a decade. For many school districts in the U.S, the enrollment of ELLs has had an intensely strong impact with regard to funding, staffing, and academic achievement (Garcia, 2006) and there has been an increasing body of knowledge that has drawn attention to teacher preparation in regards to teaching ELLs in mainstream content specific courses (De Jong & Harper, 2005). The need to provide a quality education to ELLs has led the U.S. Federal government to standardize its expectations in advancing ELLs academically in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. According to No Child Left Behind (2001):

Each State plan shall demonstrate that the State has adopted challenging academic content standards and challenging student academic achievement standards that will be used by the State, its local educational agencies [LEAs], and its schools.

No Child Left Behind (2001) continues by expecting the same academic standards to be applied to all children and schools as suggested by the plan requirements set forth by the

U.S. Federal Government, and it is expected that teachers be prepared to teach ELL students with the same academic rigor and high expectations as the non-ELL population (De Jong & Harper, 2005; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2004, 2008;). According to NCLB (2001), the following subjects that must be included in a rigorous state curriculum are mathematics, reading or language arts, and beginning in 2005-2006, science. Not only are the content subjects required to be challenging, there must be a mechanism or assessment tool in place by each state to insure accountability, adequate yearly progress (AYP), and that the assessment data must be statistically valid and reliable (NCLB, 2001). Federally funded U.S. schools are required to show academic rigor and growth among their student populations in order to continue to receive federal funding, expecting quality trained teachers to meet these standards for their students.

Measurable adequate yearly progress (AYP), as suggested by NCLB (2001), must include the achievement of economically disadvantaged students, students from major racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and finally, students identified as English Language Learners (ELLs). Key subjects, according to NCLB, will be assessed at least three times during pivotal years in a student's development. No Child Left Behind also recommends that students be assessed during grades 3 through 5, grades 6 through 9, and grades 10 through 12, in mathematics, reading, and language arts. States were required to administer an assessment for science beginning no later than school year 2005-2006 (NCLB, 2001).

The No Child Left Behind Act (2001) did not exclude students with disabilities, nor did it leave out students with limited English proficiency (LEP), although there have been accommodations suggested by NCLB in administering state assessments to LEP

students (MODESE, 2006). Those suggestions include states' abilities to make accommodations as necessary to produce an accurate and reliable assessment with regard to ELLs. This includes possibly giving state assessments in a student's first language that will provide accurate and valid data, although this accommodation as mandated by NCLB is not to exceed more than two consecutive years. According to NCLB a student may receive these accommodations as long as he/she has not reached a level of proficiency in the English language which, by linguistic expert standards is usually achieved through between four to twelve years of structured integrated content and language instruction (Anderson, 1995; Carrasquillo, 1991; Crawford, 2004; Echevarria et al., 2008; Garcia, 1993; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Krashen, 1996; Marshall, 2002; Sherris, 2008; Sleeter & Grant, 2007).

Statement of the Problem

The literature reviewed suggests that ELLs are not being accommodated as suggested by NCLB (2001) and that many are failing when it comes to state academic achievement assessments (Cartiera, 2006; Echevarria, 2006; Lesaux, 2006; NCES, 2003, 2004; Zehr, 2007). The problem the researcher will address in this body of research is pre-service and current classroom teacher preparation and training to teach ELLs (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Cartiera, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Jones, 2006; NCES, 2002; Zehr, 2007). As previously stated, according to NCLB, states are required to assess mathematics, reading, and language arts at critical intervals of students K-12 academic careers. How are ELLs and their families expected to reach challenging and rigorous goals set forth by NCLB if states are failing to reach and teach ELLs with few resources and not enough certified English as a Second

Language (ESL) instructors or districts committed to fully funding ESL programming? Students may rise to expectations set by expert, certified, motivated, experienced, and caring teachers who are willing to go the extra mile for their students (Tornatzky, Pachon, & Torres, 2003; Zarate, 2007). It is this expert, caring, flexible, multilingual, culturally competent, and qualified/certified teacher that is lacking in many classrooms that serve ELLs (Echevarria, 2006; Cartiera, 2007; Tornatzky, et al., 2003; Verdugo & Flores, 2007; Zarate, 2007). Unfortunately, administrations and district officials have been unable to find and retain enough qualified ESL teachers or have ignored responsibilities in serving ELLs within their schools (Cartiera, 2007; Echevarria, 2006; Verdugo & Flores, 2007; Zarate, 2007). According to Carrion (2006) and Glenn (2003), states and school districts need to seek funding and assistance from federal grants that promote the establishment of effective language instructional education programs ensuring that ELLs attain English proficiency while “meeting challenging state academic content and student achievement standards” (Carrion, 2006, p. 66).

According to Smith (2004) and Zarate (2007), differences exist in an ELL’s level of prior educational experiences and opportunities that have assisted in developing high-level language and literacy acquisition in the home language. Smith and Zarate mention that “family backgrounds also differ in socioeconomic status, conditions under which they emigrated, degree of contact with [the] home country, and parents’ expectations for their child’s academic achievements” (Smith, 2004, p. 46). In September 2006, the U.S. Department of Education amended the No Child Left Behind Act (2001) in regards to the regulations that governed programs administered under Title I, Part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). This amendment is related to the

assessment of academic achievement of recently arrived and former ELLs. The regulations basically allow state and local educational agencies (SEAs and LEAs) and schools more flexibility in assessment and accountability of ELLs and the scores calculated in the AYP reports generated to the federal government. The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, sent out a non-regulatory guidance memo in May 2007 in regard to assessment and accountability for recently arrived and former ELLs which stated:

In supporting State and local efforts toward the national goal of having all students achieve at proficient levels, the Department [of Education] recognizes that LEP students bring with them unique challenges from past educational experiences and circumstances. In a diverse nation, State, districts, and schools educate students from many different countries, and LEP students who have recently arrived in the United States generally need some time to adjust to their new surroundings and become proficient in English. (USDE-OESE, 2007, p. 3)

It is observable that states, LEAs, and schools have had problems providing assistance and making accommodations for ELLs within their boundaries as suggested by the NCLB memo of 2007. Most of the problems have stemmed from students not making adequate yearly progress due to the lack of academic rigor or grade equivalency content subject matter in the ELL's course work (Garza, 2006; Perez, 1995) and moreover the lack of training and preparation teachers have received in teaching ELLs (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Cartiera, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Jones, 2006; NCES, 2002; Zehr, 2007). English proficiency has been the mandate of the day rather than an inclusion of academic rigor within ESL and regular education classes that take into account ELLs. Until recently, the federal No Child Left Behind Act (2001) favored English proficiency approaches to academic achievement and raising test scores, but there is much more to learning how to speak English proficiently

and performing at a rigorous academic level and much of it depends on the preparation of the classroom teacher for such a challenge.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this mixed design study is to examine self reported evaluations and interviews of full-time elementary school teachers in regards to their use of English language acquisition techniques known as sheltered instruction (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008) when serving the ELL population in the Midwest. Today there are many teachers not equipped with adequate information about ELLs and about what comprises effective instruction for the ELL population of students (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Batt, 2008; Cartiera, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Hite & Evens, 2006; Jones, 2006; NCES, 2002; Zehr, 2007). This mixed design study surveyed 161 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers from urban, suburban, and rural school districts and conducted interviews with 11 Missouri certified teachers located within the western mid-central region of the State of Missouri. In addition, teachers provided self reported evaluations as to their use of sheltered techniques, as described by the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model, in their regular classroom environments (Echevarria et al., 2008).

ELLs need guided reading and writing support or scaffolding while developing proficiencies in English (Echevarria et al., 2004, 2008; Lucas et al., 2008) beyond that of language arts classes. Reading and comprehending academic English is challenging enough for ELLs and content area teachers cannot wait until ELLs acquire the grade level skills necessary for academic achievement (Brown, 2007). Teachers are encouraged to make modifications to instruction and guide the ELL learner in the content area

specifically being studied or taught (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Batt, 2008; Cartiera, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Hite & Evens, 2006; Jones, 2006; Zehr, 2007).

The SIOP Model was developed from a sheltered instructional model developed in the 1990s under a research project conducted for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE), funded by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The SIOP model currently is the only empirically authenticated instructional approach for English Language Learners to date and is most commonly used in school districts needing a research based staff development plan for content area teachers serving ELLs and their academic needs (Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006; Echevarria, et. al, 2008; Honigsfeld & Cohan, 2008; Guarino, Echevarria, Short, Schick, Forbes, & Rueda, 2001; Thomas, 2008). For example, teachers in Fremont Public Schools, on Long Island, NY, were given professional development opportunities to use Lesson Study (Fernandez, 2002; Lewis, 2002; Staples, 2005) and SIOP models of instruction that lead to collaborative, self reflective, efforts to improving their delivery and instruction to ELLs in their classrooms. The fusion of these techniques resulted in greater collaboration of teachers in content lesson planning and peer observations. Ultimately, meaningful discussions of their own critiques, personal reflections on SIOP techniques, and teacher generated lesson study reports of their impact on student learning were a result. The study concluded that in order for professional development to make an impact and be effective, time and administrative support is necessary for teacher success in improving their service to students (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Fernandez; Honigsfeld & Cohan, 2008; Lewis; Staples).

According to Echevarria et al. (2008), accomplished teachers of the SIOP Model are able to adjust their level of English used within the classroom among their students, eventually making content comprehensible using a variety of techniques found in high quality non-sheltered teaching for English learners. Techniques used in the SIOP Model range from using visual aids, modeling, demonstrations, graphic organizers, vocabulary previews, adapted texts, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and native language support (Echevarria et al., 2008; Guarino, et al., 2001; Tomas, 2008).

It is the intent of the researcher to investigate how Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers use sheltered instruction techniques based upon the SIOP Model (Echevarria et al., 2006, 2008). The triangulation of data will consist of the literature review, a survey of Missouri certified K-6, full-time classroom teachers and follow-up interviews with self identified survey participants. The research study will include ELL academic achievement and English proficiency data and policies related to certification requirements based upon Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE) and the expectations set by NCLB (2001) in regards to academic achievement and English proficiency of ELLs. The data analysis will include questionnaire responses from full-time elementary classroom teachers and personal interviews. This study will impart information regarding the knowledge base of Missouri certified K-6, fulltime elementary school teachers, in regards to sheltered instruction methodology specific to language and content instruction in service to ELLs through self disclosure.

Significance of the Study

There has been an increasing demand for educators to understand issues related to second language learners and their inability to reach academic success in U.S. schools (Echevarria, 2006; Zehr, 2007). This study will provide State Educational Agencies (SEAs), Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), and universities data related to reaching and teaching ELLs in the efforts to educate them to the highest standards as requested by NCLB (2001). It is not only teaching ELLs the English language for proficiency, but to do so while challenging the students at the appropriate level for academic success that is the challenge for states and school districts (Echevarria, 2006; Tornatzky, et al., 2003; Zehr, 2007). The questions SEAs and LEAs ask themselves are the following: Are ELLs making academic and English proficiency gains in efforts to earn a quality education that may lead to post-secondary educational success? Are ELLs ready for the post-secondary academic rigor that awaits them and have they met the high standards expected of them while in public schools, and if not, how do we make those academic gains with ELLs?

Research Questions

The primary research questions guiding this study are:

1. How do practicing public elementary school teachers perceive their level of preparation in ELL methodology?
2. How do practicing public elementary school teachers use ELL sheltered instruction techniques in mainstream classrooms?

According to Carrion (2006) and Garica and Cuellar (2006), states reported serving 4,017,657 ELLs with a projected immigrant high school enrollment of 15% within this decade, thus amplifying the need to serve language minority students adequately to meet

the high standards of academic achievement required by NCLB (2001). It is now up to State Educational Agencies, Local Educational Agencies, and teacher preparation programs to adequately train pre-service and regular classroom teachers for the challenge.

Conceptual Design

The following is a conceptual design to provide the reader with a better understanding of the phases and organization of this mixed design study. The researcher accessed state educational data to retrieve essential data to gain information regarding academic achievement and English reading proficiency among ELLs within the mid-central part of the State of Missouri. The researcher conducted the study within four small to mid-sized school districts with pupil population sizes ranging from 10,000 to 18,000 students. The researcher surveyed 161 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time, public school teachers and interviewed 11 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time, public school teachers. The data produced by this survey can potentially serve the Federal Government, State Educational Agencies, Local Educational Agencies, and give insight into teacher preparation in ESL methodology and the possible impact ESL teacher preparation has on ELL learning and academic achievement.

Theoretical Sensitivity

This researcher has been an educator for the past nineteen years. The first five years of professional teacher service was as a Spanish/Cultural Arts Instructor, eventually taking the position as principal at an area alternative high school. Currently, the researcher is an Assistant Teaching Professor at an urban, mid-western university, teaching in the school of education. The researcher has taught Cultural Diversity in American Education and Advanced Foundations of Education courses to pre-service

teachers. The researcher believes that this study is important to pursue for teachers of students from diverse language communities, ESL teachers, school districts, communities in general, and citizens committed to reaching out to language minority populations that have existed in this country since its inception. Considering the data provided by MODESE (2006), and the improvement of standardized testing for achievement, the researcher is allowed to incorporate his personal depth and experience into this research to determine how academic achievement data among the language minority population can be used to serve English Language Learners (ELLs). The current research study will allow the researcher an opportunity to utilize current literature on best practices for ELL academic achievement and allow time for reflection and an opportunity to analyze current studies and data related to academic achievement among the ELL population. Furthermore, this study will provide an opportunity to help school districts with significant ELL populations to align their instructional practices, strategies, professional development, and related services with best practices to the non-English speaking community of learners.

Theoretical Framework

The researcher used tenets from both Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latino/a Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) as a lens for educational research from which this dissertation will be framed. Critical Race Theory and LatCrit in educational research can be defined as frameworks that questions the dominant conversation on race, gender, and class as it concerns education by examining how educational theory, policy, and practice marginalizes certain racial and ethnic groups (Bernal, 2002; Solorzano & Delgado-Bernal, 2001; Solorzano & Yosso, 2000). Latino/a Critical Race Theory and CRT are

conceptual frameworks resulting from legal studies that assist in improving comprehension of issues related to social justice and racial inequality within U.S. society (Crenshaw, Gotanda, Peller, & Thomas, 1995; Delgado, 1995; Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, & Crenshaw, 1993; Villalpando, 2004). Latino/a Critical Race Theory and CRT also derived and expanded an array of literature that is often expressed as *critical theory*. William Tierney (1993) defined critical theory as “an attempt to understand the oppressive aspects of society in order to generate societal and individual transformation,” (p. 4) as he paraphrased Brian Fey (1987) in his research on critical theory.

Correspondingly, Mari Matsuda (1991) viewed critical race theory as:

The work of progressive legal scholars of color who are attempting to develop a jurisprudence that accounts for the role of racism in American law and that work toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination (p. 1331)

Latino/a Critical Race Theory is similar to CRT according to Solorzano and Delgado-Bernal (2001) meaning that LatCrit is concerned with a progressive implication of coalitional Latino/a pan-ethnicity and speaks to issues often overlooked by critical race theorists such as language, immigration, ethnicity, culture, identity, phenotype, and sexuality (Espinoza, 1990; Garcia, 1995; Hernandez-Truyol, 1997; Johnson, 1997; Martinez, 1994; Montoya, 1994; Valdez, 1996). According to Villalpando (2004), both CRT and LatCrit allow researchers to recognize and analyze patterns, practices and policies of racial inequality and exclusion that continue to exist in more subtle and clandestine ways. CRT and LatCrit are increasingly being used by education scholars interested in using the K-12 education process (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Parker, Deyhle, Villenas, & Nebecker, 1998; Solorzano, 1997; Solorzano & Bernal Delgado, 2001; Solorazano & Yosso, 2001; Tate 1997; Villalpando, 2004) in

analyzing racial barriers constructed against people of color. Villalpando (2004) also suggests that CRT and LatCrit assist in exposing avenues in which race-neutral institutional practices and policies propagate ethnic or racial subordination.

Using both Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) allows for a culturally sensitive lens from which to analyze educational experiences of immigrants from multilingual and multi-faceted identities and can address the intersecting issues related to racism, sexism, heterosexism, classism, and other forms of oppression against immigrants or people of color (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001; Villalpando, 2004). LatCrit specifically gives us a lens through which to view immigrants' identity at the crossroads of immigration, migration, human rights, language, gender, and class (Hernandez-Truyol, 1997; Villalpando, 2004).

The following are the five tenets or defining elements that form the basic perspectives, assumptions, and pedagogies of CRT and LatCrit as it relates to educational research (Matzuda et al., 1993; Solorzano & Delgado-Bernal, 2001; Tate, 1997; Villalpando & Delgado-Bernal, 2002):

1. *The importance of trans-disciplinary approaches.* CRT and LatCrit trans-disciplinary approaches challenge educational researchers to utilize strengths and research methods from various disciplines (i.e. ethnic studies, women's studies, sociology, history, law) in understanding and improving the educational experiences of students of color (Solorzano & Yosso, 2001).
2. *An emphasis on experiential knowledge.* Experiential knowledge of students of color has been viewed as deficient or disadvantaged in formal educational environments. CRT and LatCrit value experiential knowledge and underscore

the need to understand how the identities of people of color can actually nourish and empower their personal and academic success in educational settings (Villalpando, 2004).

3. *The commitment to social justice.* CRT and LatCrit in education are theories that have a fundamental commitment to social justice and offer a transformative or liberating response to racial, gender, class (Matsuda, 1991) generational status, sexual preference, linguistic (Villalpando, 2004) and new immigrant oppression. This is an especially relevant tenet for teachers and higher education faculty who already share a deep commitment to an ethic of caring (Noddings, 1984) and service (Villalpando, 2004).
4. *The centrality of race and racism and their intersectionality with other forms of subordination.* Race and racism are endemic, permanent and defining qualities of American society and by augmentation are embedded in the policies, structures, and discourses that guide daily practices in school, and universities (Taylor, 1999; Villalpando; 2004). According to Russell (1992), race “[is] a central rather than marginal factor in defining and explaining individual experiences of the law” (p. 762-763). Race and racism is at the center of CRT and LatCrit analysis, but it is also viewed at their intersection with other forms subordination such as class and gender discrimination (Crenshaw, 1989: 1993; Solorzano & Yosso, 2001). Villalpando (2004) and Solorzano and Villalpando (1998) suggest that class, racial, and gender oppression do not operate in a vacuum but rather educational researchers must

consider how multi-dimensional identities of people of color might also be subject to varied or additional forms of marginalization or discrimination.

5. *A challenge to dominant ideologies.* CRT and LatCrit give meaning to the creation of cultural and linguistic relevancy and varied constructs of knowledge and understanding and to the value of rethinking traditional claims of what counts as knowledge. Delgado-Bernal (2002) suggested that power and politics are at the center of all learning and teaching, and that the application of household and cultural knowledge to events outside of the home can produce a creative process that challenges the dominant ideologies and knowledge that is assumed official and true.

These five defining tenets of CRT and LatCrit work together to offer a distinctive way to approach educational research and to transport educators and researchers into a realm of critical and moral practice for all children (Delgado-Bernal, 2002). Critical Race Theory and LatCrit also allow for unique approaches to understanding and meeting the needs of ELLs in K-12 educational settings (Villalpando, 2004). Finally, the researcher will use CRT and LatCrit to guide the development of this study as it relates to the development of subsequent chapters, the instrument of analysis, and the eventual analysis of the data as it relates to perceptions that Missouri certified, K-6, public school teachers have in regards to their personal preparation in sheltered instruction techniques in service to ELLs in their schools and classrooms.

Limitations of the Study

The researcher took into account the following limitations to the study. The limitations included: 1) the data of metropolitan mid-western urban, suburban, and rural

school districts in one Midwestern state; 2) a modified survey/ questionnaire was used to determine full-time elementary school teacher (K-6 grade), self disclosure of ELL methodology preparation for academic success among ELLs; 3) results can only be generalized to a Midwestern state, school districts and their population size; 4) the data collected will be post-NCLB (2001) and the amendments to NCLB of 2007; 5) the interview participants were self-selected; and finally 6) possibility of researcher location, employment, cultural, and professional bias may exist must be taken into consideration.

Assumptions

The researcher determined that the following assumptions to the study needed to be taking into consideration: 1) data collected by MODESE (2006) is accurate and up to date; 2) teachers surveyed in this study are fulltime, Missouri certified, elementary school teachers; 3) the quantitative and qualitative analysis will reveal truths about the best practices set forth in policy and teacher certification for academic achievement and English proficiency among ELLs; and 4) researcher bias will not affect qualitative findings.

Parameters of the Study

This study will be conducted during the 2009-2010 calendar school year. During the summer of 2008, the researcher began the literature research and review and presented the proposal for the study to the dissertation committee for approval, which was granted December 17, 2008. The researcher gained permission from University of Missouri-Columbia Institutional Review Board June 17, 2009, authorizing the implementation of the questionnaire surveys and to conduct interviews in the public schools and school districts where approval was given.

Definition of Terms

According to Frankel and Wallen (2003), the definition of terms are necessary for clarity and optimal understanding within research and are an integral part of any research study regardless of methodology. Therefore, the researcher has provided the following definitions and acronym descriptions to ensure consistency and understanding of these terms throughout the study.

Academic success: For the purpose of this study, academic success is defined as scoring Advanced or Proficient on the Missouri state exams (MODESE, 2006).

Accountability: Accountability concerns the obligation of comprehensive school improvement planning, reporting, explaining, or justifying standards, making them responsible, explicable, and answerable.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): One of the foundations of the No Child Left Behind Act (2001). States must develop target preliminary goals for AYP and raise the expectations in gradual increments so that 100% of the students in the state are proficient on state assessments by the school year 2013-14. AYP applies to each district and school in the state; NCLB sanctions schools that do not make AYP for two years or more in a row, and it only applies to districts and schools that receive Title I funds.

Assessment: This term refers to any test instrument or other student achievement evaluation method used to measure student learning and performance.

Bilingual maintenance programs: Generally consist of non-English speakers and, like two way bilingual education programs, place equal emphasis on maintaining students' primary language and developing their English proficiency.

ESL pullout: This program supplements regular mainstream classroom instruction with instruction in a small group setting outside of the mainstream classroom and is aimed at developing English language skills.

English Speakers of Other Language (ESOL): a synonym of ESL, but more current because students often speak multiple languages.

English language learner (ELL): Students whose primary language is not English and who lack English language skills, according to state approved assessments that are necessary to succeed in the school's regular instructional programs. The terms "limited English proficient" and "English language learner" are synonyms for "English learners" (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997).

National Association of Educational Progress (NAEP) Achievement/Performance levels: This term is used to refer to the levels of student achievement on national achievement examinations. A description of levels are as follows:

Basic: denotes partial mastery of the knowledge and skills that are fundamental for proficient work a given grade.

Proficient: represents solid academic performance. Students reaching this level have demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter.

Advanced: signifies superior performance (NEAP, 2007)

Professional development: This term refers to a coordinated set of planned learning activities for teachers and administrators that are standards-based, and continuous. Ideally, quality professional development would result in individual, school-wide, and systemic improvement. Approved professional development activities would

be linked to the school improvement plans, demonstrate research-based best practices, and be subject-specific, and site-specific as often as possible.

Scaffolding: Scaffolding is the process a teacher uses to support the student who is not able to accomplish a task independently. It is used to aid in the completion of a task and is eventually removed.

Sheltered English Immersion Observational Protocol (SIOP): a model of sheltered instruction for ELLs where the focus is on concurrent teaching and learning of both language and content (Vogt & Echevarria, 2008).

Sheltered English Immersion Instruction: All students in the class are beginning English speakers and have an ESL endorsed teacher. Instruction is mostly provided entirely in English, but in a self contained classroom consisting of only English language learners (ELLs).

Sink or swim method of instruction: this approach provides mainstream classroom instruction with no help or scaffolding.

Transitional bilingual education: Transitional bilingual education initially delivers instruction and develops student literacy in the native language, but puts a priority on developing a student's English language skills.

Two way bilingual education: also known as Two-Way Immersion. It is designed to develop fluency in both the student's first language and the second language; teachers deliver instruction in both languages to classes consisting of both native English speakers and speakers of another language (mostly commonly Spanish).

Organization of the Study

The review of the literature can be found in Chapter Two. The review of the literature presents an overview of research-based studies and methods that are successful with English language learners. In addition, literature was reviewed that summarized successful professional development programs and best practices to help ELLs achieve academic success in school. Chapter Three will outline the methodology of this mixed design study, which will include a timeline for the research, MODESE and district data analyzed and the instrument used to analyze the data provided. Chapter Four will provide the findings and Chapter Five will outline the discussion, conclusions, suggestions, and recommendations for further studies.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The United States (U.S), as recently as the mid-1990s, has had an increasing number of ELLs entering public schools (De Jong & Harper, 2005; NCES, 2002; Vogt & Echevarria, 2008). Public school educators, particularly ESL and bilingual teachers, have been receiving in-service and professional development related to educating the recently arrived immigrant student whose first language or home language is not English (Batt, 2008; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Honigfeld & Cohan, 2008; Vogt & Echevarria, 2008). According to the National Center for Educational Statistics (2002), 42% of teachers surveyed indicated that they were serving ELLs in their classrooms, while the same NCES data showed that only 12.5% of teachers nationally had more than 8 hours of professional development related specifically to ELLs. Teachers often do seek best practices to improve their effectiveness in serving ELLs, but often fall short due to time constraints and lack of support from school district administrators (Coleman & Goldenberg; Honigfeld & Cohan).

In the U.S., only 30% of all secondary students read proficiently (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; NCES, 2005) whereas students of color fare worse according to Perie, et al., (2005) where 89% of Latino students and 86% of African American students in middle school and high school read below grade level. As for English language learners, only 4% of eighth graders classified as ELLs and 20% of students formerly classified as ELL scored at the proficient or advanced levels on the reading portion of the National Assessment for Educational Progress in 2005 (Echevarria, et. al., 2008). This means that 96 percent of the ELLs in the eighth grade scored below

the basic level in reading (Echevarria et al., 2008; Perie et al., 2005) and that a persistent achievement and literacy gap between Caucasian students and students from culturally and linguistic diverse communities continues to exist (California Dept. of Education, 2004; Echevarria et al., 2008; Grigg, Daane, Jin, & Campbell, 2003; Kindler, 2002; NCES, 2003; Nuefeld, Amendum, Fitzgerald & Guthrie, 2006; Siegel, 2002).

Demographic Changes

The 2000 U.S. Census data reported that speakers of languages other than English number 47 million, ages 5 years and older which is a significant change from the levels from the 1990's, - a 47% change (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006). Students classified as English Language Learners attending U.S. schools increased by 105% from 1991 to 2001 (Kindler, 2002; Nuefeld et. al., 2006). According to Garcia and Cuellar and U.S. Census (2000) there has been a national trend where 47 out of the 50 states have had an increase in their non-English speaking population, with southern U.S states reporting a 60% increase. States where predictable increases of non-English speakers occurred were California (103%), Arizona (75%), and Texas (51%), but the dramatic increase was in states that typically did not have large numbers of non-English speakers such as Georgia (164%), North Carolina (150%), and Arkansas (103%) (Garcia & Cuellar; U.S. Census). School age ELLs (ages 5-17) have increase from 3.8 million to 9.9 million since 1979 to 2003, representing gains of 9-19% among all U.S. school age children (Mays, 2008; Kamps, Abbot, Greenwood, Arreaga-Mayer, Willis, Longstaff, Culpepper, & Walton, 2007; NCES, 2005) where as Verdugo and Flores (2007) estimate that ELL school age population since 2001 is 9.7%.

Public elementary and secondary students who were identified by school districts as ELL had an increase of 920,000 ELL students in just a six year period between school years 1993-94 and 1999-2000. The ELL population in the Midwestern states increased by 43% with the greatest numerical increase seen in speakers whose home language was Spanish (Garcia & Cuellar, 2006; Kamps, et. al., 2007; U.S. Department of Education, 2000; U.S Census, 2000). In the state of Missouri, according to the U.S. Census (2000, revised February, 2006) there were 264,280 (.05% of the total population of 5.2 million Missouri residents) individuals who speak another language other than English while 39,395 (.7%) individuals, self identified as speaking English “not well.” Those individuals that identified themselves as “speaking English not at all” were 9,075 or 3.4% of the limited English population of Missouri (U.S. Census, 2000, revised February 2006). The ELL population as a whole in the U.S. has shown an increasing trend within the last decade and those numbers are leading educators and school districts to review test scores and revise their instructional practices in order to meet the high expectations of NCLB (2001), especially for the increasing ELL population (Echevarria, 2006; Garcia & Cuellar).

No Child Left Behind Accountability

No Child Left Behind (2001) has set high standards to be achieved by all states by the year 2014. Many states have been concerned with the quality of education for all children including the ethnic minority populations of the U.S.; but ever increasingly, states are reassessing policies, instructional practices, and procedures addressing academic achievement of students whose first language is not English and the expectations of academic growth and English proficiency as required by NCLB. English

Language Learners (ELLs) are currently subject to the same academic standards as all students attending U.S. schools and as of May 2007 in a revision of NCLB, states were required, in accordance with Title 1 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), to include limited English proficient (LEP) students or ELLs in state assessments of academic achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics (NCLB; OESE, 2007). States are also required to make appropriate accommodations to include, when practicable, assessments in the home language and in a form most likely to generate accurate data on LEP academic content knowledge and the execution of what has been learned until they have achieved English language proficiency (OESE). Regulations according to NCLB define a recently arrived LEP student as a student with limited English proficiency who has attended schools in the U.S. for less than 12 months/one year.

The flexibility permitted in NCLB (2001) with its amendments as of May 2007 includes the ability of the state to exclude or exempt a recently arrived LEP student from one administration of the State's reading/language arts assessment. Newly arrived LEPs must take an English proficiency assessment in order to participate in the state's assessment program and to account for their progress in English acquisition. These newly arrived LEPs are counted as participants in meeting of a 95% assessment participation requirement for state Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) determinations for reading/language arts (OESE, 2007). According to OESE those LEPs whose scores are exempt in the reading/language arts assessment during their first year will be counted as the first year of three where the LEP student can take the reading/language arts assessment in his/her native language. LEPs according to NCLB still must take the state's

mathematics assessments with accommodations as necessary and as of school year 2007-2008, LEPs are also required to take the State's science assessment, but with accommodations. The Office of Elementary and Secondary Education NCLB Revision Guidance/Regulations (OESE) allows states to exclude test scores of recently arrived LEPs from both state's reading/language arts and math assessments for one AYP determination cycle. Finally, states that do exempt recently arrived LEPs from reading/language arts assessments must report publicly the number of students exempted for such reasons.

It is interesting to note that State Educational Agencies (SEAs) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) are still responsible for providing appropriate instruction to recently arrived LEPs and in no way does the OESE (2007) revisions release SEAs and LEAs from those responsibilities. State and Local Educational Agencies are required to provide appropriate instruction to recently arrived LEPs so that English language skills and content knowledge is mastered in reading/language arts, mathematics, and science (OESE). It is left to the state to determine how this will be accomplished within the classrooms.

Language Acquisition

Most children obtain their first language (L1) genuinely through continual dealings with their parents/guardians or significant others (Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Augusta & Hakuta, 1997). Prior knowledge of the L1 performs a vital function in the process of attaining and studying the second language (L2), as some concepts obtained through learning of the L1 can be transferred to a L2, usually when a comparable idea exists in the L2 (Gollnick & Chinn). Foreign languages do not always

translate exactly into English and teachers are cautioned when attempting to find exact translations from one language to another mainly because each language has culturally specific nuances within their language which may be difficult in translations (Gollnick & Chinn; Marshall, 2002). Marshall and Nieto (2004) suggested that children in the U.S today bring to school the linguistic systems of their culture along with valuable learned experiences. English Language Learners (ELLs) bring with them an expansive variety of educational and cultural experiences, not to mention linguistic diversity (Echevarria et al., 2008; Gollnick & Chinn; Hanson-Thomas, 2008; Marshall; Nieto; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Not all English learners are alike according to Echevarria et. al., (2008): “They enter U.S. schools with a wide range of language proficiencies (in English and in their native languages) and of subject matter knowledge” (p. 7).

Most children who come to school understanding very little English will acquire conversational English skills within two to three years according to Marshall (2002), providing ELLs the ability to socialize among their English speaking peers. Marshall, Crawford, (2004), and Cummins (1996) reported that conversational English or basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) are sufficient for everyday dialogue, but are not enough for ELLs to function in a high-level academic situation within academic settings. Marshall explained that developing proficiency in a second language takes a considerable amount of time and that ELLs can understand a L2 more readily than what they can reproduce verbally in the L2. BICS are considered to be “playground English” or language used in everyday social interactions where nonlinguistic cues and context are used for communication which may include gestures and non-verbal indicators (Marshall, p. 217; Cummins, 1984).

Conversational English skills according to Gollnick and Chinn (2006) and Crawford (2004) are linguistic skills that are primarily used in social situations rather than in academics. Banks and Banks (2005) stress that conversing in English with peers and reciting English grammatical rules simply is not enough for academic success in high school for ELLs. Echevarria et al., (2008) explain that individuals learn best through linguistic experiences, and human beings express their understanding of knowledge, concepts, or situations through the use of language. While ELLs can acquire conversational English skills in less than two years, (Anderson, 1995; Gollnick & Chinn; Crawford; Lucas et al., 2008; Marshall, 2002; Krashen, 1996; Perez, 1995; Garcia, 1993; Carrasquillo, 1991) it takes an additional four to twelve years of additional schooling to essentially develop higher levels of academic English proficiency needed in very structured academic classroom situations (Anderson; Carrasquillo; Crawford; Echevarria et al., 2008; Garcia; Gollnick & Chinn; Krashen; Marshall; Sleeter & Grant, 2007).

Cummins (2000) suggests that there are two reasons why ELLs struggle with acquiring academic English. Academic language is the language of content subject matter, prose, periodicals, and other scholarly materials, which is very different from conversational language. Academic language is developed throughout years of schooling by native speakers already fluent in conversational English before they ever enter schools in the U.S. (Cummins; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006). While ELLs are acquiring the basic conversational English skills, native English speakers are fully functioning at a higher level of English proficiency within their classrooms while acquiring academic English (Cummins; Gollnick & Chinn). Proficiency in academic English has been identified as an element of “cultural capital” (Spring, 2004 p. 24) needed for success in the U.S. and

English is often realized as the language of power among immigrants and ELLs alike (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Gollnick & Chinn; McCollum, 1993).

Academic Achievement of English Language Learners

Statistics on students of color and their reading ability is dismal in the U.S. Echevarria et al., (2008) and Perie et al., (2005) state that only 30 percent of all secondary children in the U.S read proficiently and that 89 percent of all Hispanics and 86 percent of middle school African American students read below grade level (Echevarria et al.; Perie et al.). Ninety six percent of all ELLs assessed, scored below the basic level of the reading portion of the 2005 National Assessment for Educational Progress (NAEP) report according to Perie, et al. (2005) and ELLs have some of the highest drop-out rates; triple the national average at 31 percent (Echevarria et al.; Latinos in education, 1999; Ruiz-de-Velasco & Fix, 2000; Steinberg & Almeida, 2004). Several studies show that since NCLB (2001) was enacted, there appears to be an increase in the number of ELLs in U.S. high schools not earning high school diplomas because of high-stakes testing failure rates, while fulfilling other graduation requirements (Biancarosa & Snow, 2004; Center on Education Policy, 2005; Echevarria, et al.; Edley & Wald, 2002). Crawford (2004) and Gollnick and Chinn (2006) agree that there is an additional factor to the linguistic challenges ELLs face in regards to academic achievement and English proficiency. It is basically the socio-cultural factor that is placed within the school environment today where the dominant culture controls the power relations between the majority and minority cultures. This cultural control exercises influence in academic performance among minority children (Crawford; Cummins, 1996; Gollnick & Chinn; Spring, 2004). Teachers need to realize that ELLs have an even more challenging task within our

classrooms today; they are attempting to learn everything within the curriculum and attain academic English proficiency at the same time (Baker, 1998; Echevarria et. al.; Hansen-Thomas, 2008).

Nieto and Bode (2008), Cushner, McClelland, and Safford (2006), and Banks and Banks (2005) comment that academic achievement of ELLs is influenced by the way teachers and schools view a student's L1. Good teaching, according to Nieto and Bode, is effective classroom instruction that is almost always tied to a teacher's ability to build relationships with their students. Teachers must focus on honoring, respecting, and affirming a student's native language or L1, their families, their communities, and the resources and experiences that they bring to the classroom (Adams & Jones, 2006; Banks & Banks; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Diller & Moule, 2005; Echevarria et al., 2008; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Nieto & Bode; Ooka-Pang, 2005; Verdugo & Flores, 2007).

Marshall (2002) gives us examples of regular classroom teachers who have shown various degrees of personal and professional commitment to the academic achievement of ELLs within their classroom. According to Marshall some teachers with high levels of professional and personal efficacy learn instructional and interpersonal techniques as well as strategies that will assist them in helping ELLs and students culturally different than themselves (Batt, 2008; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Nieto & Bode, 2008). Many teachers will take courses in Spanish or another target language or attend staff development in-services in the attempt to enhance non-verbal linguistic cues to enhance communication techniques in reaching ELLs (Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Marshall). These attempts at bi-cultural, or cultural competency create true meaningful respect on behalf of the educator as they relate to cultural and linguistic differences that exist among their

student population (Banks & Banks, 2005; Diller & Moule, 2005; Echevarria et al., 2008; Gollnick & Chinn; Nieto & Bode; Ooka-Pang, 2005).

On the contrary, there are teachers who have low personal and professional self worth that are more likely to depend entirely on outside assistance from either bilingual or ESL teaching staff or may seek “pull-out” opportunities which may result in ELLs missing part if not most of the day from the regular classroom environment (Marshall, 2002). These types of teachers recognize that ELLs have different linguistic needs than the mono-lingual English-speaking students they teach, feel inadequately prepared to teach ELLs, and would prefer that other teachers instruct, reach or even deal with them (Batt, 2008; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Marshall).

Finally, Marshall, (2002) states that there are educators who openly display their displeasure with the notion of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. Due to personal attitudes or negative orientations in regards to ELLs, such teachers weaken the academic experience for these students (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Banks & Banks, 2005; Marshall; Nieto, 1999; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Ooka-Pang, 2005). A reason for such attitudes may lie in the belief that because English is the official language of the U.S, and at a very extreme, these types of teachers may believe that American schools should only be for students who are proficient in the English language (Diller & Moule, 2005; Marshall). Teachers who view ELLs as not acculturated or not assimilated enough to the American culture may certainly have lower academic expectations and hold a lower perception of ELLs in comparison to monolingual English speaking peers, regardless of their cultural backgrounds (DeJong & Harper, 2005; Marshall; Masten, Plata, Wenglar, & Thedford, 1999; Tornatzky et. al, 2003). Still, some teachers of the prevailing negative attitude feel

that an unnecessary financial burden is placed upon the school district when serving ELLs instead of other more deserving students and programs (Marshall). All in all, such teachers are discomforted by the presence of the “culturally or linguistically diverse” student and have possession of these perceptions which guide their attitudes, actions, and expectations or the lack of, toward these students (Marshall). This negative behavior and attitude on behalf of classroom teachers ultimately affects morale, motivation, and academic placement and achievement, resulting in the failure of ELLs in schools today (Banks & Banks; Campbell, 2004; Diller & Moule; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Marshall). Cushner, McClelland, and Safford (2006) remind us that “teachers who are working with children whose L1 is not English must remember that each child’s language is an integral part of that child’s personhood, and must make every attempt to regard that personhood with respect” (p. 238).

The Role of Leadership in ELL Academic Achievement

Language is a system by which members of a community communicate or use as a tool in the development of a person’s identity, self awareness, which provides an avenue for academic and psychological growth (Banks & Banks, 2005; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Jay, 2003). Institutional leadership plays a vital role in language acquisition and academic achievement among ELLs in our ever increasing multicultural, multi-lingual U.S community. The first line institutional leader within a school is that of the building principal with the greatest opportunity to influence through her/his leadership capacity. Barkley, Bottoms, Feagin, and Clark, (2001) define leadership capacity as using sweat equity to elicit the same from others and that all stakeholders of an education community play key roles in promoting academic achievement. Studies have shown that

school-level leadership in regards to ELL instruction and academic achievement begins with the building principal (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Batt, 2008; Barkley et al.; Lambert, 1998; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). At least half of the studies according to Augusta and Hakuta name the principal's role in as an important factor in academic achievement among the ELL population within their schools. Baker, (1998) in an article related to Structured English Immersion (SEI) suggests that there be a longer school day and calendar year for ELLs when serving them in schools, giving teachers and professional staff more time for ESL instruction or assistance. The suggestion that Baker makes would take leadership at all levels to make happen; especially if led by the principal, teachers, and community stakeholders. Augusta and Hakuta state:

The Principal is seen as playing a key role in many ways, for example, making the academic achievement of ELLs a priority; providing on-going direction and monitoring of curricular and instructional improvement, recruiting and keeping talented and dedicated staff, involving the entire staff in improvement efforts, and providing a good physical and social environment (p. 173)

Leadership and leader is not reciprocal according to Lambert (1998), but rather leadership involves a cyclical process of learning that enables individuals to develop and negotiate meanings that lead to a shared vision and purpose of education and achievement. Leadership leads to constructive change, is shared, is democratic, and eventually requires the reallocation of influence and license (Bolman & Deal, 2003; Lambert, 1998, 2003; Marzano, 2005). In addition to principals taking leading roles in the academic achievement of ELLs, teachers are also asked to lead the way in understanding cultural and linguistic differences that exist in our nation and to help others recognize the value of these differences while working toward enhancing ELL's

linguistic and academic skills (Cartiera, 2006; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Rojas & Reagan, 2003).

Teacher leadership at all levels of instruction of ELLs is asked to make personal connections with those students, hold high expectations for them, (Banks & Banks, 2005; Cartiera, 2006; Diller & Moule, 2005) and seek recent and relevant research related to curriculum and instructional methods for ELL academic achievement (Banks & Banks; Barkley, Bottoms, Feagin, & Clark, 2001). This kind of leadership among the teaching ranks encourages self respect among ELLs, accountability to peers, teachers and community, and promotes learning among all stakeholders at both the building and community level. The educational community is ultimately made accountable for academic achievement of all children (Barkley et al., 2001; Oakes & Lipton, 2007) and teachers have the first line of responsibility to insure that ELLs learn English as quickly as possible and at high levels to insure academic success (Coleman & Goldberg, 2009).

Parent/family diversity mirrors that of today's student population and their community's uniqueness according to Banks and Banks (2005) which bring a wide breadth of knowledge and experience sometime unimagined by schools and teachers. Opportunities within this new century are much more expansive in today's classrooms with a variety of cultures, languages, and diversity more than ever before. Teachers new and seasoned are increasingly encouraged to seek opportunities to engage parents and communities representing their diverse student populations in recognition of the vital role that families and communities play in the education of all children including ELLs (Banks & Banks; Manning & Baruth, 2004; NCCTQ&PA, 2008). Teachers need to realize that there is a direct correlation that exists between education and cultures and that

knowing and acting upon this knowledge is a precondition to effective teaching in the 21st Century (Banks & Banks; Manning & Baruth; Oakes & Lipton, 2007). Parents and community members can play significant roles when making school visits and offering their cooperation and participation. Administrators, teachers, parents and community members must all work in concert toward influencing schools to become academically rigorous and socially just learning communities for all children including ELLs. Studies have proven the benefits of parental involvement on children's academic achievement and outcomes. Similarly, parental non-involvement has earned much of the blame when educational efforts have not been successful (Oakes & Lipton). Educators, according to Manning and Baruth may have significant challenges with differing languages, misapprehension associated with the uniqueness of U.S. schools systems and the possible reluctance of some parents to share their strengths with the educational community. Parents of ELLs who only see Caucasian parents in school tend to conclude a marginalization of cultural diversity issues on behalf of teachers (Manning & Baruth; Wink, 2005). Many administrators and teachers are usually all too aware that language is also both a product and a shaper of culture when referring to U.S. culture. Native language and culture according to Adams and Jones (2006) must be respected in schools and used by teachers as a foundation for second language acquisition in order to insure academic success and a quality education among ELLs they serve. The two, according to Cushner, McClelland, and Safford, (2006) are "inextricably intertwined" and inseparable regardless of the language and culture (p. 226).

Teacher Preparation and Certification in Service of ELLs

“I was completely unprepared for dealing with the poverty issues and social issues that occur at my school.” Anonymous teacher (NCCTQ&PA, 2008c, p. 11)

As never before, teachers are asked, if not required, to ensure that all students achieve at high levels, regardless of how varied their students’ abilities and backgrounds. In 2008, the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality and Public Agenda Report (NCCTQ&PA, 2007a) suggests that leaders in educational reform review educational systems that currently train and aid teachers that do intricate and challenging work must adapt to the realities of the 21st century classroom. School reform and accountability within this century has led the educational landscape of today and has been a mainstay within the past decade. The initiation of NCLB (2001) has set into motion the goal of holding U.S. schools accountable for the success of all of their students to a higher set of standards, (Carrion, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2004, 2008; Nieto, 2004) which includes ELLs. NCLB requires SEAs and LEAs to provide highly qualified teachers in every core academic classroom, yet it does not require content teachers with ELLs to have any additional educational background in ESL methodology or second language acquisition theory or techniques (Banks & Banks, 2005; Campbell, 2004; Echevarria et al., 2008; Nieto & Bode) and in the opinion of a teacher surveyed by Batt (2008), “The problem in our school is that the mainstream teachers and administrators don’t understand LEP needs and how to teach them. We need some help here!” (p. 3). Nieto and Bode state that the responsibility for educating language minority students can no longer fall on the sole responsibility of teachers and staff who have been trained to provide bilingual education and ESL services. This responsibility first and foremost, must be shared by all teachers in all schools, yet most teachers have had minimal training if at

all in working with learning from differing cultural communities, language acquisition, and other language related issues (Banks & Banks; Echevarria et al.; Manning & Baruth, 2004; Nieto & Bode; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). Teachers in high poverty schools are much likely to be under-credentialed, underprepared, or inexperienced as compared to teachers in more affluent school districts (Batt, 2008; NCCTQ&PA, 2008c). As a consequence, according to Sleeter and Grant, (2007) students in high poverty schools are less likely to have access to strong experienced teachers who have learned to teach over time and are interesting and challenging. Studies have increasingly shown that these same schools that are attended by poor students, students of color and ELLs are also likely less to have access to teachers with professional training in teaching English language acquisition, meaningful instructional techniques for ELLs, and knowledge of valid forms of assessment related to ELL academic achievement (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Sleeter & Grant; Larson & Ovando, 2001; Verdugo & Flores; Wink, 2005). As of 2008 only three states have official policies requiring all teacher candidates in pre-service teacher programs to have an understanding of how to teach ELLs effectively: Arizona, California, and Florida (Echevarria et al.).

The circumstances at the in-service and professional development levels in teacher training, has not produced any better results in regards to instructional preparation in serving ELLs. According to a 1999-2000 Schools and Staffing Survey (NCES, 2002) 41.2 percent of the almost 3 million public teachers surveyed reported teaching LEP students, while only 12.5 percent had had eight or more hours of ELL method training in the past three years. Eight hours of training, according to Echevarria et al. (2008), is not nearly enough for effective training when serving ELLs and their academic needs.

English Language learners make up at 10 percent of the student population in the U.S. today (U.S. Census, 2000) and their proportion increases every year. The status of teacher preparation and development of second language acquisition programming needs for ELLs is inadequate today (Adams & Jones, 2006; Echevarria et al.; Kendall, 2006; Verdugo & Flores, 2007; Zehr, 2007). This inadequacy is requiring content area teachers to seek additional training either through continuing education classes or district sponsored in-services to better serve the ELL population that is rapidly increasing within their classrooms.

Research suggests that most states do not require certification in language acquisition techniques for instructing ELLs and many teacher preparation programs do not teach it, many school districts are compensating for this need for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse populations (Adams & Jones, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Honigsfeld & Cohan, 2008; Kendall, 2006; Verdugo & Flores, 2007) by providing additional in-service training. Echevarria et. al. (2008) and Darling-Hammond (2005) suggest that school districts, while moving forward in providing in-service related to teaching to ELLs, must move at a faster pace toward a goal of sustainable and on-going professional development and away from unsuccessful, all inclusive workshops for teachers. It becomes worse when nearly 50,000 individuals enter the teaching field each year without any previous training or teaching experience, wind up teaching the nation's most susceptible students in the neediest schools (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Macedo & Bartolome, 1999; NCCTQ&PA, 2007a; Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Slavin, 1996).

Furthermore, when it comes to educating linguistically diverse students, MODESE (2006) provides six guiding principles to which school districts should adhere when serving the ELL population. Those principles include:

1. That ELLs should be held accountable to the same expectations of established for all students;
2. ELLs can develop productive and receptive proficiencies in English in the domains of listening, speaking, reading, and writing, which remains consistent with the expectations for all students;
3. ELLs need to be taught challenging content to enable them to meet performance standards in all content areas;
4. ELLs need to receive instruction that builds on their previous education and cognitive abilities and that reflects their language proficiency levels;
5. ELLs need to be evaluated with appropriate and valid assessments aligned with SEA and LEA standards and that take into account stages of language acquisition and cultural backgrounds;
6. The academic success of ELLs is a responsibility shared by all educators, family, and the community (p. 54).

These six principles suggested by MODESE (2006) are only suggestions when promoting excellence for ELLs and it is assumed that classroom teachers serving ELLs are certified trained in ESL methodology or assisted by an ESL paraprofessional which is not often suggested as a permanent solution. It is also suggested by MODESE (2006) that a professional teacher certified in ESL methodology can best follow these six principles while serving the ELL population adequately for academic success. Unfortunately, MODESE does not make it a general requirement for all teachers certified in the State of Missouri.

Finally, NCLB (2001) requires highly qualified teachers in every classroom yet it does not require content teachers serving ELLs to have any additional educational

background in ESL methodology or second language acquisition theory (Batt, 2005; Echevarria et al., 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). It is quite possible to have content area teachers expand their role as a reading teacher (Brown, 2007) or to at least make an effort to seek multiple techniques related to student achievement and ability levels (Cox-Peterson & Olson, 2007). The researcher's question is then, how are teachers going to serve as highly qualified teachers within their classrooms and be expected to accomplish all of these goals in reaching, teaching and serving ELLs, if they are not prepared to do so? The problem of preparing ELLs academically begins with teacher preparation programming when serving linguistically diverse students and according to Echevarria et. al., only three states have policies requiring that all pre-service teachers in university teacher education programs have an understanding of how to teach ELLs effectively.

Summary

In summary, demographics of English language minority continue to increase in the U.S. and have done so since the 1990's. State and local educational agencies are required to hold the same expectations for all children regardless of linguistic ability in the English language according to NCLB (2001) with necessary accommodations when applicable to ELLs. These high stakes testing expectations and accountability placed upon school districts in the U.S. have frustrated SEAs and LEAs as they make modifications in state assessments when it comes to educating and assessing ELLs accurately. Academic English skills are vastly different from conversational language skills where as academic skills, honed over many years, can be acquired much easier when conversational skills have been mastered by the ELL (Anderson, 1995; Gollnick &

Chinn, 2006; Crawford, 2004; Cummins, 1996; Lucas et al., 2008; Marshall, 2002; Krashen, 1996; Perez, 1995; Garcia, 1993; Carrasquillo, 1991). It takes only two to three years to master conversational English versus five to seven years when acquiring academic English skills. ELLs must accomplish both academic and basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) successfully at the same time (Crawford; Cummins). Leadership is vital to a successful ELL program that involves key individuals such as a strong principal, committed teachers, staff, and a supportive community. Teachers and school districts are asked to be accountable for successfully making academic progress with ELLs, yet many school districts still rely on out of classroom assistance from ESL specialists who are in high demand and in deficit numbers. Teachers are also asked to change their attitudes toward ELLs and their cultural ties to their L1. Competency in L2 acquisition, teaching qualifications, years of experience and a positive attitude is preferred when making successful strides in teaching, reaching and motivating ELLs. Professional development and in-services need to be instrumental in the success of teaching ESL methodology to content area teachers as a whole. University pre-service teacher programs have also been tapped to assist all teacher candidates in providing training in reaching, teaching, and learning English language acquisition techniques before they enter the classroom, making all teachers truly advocates and experts. It will take a community of leaders, teachers, and stakeholders to come together and realize the importance of learning and eventually applying new techniques in pedagogy in service of ELLs as they maneuver through our educational system. In Chapter Three, the Methodology section, the researcher will underline the method of inquiry as far as obtaining data from local school districts and their teaching staff. The researcher will also

outline the theoretical foundation for this study in attempts to provide a lens through which this study will be analyzed.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research suggests an existence of an increasing demand for educators to understand issues related to second language learners and their inability to reach academic success in U.S. schools (Echevarria, 2006; Zehr, 2007). Giambo and Szecsi (2006) state that a variety of trends in second language teaching leaves many ELLs with purposeful and caring teachers who, unfortunately, have limited understanding of second language acquisition or cultural diversity issues that affect ELLs. The current challenge for teachers and school districts is not just to teach ELLs the English language for proficiency, but to do so while challenging the students at the appropriate content level for academic success (Echevarria; Tornatzky, Pachon, & Torres, 2003; Zehr).

The English language acquisition skills required for success in school, according to Bishop (2003), Brown (2007), and Krashen, (1995) is considered to be the most vital academic skill one can possess and is interconnected with academic achievement. Often solely associated with literature and language arts, reading or the skills needed for reading in content areas has received minimal attention. Content area teachers must realize that reading comprehension in the content areas is essential to successful learning and that this knowledge then expands their role as a de-facto reading teacher (Brown; Echevarria et al., 2008). English language learners today face both the task of learning how to acquire English communication skills and academic English at the same time (Wright, 2006).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this mixed design study was to examine self reported evaluations and interviews of full-time elementary school teachers in regards to their use of English language acquisition techniques known as sheltered instruction (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008) when serving the ELL population in the Midwest. Today there are many teachers not equipped with adequate information about ELLs and about what comprises effective instruction for the ELL population of students (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Batt, 2008; Cartiera, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria; Echevarria et al., 2006; Echevarria et al.; Hite & Evens, 2006; Jones, 2006; Macedo & Bartolome, 1999; NCES, 2002; Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Slavin, 1996; Zehr, 2007;). This mixed design study surveyed a random selection of 161 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers from urban, suburban, and rural elementary schools and the researcher interviewed 11 self-selected, Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers located within the mid-central western region of the State of Missouri. This mixed design survey and interview structure studied and examined self reported evaluations of elementary classroom teachers, as to their use of sheltered techniques as described by the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model in their regular classroom environments (Echevarria et al.).

English Language Learners (ELLs) need guided reading and writing support or scaffolding while developing proficiencies in English (Echevarria et al., 2004, 2008; Lucas et al., 2008) beyond that of language arts classes. Reading and comprehending academic English is challenging enough for ELLs and content area teachers cannot wait until ELLs acquire the grade level skills necessary for academic achievement (Brown,

2007). Teachers are encouraged to make modifications to instruction and guide the ELL in the content area specifically being studied or taught (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Batt, 2008; Cartiera, 2006; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al.; Hite & Evens, 2006; Jones, 2006; Zehr, 2007).

It was the intent of the researcher to investigate how Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers used sheltered instruction techniques based upon the SIOP Model (Echevarria et al., 2006, 2008). The triangulation of data consisted of the literature review, a survey/questionnaire of Missouri certified, K-6, full-time, public school teachers and follow-up interviews with self identified survey/questionnaire participants. The research study included ELL academic achievement and English proficiency data and policies related to certification requirements based upon Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE) and the expectations set by NCLB (2001) in regards to academic achievement and English proficiency of ELLs. The data analysis included questionnaire and interview responses from certified K-6 full-time elementary classroom teachers. This study imparts information regarding the knowledge base that state certified elementary school teachers, grades K-6, in regards to sheltered instruction methodology specific to language and content instruction in service to ELLs.

Rationale for Mixed Design Research

The research paradigm was that of a qualitative cross sectional questionnaire/survey. The cross sectional survey can be defined as an instrument used by researchers interested in the opinions of a large group of individuals about a particular topic or issue and quite often the data collected is done so at just one point in time (Frankel & Wallen, 2003). There are three major characteristics that make up most

surveys according to Frankel and Wallen, which include, a) the collecting of information from individuals or groups in order to describe some aspects or characteristics of a population of which that group is a part; b) information is usually collected through asking of questions and the answers to these questions by the target population comprises the data of the study; and c) the information collected in the survey is an illustration rather than from every member of the population. The major purpose of surveys is to describe the characteristics of a population and research is usually sought out to discover how members of a population distribute themselves on one or more variables (Creswell, 2003; Frankel & Wallen).

Methodology

Design of the Study

This multi-case study used triangulation or multiple sources of data of method to explore the research questions presented previously in this chapter. Using triangulation, the researcher approached the research questions from different viewpoints and angles to explore the problem in a multi-faceted way to gain a focused and deep understanding of the data (Patton, 1999, 2003; Mason, 2002). According to Bogdan and Bilken (2003), and Mason, triangulation improves validity and credibility of findings by viewing a problem from one or more perspectives. The researcher used triangulation by administering and collecting 161 questionnaires/surveys, 11 interviews, and took detailed field notes to explore different parts of the process to answer the research questions with differing methods of inquiry ultimately enhancing the findings of this study.

This mixed design multi-case study was a homogenous case study allowing for a purposeful sample to gather in-depth information from a small population of Missouri

certified, K-6, fulltime, public school teachers. Patton (2002) suggests that research done on particular programs having many participants, uses homogenous samples to collect in-depth information about unique subgroups. This study utilized survey questionnaires and personal follow-up individual focused interviews. It was the intent of the research to collect survey data from approximately 100 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers, (approximately 25 school teachers from two metropolitan Kansas City area public schools districts and approximately 50 teachers from four rural central Missouri school districts known to have large ESL student populations). In addition, 11 Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school teachers from this homogeneous population were self-selected for face-to-face interviews.

Criteria for the selection of the units of study were: Missouri certified, K-6, fulltime, public school teachers; teaching in a rural, suburban, or metropolitan school district; and teaching grades kindergarten through sixth grade. In accordance with survey techniques suggestions, the questionnaire/survey provided an opportunity for “additional comments” at the end of each questionnaire. There were additional opportunities to self select for a possible follow-up interview session with the researcher to provide a greater understanding and specific illustrations of teachers’ perspectives and opinions on methods of sheltered instruction specifically tailored to teaching language minority students.

Type of Data

The data produced was both quantitative and qualitative. The units of analysis provided descriptive data conveyed through direct quotations expressing personal opinions, feelings, experiences, and knowledge (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Patton, 1990,

2003) collected through closed and open ended short answer questionnaire/survey, follow-up focused interviews, and observations. Data collection, according to Merriam (1998) and Wolcott (1992), is about documenting common everyday language by watching, asking, and analyzing. Qualitative short answer/essay questions produce rich, thick, and descriptive data allowing for a greater depth of information with particular attention to detail, situations, nuances (Patton), presentation of samples, events, quotes, and artifacts, according to Merriam, through written responses by the subjects surveyed. The units of analysis provided the researcher with rich descriptive and rough data (Bogdan & Bilken) related to perceived preparation in regards to the teachers' own instruction in sheltered instruction methodology in service to ELLs. The questionnaire also gathered demographic data related to Missouri certified K-6, full-time public elementary school teachers with a final question seeking opportunities for personal interviews and further discussion of the questionnaire items if applicable. Additional qualitative data came from naturalistic researcher observations (Frankel & Wallen, 2003) and field notes of full-time teaching staff, pre-service teachers, and university teaching faculty which, according to Merriam, are analogous to interview transcriptions.

Timeline

The researcher began administering questionnaires/surveys August 2009. Data collection was completed February 2010, and data coding, transcription and analysis of data began March 2010. It was the desire of the researcher to complete data analysis by April 2009 and finalize Chapter Four: Data Presentation and Analysis and Chapter Five: Findings, Discussions, and Conclusions by May 2010.

Limitations of the Data

The researcher took into account the following limitations to the study. The limitations included: 1) the data of metropolitan mid-western urban, suburban, and rural school districts in one Midwestern state; 2) a modified survey/ questionnaire was used to determine full-time elementary school teacher (K-6 grade), self disclosure of ELL methodology preparation for academic success among ELLs; 3) results can only be generalized to a Midwestern state, school districts and their population size; 4) the data collected will be post-NCLB (2001) and the amendments to NCLB of 2007; 5) the interview participants were self-selected; and finally 6) possibility of researcher location, employment, cultural, and professional bias may exist must be taken into consideration.

Summary

This mix design quantitative/qualitative study will provide State Educational Agencies (SEAs) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), as well as teacher preparation programs, data related to reaching and teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) in their efforts to educate them to the highest academic standards as requested by NCLB (2001). Teaching ELLs the English language for proficiency cannot be the sole purpose of instruction, but rather teachers of ELLs must teach English language proficiency while challenging the students at the appropriate level for academic success, which is the current challenge for states and school districts today (Echevarria, 2006; Tornatzky, Pachon, & Torres, 2003; Zehr, 2007).

This researcher documented Missouri certified K-6 full-time teaching faculty perceptions in regards to their personal experiences with sheltered instruction methodologies and strategies for professional development or preparation in service to

ELLs. The data were collected through a questionnaire/survey, and personal focused interviews. Because there is an increasing demand for educators to understand issues related to second language learners and their inability to reach academic success in U.S. schools (Echevarria, 2006; Zehr, 2007), this mixed design survey study may be valuable to the enhancement of academic knowledge to the field of teacher education and professional development research for teachers of ELLs. According to Giambo and Szecsi (2006), a variety of trends exist in second language teaching that leaves many ELLs with purposeful and caring teachers who, unfortunately, have limited understanding of second language acquisition or cultural diversity issues that affect ELLs.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

The researcher, while on his journey to seek understanding about teacher knowledge, use, and preparation of English Language Methodology, encountered many socially, culturally, and economically diverse communities within several mid-central western counties in the State of Missouri. The communities and their populations were as diverse and complex as the U.S. landscape and provided the researcher with a depth of personal experiences and knowledge, providing insight into the professional lives of Missouri elementary teachers and the communities they serve. The humble nature of the Missouri elementary teachers' commitment to learning and improving overall academic achievement among their students provided a foundation for hope, caring, culturally competent, qualified professional teachers in the State of Missouri. Chapter Four presents the data collected from various unique communities throughout mid-central western Missouri.

The researcher officially received permission to begin data collection from the University of Missouri-Columbia campus Institutional Review Board in June 2009. The researcher began administering and collecting data from surveys/interviews August 2009. Data collection was completed February 2010, and data coding, transcription, and analysis began March 2010.

The population targeted for this research was all Missouri certified, K-6, fulltime, public school teachers. The accessible population was all Missouri certified, K-6, fulltime public school teachers within the urban, suburban, and rural public school districts around Kansas City, Missouri area. Participants for this research study came from a

representative sample group from 13 urban, suburban, and rural public schools, 6 public school districts, among four counties in the mid-central western region of the State of Missouri. The researcher surveyed 161 urban, suburban, and rural, Missouri certified, K-6, fulltime, public school teachers and conducted 11 purposefully selected follow-up interviews.

Validity of the Instrument

The researcher administered a Likert-type scale survey that asked questions based upon 30 items grouped into eight components of the SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol) for validity of instrumentation. The SIOP model is often used to evaluate teachers' knowledge of essential teaching techniques for making content comprehensible for ELLs (Echevarria et al., 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008). Content validity and appropriateness of the survey instrument and interview questions were evaluated by two Missouri certified ELL public school coordinators and one Missouri certified public elementary school ESL teacher. Content validity of survey instruments and interview questions provides adequacy of content and format appropriateness to the sample of subjects to be measured and content being addressed (Creswell, 2003; Frankel & Wallen, 2003; Merriam, 1998).

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability of an instrument allows for checking internal consistency of scores from one administration of the survey to another to make certain that inferences drawn by the researcher are based upon the data obtained through an instrument that is credible and appropriate (Creswell, 2003; Frankel & Wallen, 2003). Internal consistency was calculated using the Cronbach alpha coefficient. The Cronbach alpha coefficients for Q1-

Q30 were calculated to be .92, which is good overall. Creswell, and Frankel and Wallen, state that the reliability coefficient should be .70 or higher. Reliability of the instrument was also determined by administering the survey to a convenience sample of twenty-one, K-6, elementary pre-service teacher candidates in the summer of 2009. This reliability procedure was administered two times to the same convenience sample pre-service teacher candidates by the researcher to check instrument reliability. Changes to the instrument were made to ensure consistency and credibility of future data (See Appendix A).

The interview questions were conducted in a semi-structured manner. All interviews were digitally recorded with permission from the participants. A series of questions relevant to knowledge about sheltered English instruction was asked to elicit specific answers from the teachers who volunteered to be interviewed. All teachers who volunteered to be interviewed had previously completed the survey/questionnaire. Triangulation of the data allows the researcher to compare results and use the findings for validation and reliability of the instruments used to collect the data (Creswell, 2003; Frankel & Wallen, 2003; Merriam, 1998). Member-checking of the digitally recorded data (participants reviewed and made corrections to their transcribed data) and data collected from observational field notes made by the researcher were utilized for the purpose of triangulation (See Appendix B).

Before the research could begin, key school district officials, or gate-keepers, were contacted to receive permission to administer the surveys to the 161 respondents. All teachers were willing participants. School district officials provided liaisons and coordinators to arrange and organize the researcher's official school visits for survey

implementation. As soon as official dates were coordinated with the school principals, the researcher sent electronic copies of an invitation/flyer to participate in the research study. The flyer outlined the purpose of the research study, the name and contact information of the researcher, participant guidelines, date, time, duration, and location/room of the proposed research study administration. The flyer was either posted on school grounds or sent electronically to the faculty by the principal or liaison of the participating school district.

The researcher visited schools as coordinated and conducted the surveys in designated areas provided by school officials. While in the designated areas, the researcher would wait for teachers to arrive. Upon arrival, qualified teachers were asked to read, sign, and date, the survey consent form. Two copies of the survey consent form were given, one was signed, dated, and kept by the researcher, while the other copy was offered to the participants to keep for their records. If questions arose about the survey, the researcher answered the question as appropriately as possible. Upon completion of the consent form, the qualifying teacher completed the survey and turned in the survey to the researcher. Contact sheets were made available for those participants willing to be interviewed later by the researcher. There was a 100% completion rate of the surveys. One hundred sixty-one Missouri certified, K-6, fulltime public school teachers completed the survey, and 11 teachers who completed the survey volunteered for a follow-up, face to face, interview with the researcher.

Those teachers who volunteered to be interviewed were asked to provide the researcher with personal contact information so that arrangements could be made later for a follow-up interview. The researcher personally contacted 11 teachers via phone calls or

email to arrange meeting times for interviews. All interviews except one were conducted on school district grounds, specifically in the participant's classrooms. One interview was conducted off school grounds for convenience purposes, as requested by the participant. Interviews were begun early January 2010 and completed late February 2010. The participants were recorded with a digital voice recorder and recorded data were transcribed using a computer based transcription program.

Quantitative Data Presentation and Analysis

The representative sample of Missouri certified, K-6, public school teachers were selected from 13 urban, suburban, and rural public schools, representing 6 public school districts among four counties in the western mid-central region of the State of Missouri. There were 161 teachers who completed the survey of 30 questions related to sheltered instruction. The survey also asked basic demographic information and allowed for open-ended responses to be filled in as necessary by the participant.

Descriptive Statistics

Survey data were entered, coded, and analyzed using *SPSS* computer software. The average age of the participant was 37 years old. There were more females in the study than males, with 139 (85.8%) females, compared to 22 males (13.6%). The participants have taught an average of 11.5 years (*SD* 7.524) and ranged in teaching experience from one year to 37 years. There were 69 (42.9%) participants who were from metropolitan public school districts (urban and suburban), and 92 (57.1%) were from rural communities. When asked if the participants were bilingual or fluent in a second language, 148 (91.4 %) said that they were not bilingual, while only 14 (8.6%) said they were. Most bilingual participants stated that they were fluent in Spanish. Earned degrees

among the participants were as follows: 102 (63%) Master's degrees, 51 (31.5%) Bachelor's degrees; 6 (3.7%) Doctorate degrees; and 3 (1.9%) Juris Doctorate degrees. Most participants, 143 (91.1%), were Caucasian of European decent, non-Latino; there were 7 Latinos (4.5%); 2 American Indians (1.3%); 1 African American, non Latino (.6%); 1 international citizen (.6%); and 3 participants considered themselves to be Bi-ethnic (1.9%). There were no teachers who identified themselves ethnically as "Asian" in this study.

One hundred fifteen (71%) of 161 participants responded "yes" to having any knowledge about sheltered English language instruction strategies and techniques, while 47 (29%) participants responded "no." Of those participants who had any knowledge of sheltered instruction techniques, 64 (57.2%) participants said that they had been taught through district in-services and graduate courses, while 27 (23.7%) participants mentioned they had learned sheltered English language techniques as undergraduates. The remaining 23 (20.2%) participants noted they had either learned the skills on the job, sought advice from the ESL school building teacher, or had researched strategies on their own. More than half of the participants (57.4%) responded they *had not* taken a multicultural course during their undergraduate studies, while only 68 (42%) participants indicated they had. Of those 68 (42%) participants who had taken a multicultural course previously, most had taken their coursework within the last two decades, starting in 1990s to 2009. One hundred twenty teachers (74.5%) reported they had taught ELLs within the last five years, for an approximate total of 3,809 ELLs served.

The survey used a Lickert-type scale that addressed 30 questions related to pedagogical skills necessary for successful sheltered English instruction based upon the

SIOP model (Echevarria et al., 2006, 2008). The scale ranged from (1) “not like me,” (3) “somewhat like me,” to (5) “a lot like me.” The Lickert-type scale numbers (2) and (4) used on the survey addressed ranges in-between (1), (3), and (5). On average, the 161 participants rated themselves between “somewhat like me” (3) and “a lot like me” (5), for an average score of “4” (See Tables 1-8 and Appendix A).

Additional Comments

Participants were also allowed to give comments at the end of the survey. Many comments were both affirming of their experiences and training in sheltered English instruction to ELLs, while others mentioned concern. For example, one teacher stated: “I model my lessons according to research based techniques; these encourage direct and explicit teaching with a high level of student engagement. I am sure to assess student understand[ing] every few minutes.” Another teacher commented on her lack of training by saying:

For the last five years I have been working with special education students. Prior to that, I worked in grade 1st and 2nd [Sic]. I remember when the ELL program was introduced in our school district, but I never had any training in techniques and strategies that would have been beneficial to me or the students.

A few participants were concerned about their materials, resources, training, and the lack of personnel trained within their schools in sheltered English language techniques. A male teacher said, “I feel really good about my materials and resources to support my daily instruction. However, if I were to have an ELL student in my classroom, I don't feel I would have any resources to use.” Another commented, “I try, no aide, sometimes other students help,” while another teacher spoke specifically to the “lack of materials and people.”

Participants also mentioned having good experiences with their sheltered English instructional training and experiences with ELLs and their families. Those comments included: "SIOP really helped me understand the importance of concept and language objectives," and "I taught in Florida for 5 years. I had to take 32 hours of ELL classes to help my certification. In Missouri it would have been a Master's." A few participants believed that much of the curriculum they taught overly directed their teaching through pacing guides that were often mandated, reducing time needed to appropriately teach ELLs valuable concepts needed for academic achievement. One teacher mentioned that "Much of our curriculum is so scripted and forced [upon us] that we are less able to spend the time we need to make sure they get the concepts; it's the pacing guides from district."

Participants did speak to their willingness to improve their service to English Language Learners in their schools. One teacher said, "I am working to try to do a better job with my ESL students. I know that I need to work on the interaction piece. This is a goal for this year." A few teachers commented on how much Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) training in their district really helped them understand the importance of content and learning objectives with ELLs. One male teacher mentioned that "I did take a workshop in the SIOP Model and that was done, not at the university, but it was done through district in-services." Other teachers claimed to be former ESL students themselves and having had lived experiences while some had training in states that required sheltered English language instruction in service to ELLs. Finally, some teachers felt prepared to teach ELLs, but lacked the appropriate bilingual skills to communicate with parents in their first language.

Survey Responses Dealing With SIOP

Teachers were asked 30 questions related to the Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model of teacher observation protocol used to evaluate teachers on their knowledge and ability to effectively serve English Language Learners. The following data are responses to the themed grouping of questions on the survey (See Appendix A).

Teacher Preparation of Content Objectives

Questions 1-6 on the survey asked participants about the planning and preparation of content and language objectives and whether the objectives used were age appropriate and at the educational level of the student. The questions also referred to how often supplemental materials were used to make lessons more clear and meaningful to students. Additionally, these questions referred to grade level and linguistic adaptations, along with meaningful opportunities for students to engage in authentic English language practice using writing, reading, listening, and speaking skills.

Table 1. *Summary Statistics for Items Q1-Q6*

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q1	161	4.03	4.00	4	.881	4.00	5.00	3 1.9	3 1.9	33 20.4	70 43.2	53 32.7
Q2	157	3.51	4.00	4	1.175	3.00	4.00	13 8.3	15 9.6	42 26.8	53 33.8	34 21.7
Q3	161	4.58	5.00	5	.588	4.00	5.00	0 0	1 .6	5 3.1	55 34.2	100 62.1
Q4	161	4.33	4.00	4	.678	4.00	5.00	0 0	1 .6	16 9.9	73 45.3	71 43.8
Q5	160	4.23	4.00	5	.839	4.00	5.00	2 1.3	3 1.9	21 13.1	65 40.6	69 43.1
Q6	160	4.19	4.00	4	.765	4.00	5.00	0 0	3 1.9	25 15.4	70 43.2	62 38.3

Question 1 responses showed 43.2% of the participants believed they were (4), closer to “a lot like me” in clearly defining reviewing, and displaying content objectives in the classroom with a mean of 4.03. Question 2 results suggested that when defining, reviewing, and displaying the language objectives in the classroom, 33.8% of the participants believed they were (4) closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 3.51. Question 3 asked participants about their use of content objectives that were age appropriate and at the educational level of the student. A total of 62.1% of participants selected (5) “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.58. Question 4 asked if participants used supplementary materials to a high degree, making lessons clear and meaningful. Responses indicated 45.3% were (4) closer to “a lot like me” with a mean of 4.33. Question 5 related to making adaptations to content at all levels of student language

proficiency, 43.1% of participants said (5) “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.25. On Question 6, Participants were asked about their planning of activities that were meaningful and integrate concepts with language practice opportunities for reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking; 43.2% said that they were (4) closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.19.

Building Student’s Background Experiences

Questions in this section of the survey asked participants how they related content to students’ background experiences, links between past learning experiences and new concepts, and how teachers emphasized new vocabulary when teaching.

Table 2. Summary Statistics for Items Q7-Q9

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q7	161	3.98	4.00	4	.758	3.50	4.50	0 0	4 2.5	36 22.4	81 50.3	40 24.8
Q8	161	4.28	4.00	4	.726	4.00	5.00	0 0	3 1.9	17 10.6	73 45.3	68 42.2
Q9	161	4.39	5.00	5	.735	4.00	5.00	0 0	2 1.2	18 11.2	56 34.8	85 52.8

Question 7 asked participants how they used concepts explicitly linked to students’ background experiences, and 50.3% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 3.98. On Question 8, participants were asked if they made explicit links between past learning and new concepts when teaching; 45.3% said that they were (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.28. Question 9 results emphasized key vocabulary in classroom lessons. A total of 52.8% of the participants selected (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.39.

Comprehensible Input Geared toward Students

Question 10-12 of the survey asked how teachers use appropriate speech for English language proficiency, how clearly they explain academic tasks, and what techniques are used to make content clearer.

Table 3. Summary Statistics for Items Q10-Q12

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q10	160	4.12	4.00	4	.827	4.00	5.00	2 1.3	2 1.3	28 17.5	71 44.4	57 35.6
Q11	161	4.49	5.00	5	.582	4.00	5.00	0 0	0 0	7 4.3	68 42.2	86 53.1
Q12	161	4.65	5.00	5	.529	4.00	5.00	0 0	0 0	4 2.5	49 30.4	108 67.1

Question 10 asked participants about the appropriate use of speech for students' English language proficiency level, and 44.4% of the participants answered (4), closer to "a lot like me," with a mean of 4.12. Question 11 asked how clearly participants explained academic tasks. A total of 53.1% of the participants answered (5), "a lot like me," with a mean of 4.49. On Question 12, a total of 67.1% of the participants answered (5), "a lot like me," with a mean of 4.65, when asked whether they used a variety of techniques to make content concepts clearer to their students.

Teaching Strategies

Question 13-15 of the survey asked questions related to opportunities for student use of learning strategies, how often scaffolding techniques are used for student support and understanding, and how higher order thinking skills are used with questions or tasks in the classroom.

Table 4. *Summary Statistics for Items Q13-Q15*

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q13	161	4.37	4.00	4	.631	4.00	5.00	0 0	0 0	13 8.1	75 46.6	73 45.3
Q14	159	4.19	4.00	4	.799	4.00	5.00	1 .6	5 3.1	17 10.7	75 47.2	61 38.4
Q15	160	4.13	4.00	4	.791	4.00	5.00	2 1.3	2 1.3	23 14.4	80 50	53 33.1

Question 13 asked participants if they provided ample opportunities for students to use learning strategies. A total of 46.6% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.37. On Question 14, participants were asked whether they used scaffolding techniques consistently to assist and support students’ understanding. A total of 47.2% of the participants said (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.19. Question 15 asked participants if they used a variety of questions or tasks that promoted higher order thinking skills. A total of 50% answered, (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.13.

Teacher to Student Interaction

Questions 16-19 asked the participants about opportunities for interaction and discussion among students and between teacher and student, grouping configurations to support language and content objectives, whether sufficient wait time was given for responses, and whether opportunities were given to students to clarify key concepts in their first language with an aide, peer, or text in their first language.

Table 5. *Summary Statistics for Items Q16-Q19*

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q16	160	4.28	4.00	4	.752	4.00	5.00	0	2	17	70	69
								0	2.5	10.6	43.8	43.1
Q17	160	4.04	4.00	4	.893	3.00	5.00	3	2	36	63	56
								1.9	1.3	22.5	39.4	35
Q18	161	4.24	4.00	4	.703	4.00	5.00	0	0	25	73	63
								0	0	15.5	45.3	39.1
Q19	156	3.87	4.00	4	.969	3.00	5.00	3	13	27	71	42
								1.9	8.3	17.3	45.5	26.9

Question 16 asked participants whether they gave opportunities for interaction and discussion between students and the teacher for elaborated responses about lesson concepts, 43.8% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.28. Question 17 asked participants about grouping configurations to support language and content objectives of the lesson. A total of 39.4% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.04. Results for Question 18 were 45.3% , (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.24, when asked if participants gave sufficient wait time for student responses. On Question 19, participants were asked whether ample opportunities were given to students to clarify key concepts in their first language as needed with an aide, peer, or a text in their first language. A total of 45.5% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 3.87.

Practice and Application of Sheltered Strategies

The Practice and Application of Sheltered Strategies section of the survey (questions 20-22) asked about hands-on materials/and or manipulatives, activities to

apply content and language knowledge in the classroom, and the integration of language skills in all classroom activities.

Table 6. *Summary Statistics for Items Q20-Q22*

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q20	160	4.36	5.00	5	.748	4.00	5.00	0 0	3 1.9	17 10.6	59 36.9	81 50.6
Q21	159	4.33	4.00	4	.681	4.00	5.00	0 0	2 1.3	13 8.2	74 46.5	70 44
Q22	160	4.21	4.00	5	.804	4.00	5.00	0 0	4 2.5	26 16.3	62 38.3	68 42.5

Question 20 asked participants whether they provided hands-on activities or manipulatives for students to practice using new content knowledge. A total of 50.6% of the participants answered (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.36. On Question 21, participants were asked whether they used activities for students to apply content and language knowledge in the classroom. A total of 46.5% of the participants responded (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.33. Question 22 asked participants whether they integrated all language skills in the activities they used in class. A total of 42.5% of the respondents said (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.21.

Teacher Lesson Delivery

The Lesson Delivery section of the survey (questions 23-26) asked participants questions related to content and language objectives that support lesson plan delivery, student engagement percentages, and lesson delivery pacing related to student ability.

Table 7. *Summary Statistics for Items Q23-Q26*

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q23	160	4.48	5.00	5	.571	4.00	5.00	0 0	0 0	6 3.8	72 45	82 51.3
Q24	158	4.26	4.00	4	.792	4.00	5.00	2 1.3	2 1.3	16 10.1	71 44.9	67 42.2
Q25	160	4.13	4.00	4	.710	4.00	5.00	0 0	2 1.3	25 15.6	83 51.9	50 31.3
Q26	160	4.31	4.00	4	.682	4.00	5.00	0 0	3 1.9	11 6.9	80 50	66 41.3

Question 23 asked participants whether their content objectives were clearly supported by the lesson delivery, and 51.3% answered (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.48. On Question 24, participants were asked whether the language objectives were clearly supported by their lesson delivery. A total of 44.9% of the participants responded (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.26. Question 25 asked participants if they believed that the students were engaged at least 90-100% of the class period. A total of 51.9% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.13. Question 26 asked participants whether the pacing of their lessons were appropriate to the students’ ability level. A total of 50% of the participants said (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.31.

Review/Assessment

Questions 27-30 in this section of the survey asked participants about reviewing key vocabulary and concepts, whether the participants gave regular feedback to the

students, and how regular they assessed levels of comprehension and learning of lesson objectives.

Table 8. *Summary Statistics for Items Q27-Q30*

Item	N	M	Mdn	Mode	SD	Q1	Q3	Response				
								1	2	3	4	5
Q27	160	4.03	4.00	4	.816	4.00	5.00	1 .6	5 3.1	30 18.8	77 48.1	47 29.4
Q28	160	4.31	4.00	4	.684	4.00	5.00	0 0	4 2.5	8 5	82 53.1	66 41.3
Q29	162	4.36	4.00	5	.736	4.00	5.00	0 0	5 3.1	9 5.6	72 44.4	75 46.3
Q30	162	4.51	5.00	5	.603	4.00	5.00	0 0	1 .6	6 3.7	65 40.1	90 55.6

Question 27 asked participants if they provided comprehensive reviews of key vocabulary. A total of 48.1% of the participants answered (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.03. On Question 28, participants were asked whether they provided comprehensive reviews of key concepts. A total of 53.1% of the participants responded (4), closer to “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.31. Question 29 asked participants if they gave regular feedback to students as it related to their output. A total of 46.3% of the participants answered (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.36. Question 30 asked participants if they assessed students regularly for comprehension and learning of all lesson objectives. A total of 55.6% of the participants answered (5), “a lot like me,” with a mean of 4.51.

Qualitative Data Presentation and Analysis

Eleven teachers volunteered to participate in a face-to-face, follow-up interview with the researcher. All interview participants (IPs) had completed the in-school survey originally conducted by the researcher. The IPs provided the researcher with contact information for a possible interview upon completion of the survey. All IPs were informed that they would be recorded on a digital recording device and the researcher would be taking notes while the questions were being asked. Ten interviews were conducted on school grounds, specifically within the interviewee's classrooms, while one interview participants requested another venue and the researcher obliged. All interviews were recorded on a digital recording device and transcribed through a computer based transcription program. All IPs were given two blank interview consent forms, approved by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at University of Missouri-Columbia (MU-C), to sign and date before the interviews could proceed. Upon receiving the copy of the signed interview consent form, the second copy of the interview consent form was kept by the interview participant for their records. The interviews began early January 2010 and were completed late February 2010. Interviews averaged approximately 45 minutes in length.

Description of Interview Participants (IPs)

There were a total of 11 interview participants (IPs). Nine IPs were female, while two were males. All IPs were self selected and personal contact information was given to the researcher to schedule interviews. All IPs were Missouri certified, fulltime, elementary school teachers. Ten IPs were Caucasian of European decent and one was a Latino. Nine IPs were from metropolitan school districts (urban and suburban) while two were from rural school districts. Three IPs held Bachelor's degrees and eight had earned

Master's degrees. Two IPs were bilingual in French and Spanish. Three IPs were Missouri certified ESL teachers. The researcher assigned pseudonyms to the IPs to maintaining anonymity. There were two art teachers (Mr. Hernandez, 4 years of teaching experience, and Ms. Amelia, 11 years of teaching experience); two 1st grade classroom teachers (Ms. Katya, 2 years of teaching experience); one K-2 newcomer (new immigrant arrival) classroom teacher (Ms. Patricia, 21 years of teaching experience); two 3rd grade classroom teachers (Ms. Mendez, 10 years of teaching experience, and Ms. Grace, 17 years of teaching experience); one 4th grade classroom teacher (Ms. Mathews, 41 years of teaching experience); one sixth grade health and physical education classroom teacher (Ms. Carrion, 21 years of teaching experience); one 5th grade classroom teacher (Mr. Karnes, 15 years of teaching experience); and two 6th grade classroom teachers (Ms. Olvera, 13 years of teaching experience, and Ms. Alexander, 4 years of teaching experience).

Field Observations

The researcher visited 13 school building sites within 6 school districts. These schools were located within urban, suburban (metropolitan), and rural school districts. The researcher visited each school building at least once and made several visits to schools where the IPs requested an on-site interview. The researcher was always identified with a university assigned identification badge and visitor's pass/sticker. The researcher took detailed field notes of the school environment inside and out, and visited several classrooms. The researcher was allowed to walk through the hallways unassisted, and casual contact and communication with students, support staff, principals, faculty, and custodial staff did occur.

Field Notes/Observation Presentation

The researcher found the support staff very helpful and willing to assist the researcher upon arrival. All support staff were informed of the researcher's visit, and all building administrators were very helpful when tables or chairs were needed in conducting the surveys in the hallways when classroom space was not available. Only two buildings visited had any bilingual staff in the front office. Both schools had at least one Spanish speaking employee in the main office and only 3 buildings visited had bilingual signage of any kind. Those that did have bilingual signage were for Spanish speaking visitors only, welcoming and guiding them to the front office. One particular school informed me they served students who spoke 40 different languages and dialects and that the Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLC) represented 40 nations. All schools visited had at least one ethnic population represented and all had ESL certified staff available within their school district as needed. Half of the schools visited did have professional bilingual staff available within their school buildings.

The researcher found most of the school buildings to have been built between the 1950s and 2000. Most of the building that were at least 40 years old or older had new additions. The new additions included either new gymnasiums/cafeterias or new libraries/computer technology centers. All of the buildings and classrooms were kept clean and most were conducive to learning in the opinion of the researcher. Some classrooms had an abundance of word schemes, student work examples, and student generated posters, while others had walls that were minimally covered with any information. Very few classrooms visited had language objectives of the day posted. Most of the classrooms had mission statements and school values either posted in the

main hallways or within the front entrance of every classroom. No mission statement or school values poster was translated into any foreign language. Some school buildings included the nation's flags representing the international diversity that existed within the school building, while others prominently displayed patriotic themes of freedom and responsibility to the republic with murals of U.S. flags and eagles.

Qualitative Analysis Procedures

The researcher coded the interview participant's (IPs) responses using the open and axial coding method (Strauss and Corbin, 1998) of qualitative inquiry. The coding allowed the researcher to seek objectivity through thoroughness and academic rigor within the initial design of the qualitative procedures, data collection, and final analysis, concluding in theoretical generation based upon the interview responses (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003; Glasser, 2000; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002).

The researcher began analysis of qualitative data by first coding responses to the interview questions (See Appendix B). The researcher began microanalysis of each line within the interview participant's (IPs) responses to generate initial categories with properties and dimensions allowing for the development of relationships among categories (Patton, 2002). Open coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) of the data allowed the researcher to discover further properties and dimensions of the categories, while axial coding (Strauss & Corbin) was conducted to discover the relationships among the categories linking levels of categories with their dimensions and properties (Strauss & Corbin). Theoretical saturation was achieved as no new properties, dimensions, or relationships emerged during the researcher's analysis. Once the "theoretical saturation"

(Strauss & Corbin, p. 73) occurred the researcher began to code the frequency of connections each IP had to the categories discovered.

Qualitative Data Analysis and Presentation

The researcher discovered several main ideas based upon the interview participants' responses and the frequency of responses to those topics generated by the respondents. Nine major ideas were discovered from IP transcriptions. Those nine major ideas were coded into 65 individual categories using distinct color schemes to identify the major topics within the transcriptions. The nine major ideas discovered were as follows:

1) Responsibility towards Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs); 2) Professional growth/confidence in teaching skills; 3) Effective communication with DLCs; 4) Professional behavior and teaching skills; 5) Professional development opportunities; 6) ESL personnel availability; 7) Teacher dispositions towards DLCs; 8) Teacher/parent communication; and 9) The presence of ethnic and DLCs.

Responsibility Towards Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLC)

All 11 interview participants (IPs) felt personally responsible for the Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs) within their schools to some extent. The ESL certified teachers and those teachers who served ELL populations within classrooms, had the highest response for responsibility and accountability toward academic achievement of the ELLs. A few of the IPs mentioned that sometimes their schools showed a lack of support to the DLCs. Administration and district support seemed adequate for DLCs and a few IPs mentioned that their school districts did provide opportunities of school and DLC engagement. Still a few IPs spoke of an existence of stress factors because of ELLs in their classrooms/schools and that some administrations were not prepared to engage

with DLCs and their academic achievement. It was mentioned on a few occasions that bilingual children were sometime used as translators for ELLs within classrooms by the teaching staff when no bilingual paraprofessionals were present or available within the schools. For example: Mr. Karnes, a 5th grade metropolitan classroom teacher, had a positive response to serving English Language Learners.

... the reality is that the teachers really are changing, because, out of necessity sometimes. And they are willing to learn. There's really nobody here, who's like 'I can't do it,' 'I don't want to do it,' 'don't show me,' they all want to know [how to teach to ELLs]. And if they [teachers] have an issue, they're not intimidated or worried about asking what to do. And whether it's knowledge of that culture or how to teach a specific lesson to make it more engaging or more interactive, they don't hesitate.

In contrast, Ms. Grace, a suburban, 3rd grade, ESL certified teacher, experienced a lack of support for teachers in schools serving ELLs.

A lot of our classroom teachers here don't know how to modify lessons and there's no way I can spend the amount of time it would take with each teacher to help them modify every lesson. And we say we need to have high expectations, and we do, but I've also seen kids [ELLs] get an "F" on a Social Studies test because they [ELLs] don't understand English. Not because they [ELLs] don't understand Social Studies.

Ms. Grace continued by discussing her own frustration with the lack of support in serving ELLs in her school building.

We've talked about doing a push-in program here, excepting I have so many students. I have more students than would fill a kindergarten class and we don't have enough teachers. If you're doing that kind of pushing, you need to be there for all the important academic things, you know, and I can't be in five grades...

While Ms. Alexander, a rural, 6th grade teacher, discussed her displeasure with the district's communication in regards to training and service to ELLs.

They [the district] have not been present[ing] on ELL services. It seems to me [the]district's focus [is] on one thing. Our district is focused on DI, differentiated instruction. That's their big idea right now... We've never

had professional development, to this day, that talks about the content delivery, like how we're supposed to deliver what we're teaching to ELL students...

Ms. Amelia, a metropolitan, K-6, Art Teacher, talked about using children as translators in class.

One thing that I don't do, that a lot of the times the classroom teachers do...sometimes when [they] have a new kid come in, they'll say: 'Make sure they sit next to so and so, so they can translate for them.' And I purposefully don't do that because then I find that the ELL kid does not pay attention to me. All [of] their focus goes to the that one kid that translates, but it's good to know if there's another kid that does speak their language, so if I do occasionally have something that I want to explain then I can go to a resource, but I do not like to have them translating everything.

Professional Growth/Confidence in Teaching Skills

Overall, all teachers interviewed felt very confident in their own teaching skills and mentioned a willingness to seek new knowledge for personal professional growth. Three interview participants (IPs) were very confident with sheltered instructional techniques while three had no confidence with sheltered instructional techniques, even after having some knowledge of sheltered instructional techniques. Six IPs mentioned never having any knowledge or training in sheltered instruction techniques either during their undergraduate or graduate programs. Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, bilingual, K-6, Art Teacher, mentioned confidence in some of his good teaching techniques.

...[A teacher] has clear objectives and goals from the teacher posted in the classroom...rules and regulations posted, clearly seen. [one needs to be] a teacher that is not stagnant, moves around the classroom...scaffolding... modeling. A teacher that learns from—that does constant assessments, be it formal or informal.

Ms. Katya, a metropolitan 1st grade teacher, also referred to her own personal knowledge of good teaching skills.

...to me good teaching is when you are, you hook 'em, you get them

involved. I try to do things hands-on like in math if we can use manipulatives, I would much rather do that than lecture... reading is probably my favorite thing to teach and so I definitely like to immerse them in, in words. We have charts that we refer to like up here this is what they do during reading, umm, so I like to keep charts up on the wall.

Still, Ms. Alexander, a rural 6th grade teacher, echoed her experiences with good teaching skills.

I've learned that there is pride within every community and that you have to learn to appreciate the differences among people and not judge them for being different, but appreciate them for being different. So I really try to imply that to my class during social studies that you may think in your mind that we are totally different from everybody else when we're talking, but when you see the similarities between the different religions and the different ethnic groups, there's really not that much difference and I kind of try and open that up.

Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2, teacher, spoke to her experiences in using good teaching techniques after 21 years of experience.

I think good teaching is—has to be hands-on. You need to get away from the worksheets and the workbooks and get into the hands-on, the...using the manipulatives and the realias and the toys and letting the kids experience and learn on their own, with guidance from the teacher.

Finally, Ms. Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade, teacher expressed her feeling about good teaching skills and her personal experiences.

I don't think there's any one description that could possibly fit...I think I'm a good teacher. I draw a lot on my Montessori background because it's exactly what's perfect for teaching ELLs, which is using a lot of real things and hands-on activities and if you don't have real things...at least pictures that go along with what you're talking about so that the ideas are not abstract. Good teaching is individualized and I wish I could do even more of that, although I do some.

Readiness to Teach English Language Learners (ELLs)

The researcher asked questions about sheltered instruction strategies and interview participant's (IPs) preparation in regards to the ELL techniques. The IPs responses were varied. For example, Question 4 asked "*How prepared do you feel to*

teach ELLs in your classroom?” Ms. Olvera, a rural, 6th grade, Social Studies teacher gave her honest opinion when she said, “I don’t feel prepared at all...I mean we, we haven’t had any, you know like in-service days or anything on...on what, what we should do.” Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade, 41 year veteran teacher, did not know about sheltered instruction, but was willing to give it try when she said, “I think if I were to take responsibility for designing and implementing my own program, I think I could pull it off...fine and dandy...” While Ms. Katya, a metropolitan, 1st grade teacher from the same school district also echoed her lack of preparation in sheltered instruction methodology in service to ELLs when she commented, “I am not prepared to teach ELLs. I mean [I] wouldn’t know, I would definitely look it up on the internet if that were to happen, but I am not prepared...No, it sounds really bad though...I’m not prepared to teach an ELL student at all.”

There were some teachers who expressed their comfort like Mr. Karnes, a metropolitan, ESL certified, 5th grade teacher. He said, “I’m very prepared. I have ten years of experience in California before coming here...I had three years in Japan teaching in Japanese public high schools. So, it, it was no, no issue for me.” Ms. Amelia, a metropolitan, K-6, Art teacher also mentioned her comfort in serving ELLs. She said,

Well, when they first came 6 years ago I was clueless, and I really was not sure what to do at all, but after having so many of them for so long, I feel really comfortable with [them]...in fact, they [ELL students] are some of my best students in a lot of cases.

Finally, Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher, echoed her confidence in serving ELLs when she commented, “Well, right now I’m fairly comfortable. I have resources to help, there are two ELL students, I do have limited Spanish, but I’m trying to get better.”

Knowledge of Sheltered Instruction Techniques

During the interviews, interview participants (IPs) were asked whether they could describe what sheltered instruction techniques were and how they can be used for teaching language and content to ELLs. Ms. Carrion, a rural, K-6, health/PE, teacher frankly said, “No. (laughs)... You know, I don’t. I can’t... I don’t know.” While Ms. Alexander, a rural, 6th grade teacher, responded rhetorically by saying, “What sheltered instruction techniques are and how they are used for teaching? I have no idea, I’ve never even heard of it.” Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade teacher commented on her knowledge about sheltered instruction by saying, “Not even a clue.”

There were interview participants who did know what sheltered instructional techniques were and demonstrated their knowledge through their own schemata. Ms. Hernandez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher, gave her interpretation of sheltered instructional techniques.

I use a lot of visual aids. If I don’t have an actual object, I’ll go on the computer and put it up, so that they can physically see what it looks like or I’ll have posters. I use a lot of visual aids. I talk slower... which, for me, is hard. And I found that, of course you need to repeat, repeat, repeat, but I find that that is really good for every student. Because the more you repeat, the better [the ELLs learn]. I do a lot of demonstrations. I pause a lot more frequently to make sure that all the students understand, and if they don’t I will recap.

Finally, Ms. Grace, an ESL certified, suburban, 3rd grade teacher, mentioned her experience with sheltered instructional techniques for the ELLs she serves.

My understanding is that the class is only ELLs, so that you don’t have mainstream Americans and you don’t modify the content, but you modify the language load of it. You use always the same words, you use a lot of realia and pictures and stuff and examples and playacting and all of the things that I do, all of the things that good teachers could do anyhow.

Effective Communication with Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs)

Six interview participants (IPs) specifically spoke to their lack of bilingual skills, and challenges in communicating with the DLCs. Four respondents mentioned their bilingual ability or to at least making attempts in seeking understanding and making personal connections with the limited bilingual skills that they possessed. Three of the IPs considered themselves to be bilingual, two in Spanish, and one in French. Many teachers mentioned the extent of their bilingual abilities. Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2 teacher said, “Not with spoken language, but I am fluent in sign language.” While Ms. Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade teacher mentioned how she was sought out for knowledge of Spanish. “...the principal knew that I spoke Spanish and asked, you know, she told me, she’d like to put her [a Spanish speaking student] in my class because she thought I’d be able to help her out.” Still, Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, K-6, Art teacher spoke to the tremendous responsibility he had in being a bilingual professional in the building. “*I am* the only bilingual teacher [in the building].” Some teachers spoke to their lack of bilingual skills. Ms. Carrion, a rural, K-6, Health/Physical Education teacher, said, “I am not bilingual. I wish I was...I’ve used English all my life and I don’t do too well at it, so...” While Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher mentioned her life as a former bilingual child and how she lost her bilingual ability over time. She said, “I was born bilingual. However, as I...I lived the first seven and a half years in Panama, as I came to the United States I spoke less and less, but I’m beginning to relearn it. I did take Spanish in high school and college.” Finally, when the researcher asked Ms. Katya, a metropolitan, 1st grade teacher “Are you bilingual?” She simply said, “No, not at all.”

Teacher Attempts to Communicate with Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs)

Some teachers made real attempts to communicate with the DLCs, such as Ms.

Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade teacher. She said,

I am hesitant to exit kids completely from the program in elementary school because so much seems to be riding on MAP scores and if we exit the kids then they're no longer counted as ELLs... Well, I have kids that I see once a week and I've been calling them my 'monitor kids' ... Because I don't want them out of my clutches, I want to be able to count them as having been ELLs who have made progress and are doing really well. I don't want them to get erased as soon as they pass; they become part of the anonymous masses.

Ms. Grace continued by saying, "They know me, they love me, I love them. I have a lot of books in Spanish... I encourage the parents who can to read to the kids in Spanish because that counts as reading." Mr. Karnes, a metropolitan, ESL certified, 5th grade teacher mentioned his experiences as a foreigner himself and his connections to DLCs.

He said,

I've been the foreigner..so I know how tough it can be... we all have a lot of different experiences and you know this is what we like, that international, [feeling], and try and bring that and make that available to the other teachers. And trying to let them know that they don't have to be scared of that [the differences among each other].

Finally, Mr. Karnes spoke to the course he teaches to other professionals. He said, "I teach a professional and growth course for teachers [in the district]. And so there are a lot of neighborhood schools that are very uncomfortable have immigrants in there. And so I took them to the Westside Community Action Network (CAN) Center and gave them a real experience..."

Teacher Challenges with Communication with Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLC)

Some teachers have made attempts to communicate with DLCs. Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, K-6, Art teacher said, "I do ask my Vietnamese students how one would

say this in a particular [the Vietnamese] language. Yeah, I would ask: how to say this or how to write [something]. However, it being in my lesson plan? No.” Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2 teacher demonstrated her willingness to try to communicate with DLCs and her frustration with other teachers who do not, when she said,

I get teachers [who] come in all the time: “What do I do?” “How do I handle...?” “Can you take care of...?” Yeah, sometimes they think I have a magic wand. I have to tell them: “I don’t know Burmese either!” “I don’t know how to get this across either, but I’ll try!”

Additionally, Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher also said, “...if I have a problem [with the student homework binder] I’ll write one of these [notes] here and they’ll look at this and so they’ll contact me. And if they call and I need a translator then I have one of the ELL teachers help with that.”

Professional Behavior and Teaching Skills

The teachers all spoke to possessing basic knowledge of effective teaching strategies or good teaching skills, and demonstrated a deep commitment to professionalism within the field of education. Accountability and collegiality was a strong characteristic for the interview participants (IPs), although a couple of teachers mentioned having a fear of how to teach to ELLs upon their arrival to teacher’s classrooms. Seven IPs projected a strong commitment to the academic achievement of all ethnic students, and likewise spoke to having good communication with their students in general. Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher mentioned her commitment to teaching strategies and professionalism in the field. She said,

...also I do a lot of the Kagan structures, I went to a five day Kagan conference, so, I use them daily and they love the structures. So,

they're very good about going to a reading buddy... [good teaching] is individualized, it's student-driven—students have input into the learning. I believe in whole groups, small groups and individual instruction. With the ELL population, or actually any population, sometimes you have to give alternate assignments.

Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2 teacher mentioned one of her teaching strategies when she said,

I've got flash cards and we're going to match up the toy foods with the flash cards. I have this one set that's got the food in 14 different languages, the only one that's common to my students is Spanish, but they get a kick out of listening to me try to pronounce them.

And she continued by mentioning that,

Kids like the hands-on, but they're also more talkative when they are working on their art project that I'm trying to get out of them... They're more talkative. They're interacting more with their peers.

Two teachers mentioned a desire to seek information if and when an ELL student would arrive to their classroom. Ms Katya, a metropolitan, 1st grade teacher said,

[ELL strategy improvement] I haven't, but that's because I haven't had one [an ELL] in my classroom. However, if I had one I would definitely look up on the internet or do some research, I don't, but I haven't had that yet. So, I haven't done it.

And Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade teacher mentioned her commitment to ELLs, when she said, "I'd probably derive a lot of satisfaction in seeing those children who are English as a Second Language learners grow and develop... I think if I were given some kind of a grassroots foundation, I would take it and I would run with it." Still a few teachers mentioned a strong commitment to ELLs academic success in service to other teachers and reaching ELLs. Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2 teacher said,

I'm one of the master trainers in that Project Excel and I know that they're changing the syllabi and making that more ELL friendly. But I think even within the elementary school, like when I did my presentation, I had two or three teachers come up to me and say: "I never knew that," "That's so nice

to know,” “That’s so nice to hear,” “I didn’t know we could do that,”
“That was really beneficial...”

Ms. Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade teacher spoke to her training as an ESL teacher. She said,

I actually made...made up an entire lesson plan thing for that class that I still use sometimes. It was about habitats and I start with a Sesame Street video about we are all earthlings. So, the strategies I learned from [her ESL graduate] class, I learned from doing, I learned from my Montessori training, I learned from raising four kids...And if I try something and it works, I try and remember and do it again.

Finally, Mr. Karnes, a metropolitan, ESL certified, 5th grade teacher spoke to his willingness to do whatever is needed to get done to reach and teach the ELLs. Mr. Karnes mentioned,

I’ve figured [it] out, I’ve got the confidence and now I have been doing it [teaching] long enough, I’ve been doing it in enough different places, I don’t care if anybody thinks I’m crazy. So the kids know I am. I have to teach with my door closed most of the time because when we are reading speeches, I’m waving my arms around and hoppin’ on the table... And with the “new comers” [immigrants] that are doing prepositions, like “in,” and “on,” and “under,” I am in a box... I am under a table, I am on the table... how many teachers do you think any kid has ever seen a person standing on the table. Well, they know “on” now.

Professional Development Opportunities

Five interview participants (IPs) mentioned a lack of opportunities or support for teachers from professional learning communities, where they could support each other in seeking advice in serving ELLs. Only three IPs mentioned that professional learning communities existed in their schools at all. Eight IPs mentioned the availability of professional development opportunities in general, while nine IPs spoke to having no or limited opportunities in sheltered instruction. Nine IPs said that no sheltered instructional training has ever been required of them by either their administration or school district.

Six IPs mentioned encountering limited knowledge or complete ignorance of sheltered instructional techniques among the faculty. Only two IPs mentioned ever encountering any sheltered instructional training opportunities afforded to them. Ms. Alexander, a rural, 6th grade teacher, mentioned having no support for professional learning opportunities in ELL strategies. She said, “They [the district] have not required us to get any training, but I haven’t seen that there’s been an influx of ELL students that has overwhelmed our actual classrooms so far, at my level...” The researcher’s response to her comment was: “So the district doesn’t see the need right now to require anyone or all of the teachers to get any ELL methods training?” She replied, “That’s what I see.” Mr. Karnes, a metropolitan, ESL certified, 5th grade teacher spoke to a minimal effort by the district in providing training in ELL methods. He said,

...But here at school one of the other ELL instructors has actually done a professional development at one of the morning meetings. You know, thirty minute,...short little thing, little thing, but you know, every little bit of that helps.

While Ms. Katya, a metropolitan, 1st grade teacher spoke to the lack of support when serving ELLs in her school district. She mentioned,

We have not had any professional development with ELLs in the district. We have a reading coach, we have science and math coaches, but, I would go to them and see if they know anything about ELLs [sic]? Then I’m not even sure if they do... I’m not aware that they have strategies for ELL students.

Ms. Carrion, a rural, K-6, Health/Physical Education teacher echoed her concerns about not having any in-services or guidance related to sheltered instruction techniques when she said, “We haven’t had any, you know like in-service days or anything on [sheltered instruction]... on what we should do... I don’t know, I mean, no one has ever said what we’re suppose to do.” Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, K-6, Art teacher also mentioned

experiencing a minimal effort to prepare teachers in sheltered instruction techniques by his school district. He said, “It [the sheltered instruction in-service] was a two-day course and I have some resources; a couple of books. Also, we have an ELL specialist coming into our school now.” Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade teacher clearly stated, “I have never heard ‘ELL’ mentioned in the last, whatever, how many years in my professional setting... never one time.” Ms. Alexander, a rural, 6th grade teacher spoke to her exposure to sheltered instruction from her mother-in-law. She commented,

The only place that I would have learned them is from my mother-in-law who teaches ELL. She’s a retired teacher, she taught for 35 years and now she’s doing part-time ELL with a metropolitan school district. She’s given me some clues, but I haven’t had that many ELL students in my career so far. At my previous university I had two diversity classes, but didn’t really talk about methods too much. And in my masters I know for sure we didn’t talk about methods.

Some teachers spoke to some ELL support among learning communities. Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, K-6 Art teacher mentioned, “Opportunities are always there for professional development if there is something that you sought out..., yeah, as far as it being, mandatory? No.” Ms. Amelia, another metropolitan, K-6 Art teacher spoke to her better understanding of sheltered instruction from a brief in-service. She said,

We had one staff development day that somebody came and demonstrated and the thing that stood out is they showed a video of, it was in a different language of somebody that just got up and talked. And then they showed a better way to do it where they had the visuals and examples and it was amazing how much more you understood it.

Finally, Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher spoke to her positive experiences with the building ELL instructor. She said,

Our ELL teacher, Ms. Watkins (a pseudonym), does do some tests to help determine their proficiency in speaking, writing and reading and she does share them with us. But, that does not give me all the data I need, so, I also

have them read to me and discuss books and just carry on a conversation to hear their fluency. Once I've determined their level of fluency then it is my job as a teacher to try to teach them where they are and to bring them up to grade level.

ESL Personnel Availability

Eight interview participants (IPs) addressed the availability of ESL personnel in their school buildings. Seven IPs mentioned having ESL instructional coaches available to them at all times. Five IPs had school sites that provided ESL pull-out programming and five IPs mentioned having bilingual paraprofessionals on staff. Two IPs said that they had no idea if the building instructional coach even knew anything about sheltered instructional strategies and the same two teachers mentioned not having anyone on staff who was ESL certified. Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, K-6 Art teacher spoke to the limited availability of ELL assistance in his school building. He said, "...[we had] no [ELL] coaches. We've had [a] new [ELL specialist], since the initial two-day in-service, I mean it's a step in the right direction having this ELL specialist come in and give more ideas, or more guidance to teachers." Ms. Olvera, a rural, 6th grade Social Studies teacher mentioned seeking translating assistance when needed from the ESL coordinator. She said, "And I've talked to her [the ELL coordinator] some, but mainly I ask her (*laughs*) to help me with my class because she speaks Spanish and French." While Ms. Alexander, another rural, 6th grade teacher mentioned positive experiences with the ESL coordinator. She commented,

I think it's in district [ELL support], from building to building. So, we do have one [ELL coach]. We do, we have a resource team. Every month we, not just for ELL, it's for any student who is struggling. And if I couldn't provide for them in my classroom and felt like they were falling below, then I would recommend them to this Student Assistant Team and then they would do some research and come up with some other ideas as a team to brainstorm what I could implement to help.

Ms. Amelia, a metropolitan, K-6 Art teacher spoke to the limited exposure to sheltered instruction when she said, “I remember that we had one [an in-service] once this year where one of our ELL teachers just like thirty minutes...on the staff meeting floor, went over a few things.” Ms. Katya, a metropolitan, 1st grade teacher expressed an ELL scenario in her building. She said, “There is another teacher here that has a student that is bilingual...and they think reading is becoming an issue, but I don’t think that teacher has been given any strategies on or what to do...” The researcher’s response was: “No help?” And she said “No help really.”

Three IPs mentioned their own responsibilities as ESL teachers in the building.

Mr. Karnes, a metropolitan, ESL certified, 5th grade teacher said,

I am one of the four ELL instructors. I do a lot of different things. Also the ELL teachers are resources for the regular classroom teachers. If they have a question about what to do with something, we can help them with a particular issue. We tend to be the ones to know everything about every culture, whether we do or not. Just because we’re the ELL teacher, so if you don’t know you do a little research and you find out. And I think that’s why it’s not necessary to have that background, but it doesn’t hurt. And I’ve been all over the world so I’ve had it, had those experiences, everywhere. And, so, I’m familiar with what it’s like to have to be in the new place and make those transitions...

While Ms. Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade teacher said, “I...organize, run, I am *the* ESL teacher here at the school. I set my own schedule. I am expected to work with all of the ESL students that qualify.” Finally, Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2 teacher, commented,

I teach kindergarten, 1st and 2nd grade, English as a second language. In the morning, I have a big block of kids for three hours of newcomers and then in the afternoon, I push in to 1st grade and kindergarten math classes to help with the math classes. And then, I pull my kindergarteners back out and work with them for another thirty minutes on their language and reading.

Teacher Dispositions Towards Diverse Learning Communities (DLCs)

Most of the interview participants (IPs) held an open mind and were flexible toward learning new ideas as they related toward sheltered instructional strategies. All of the IPs displayed attitudes of respect toward DLCs and ethnic groups within their school districts. All of the IPs displayed a genuine attitude of caring or concern for students. Three IPs mentioned having significant contact outside of school with DLCs and seven IPs demonstrated some interest in learning about diverse communities/cultures in general. All IPs made mention of a commitment to self improvement in teaching and reaching DLCs.

Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher, held positive dispositions toward DLCs and ethnic communities. She said, "...and I've lived in Thailand and Malaysia and Jordan and other places, so, I...I have been the foreigner. The one who looks different, the one that doesn't speak the language...I can empathize greatly with the students." Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade teacher expressed concern towards DLCs when she said, "I'd probably derive a lot of satisfaction in seeing those children who are English second language learners grow and develop. So, I could do that. I'm amazed and somewhat disappointed though, that that's not an expectation in terms of my employment." Ms. Patricia, a metropolitan, ESL certified, K-2 teacher also empathized with DLCs as a second language learner herself. She said,

I taught overseas for 3 years too, so that makes a big difference. I, myself, was a second language learner. Although, I didn't come near learning the language, let alone mastering it. But I know what it's like to have to go out and navigate in a language.

And Mr. Karnes, a metropolitan, ESL certified, 5th grade teacher also connected with DLCs when he said,

I've been the foreigner. Yes, in places where now...the...going to buy a jar of peanut butter, you might end up with something you might not want to put in your mouth. It looked like peanut butter but wasn't something you wanted to eat. So I know how tough it can be. One of our, one of the ELL teachers is from another country, so she knows what that's like, and then the second teacher has been, extensively abroad and she's been doing TESOL teaching all over the world.

Finally, Mr. Karnes continued with positive experiences with teachers wanting to connect with DLCs when he mentioned,

And, and the reality is that the teachers really are changing, because, out of necessity sometimes. And they are willing to learn. There's really nobody here, yes, there's nobody here who's like "I can't do it," "I don't want to do it," "don't show me," they all want to know. And if they have an issue, they're not intimidated or worried about asking what to do. And whether it's knowledge of that culture or how to teach a specific lesson to make it more engaging or more interactive, they, they don't hesitate.

Teacher/Parent Communication

Only four interview participants (IPs) mentioned having any contact or communication sent home or received to or from the DLCs or parents in general. The four teachers who did have contact were the ESL certified teachers and one monolingual teacher who made an effort to get to know the Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs). Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher, demonstrated her efforts communicating with Diverse Linguistic Communities when she mentioned,

If I have a problem I'll write one of these here [notes] and they'll look at this and so they'll contact me. And if they call and I need a translator then I have one of the ELL teachers help with that... And any note that we send home, such as our newsletter or anything that has to do with any note, we have it translated. And on one side would be the English version and on the other side is the Spanish version.

Ms. Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade teacher also mentioned her own efforts in communicating with DLCs. She said,

I wish I could do, even an after school class or something, to teach my kids to read in Spanish. Some of the parents would really like to have that, a lot of our parents are illiterate completely and they would love for their kids to be able to read Spanish...[I encourage] parents to take home books with tapes so that they can listen to it together. If the parent can't read, well you can listen together and look at the pictures and listen to the story and connect that way over a story.

To the contrary, Ms. Carrion, a rural, Health/Physical Education teacher, was glad that her ELLs were “bilingual enough” to assist their parents with any communication sent home. She said,

A lot of times some of the challenges have been not with their understanding, but if you give them a project or give them a homework, giving that understanding to their parents. And that can be difficult because trying to get their parents to understand what you need from their child, can be difficult. But, fortunately, like I said, they've [ELLs] been pretty proficient so they can deliver that information to their parent pretty well.

Finally, Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade teacher mentioned her ignorance of Latino culture, literature, or just about anything that could relate to a Latino child in her class if she ever had one. She said,

Honestly, as far as Hispanic authors and literature, I don't know anything about it. I don't know anything about it, I really don't. I couldn't tell you the name of a children's literature author, I don't know...about my extended exposure to Hispanic, culture, traditions, let me show you how limited it is... very limited. Ah, as far as having visited a home, Hispanic...is that [the] right name or do I say “Mexican?”

The Presence of Ethnic and Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs)

All interview participants (IPs) mentioned having an ethnic community present within their school district, nine IPs spoke to serving at least one ELL in their classroom currently or in the past, and nine IPs said that they knew that there were ELLs in the building or school district. Two IPs had no idea if any ELLs were in the school building let alone in the school district, while another IP mentioned knowing that ELLs existed in

the district, and knew of a DLC center that served ELLs within the district. Ms. Carrion, a suburban, K-6 Health/Physical Education teacher confirmed DLC growth in her own neighborhood. She said,

I have several every year who are in the ELL program. So, I know that it is growing and, and through the community I can see it because I do live in the community, I see a growth in the community. So, I know that it will keep increasing... And Spanish-speaking or bilingual students are probably very low percent. But, we've seen an increase over the years and I know that we will be increasing.

She continued as she reflected upon her first encounter with an ELL. She said, "The first time that I had an ELL student, the first year that we had one, I could remember it very clearly. They couldn't understand any English at all." Ms. Mathews, a metropolitan, 4th grade teacher was not clear as to an ELL population in her school. She mentioned,

Well, having been here for five years, uh, I have not noticed a significant change in [ELL] numbers. I, honestly, I don't know the percentages of the different ethnic groups in my school. It's predominantly African-American, I would say second to that, I think would be European American, but I'm not sure because we do have some Hispanic children, beyond that other ethnicities I'm not sure about...So, I've really seen very little change in the five years that I've been here.

But Ms. Mathews did finally meet her first Latino student and seemed to be impressed with the academic skills he already possessed. She said,

I think my friend [a student] Carlos Armendariz (a pseudonym) came right after Christmas. He's my first Hispanic child, and frankly I have not done anything with Carlos being an English language learner. I don't know too much yet about his background, he's a sharp student, he has excellent language skills, written and verbal.

Ms. Alexander, a rural, 6th grade teacher mentioned, "We are majority white. We have about 15% African American and then maybe 2% Latino population. And I am not even

sure if we have any ELL students. I know that sixth grade does not at this time.” And Ms. Katya, a metropolitan, 1st grade teacher knew that ELLs did exist in the district somewhere. She said, “...actually I know the district has ELL classes, but they’re offered, I think, at two other elementary schools...[that] is where they do ELL stuff.”

Mr. Hernandez, a metropolitan, K-6 Art teacher talked of great diversity in his building. He said, “We have about 215, I would say, students. [We have a] very diverse, very eclectic group of students. We have students from Ethiopia, Vietnam, Mexico, Somalia, we have Haitian students. [We have a] very diverse group.” Ms. Grace, a suburban, ESL certified, 3rd grade teacher echoed the growth in her own school district after she reviewed her own district data before the researcher arrived to interview her. She said,

I started to go back through data that I had and what I could find quickly this afternoon, is a list of the students who took the English proficiency test in 2003 compared with the number of kids that I’m preparing to get the materials for in 2010. In 2003, we gave the test to 94 students and this year we’ll be giving it to 143, plus however many at the high school, I don’t have that number yet. So, probably around 150.

The researcher responded to her comment: “So, there has been a significant growth?”

Ms. Grace said, “An enormous growth.” Both Mr. Karnes and Ms. Patricia, metropolitan, ESL certified teachers spoke to the sometimes overwhelming DLC in their schools. Mr. Karnes said,

I don’t know a whole lot of the details because I have only been in the district slightly over a year, about a year and a half. This school in particular, last year we had an influx of approximately sixty Burmese refugees and so that within a year time frame, we doubled our ELL population. And that come in three waves, the first wave was October, the second was about Christmas and then the third was about Spring Break. And they actually came as a result of the meat packing plants in St. Joe... This school has always had one of the higher ELL populations...But within the last two years it has doubled in the overall district. We had an ELL meeting yesterday and we said there are a thousand

ELL students that are receiving a concentrated service not monitoring and they have exited six hundred in the last five years.

Ms. Patricia added,

Our numbers have probably doubled in the last 10 years. We're up to over a thousand in our district at this point and the number continues to grow each year. We're expecting, with the unfortunate earthquake in Haiti, we're expecting potential new growth with Haitian refugees coming to our school. Coming to our district, not necessarily this school, but to the district. So, it continues to grow every year.

And finally, Ms. Mendez, a suburban, 3rd grade teacher answered my question about the growth of DLCs in her school district. She affirmed,

Yes. It has ballooned. This is our...we had an ELL population before 3 years ago, that was only at one school, and it started out with very few and gradually when it got...when it was over, I want to say a hundred students, they started having...splitting the schools. And so, now we have two schools that have ELL populations and I want to say our population is... 86 students or something like that... And prior to that, this is my tenth year teaching, I did not—I did have Hispanics in my classroom, but they spoke English fluently and it was never a problem... I have never had an ELL student in my classroom until three years ago.

Summary

The researcher discovered a greater understanding about teacher knowledge, use, and preparation of English Language Methodology, and encountered many socially, culturally, and economically diverse communities within several mid-central western counties in the State of Missouri. The communities and their populations were as diverse and complex as the U.S. landscape and provided the researcher with a depth of personal experiences and knowledge, providing insight in to the professional lives of Missouri elementary teachers and the communities they serve. The humble nature of the Missouri elementary teacher's commitment to learning and improving overall academic achievement among their students provided a foundation for hope, caring, culturally

competent, qualified professional teachers in the State of Missouri. Chapter Four presented data collected from various unique communities throughout mid-central western Missouri. Missouri elementary certified teachers have the requisite skills to teach and guide ELLs academically, according to the survey data. It seems that what the survey respondents lacked was the explicit knowledge in using their “good teaching skills” in service to ELLs that are also found in SIOP Methodology (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008). Basically fulltime, Missouri certified, elementary school teachers do not know that they already possess the “good teaching skills” to serve ELLs.

The researcher also discovered several main ideas based upon the qualitative data that were produced by interview participant’s (IPs) responses. Nine major ideas were discovered from IP transcriptions. The nine major ideas discovered were as follows: 1) Responsibility towards Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs); 2) Professional growth/confidence in teaching skills; 3) Effective communication with DLCs; 4) Professional behavior and teaching skills; 5) Professional development opportunities; 6) ESL personnel availability; 7) Teacher dispositions towards DLCs; 8) Teacher/parent communication; and 9) The presence of ethnic and DLCs. Responsibility Towards Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLC). The IPs responses presented the researcher with in depth descriptions of professional commitment toward their students in general, their willingness to seek information and professional development for growth in serving ELLs, the desire to stay informed about the DLCs that exist in their schools districts and the ability to effectively advance ELLs academically. Basically, fulltime, Missouri certified, elementary school teachers cannot teach ELLs effectively if they do not possess the skills or knowledge base in ELL methodology, according to the IPs responses.

The presentation and analysis of the data discovered from this multi-case study in Chapter Four provided the researcher with a wealth of information from which to draw conclusions related to the study. Chapter Five will allow the researcher to present a view of the findings derived from the data presented, permit discussions based upon the data presented, and finally the researcher will be given the opportunity present a conclusion to this study with implications for further research.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS, AND CONCLUSIONS

This multi-case study has the potential to provide State Educational Agencies (SEAs) and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs), as well as teacher preparation programs, data related to reaching and teaching English Language Learners (ELLs). These data may be useful to practicing teachers in the field who are seeking efforts to educate and serve ELLs to the highest standards as required by NCLB (2001). Teaching ELLs the English language for proficiency cannot be the sole purpose of instruction, but rather teachers of ELLs must teach English proficiency while challenging the students at the appropriate level for academic success which is the current challenge for states and school districts (Echevarria, 2006; Tornatzky, Pachon, & Torres, 2003; Zehr, 2007).

The researcher in this study gathered both quantitative and qualitative data from Missouri certified, K-6, full-time public school faculty. These data produced perceptions in regards to personal experiences with sheltered instruction methodologies and strategies for professional development or preparation in service to ELLs. Data were collected via a survey, personal semi-structured interviews, and through field observations. There is an ever increasing demand for educators to understand issues related to Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs) and the challenges they face in reaching academic success in U.S. schools (Echevarria, 2006; Zehr, 2007). This study was conducted to contribute to and enhance academic knowledge in the field of teacher education and professional development research for teachers of ELLs. Giambo and Szecsi (2006) suggest the existence of a variety of trends in second language teaching that leave many ELLs with

purposeful and caring teachers who, unfortunately, have limited understanding of second language acquisition or cultural diversity issues that affect ELLs.

Findings: Quantitative Data

Students may rise to expectations set by expert, certified, motivated, experienced, and caring teachers who are willing to go the extra mile for their students (Tornatzky et al.; 2003; Zarate, 2007). Many classrooms with ELLs lack a flexible, multilingual, culturally competent, expert teacher who is caring (Echevarria, 2006; Cartiera, 2007; Tornatzky et al.; Verdugo & Flores, 2007; Zarate). Teachers possessing the skills necessary for authentic rigorous and meaningful engagement with ELLs can make adjustments to the level of English used within the classroom. Making the content comprehensible using a variety of techniques found in high quality non-sheltered teaching for English learners can lead to greater annual academic gains for ELLs. Ultimately it is the expert, caring, flexible, multilingual, culturally competent, and qualified/certified teacher who will know how to use the “good teaching skills” that can make the academic gains a reality in service to ELLs (Echevarria; Echevarria et al., 2008). The teachers in this study did not believe that they possessed the requisite skills and knowledge of good teaching strategies demonstrated in sheltered English language instructional techniques when actually they did. On average, teachers scored on the survey to a high level of confidence, rating themselves at a “4,” scoring between “somewhat like me” (3), and “a lot like me” (5). Teachers demonstrated that they possess the requisite skills for teaching ELLs, but did not know that they already possessed those good teaching skills to advance ELLs academically in their classrooms.

The majority of survey participants were females of European decent, and most participants were monolingual. Only 64 out of 161 survey participants mentioned having authentic knowledge of sheltered instructional techniques, and those who had exposure to sheltered instructional techniques were taught either through school district in-services or graduate courses, while 27 of the 64 survey respondents said they had learned the sheltered instructional techniques though on- the-job experience or sought advice from either a colleague or the ESL instructional coach in the building. According to this study, teachers are adequately trained and prepared to serve linguistic and academic needs of ELLs in the U.S., but are unaware of the skills they already possess in serving ELLs. Teachers have also self disclosed the need for training in ELL methodologies and strategies that can best serve ELLs and make connections with their families and communities (Augusta & Hakuta, 1997; Cartiera, 2007; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008; Jones, 2006; NCES, 2002; Zehr, 2007). This survey demonstrated that the sheltered instructional strategies used in serving ELLs, which are the same as “good teaching skills,” are not being connected in training to pre-service teachers or professional development in-services to current teachers.

Approximately half of the participants had not taken any multicultural courses during their professional training. Of those teachers who did take a multicultural course, most took their course work during the 1990s and the 2000s. Teachers surveyed also mentioned a desire to serve ELLs better, but lacked the necessary building level or district guidance in improving academic success among Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs). According to Marshall (2002), some teachers with high levels of professional and personal efficacy learn instructional and interpersonal techniques, as well as

strategies, that will assist them in helping ELLs and students culturally different than themselves (Batt, 2008; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Nieto & Bode, 2008). The representative sample of teachers in this study have the basic skills necessary to teach ELLs, but lack the basic comprehension and appropriate training to use those good teaching skills as sheltered instructional techniques when teaching and improving academic achievement among DLCs. Giving teachers and professional staff more time for ESL instruction or assistance, Baker (1998) suggests, would serve ELLs well; especially if lead by the principal, teachers, and community stakeholders. Basically, teachers do not know that they already possess the basic skills in teaching, reaching, and ensuring academic success among ELLs.

Missouri elementary certified teachers have the competency and the requisite skills to successfully teach and guide ELLs academically, according the survey data. It seems that what the survey respondents lacked was the explicit method terminology in using their “good teaching skills” in service to ELLs that are also found in SIOP Methods (Echevarria, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008). Finally, fulltime, Missouri certified, elementary school teachers do not know that they already possess the “good teaching skills” to serve ELLs. It is up to school districts with district ESL coordinators and departments to disseminate and make effective connections with “good teaching skills” that district teachers already possess with sheltered instruction strategies in service to ELLs.

Findings: Qualitative Data

Missouri certified, K-6, public school teachers who interviewed with the researcher expressed a strong desire to seek professional development opportunities that would assist academic achievement among English Language Learners (ELLs). Teachers among the sample interviewed had confidence in their teaching and demonstrated high levels of good teaching skills. Interview participants (IPs) also believed that school and district administrators should provide more professional development opportunities in English language sheltered techniques so that they could better serve Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs) with greater confidence. Those English as a Second Language (ESL) certified teachers interviewed mentioned a desire for all teachers to possess a basic knowledge of sheltered instructional techniques. Consistency in sheltered English techniques for all teachers would increase ELL academic achievement overall, according to the IPs. The educational community is ultimately made accountable for academic achievement of all children (Barkley et al., 2001; Oakes & Lipton, 2007) and teachers have the first line of responsibility to insure that ELLs learn English as quickly as possible and at high levels to ensure academic success (Coleman & Goldberg, 2009).

As the researcher interpreted the data, interview participants (IPs) who had the most contact with English Language Learners (ELLs) in their classrooms seemed to have greater respect, personal connections, and interest in the academic achievement of ELLs. The attempts at meaningful bicultural, or cultural competency creates true respect on behalf of the educator as they relate to cultural and linguistic differences that exist among their student population (Banks & Banks, 2005; Diller & Moule, 2005; Echevarria et al., 2008; Gollnick & Chinn, 2006; Nieto & Bode, 2008; Ooka-Pang, 2005). Most teachers

who were interviewed expressed regret not learning sheltered techniques during their pre-service undergraduate training, and many lamented not having the professional development opportunities in sheltered instruction now. Professionalism and accountability was prominent among the IPs, although not all IPs had confidence in their bilingual skills and some lacked confidence in making personal connections with the Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs). High levels of parental communication and student academic success was demonstrated among those teachers who did step out of their comfort zones and openly engaged DLCs within their school districts. Confidence and personal connections matter with ELLs and DLCs. According to Nieto and Bode, effective classroom instruction or good teaching is almost always tied to a teacher's ability to build relationships with students. Teachers must focus on honoring, respecting, and affirming a student's native language or first language, their families, their communities, and the resources and experiences that they bring to the classroom (Adams & Jones, 2006; Banks & Banks; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Diller & Moule; Echevarria et al.; Gollnick & Chinn; Nieto & Bode; Ooka-Pang; Verdugo & Flores, 2007). All of the teachers interviewed mentioned significant levels of ethnic and diverse linguistic communities entering their communities and neighborhoods, but few mentioned actually getting involved with DLCs outside of traditional school hours.

Research Questions

The primary research questions guiding this multi-case study were:

1. How do practicing elementary school teachers perceive their level of preparation in sheltered instructional methods/strategies?
2. How do practicing elementary school teachers use sheltered instruction

techniques in mainstream classrooms?

In response to Research Question One, “How do practicing elementary school teachers perceive their level of preparation in sheltered instruction methods/strategies?” results indicate that the representative sample of Missouri certified, K-6, elementary public school teachers perceive their preparation in sheltered instruction methodology/strategies to be inadequate at all levels of professional development and training, but actually the teachers demonstrated, based upon survey results, that they in fact do know sheltered instruction techniques, they just do not know it.

Many teachers felt a lack of preparation in sheltered instructional techniques during their pre-service undergraduate training, graduate programs, and school district in-services/professional development. After not answering many of the interview questions confidently, a second year teacher stated,

...it sounds really bad...I mean, I'm not prepared to teach an ELL student at all...it would've been nice to have like a class in college offered or part of a class offered on strategies for ELLs...if this is something that our district wants, then they should offer something as well.

Teachers with high levels of professional and personal responsibility seek opportunities to learn instructional and interpersonal techniques, as well as strategies that will assist them in helping ELLs and students culturally different than themselves (Batt, 2008; Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Marshall, 2002; Nieto & Bode, 2008).

In response to Research Question Two, “How do practicing elementary school teachers use sheltered instruction techniques in mainstream classrooms?” survey responses demonstrated a very good knowledge base of sheltered instruction techniques based upon the SIOP Model (Echevarria et al., 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008) of teacher evaluation in sheltered instruction to ELLs. Most of the teachers surveyed used the

sheltered instruction techniques necessary for advancing ELLs academically. It was evident that the teachers have the basic requisite skills that can be nurtured by professional development in sheltered instruction techniques in service to ELLs and improving academic success among Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs), but for some reason were never informed as to the valuable use of the those good teaching skills in service to ELLs in their classrooms. Many of the teachers that knew the sheltered instructional techniques were already trained as English as a second language (ESL) teachers, or teachers who had ELLs building coaches and resources or district assistance in serving ELLs.

Theoretical Underpinnings

The five defining tenets of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) work together to offer a distinctive way to approach educational research and to guide educators and researchers into a realm of critical and moral practice for all children (Delgado-Bernal, 2002). The five tenets of CRT and LatCrit are as follows: 1) The importance of trans-disciplinary approaches; 2) An emphasis on experiential knowledge; 3) The commitment to social justice; 4) The centrality of race and racism, and their intersectionality with other forms of subordination; 5) A challenge to dominant ideologies (Matzuda et al., 1993; Solorzano & Degado-Bernal, 2001; Tate, 1997; Villalpando & Delgado-Bernal, 2002). Critical Race Theory and LatCRit also allow for unique approaches to understanding and meeting the needs of ELLs in K-12 educational settings (Villalpando, 2004). The researcher used CRT and LatCrit to guide the development of this study as it related to the development of chapters, the instruments used in gathering data, and the final analysis of the data. The researcher believes that

teachers of children of Diverse Linguistic Communities can ultimately harm the academic success in classrooms of ELLs if they lack a clear understanding of research based sheltered instruction techniques that are aligned with good teaching strategies, and if there is a deficit in real authentic cultural exchanges and experiences with DLCs. Although some teachers had demonstrated a positive grasp of the sheltered instructional techniques, very few were familiar with the official terminology and the varied and effective uses in service to ELLs. Personal professional fears in not serving ELLs due to a lack of confidence or ignorance in sheltered instruction techniques and not personally engaging the DLC ultimately may limit academic success of ELLs. This ignorance or fear can also lead to prejudicial feelings against ELLs and/or marginalization that can impede academic success and foster inadequate yearly progress in schools. Teachers as demonstrated in this study have the professional authority and a responsibility to engage in social justice issues related to ELL issues that can bring equity in educational endeavors for DLCs.

Implications for Practice

The representative sample of Missouri teachers surveyed and interviewed are generally prepared in good teaching strategies that are aligned with research based sheltered instruction techniques that serve ELLs adequately and advance ELLs and Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs) academically. Teachers among this representative sample need more professional opportunities and support when obtaining training in sheltered instruction techniques. Methods are varied in instructional techniques and this multi-case study was limited to SIOP Model (Echevarria et al., 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008) procedures. Many teachers surveyed and interviewed had limited

contact with DLCs and often blamed the limited contact on lack of their own bilingual skills. Opportunities are always afforded for contact among DLCs, but it is up to teachers, schools, and school districts to make purposeful, initial, and continued contact.

Teachers need to make real and concerted personal connections with ethnic and Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs). These personal connections can lead to personal insight within DLCs and a greater understanding of social justice issues that exist within DLCs. Because race and racism is at the center of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latino Critical Race Theory (LatCrit) analysis, marginalization of ethnic and DLC are present. Findings of this study suggest there is lack of explicit training in sheltered instruction strategies and multicultural courses engaging in a general understanding of the complexities DLCs. Teachers, schools, school districts, established communities, and DLCs must have opportunities to experience each other. New knowledge and connections can create diverse critical thinkers among ELLs and established communities where ideologies and current schemas can be challenged, critically analyzed, and changed through purposeful, respective inclusion at all levels of educational processes.

Discussions

The current law guiding U.S. education policy, No Child Left Behind (2001), requires English language learners (ELLs) to show significant academic gains after two years of English language development. Because public school teachers today are not adequately trained to maintain and sustain adequate yearly progress among ELLs in the U.S., academic failure among Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs) will persist (Adams & Jones, 2006; Echevarria et al., 2008). It is up to Local Educational Agencies

(LEAs) and State Educational Agencies (SEAs) to provide professional development opportunities in strengthening current core teacher knowledge of effective school strategies among highly qualified public school teachers (Darling-Hammond, 2005; Macedo & Bartolme, 1999; NCCTQ&PA, 2007a; Ochoa & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2004; Slavin, 1996). Professional development and training in sheltered instruction methods/strategies should not just be left to LEAs and SEAs. University undergraduate teacher preparation and graduate programs nation-wide also have a responsibility to educate teacher candidates in either basic or advanced sheltered instructional techniques. Teachers are committed to their students and seek the basic sheltered instruction strategies to better serve ELLs. Teachers are often not confident of their limited sheltered instruction skills, resulting in limited or no academic success among the DLCs they serve. There must be a real concerted effort among SEAs, LEAs, and teaching institutions to better prepare pre-service teachers and the actual teaching population in service to ELLs (Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009; Honigfeld & Cohan, 2008).

Continued and sustained support from Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) with professional development opportunities in sheltered instruction techniques could encourage qualified teachers to seek ESL state endorsements for possible leadership positions as instructional coaches within school districts. The teachers in this study would prefer to have had some exposure to sheltered instruction techniques during pre-service training. Ultimately, State Educational Agencies (SEAs) could request specific coursework related to research based English sheltered instruction techniques of all pre-service teacher candidates graduating from state sanctioned teacher preparation programs (Banks & Banks, 2005; Campbell, 2004; Echevarria et al., 2008; Neito & Bode, 2008).

English language learners can eventually improve their academic success rate if their teachers are informed and prepared to serve them with research based sheltered instruction techniques and purposefully make attempts to have focused and meaningful engagement with Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs). Many teachers already possess the requisite good teaching skills that can assist them in serving DLCs; they just do not know that those same good teaching skills are aligned with research based sheltered instructional techniques currently used for ELL academic achievement.

Suggestions for Future Research

The researcher believes that there is a need for more studies in critical, quality, and successful research based sheltered instructional techniques and the combination of methods that can be used in the academic success of English language learners (ELLs). It is also suggested that more U.S. and Missouri public school teachers be surveyed and interviewed based upon their perception of sheltered instruction techniques to enhance to an existing field of ELL research. Finally, university teaching faculty and teacher preparation and graduate programs could provide data as to attitudes and intentions in including sheltered instructional strategies to pre-service teachers before they engage Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs). Pre-service and current teachers have suggestions as to when sheltered instruction strategies in service to ELLs should be taught to better serve DLCs.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the researcher discovered two major themes from the study. First of all, there seemed to be a “spirit of caring” among the teachers surveyed and interviewed. Teachers genuinely want assistance with professional development to better serve

English Language Learners (ELLs) and the myriad of Diverse Linguistic Communities (DLCs) in their school districts. Survey respondents positively demonstrated their knowledge and use of model sheltered instruction techniques. Unfortunately, many teachers do not realize they already possess skills necessary for service to ELLs and their academic achievement. The interview participants mentioned their overwhelming commitment to their students and to the teaching profession. The teachers interviewed care about their students' success and want to insure that all children succeed. A teacher cannot teach what they do not know. It is also difficult if teachers cannot engage with DLCs because of ignorance or fear. School districts must make efforts to assist teachers with cultural competency among the DLCs. That means more needs to be done in meaningful and constructive community engagement.

A second idea was discovered by the researcher. Teachers believed that they were often "left in the dark" when it came to professional development related to sheltered instruction techniques and general knowledge about ELLs in their school buildings and districts. Those teachers who were interviewed quite often mentioned the lack of meaningful or mandatory professional development that related to ELL methods. Interviewees complained of not really knowing the DLCs that existed around their schools or districts and even how to engage them. Many interview participants (IPs) did not even know where to begin in serving ELLs and engaging their parents. Some interview participants wanted to have learned many of these techniques before they engaged ELLs in their professional capacities, while others wished that the school district provided more meaningful professional development of sheltered instruction techniques. Finally, many IPs and survey respondents believed that SEAs and LEAs needed to lead

the charge in efforts providing and improving professional development in service to ELL methodology. Teachers care about their students in general, but having the requisite knowledge and skills to improve academic achievement among ELLs they feel is paramount.

The researcher has come to the conclusion that more must be done at all levels of teacher preparation, to include university teacher preparation, graduate teaching programs, and school districts to provide quality, research based instructional sheltered instructional techniques. If ELLs are to have success in the U.S education system as required by No Child Left Behind (2001) then teachers in the U.S. must be prepared to serve them adequately for academic success at all levels of education to include post secondary success and the challenges of life in the U.S. and abroad.

References

- Abadiano, H. & Turner, J. (2002). *Sheltered instruction: An empowerment for English language learners*. The New England Reading Association Journal 38, no3, p. 50-55.
- Adams, M., & Jones, K. (2006). *Unmasking the myths of structured English immersion: Why we still need bilingual educators, native language instruction, and incorporation of home culture*. Radical Teacher, no. 75, p. 16-21, Spring.
- Anderson, P. J. (1995). *Language variation in the United States: Untangling issues*. Multicultural Education, vol. 3, no. 4, p. 8-11.
- August, D., & Hakuta, K. (1997). *Improving schooling for language-minority children: A research agenda*. National Academy Press. Washington, DC, USA.
- Baker, K. (1998). *Structured English immersion breakthrough in teaching limited-English-proficient students*. Phi Delta Kappan vol. 80, no. 3, p. 199-204, November.
- Banks, J., & Banks, C. (2005). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. 5th ed. Wiley Jossey-Bass education. Hoboken, NJ, USA.
- Barkley, S., Bottoms, G., Feagin, C., & Clark, S. (2001). *Leadership matters: Building leadership capacity, a guide*. Southern Regional Education Board. Atlanta, GA, USA. www.sreb.org.
- Batt, E. G. (2008). *Teachers perceptions of ELL education: Potential solutions to overcome the greatest challenges*. Multicultural Education, vol. 15, no. 3, p. 39-43, Spring.

- Biancarosa, C., & Snow, C. (2004). *Reading next: A vision for action and research in middle and high school literacy*. Report to the Carnegie Corporation of New York. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Bishop, A. G. (2003). *Prediction of first-grade reading achievement: A comparison of fall and winter kindergarten screenings*. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, vol. 26, no. 3, p. 183-200.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research for education: an introduction to theories and methods*. 4th ed. Pearson Education Group, Inc. Boston, MA, USA.
- Bolman, L., & Deal, T. (1997). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. 2nd ed. Jossey-Bass. A Wiley company. San Francisco, CA, USA.
- Brown, C. L. (2007). *Supporting English language learners in content-reading*. *Reading Improvement*, vol. 44, no. 1, p. 32-39, Spring.
- California Department of Education, Educational Demographics Unit. (2004). *Statewide Stanford 9 test results for reading: Number of students tested and percent scoring at or above the 50th percentile ranking (NPR)*. Retrieved May 20, 2007, from www.cde.ca.gov/dataguest/.
- Campbell, D. (2004). *Choosing democracy: A practical guide to multicultural education*. 3rd ed. Pearson: Merrill Printice Hall. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Cartiera, M.R. (2006). *Addressing the literacy underachievement of adolescent English language learners: A call for teacher preparation and proficiency reform*. *The New England Reading Association Journal*, vol. 42, no. 1, p. 26-32.

- Carrasquillo, A.L. (1991). *Hispanic children and youth in the United States*. New York: Garland.
- Carrion, T. (2006). *No Child Left Behind Act, Title III, language instruction for limited English proficient and immigrant students*. *Journal of American Indian Education*, vol. 45, no. 2, Special issue, p. 65-67.
- Center on Education Policy. (2005). *States try harder, but gaps persist: High school exit exams 2005*. Washington DC: Center on Education Policy.
- Chamot, A., & O'Malley, J. (1986). *A cognitive academic language learning approach: An ESL content based curriculum*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Chamot, A., & O'Malley, J. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. Reading, MA: Addison Wesley.
- Coleman, R., & Goldenberg, C. (2009). *What does research say about effective practices for English language learners? Introduction and part I: Oral language proficiency*. *Kappa Delta Record* 46, no 1, pg. 10-16. Fall.
- Cox-Peterson, A., & Olson, J. K. (2007). *Alternative Assessments for English language learners*. *Principal* (Reston, Virginia, USA), vol. 87, no. 2, p. 32-34, November/December.
- Crawford, J. (2004). *Education of English language learners: Language diversity in the classroom*. 5th ed. Los Angeles, CA: Bilingual Education Services.
- Crenshaw, K., Gotanda, N., Peller, G., and Thomas, K. (1995). *Critical race theory: The key writings that formed the movement*. New York: New York Press.

- Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. 2nd ed. Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- Cummins, J. (1981). *The role of primary language development in promoting education success for language minority students*. In California State Department of Education (Ed.). *Schooling and Language Minority Students: Theoretical Framework*, (p. 3-50). Los Angeles Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.
- Cummins, J. (1984). *Wanted. A theoretical framework for relating language proficiency to academic achievement among bilingual students*. In *Language proficiency and academic achievement*, ed C. Rivera, 2-19. Clevedon, Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Cummins, J. (1996). *Negotiating identities: Education of empowerment in a diverse society*. Los Angeles California Association for Bilingual Education.
- Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multicultural Matters.
- Cushner, K., McClelland, A., & Safford, P. (2006). *Human diversity in education: An integrative approach*. 5th ed. McGraw Hill-Higher education. Dubuque, IA. USA.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2005). *Teaching as a profession: Lesson in teacher preparation and professional development*. *Phi Delta Kappan*, vol. 87, no. 3, p. 237-240, November.
- De Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2005). *Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough?* *Teacher Education Quarterly*, vol. 32, no. 2, p. 101-124, Spring.

- Delgado, R. (1995). *The Rodrigo chronicles: Conversations about America and Race*.
New York: New York University Press.
- Delgado-Bernal, D. (2002). *Critical race theory, Latino critical theory, and critical
raced-knowledge*. *Qualitative Inquiry*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 105-126.
- Diller, J., & Moule, J. (2005). *Cultural competence: A primer for educators*. Wadsworth,
a division of Thompson Learning, Inc. Belmont, CA, USA.
- Doherty, R., Hilberg, R., Pinal, A., & Tharp, R. (2003). *Five standards and student
achievement*. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 1-24,
Winter.
- Dong, Y. R. (2004). *Preparing secondary subject area teachers to teach linguistically
and culturally diverse students*. *The Clearing House*, vol. 77, no. 5, p. 202-206,
May/June.
- Echevarria, J. (2006). *Helping English language learners succeed*. *Principal Leadership*
(high school ed.), vol. 6, no. 6, p. 16-21, February.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Powers, K. (2006). *School reform and standards based
education: a model for English language learners*. *The Journal of Educational
Research* (Washington, DC), vol. 99, no. 4, p. 195-210, March/April.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2000). *Making content comprehensible for English
language learners. The SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2004). *Making content comprehensible for English
language learners. The SIOP model*. 2nd ed. Needham Heights, MA, USA. Allyn-
Beacon.

- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2008). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model*. 3rd ed. Pearson: Allyn and Bacon. Boston, MA, USA.
- Edley, C. Jr., & Wald, J. (2002, December 16). *The graduate retention fallacy*. The Boston Globe.
- Espinoza, L. G. (1990). *Masks and other disguises: Exposing legal academia*. Harvard Law Review, vol. 103, p. 1878-1886.
- Fay, B. (1987). *Critical social science: Liberation and its limits*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Fernandez, C. (2002). *Learning from Japanese approaches to professional development: The case of lesson study*. Journal of Teacher Education, 53, p. 393-405.
- Garcia, E. (1993). *Language, culture, and education*. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.), Review of Research in Education, p. 51-98. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Garcia, E. (2001b). *Understanding and meeting the challenge of student diversity*. 3rd ed. Boston, MA, USA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Garcia, E., & Cuellar, D. (2006). *Who are these linguistically and culturally diverse students?* Teachers College Record, vol. 28, no. 11, p. 2220-2246, November.
- Garza, E. (2006). *In the shadow of the Mexican border: Taking a radical stand*. Radical Teacher, no. 75, p. 22-27, Spring.
- Gass, S. M. (1997). *Input, interaction, and the second language learner*. Mahawah, NJ; Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Giambo, D., & Szecsi, T. (2006). *Opening up to the issues: Preparing preservice teachers to work effectively with English language learners*. *Childhood Education*, vol. 82, no. 2, p. 107-110.
- Glaser, B. (2000). "The future of grounded theory." *Grounded Theory Review*. 1:1-8.
- Glenn, C. (2002). *One language or two?* *Principal* (Reston, VA). Vol. 82, no. 2, p. 28-31, November/December.
- Gollnick, D., & Chinn, P. (2008). *Multicultural education in a pluristic society*. 8th ed. Pearson Education Inc. Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA.
- Grigg, W., Daane, M., Jin, Y., & Campbell, J. (2003). *The nation's report card: Reading 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Guarino, A. J., Echevarria, J., Short, D., Schick, J. E., Forbes, S., & Rueda, R. (2001). *The Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol*. *Journal of Research in Education*, vol. 11, no.1, p. 138-140.
- Hernandez-Truyol, B. E. (1997). *Borders (En)gendered: Normativities, Latinas, and a LatCrit paradigm*. *New York University Law Review*, vol. 72, p. 882.
- Hite, C. E., & Evans, L. S. (2006). *Mainstream first grade teachers' understanding of strategies for accommodating the needs of English language learners*. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, vol. 33, no 2, p. 89-110, Spring.
- Honigsfeld, A., & Cohan, A. (2008). *The power of two: Lesson Study and SIOP help teachers instruct ELLs*. *Journal of Staff Development* 29, no.1, p. 24-26, 28 Winter.
- Jay, T. (2003). *The psychology of language*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

- Johnson, K. (1999). *How did you get to be Mexican? A white/brown man's search for identity*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Kamps, D., Abbot, M., Greenwood, C., Arreaga-Mayer, C., Willis, H., Longstaff, J., Culpepper, M., & Walton, C. (2007). *Use of evidence-based, small group reading instruction for English language learners in elementary grades: Secondary tier intervention*. *Learning Disability Quarterly*, vol. 30, no. 3, p. 153-168, Summer.
- Kauffman, D. (2007). *What's different about teaching reading to students learning English?* Center For Applied Linguistics (CAL), Delta Publishing.
- Kendall, G. (2006). *The principal's dilemma: Serving English language learners in an unfriendly environment*. *Catalyst for Change*, vol. 34, no. 2, p. 73, Summer.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second language acquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S. (1995). *School libraries, public libraries, and the NAEP reading scores*. *School Library Media Quarterly*, vol. 24, no 4, p. 235-237.
- Krashen, S. (1996). *Is English in trouble?* *Multicultural Education*, vol. 4, no. 3, p. 16-19.
- Krashen, S. & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach*. San Francisco, CA: Pergamon/Alemany Press.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). *Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice place education?* In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, S. Villenas, and K. Nebecker (eds.) *Critical Race Theory and Qualitative Research in Education*. (Special Issue). *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, vol. 11, no. 1.
- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. (1995). *Toward critical race theory of education*. *Teachers College Record*, vol. 97, p. 47-68.

- Lambert, L. (1998). *Building leadership capacity in schools*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA, USA.
- Lambert, L. (2003). *Leadership capacity for lasting school improvement*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, VA, USA.
- Larson, C., & Ovando, C. (2001). *The color of bureaucracy: The politics of equity in multicultural school communities*. Wadsworth: Thomas Learning. United States.
- Latinos in Education: Early childhood, Elementary, Undergraduate, Graduate. (1999). *Washington, D.C.: White House initiative on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans*. Retrieved on May 20, 2008, from www.ed.gov/offices/OIIA/Hispanic/rr/ech.html.
- Lesaux, N. K. (2006). *Building consensus: Future directions for research on English language learners at IRsk for learning difficulties*. Teachers College Record, vol 108, no. 11, p. 2406-2038, November.
- Lewis, C. (2002). *Lesson study: A handbook of teacher-led instructional improvement*. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools.
- Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). *Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition*. TESOL Quarterly, vol. 19, no. 2, p. 207-228.
- Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M., & Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). *Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners*. Journal of Teacher Education, vol. 59, no. 4, September/October. Sage Publications.
- Macedo, D., & Bartolome, L. (1999). *Dancing with bigotry*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- Manning, M. L., & Baruth, L. G. (2004). *Multicultural education of children and adolescents*. 4th ed. Pearson: Allyn & Beacon. Boston, MA, USA.
- Marshall, P. (2002). *Cultural diversity in our schools*. Wadsworth/Thompson Learning, Belmont, CA, USA.
- Marzano, R., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, Virginia, USA. Mid-continent research for education and learning. Aurora, CO, USA.
- Martinez, G. A. (1994). *Legal inter-determinacy, judicial discretion, and the Mexican-American litigation experience: 1930-1980*. U.C. Davis Law Review, vo. 27, p. 555-618.
- Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative researching*. (2nd. Ed). London: Sage.
- Masten, W. G., Plata, M., Wenglar, K., & Thedford, J. (1999). *Acculturation and teacher ratings of Hispanic and Anglo American students*. *Roeper Review*, 22(1), 64-65.
- Matsuda, M. (1991). *Voices of America: Accent antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction*. *Yale Law Journal*, vol. 100, p. 1329-1407.
- Matsuda, M., Lawrence, C., Delgado, R., and Crenshaw, K. (eds.). (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the First Amendment*. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.
- Mays, L. (2008). *The cultural divide of discourse: Understanding how English language learners' primary discourse influences acquisition of literacy*. *The Reading Teacher*, vol. 61, no. 5, p. 415-18, February.

- McCollum, P. (1993). *Learning to value English: Cultural capital in a two way bilingual program*. Paper presented at the annual meeting AERA, Atlanta, GA, USA. Mississippi State University.
- Menkart, D. (1993). *Multicultural education: Strategies for linguistically diverse schools and classrooms*. (NCBE Program Information Guide Series, No. 16). Available: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/pigs/pig16.htm>.
- Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. Josse-Bass Publishers. San Francisco.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE). (2006). *Educating linguistically diverse students: Requirements and practices*. 2006 updated version. MODESE, Federal discretionary grants, Jefferson City, MO, USA.
- Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (MODESE). (2007). *Annual report of school data*. Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education Core Data as submitted by Missouri Public Schools. Retrieved on May 28, 2008 from <http://dese.mo.gov/schooldata/four/024093/demonone.html>.
- Moll, L. C. (2005). *Social competence in teacher education*. *Journal of teacher education*, 56, no. 3 (May/June 2005): 242-247.
- Montoya, M. (1993). *Mascaras, trenzas, y grenas: Unmasking the self while unbraiding Latina stories and legal discourse*. *Chicano/Chicana Law Review* (UCLA School of Law), vol. 15, no. 1, p. 1-37.
- Morse, S. C., & Ludovina, F.S. (1999). *Responding to undocumented children in the schools*. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small

Schools. Charleston, West Virginia, USA. Retrieved May 29, 2008, from www.ericdigest.org/2000-2/schools.htm.

National Assessment of Education Statistics (NAES). (2005). *The nation's report card*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2002). *Schools and staffing survey, 1999-2000: Overview of the data for public, private, public charter, and Bureau of Indian affairs elementary and secondary schools*. (NCES 2002-313). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Educational Statistics.

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2003). *National assessment of educational progress, 2003, reading assessments*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2004). *Language minority learners and their labor market indicators: Recent trends*. Retrieved August, 21, 2008, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2004/2004009.pdf>.

National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES). (2005). *National assessment of educational progress*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences.

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda (NCCTQ&PA). (2007a). *They're not little kids anymore: The special challenges of new teachers in high schools and middle schools. Lessons learned: new teachers talk about their jobs, challenges and long-range plans*. Issue No. 1. A report from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda. www.publicagenda.org.

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda (NCCTQ&PA).

(2007b). *Working without a net: How new teachers from three prominent alternative route programs describe their first year on the job. Lessons learned: New teachers talk about their jobs, challenges and long-range plans.* Issue No. 2. A report from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda. www.publicagenda.org.

National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda (NCCTQ&PA).

(2008c). *Teaching in changing times. Lessons learned: New teachers talk about their jobs, challenges and long-range plans.* Issue No. 3. A report from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality & Public Agenda. www.publicagenda.org.

Neufeld, P., Amendum, S. J., Fitzgerald, J., & Guthrie, K. M. (2006). *First grade Latino students' English reading growth in all English classrooms.* Reading Research and Instruction, vol. 46, no. 1, p. 23-52, Fall.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Nieto, S. (2004). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education.* 4th ed. Pearson education Inc. Boston, MA, USA.

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. 107th Congress of the United States of America. Retrieved December 27, 2007, from www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/107-110.pdf.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring, a feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Oaks, J., & Lipton, M. (2007). *Teaching to change the world. 3rd ed.* McGraw-Hill, higher education. Dubuque, IA, USA.
- Ochoa, A., & Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2004). *Towards promoting bi-literacy, and academic achievement: Educational programs for high school Latino English language learners.* High School Journal, 87(3), 27-43.
- Ooka-Pang, V. (2005). *Multicultural education: A caring-centered, reflective approach.* McGraw Hill. New York, NY, USA.
- Parker, L., Deyhle, D., Villenas, S., and Nebecker, K. (eds.). (1998). *Critical race theory and qualitative research in education.* (Special issue). International Journal of Qualitative Research in Education, vol. 11, no. 1.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* 2nd ed. Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- Patton, M. Q. (1999). *On enhancing the quality and credibility of qualitative analysis.* Health Sciences Research, vol. 34, no. 5, part 2, December: p. 1189-208.
- Patton, M. Q. (2003). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods.* 3rd ed. Sage Publications, Inc. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA.
- Perez, B. (1995). *Language and literacy issues related to Mexican-American secondary students.* High School Journal, p. 236-243, April/May.
- Perie, M., Grigg, W. S., & Donahue, P. L. (2005). *The national report card: Reading 2005 (NCES 2006-451).* U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Educational Sciences, National Center for Educational Statistics, Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- Rigg, P., & Enright, D. (1986). *Children & ESL: Integrating perspectives*. Alexandria, VA: Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
- Ruiz-de-Velasco, J., & Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Saunders, W. (2003). *Research evidence: Five standards for effective pedagogy and student outcomes*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity, & Excellence. Technical report no. G1, March, 2003, revised 2004. Retrieved October 3, 2008, from <http://crede.berkeley.edu/products/print/occreports/g1.html>.
- Sherris, A. (2008). *Integrated content and language instruction*. Center for Applied Linguistics Digest. Washington, DC, September.
- Short, D. (1991a). *Integrating language and content instruction: Strategies and techniques*. (NCBE Program Information Guide Series, No. 7). Washington DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/pigs/pig7.htm>.
- Slavin, R. E. (1996). *Success for all: A summary of research*. Journal of Education for Student Placed at Risk. 1 (1), 41-76.
- Sleeter, C., & Grant, C. (2007). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class, and gender*. John Wiley & Son's, Inc. Hoboken, NJ, USA.
- Solorzano, D. G. (1998). *Images and words that wound: Critical race theory, racial stereotyping and teacher education*. Teacher Education Quarterly, vol. 24, p. 5-19.

- Solorzano, D. G., & Delgado-Bernal, D. (2001). *Examining transformational resistance through a critical race and LatCrit theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context*. *Urban Education*, vol. 36, no. 3, p. 308-342.
- Solorzano, D. G., & Villalpando, O. (1998). *Critical race theory, marginality, and the experiences of students of color in higher education*. In C. A. Torres and T. A. Mitchell (eds.), *Sociology of Education: emerging perspectives*. New York: State University Press.
- Solorzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. (2000). *Toward a critical race theory of Chicana and Chicano education*. In c. Tejada, C. Martinez, and Z. Leonardo (eds.), *Charting New Terrains of Chicana(o)/Latino(a) Education*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Spring, J. (2004). *The intersection of cultures: Multicultural education in the United States and global economy*. 3rd ed. McGraw-Hill higher education. New York, NY, USA.
- Smith, K. M. (2004). *Language as we know it, literacy as we know it, and content area instructions: conscious strategies for teachers*. *Multicultural Education*, vol. 11, no. 4, p. 46-50, Summer.
- Staples, B. (2005, November). *Why the United States should look to Japan for better schools*. *The New York Times*, p. A22.
- Steinber, A., & Almeida, C. (2004). *The dropout cIRsis: Promising approaches in prevention and recovery*. Boston, MA: Jobs for the Future.
- Strauss, A. & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Swain, M. (1995). *Three functions of output in second language learning*. In G. Cook &

- B. Seidhofer (Eds.) Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H.G. Widdowson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Szpara, M. Y. & Ahmad, E. (2007). *Supporting English-language learners in social studies class: Results from a study of high school teachers*. The Social Studies (Washington, D.C.) vol. 98, no. 5, p. 189-95, September/October.
- Tate, W. (1997). Critical race theory and education: history, theory, and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, vol. 22, p. 195-247.
- Taylor, E. (1999). *Critical race theory and interest convergence in the desegregation of higher education*. In L. Parker, D. Deyhle, and S. Villenas (eds.), *Race Is...Race Isn't: Critical Race Theory and Qualitative Studies in Education*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). (2000b). *Family involvement in the education of ESOL students*. Alexandria, VA: Author. Available: <http://www.tesol.org/assoc/statements/2000-family.html>.
- Tharp, R., & Gallimore, R. (1988). *Rousing minds to life: Teaching, learning, and schooling in social context*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tharp, R., Estrada, P., Dalton, S., & Yamauchi, L. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tharp, R., Doherty, R., Echevarria, J., Estrada, P., Goldenberg, C., Hilberg, R., & Saunders, W. (2003). *Research evidence: Five standards for effective pedagogy and student outcomes*. Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE). Technical report, no. G1, March, 2003, revised, 2004.

- Thomas-Hansen, H. (2008). *Sheltered Instruction: Best practices for ELLs in the mainstream*. Kappa Delta Phi Record, 44, no 4, pg. 165-169. Summer 2008.
- Thompson, L. (2008). *Hispanic students at Interlake pull together to graduate*. May 8, 2008 article, Seattle Times.
- Tierney, W. (1993). *Building communities of difference: Higher education in the twenty-first century*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Tomas, H. H. (2008). *Sheltered instruction: Best practices for ELLs in the mainstream*. Kappa Delta Pi Record, vol. 44, no. 4, p. 165-169, Summer.
- Tornatzky, L., Pachon, H., & Torres, C. (2003). *Closing achievement gaps: Improving educational outcomes for Hispanic children*. A policy report for the National Hispanic Caucus of State Legislators. The Center for Latino Educational Excellence, The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2000). Resident population by race and Hispanic origin-status projections: 2005-2050. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
Retrieved December 27, 2007, from
<http://www.census.gov/population/www/projections/natsum-T3.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2006). *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2006 (126th ed.)*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Commerce.
- U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). (2000). *Schools and Staffing Survey (SASS), 1999-2000 "Public School Questionnaire" and "Charter School Questionnaire."* Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education (May 2007). *Assessment and accountability for recently arrived and former limited English proficient (LEP) students: Non regulatory*

- guidance*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. Retrieved December 27, 2007 from www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/finrule/2006-3/091306a.html.
- Valdes, F. (1996). *Latina/o ethnicities, critical race theory, and post identity politics in postmodern legal culture: from practices to possibilities*. La Raza Law Journal, Spring.
- Verdugo, R.R., & Flores, B. (2007). *English-language learners: Key issues*. Education and Urban Society, vol. 39, no. 2, p. 167-193, February.
- Villalpando, O. (2004). *Practical considerations of critical race theory and Latino critical theory for Latino college students*. New Directions for student services, no. 105, Spring.
- Violand-Sanchez, E., Sutton, C., & Ware, H. (1991). *Fostering home-school cooperation: Involving language minority families as partners in education*. (NCBE Program Information Guide Series, No. 6). Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Available: <http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/ncbepubs/pigs/pig6.htm>
- Vogt, M. E., & Echevarria, J. (2008). *99 ideas and activities for teaching English learners with the SIOP Model*. Boston, MA, USA. Allyn & Bacon.
- Williams, R. (1997). *Vampires anonymous and critical race practice*. Michigan Law Review, vol. 95, p. 741-765.
- Wink, J. (2005). *Critical Pedagogy: Notes from the real world*. 3rd. ed. Pearson: Allen and Bacon. Boston.
- Wong-Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. (2005). *What teachers need to know about language*. In

C. T. Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), What teachers need to know about language (pp. 7-54). Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wright, W. (2006). *A catch-22 for language learners*. Educational Leadership, 64, no. 3, p. 22-27, November.

Zarate, M. E. (2007). *Understanding Latino parental involvement in education: Perceptions, experiences, and recommendations*. A study written for Tomas Rivera Institute Policy Institute, University of Southern California, School of Policy, Planning and Development, Los Angeles, CA, USA.

Zehr, M. A. (2007). *Reading aid seen to lag in ELL focus*. Education Week, 27, no 9, vol. 1, p. 20-21, October 24.

Appendix A

Sheltered Instruction: Self Evaluation of Teaching and Instruction Survey

Full-time Missouri Certified Elementary School Teachers (K-6)

Directions for Section One: Please answer the following demographic questions as best as possible by filling in the circle that best describes you or by writing your answers in the spaces provided.

1. Indicate your gender:

- male
- female

2. Age (optional): _____

3. Indicate your cultural ethnicity:

- Anglo American (European descent; non-Latino)
- African American (non-Latino)
- Asian American (Samoan, Pacific Islander, South Asian, etc.)
- Latino(a) American (non Anglo, non African American)
- American Indian
- International citizen: please write in nationality _____
- Bi-Ethnic: please indicate bi-ethnicity _____

4. Do you have any knowledge about English Language Learner techniques or strategies that can be used with ELLs in your classroom?

- Yes
- No

If yes, where did you learn about ELL techniques or strategies?

- undergraduate classes
- graduate classes
- district in-services
- other: please state _____

5. Were you required to take a multicultural education course as an undergraduate student?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please list course(s) required and year taken:

6. Please indicate the highest level of education attained thus far:

- B.S./B.A./B.F.A.
- M.A.T./M.S.Ed.
- Ed.S., Ed.D, Ph.D
- Other: _____

7. How many years have you been teaching? _____

8. Please list which current certifications you hold:

9. Are you multi-lingual?

- Yes
- No

If yes, please list the languages you speak near proficiently or fluently:

10. In the past five years, approximately how many ELL students have you taught in your classroom? _____

Directions for Section Two: Please rate yourself according to the following statements where one (1) is the lowest (not like you) and five (5) is the highest (a lot like you).

Preparation

- | | | | |
|--|-------------|------------------|---------------|
| 1. The content objectives are clearly defined and displayed and I review them with my students. | not like me | somewhat like me | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |
| 2. The classroom language objectives are clearly defined and displayed and I review them with my students. | not like me | somewhat like me | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 4 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--------------------|
| 3. The content objectives I use in class are appropriate for the age and educational level of my students. | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |
| 4. The supplementary materials I employ are used to a high degree, making the lesson clear and meaningful (e.g. computer programs, graphs, models, visuals). | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |
| 5. I make adaptations of the content (e.g. text, assignment) to all levels of student language proficiency. | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |
| 6. I plan activities that are meaningful and I integrate lesson concepts (e.g. surveys, letter writing, simulations, constructing models) with language practice opportunities for reading, writing, listening, and/or speaking. | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |

Building Background

- | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--------------------|
| 7. I use concepts explicitly linked to students' background experiences. | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |
| 8. I use explicit links between past learning and new concepts. | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |
| 9. I emphasize key vocabulary (e.g. introduced, written, repeated and highlighted for students to see). | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |

Comprehensible Input

- | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--------------------|
| 10. I use appropriate speech for students' English language proficiency level (e.g. slower rate, enunciation, and simple sentence structure for beginners). | not like me
1 | 2 | somewhat like me
3 | 4 | a lot like me
5 |
|---|------------------|---|-----------------------|---|--------------------|

- | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| 11. I clearly explain academic tasks. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. I use a variety of techniques to make content concepts clear (e.g. modeling, visuals, hand-on activities, demonstrations, gestures, body language). | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Strategies

- | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| 13. I provide ample opportunities for students to use learning strategies. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. I use scaffolding techniques consistently to assist and support students' understanding (e.g. think-alouds). | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. I use a variety of questions or tasks that promote higher-order thinking skills (e.g. literal, analytical, and interpretive questions). | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Interaction

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| 16. I frequently give opportunities for interaction and discussion between teacher/student and among students, which encourage elaborated responses about lesson concepts. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. I use grouping configurations to support language and content objectives of the lesson. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. I consistently give sufficient wait time for student responses | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. I give ample opportunities for students to clarify key concepts in their first language as needed with the aide, peer, or a text in their first language. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Practice/Application

- | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| 20. I provide hands-on materials and/or manipulatives for students to practice using new content knowledge. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. I use activities for students to apply content and language knowledge in the classroom. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 22. I integrate all language skills in the activities I use (i.e. reading, writing, listening, and speaking). | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Lesson Delivery

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| 23. The content objectives I use are clearly supported by my lesson delivery. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. The language objectives I use are clearly supported by my lesson delivery. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. The students I teach are engaged approximately 90-100% of the period. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. The pacing of my lessons is appropriate to the students' ability level. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Review/Assessment

- | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---|------------------|---|---------------|
| 27. I provide a comprehensive review of key vocabulary. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. I provide a comprehensive review of key concepts. | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. I give regular feedback to my students on their output (e.g. language, content, work). | not like me | | somewhat like me | | a lot like me |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

30. I regularly assess my students for comprehension and learning of all lesson objectives (e.g. spot checking, group response) throughout the lesson.	not like me	somewhat like me	a lot like me		
	1	2	3	4	5

Additional comments:

Based upon the comment section, the researcher may seek individuals for personal interviews. If you would be willing to be contacted for an interview, please fill out a contact sheet provided by the researcher.

Thank you for your willingness to take time out of your busy schedule to complete this survey.

Respectfully,

Uzziel H. Pecina

Mr. Uzziel H. Pecina, M.S. Ed. (Ed.D., Candidate, 2010)

Survey questions are based upon The Sheltered Instruction Observational Protocol (SIOP) Model (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000, 2004, 2008).

Appendix B

Interview Questions

Missouri Certified, Full-Time, Public School Teachers (K-6)

1. Can you give me examples of population growth in your district in the past 10 years in the area of English language learners (ELLs)?
2. Can you describe what your responsibility is in regards to teaching ELLs in your classroom?
3. Can you describe what good teaching looks like?
4. How prepared do you feel to teach ELLs in your classroom?
5. What challenges do you see in serving ELLs in your classroom?
6. Can you describe what sheltered instruction techniques are? And how they can be used for teaching language and content to ELLs?
7. What strategies do you use when teaching language and content to ELLs in your classroom? Can you explain what you do in planning a lesson?
8. Where did you learn those strategies?
9. Do you have instructional coaches or aides when planning lessons using these strategies?
10. Describe how your professional development and in-service opportunities address language and content delivery in service to ELLs?
11. What efforts have you made to improve yourself as a classroom teacher in service to ELLs and their academic achievement?
12. Is there anything else you would like to add?

Appendix C

Informed Consent Form

Survey

Title: Perceptions of ELL Sheltered Instruction Methodology use among Elementary School Teachers in service to English Language Learners.

Researcher: This research is being conducted by Mr. Uzziel Hernandez Pecina, M.S. Ed., a Doctor of Education Candidate at the University of Missouri-Columbia, in cooperation with University of Central Missouri (UCM). Uzziel H. Pecina is also a Visiting Assistant Professor at University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) in the Department of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education and teaches Diversity and Foundation in Education courses in the School of Education. This research is under the supervision of Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Associate Professor of School Administration, Department of Educational Leadership and Human Development, College of Education, UCM. Dr. Hutchinson can be contacted at hutchinson@ucmo.edu or 660-543-4720 for further information regarding this research.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to understand perceptions of current elementary school teachers related to English Language Learner (ELL) methodology.

Request for Participation: I am inviting you to participate in a study on teacher perceptions on personal preparation in regards to ELL methodology in service to ELLs in public schools. It is up to you whether you would like to participate. If you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. You can also decide to stop at anytime without penalty. If you do not wish to answer any of the questions, you may simply skip them. You may withdraw your data at the end of the study. If you wish to do this, please tell us before you turn in your materials. Once you turn in the materials, we will not know which survey or test is yours.

Exclusions: You must be a fulltime K-6 grade Missouri certified classroom teacher.

Description of Research Method: The research involves completing a short survey. The survey will ask for demographic information and about your experience with ELL instruction methodology. This research will take approximately 30 minutes to finish. You will have an opportunity to ask questions. If you would like to know the results of this study, please contact Mr. Uzziel H. Pecina. He can be reached at pecinau@umkc.edu or 816-235-2447.

Privacy: All of the information the researcher collects will be confidential. We will not record your name, faculty/employment/student number, or any information that could be used to identify you.

Explanation of Risks: The risks of this study are similar to the risks of everyday life.

Explanation of Benefits: You may enjoy knowing that you have provided data for educational research that may benefit you, your profession, the greater and educational community, and the children you serve.

Questions about Your Rights: If you have any questions about human subject's participation and your rights in this research project, please contact the Campus Institutional Review Board (573) 882-9585 at MU-C. If you would like to participate, please sign a copy of this letter and return it to me. The other copy is for you to keep.

I agree to participate in this survey.

Signature

Date

Appendix D

Informed Consent Form

Interviews

Title: Perceptions of ELL Sheltered Instruction Methodology use among Elementary School Teachers in service to English Language Learners.

Researcher: This research is being conducted by Mr. Uzziel Hernandez Pecina, M.S. Ed., a Doctor of Education Candidate at the University of Missouri-Columbia, in cooperation with University of Central Missouri (UCM). Uzziel H. Pecina is also a Visiting Assistant Professor at University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) in the Department of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education and teaches Diversity and Foundation in Education courses in the School of Education. This research is under the supervision of Dr. Sandy Hutchinson, Associate Professor of School Administration, Department of Educational Leadership and Human Development, College of Education, UCM. Dr. Hutchinson can be contacted at hutchinson@ucmo.edu or 660-543-4720 for further information regarding this research.

Purpose of the Study: The purpose of this research is to understand perceptions of current elementary school teachers related to English Language Learner (ELL) methodology.

Request for Participation: You have identified yourself as a willing participant for a personal interview based upon the contact information you provided the researcher after you completed the survey portion of this research. I am officially inviting you to participate in a personal interview related teacher perceptions on personal preparation in regards to ELL methodology in service to ELLs in public schools. It is up to you whether you would like to participate in the personal interview. If you decide not to participate, you will not be penalized in any way. You can also decide to stop the interview at anytime without penalty. If you do not wish to answer any of the interview questions, you may simply ask the researcher to stop the interview session. You may withdraw your data at the end of the study. If you wish to do this, please tell the researcher after the interview session has ended.

Exclusions: You must be a fulltime K-6 grade Missouri certified classroom teacher.

Description of Research Method: The research involves completing a short interview session. The researcher will ask for demographic information and about your experience with ELL instruction methodology. The personal interview will take approximately 30 minutes to finish. You will have an opportunity to ask questions. If you would like to know the results of this study, please contact Mr. Uzziel H. Pecina. He can be reached at pecinau@umkc.edu or 816-235-2447.

Privacy: All of the information the researcher collects will be confidential. We will not record your name, faculty/employment/student number, or any information that could be used to identify you.

Explanation of Risks: The risks of this study are similar to the risks of everyday life.

Explanation of Benefits: You may enjoy knowing that you have provided data for educational research that may benefit you, your profession, the greater and educational community, and the children you serve.

Questions about Your Rights: If you have any questions about human subjects participation and your rights in this research project, please contact the Campus Institutional Review Board (573) 882-9585 at MU-C. If you would like to participate, please sign a copy of this letter and return it to me. The other copy is for you to keep. I agree to participate in this interview.

Signature

Date

VITA

Mr. Uzziel Hernandez Pecina was born in Kansas City, Missouri in 1968. He is a bilingual, first generation Mexican American. He was born to Antonio C. Pecina (deceased) and Graciela H. Pecina, both immigrants from Parras de la Fuente, Coahuila, Mexico. He is the eldest son of five children. He graduated in 1986 from Westport Senior High School in the Kansas City Missouri School District (KCMSD). He graduated Valedictorian and attended Kansas State University (KSU) where he earned a B.A. in Modern Languages (1991), and a M.S. in Urban Education (1997). He is a certified Spanish teacher both in Kansas and Missouri and holds a Building Administrator's certificate in Missouri. He has taught both in the public, alternative, and charter school systems in Kansas City, Missouri, and is the former principal of Guadalupe Center's Alta Vista Alternative/Charter High School (1996-2002). He has taught at University of Central Missouri (UCM) as an Assistant Professor of Elementary Multicultural Education in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction in the College of Education and Human Services (2002-2007). Uzziel currently is an Assistant Teaching Professor in the Division of Urban Leadership and Policy Studies in Education (ULAPSIE) in the School of Education at University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC). He currently teaches multicultural and educational foundations courses at UMKC. Uzziel is married to Adriana Melgoza Pecina and they have four children: Ximena (14), Uziel jr. (12), Alejandra (8), and Luis Enrique (4). Their children currently attend Foreign Language Academy, a KCMSD school. Adriana and Uzziel are very active both in the Latino and greater Kansas City community, championing social justice and educational issues in all communities. Uzziel is an accomplished musician/guitarist/vocalist. He currently leads a

Mexican folkloric trio named, Trio Aztlan. Trio Aztlan has two recording efforts: *Trio Aztlan* (2002) and *Peor es Nada* (2005) on independent labels. Uzziel is also a former U.S. Army Kansas National Guardsman, MOS-13 Bravo (Artilleryman-Assistant gunner), and earned the rank of Specialist (1989-1997).