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Abstract

As U.S. public school classrooms become hubs for an array of linguistically diverse students, mainstream teachers are faced with the challenge of meeting not only the academic needs of these students but also their linguistic needs. Although schools are forced to hire more and more ELL instructors, these students still spend the majority of their day in mainstream classrooms where the teachers may not be well equipped to handle their linguistic needs. Therefore, it has become critical that teachers be well versed in ELL instruction. In order to improve the instructional quality of the teachers, their knowledge of ELL instruction must be examined.

This study examined ten high school teachers who taught in a district with a significant ELL population. Of these ten teachers, five were tenured teachers with ten or more years of teaching experience, and the other five were non-tenured teachers with three or less years of teaching experience. The main focus of the study was to examine whether mainstream teachers still believed in certain myths about English language learners as well as whether the beliefs between the two test groups differ or are the same.

The results of the survey showed that the participants in both groups did not believe the common myths about ESL. The responses indicated that participants, whether by experience or observation, had some knowledge of ESL. The data gleaned from the interview showed that there was no real difference between the tenured and non-tenured group. The two main themes that emerged from the research was first, that both groups believed that motivation on the part of the student played a major role in determining how fast the he or she would learn the target language. Second, that was the student’s prior education was key factor in there ability to acquire the target language.
It is remarkable how many misconceptions there are here about life in the developing world and I think that that knowledge gap has done a lot to contribute to the imbalance quite frankly.

-Emma Thompson
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Chapter 1: Introduction

According to the National Center for Education, English Language Learners are the fastest growing demographic in public schools in the United States (NCES, 2016). Owing to an ever-growing population of ELLs in the United States (Batt, 2008), mainstream teachers must be well equipped to handle the language needs of their ELL students. Because so many ELLs will be placed in mainstream classrooms without the linguistic and academic skills needed to thrive, the need to correct the misconceptions of ELL instruction is critical to their success. This can be achieved through providing mainstream teachers with accurate knowledge of the language learning process as well as skills and strategies to use in the classroom. The following section looks at several studies that examine myths and misconceptions, which influence ELL instruction as well as the perceived knowledge and needs of mainstream teachers and how that perceived knowledge could affect content teachers’ pedagogy.

Examining mainstream teachers’ views on the myths and misconceptions of ESL is extremely important in the field of education. These views ultimately shape and guide a teacher’s view of the students they teach as well as how they teach them. For me, I teach in a district with a significant ESL
population. Many times throughout the school year I am asked by my mainstream colleagues’ questions that pertain to ESL and ELLs. Quite often these questions are very telling of the teacher’s lack of knowledge concerning a large percentage of the students that make up their classroom. Therefore, the data of this research serves two purposes. First, the information gleaned from the interviews provided some insight as to what mainstream classroom teachers believe or perceive when it comes to ELLs. Second, the results of this research serve as a basis for professional development, which will provide mainstream classroom teachers with the information and tools needed to better serve their ELL students.
Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Why Their Beliefs Matter

Teachers’ pedagogical beliefs directly influence how they will teach their students. Therefore, it is imperative that teachers be well-informed when it comes to the types of students that they have in their classroom along with teaching practices that will best fit the needs of their students. Research suggests that teachers’ perceived knowledge is that language acquisition occurs indirectly and through meaningful contact with native speakers of the target language. Existing research suggests that if misconceptions and beliefs about language learning are not addressed, classroom instruction based on these fallacies will remain ineffective in addressing the linguistic and academic needs of these students (Harper & De Jong, 2004).

Roots of Believed Myths

Researchers Harper and De Jong argued that much of mainstream teachers’ misunderstanding about ELL instruction is stimulated by poor professional development (2004). In a study conducted by researcher Ellen Batt (2008) where she surveyed over 100 ESL instructors in the state of Idaho, the general consensus was that administration and content teachers were simply poorly educated and misinformed when it came to the
needs of their English Language Learners. As early as 2002, data collected by the National Council of Teachers of English (2008) shows that less than 15% of content teachers had received as little as 8 hours or more of ELL training. Also, content teachers have been misguided by oversimplified professional development on ELLs and language acquisition (Harper & De Jong, 2004). In addition, a later survey by Batt revealed that ELL instruction suffered due to limited resources to hire qualified ESL instructors within the school district as well as a deficiency in quality professional development for content teachers whose classrooms consisted of a significant number of ELL students. Batt (2008) suggests the responsibility of ELL instruction cannot rest entirely on the shoulders of certified ESL instructors but must become a whole school approach. Content teachers must have adequate professional development in order to gain the essential knowledge and skills to meet the needs of their linguistically diverse students.

**Common Myths in ESL Instruction**

Although many programs have been implemented in public schools to help increase the academic success of ELLs, many of these programs have been built around misconceptions. Several studies have examined some of the major pedagogical
misconceptions among mainstream teachers (Harper & De Jong, 2004; McLaughlin, 1992). Their research looks at many of the common myths and misconceptions that run rampant in teachers’ classrooms and how these misconceptions play a major role in teachers’ beliefs about ELL education. My research will examine ten common myths among mainstream teachers.

Myth 1: ELL students can and will acquire their L2 solely through interaction and exposure to the target language. One myth found among classroom teachers suggests that ELL students can and will acquire their L2 solely through interaction and exposure to the target language. Second language acquisition research shows that like first language acquisition, the acquiring of the complex grammar of the target language must be explicitly taught. Teachers should not assume that these difficult concepts will be learned simply through exposure in the target language (Harper & De Jong, 2004, p. 153). This myth seems, at least to some degree, to stem from the behaviorist view that language is learned through environment and is perfected through positive and negative feedback. This view is the same when it comes to second language acquisition. However, there is no actual evidence that supports this point of view; yet it seems that this theory still pervades the
mainstream teachers’ view on how ELLs acquire language (Vanpatten & Williams, 2007, p. 19).

Effective instruction for ELLs means differentiating instruction as well as accessing the student’s prior knowledge. ELLs, like most students, come to the classroom with a host of experiences. These experiences have much to do with how they will progress through their academics. Research proposes that simply exposing an ELL to the target language is not enough. The target language must be presented in a meaningful way that activates the student’s background knowledge so that connections can be made between the existing schema and the newly acquired content (McLaughlin, 1992).

**Myth 2: ELLs learn at the same rate and in the same manner.** A second myth is that all ELLs learn at the same rate and in the same manner (Gil & Bardack, 2010). This misconception has led teachers to assume that certain mistakes made by students are the result of cognitive disorders rather than the natural progression of learning a second language. This myth is typically predicated on the teacher’s own experience with learning a second language and perceptions of how language should be learned.

There are many factors both internal and external that impact why ELLs learn at the rate they do. Some internal
factors include prior education in a child’s L1, motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic), and aptitude. External factors that influence the rate in which a child learns are curriculum, motivation (extrinsic), instruction and access to native speakers of the target language (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013).

One of the main contributing factors as to how fast learners acquire language is their prior educational experience (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Many ELLs are labeled as SLIFE, or Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal Education (Cortada, Austin, Keppler, & Morales, 2015). These are students who come from countries where poverty or other circumstances have prevented them from attending school or continuing their education. Other children come from countries where war or violence has forced them to leave their homes and resettle in a place where going to school is extremely difficult or there simply is no school to go to. Students with limited or interrupted formal education often lack literacy in their native language as well as many other academic skills. These skills can vary from the physical act of holding a pencil and writing to basic arithmetic. Many mainstream teachers are misled by a student’s age when they arrive in their classrooms and assume that although they may not know the target language, they possess the skills needed to learn
that language. Students with limited or interrupted education come to the classroom with a range of academic experiences that may range from no experience at all to a large amount. All of their experiences play a significant role in the rate at which they will acquire the target language. Since all students come to school with different educational backgrounds, it can be safely assumed that all students will learn at different rates (Cortada et al., 2015). Educators need to be cognizant of each ELL’s individual needs and differences (McLaughlin, 1992). Teachers cannot apply a one-size-fits-all approach to ELLs just as they should not apply a singular approach to native English speakers in their classrooms.

**Myth 3: Good teaching for native speakers is the same as good teaching for ELLs.** The third myth is based upon the claim that effective teaching for ELLs is the same as effective teaching for native English speakers (Gil & Bardack, 2010). The issue that arises with this myth is that while teachers are following state academic standards, these standards may not be appropriate for their ELL students. Such standards neglect to take into account that although a child is placed in a certain grade, that does not mean that he or she has the
appropriate linguistic or academic skills to be successful in the grade (O’Day, 2009).

Often overlooked is that ELLs require more support than their native English-speaking peers. The question is what “support” do ELLs need? Apart from simply exposing the students to the target language, there needs to be explicit instruction in the target language’s grammar. Teachers need to be aware that even as ELLs begin to learn the language and are able to use it conversationally, they still need to be explicitly taught the academic language needed to be successful in the classroom. Also, it is important to understand that ELLs who may have strong verbal skills and are able to communicate still lack academic language in the target language. Teachers of these students must also have at least some knowledge of the language acquisition process in order to foresee problems that ELLs will face during their acquiring of the target language (Gil & Bardack, 2010).

The use of differentiation or making content accessible to ELLs is essential to helping ELLs succeed in the classroom. An area that requires significant differentiation for ELLs is literacy. Text must be intentionally and purposefully chosen and modified so that it meets the linguistic needs of the student. Research has shown that mainstream teachers must also
have some knowledge of second language acquisition in order to make their differentiation more effective (O’Day, 2009).

**Myth 4: Effective instruction means nonverbal support.**

Another myth is that effective instruction means nonverbal support (Harper & De Jong, 2004). Teachers have tried to come up with methods to help ELLs circumnavigate complex concepts and texts through the use of visual aids and graphic organizers. When this support is not there, ELL students are still left with the task of navigating through complicated text without sufficient language skills. Creating support in the form of non-verbal assistance can only take the student so far. The fact is ELLs must be explicitly taught the forms and functions of the target language if they are to be able to proceed independently (2004).

Researchers Dale and Cuevas (1987) observed that one area where images and visual aids fail to provide for the learner’s academic needs is in math. There are many concepts and terms that cannot be deciphered by merely showing pictures. They point out that this is especially true when it comes to more complex terminology. Teachers need to be able to predict and be prepared for potential linguistic problems when it comes to their content area. Instruction needs to happen in a way in which the student is able to acquire content and academic
language. This can be accomplished through meaningful input and making sure to operate within the learner’s zone of proximal development. In other words, the student is able to complete a task or understand a particular concept by applying what they already know paired with some guidance from a teacher or peer (Harper & De De Jong, 2004; Lightbrown & Spada, 2013).

**Myth 5: Learning two or more languages will impede a child’s fluency in both languages.** In the past, researchers suggested that learning two or more languages at the same time would cause one if not both languages to suffer (Gil & Bardack, 2010). This myth is likely predicated on the assumption that learning two or more languages would confuse the learner or impair the way he thinks or learns. After all, how can the brain switch from one language to another without getting mixed up? However, by observing children in countries all around the world who not only learn a second language, but a third, fourth or even fifth, it is evident that there is little if not any truth to this myth (Mind/Shift, 2016).

Although newer research does not support this claim, critics continue to argue that ELLs’ acquisition of the target language is hindered by the continued use and learning of their L1 (First Language). The basis of this misconception can
be attributed to several things. Some critics argue that ELLs’ low test scores on high stakes standardized tests confirm their claim (National Council of Teachers of English, 2008). However, test scores alone cannot provide conclusive evidence to support the claim that learning two languages is detrimental. There are many factors that must be accounted for when trying to figure out why an ELL scores low on a state mandated exam. Such factors include ELLs whose education is devoid of direct explicit instruction in the target language, lack of academic language as well as students with limited or interrupted formal education.

Research has even shown that ELLs whose first language is stifled by mainstreaming the child in English-only type classrooms rarely reach the same level of success as their grade level classmates. However, ELLs who attended schools which had some form of language support program showed less gaps in their reading and math skills as compared to those ELLs who attended schools with no home language support (Thomas & Collier, 2002). Essentially, the research suggests that learning another language actually supports growth in both languages rather than impeding its development as previously thought (Gil & Bardack, 2010). Research now clearly suggests that learning more than one language is more
advantageous than adversarial and, furthermore, may be beneficial to the development of the brain (Mechelli et al., 2004).

Another area of research which pokes holes in this myth, is the area of dual language programs and bilingual schools. These studies show that students in these programs and/or schools scored above the 50th percentile in content-area assessments in English. In addition, dual language learners scored either equal to or higher than English monolinguals on exams given in English (Thomas & Colliers, 2002). Furthermore, there is little evidence showing that ELLs suffered delays in their acquisition due to learning two languages. In fact, learning two languages appears to be more beneficial than detrimental (Thomas & Colliers, 2002).

**Myth 6: All ELLs are immigrants.** Where do ELLs come from? The common myth is that they come from another country. Although there is some merit to this statement, it certainly does not represent the entirety of the ELL population. According to a study done by the National Council of Teachers of English (2008), 57% of adolescent ELLs were born in the United States. Research by the same group also found that of this percentage, 27% were second generation, and 30% were third generation. ELLs come from a variety of backgrounds.
Some have recently immigrated to the United States while others were born here to parents who have lived in the country for years. What is even more astounding is that many of these ELL students who were born in the United States are still classified by their schools as LEP (Limited English Proficient). Many of these students come from homes where no English is spoken; however, some ELLs live in homes where English is the dominant language. Mainstream teachers must recognize that ELLs are a heterogeneous group coming from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds (Gil & Bardack, 2010).

**Myth 7: ELLs with high levels of verbal proficiency are ready for grade level mainstream classes.** Another common myth among mainstream teachers is that students’ verbal skills are indicative of their academic ability. In other words, teachers assume that once students have developed their BIC (Basic Interpersonal Communication) portion of the target language, they have also acquired the academic language or CALP (Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency) needed to be successful in the classroom. However, often students are hurried into the mainstream classroom when they have shown signs of verbal proficiency in the target language. Consequently, when students are mainstreamed or exit an EL
program solely based on this qualification, they may (and often do) still struggle academically. Even though students may have acquired enough of the language to begin conversing with some semblance of fluency, they are often not ready to be left on their own in a mainstream class (McLaughlin, 1992).

It is crucial to understand that although oral proficiency is important it is not necessarily indicative of the how well the learner will do in the classroom. Teachers too often assume that oral proficiency in the target language is sufficient for grade level placement. Then they wonder why the student struggles when it comes to reading and writing in the target language. It is important that ELLs are assessed beyond their oral abilities in order to prevent possible academic language gaps that will certainly hinder them as they are moved along from one grade level to the next (McLaughlin, 1992).

Equally important for teachers to understand, is that ELLs do not develop social language and academic language in the exact same way and or at the same rate. BICS is the social language that is used the majority of the time to communicate with friends, family and colleagues. Social language requires context more than explicit instruction. Social language will naturally be acquired within the first few years of being
exposed to the target language. This is not the case when it comes to academic language or CALP. This type of language is needed for ELLs to succeed in the classroom. Academic language takes much more time to learn, several years according to research, and requires explicit instruction in order to help navigate the intricacies and abstract concepts presented in mainstream classes (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013).

**Myth 8: Many children from non-English speaking backgrounds have learning disabilities rather than problems with language acquisition.** Another pervasive myth about ELLs is that students who do not learn the target language in a prescribed amount of time have a learning disability (Gil & Bardack, 2010). ELLs are often misdiagnosed with having a learning disability when their CALP develops slower than their BICS (Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills). Again, the problem lies in the perception that a conversationally proficient ELL is also proficient in the academic language of the target language. As research demonstrates, these two areas of language develop at different rates and one before the other. That is, conversational skills take significantly less time to acquire, 2-5 years, as compared to the acquisition of academic language, which takes 4-7 years (Cummins, 2001).
Researchers Artiles and Ortiz (2002) suggest that one of the contributing factors for the overrepresentation of ELLs as having learning disabilities stems from inadequate assessment tools. They suggest that these tools are ill equipped to decipher between a linguistic issue and a disability (2002). As a result of these inadequate tests, ELLs are placed in special education programs that are not designed to meet the needs of an emerging ELL. Further misinformation on this topic has suggested that some educators see little problem with placing ELLs in special education programs saying that a simplified, slow-paced curriculum would be beneficial for them. However, research shows that the decision to place ELLs in programs for students with learning disabilities is ill advised (Artiles & Ortiz, 2002). What research does suggest is that ELLs be placed in language support programs for a period of 2 to 6 years. These programs are designed to meet the linguistic needs of the student.

**Myth 9:** Parents of ELL students do not want to be involved in their children’s education. Whose job is it to teach my child? For many Americans, the answer is the parents. Whether this is correct or not is not the point. The genesis of this myth that parents do not wish to be involved in their children’s education is likely built on the perception that
teachers “tend” to only see parents of non-ELLs at conferences or at school events. Although it is probably safe to say that some parents of ELLs do not wish to be involved in their child’s education, it is not accurate to say that all parents of ELLs do not want to be involved. It is perhaps better to look at this myth from the point of view of the parents of ELLs. First, it is important to keep in mind that parents of ELLs do not operate under the same paradigm as parents born and raised in the U.S. Parents of children from other countries do not always view parenting or education in the same way that parents that were born in the U.S. For example, Somali parents often describe their child’s teacher as one who assumes the role of both educator and parent in the classroom. In contrast, students who come from Mexico are expected to learn academics from their teacher and manners and morality from their parents (Sparks, 2009).

There are many reasons as to why parents may appear to withdraw from their child’s education. One is that their son or daughter is in the process of learning a language which they have little or no experience with. These parents, regardless of their desire to help their child, may simply not have the skills to do so. There is also the reality that these parents lack the knowledge to parent their children
appropriately when it comes to their academics. Another possible reason that educators may perceive parents to be absent in their child’s education is that they simply are not aware of what is happening at school or in the classroom. Research shows that schools where cultural liaisons have made concerted efforts to communicate and inform parents of ELLs about what is happening with their child at school often see greater parent involvement (Gil & Bardack, 2010).

**Myth 10: ELLs should be able to acquire English within two years of being in school.** How long should it take an ELL student to learn English? Many mainstream teachers tend to lean towards a shorter time period when it comes to proficiency or fluency in the target language. The belief that children will acquire proficiency in a language in a short amount of time is simply not true. First of all, the term proficiency in language must be defined. For example, is an ELL proficient when he or she can converse in the target language or does it mean that an ELL is proficient when he or she is able to read a text and then correctly respond to comprehension questions about that text? Also, it must be understood that language divides itself into two categories. One is the learner’s interpersonal communicative skills (BICS) and the other their academic language (CALP) (Lightbrown &
Spada, 2013). Learners acquire these two aspects of language at different times. Therefore, it is important to keep in mind that because the learner has obtained proficiency in his or her BICS, he or she may not have obtained a high level of academic language. Thus, appropriate assessment of the learner’s actual language ability is imperative so that false assumptions about the learner’s language proficiency can be avoided and the student can be placed appropriately in EL programs (2013).

It is also important that mainstream teachers understand that time alone is not an indicator of language proficiency. There are many factors that may play a role in how long it takes a student to acquire language such as age, time spent in country, time spent in an academic institution, attitude, and aptitude. Keeping all these factors in mind, research suggests 3-5 years for the acquisition of the learner’s BICS and 4-7 years for acquiring CALPS (Cummins, 2002). Even these numbers are subject to change depending on the aforementioned factors.

**Mainstream Teachers’ Perceived Needs**

Research done on teachers’ attitudes towards teaching English Language Learners and overall best practices for teaching ELLs suggests that many teachers feel inadequate when
facing the linguistic needs of their students (Reeves, 2006). When surveyed, a significant number of teachers expressed the desire to attend workshops or professional development concerning strategies and teaching techniques that would help them reach their ELLs. A survey conducted by Reeves (2006), in which she examined the attitudes of content teachers towards including ELLs in mainstream classrooms, revealed that although many teachers showed interest in receiving more professional development, nearly half were ambivalent to the idea. Researchers attribute this negative attitude to the fact that seasoned teachers have become calloused by programs which do not provide adequate support for teachers (Gonzalez & Darling-Hammond, 1997). This research suggests that adequate professional development, which seeks to provide teachers with useful and applicable strategies, can be incorporated into the classroom and is desperately needed.

**Whole School Approach**

As the ELL population increases and mainstream teachers are being held more accountable for the success of their ELL students, districts are faced with either hiring more ELL teachers or coming up with another solution in order to meet the demands of this rapidly growing demographic. Research done by Calderon and Minaya-Rowe (2011) posits that a school-wide
approach is one possible solution to promoting academic achievement among ELL students. Since many districts are not able to spend more money on hiring more ELL teachers, these districts are starting to look to their own to help solve the issue of providing adequate service to their ELL students. By developing resources and professional development for content area teachers, ELL students are able to still receive comprehensible input outside of the ELL classroom. Since many ELL students spend only a small fraction of their day with their ELL teacher, it is even more critical that mainstream teachers are well equipped to handle the demands of their ELL students. Calderon goes on to explain the benefits to this type of approach. One is that ELLs are able to function inside the classroom and not feel isolated due to their language ability. Another benefit is peer scaffolding: as ELL students are able to work side-by-side with native English speakers, they are able to improve their language skills (Calderon & Minaya-Rowe, 2011).
Chapter 3: Methodology

Research Question

Do mainstream teachers still believe the myths about ELLs?

Participants

For this study, I interviewed 10 teachers from a 9-12 high school where I work. The experience of the teachers being surveyed ranged from first year teachers to those at the end of their careers. The 10 teachers who were interviewed were divided into two groups. One group consisted of five tenured teachers (3 males and 2 females). In this study, tenure meant 10 or more years of teaching experience. Ten years of experience was designated so that there would be a significant amount of time between those with tenure and those without. The other group consisted of five non-tenured teachers (1 male and 3 females), or teachers with 3 or less years of teaching experience. Given the stipulations imposed by the survey only a small number of teachers were actually able to take part in the study. This is due to the fact that teachers who had between 4 and 9 years of experience were neither considered tenured or non-tenured. Participants represented the subject areas of art, math, science and English.
The school in this district is located in rural Southwest Minnesota. The ELL population of the school represents approximately one-third of the student body. The two main ethnic groups that comprise the ELL population are Somali and Hispanic. The ELL levels of the students in these classrooms range from 1-5 on the WIDA language proficiency scale. The population also includes a significant population of students who were once classified as ELLs and have since exited the program. The content areas of the teachers surveyed included, but are not limited to, mathematics, science, reading, and social studies.

**Materials**

In order to document the participants’ responses I used a device to record their answers. After the interview, their recorded responses were typed out in order to make analyzing their responses easier.

**Procedure**

I interviewed 10 teachers. The interviewees were divided into two groups. Five of them were non-tenured teachers and the other five were tenured teachers. All of the teachers were mainstream classroom teachers from the same high school. The interviews were held in either my classroom or the interviewee’s classroom. The interview questions were based on
8 myths discussed in the literature review section of the thesis. Although there are 10 myths discussed in the literature review, two were (Myth 3 and Myth 6) removed from the survey since they appeared to be so overt or obvious it would sway the participants’ response. After each question, the interviewee was given the opportunity to provide anecdotal evidence for why he/she affirmed or refuted the myth. The interviews lasted between 10 and 15 minutes depending on the level of detail in the given responses. A recording device was used to capture the participants’ responses. After the interview, the content of the interview was typed out word for word.

Analysis

In this study I used a qualitative analysis approach in order to find emerging patterns within the participants’ responses. For example, do responses from tenured and non-tenured teachers differ? And if so, how? Each interview was recorded using an iPad. The recorded responses from the interview were transcribed to better facilitate coding and analysis. Coding and categorizing were determined after the participants’ responses have been transcribed.

The first step in the analysis was to go through each of the transcripts from the interviews and label relevant
information. The relevancy of the information was based on words or phrases that were continually repeated, explicitly expressed opinions towards a certain question, or anything that was surprising or unexpected. The next step was to look at the participants’ responses and compare the responses from the tenured and non-tenured teachers. In addition to that, I looked to see if any patterns emerged from their responses.

**Expected Outcome**

Based on the research presented in the literature review, I expected to find that as a whole, teachers still believed in many of the aforementioned myths about ELLs. I also expected to see non-tenured teachers give responses more closely aligned with what current research says about ELL pedagogy. I believed that newer mandated academic requirements concerning ESL helped change the paradigm of new teachers. Therefore, I proposed that these teachers would have differing answers and opinions on certain questions than their tenured colleagues. I also expected to find that tenured teachers with ten or more years of experience would respond in a way that was indicative of a continued belief in the mentioned myths.

With the information gleaned from this research, I hoped to present it to the superintendent in the district where this study took place. The findings from this study should help
provide critical information pertaining to what professional development is needed in the district.
Chapter 4: Results

Ten mainstream classroom teachers were asked a set of eight questions. Two of the original ten myths (Myth 3 and Myth 6) were removed from the survey since they appeared to be so overt or obvious it would sway the participants’ response. The teachers were divided into two groups: five tenured (10 years or more of teaching); of the tenured participants four were males one was female, and five non-tenured teachers (3 years or less of teaching) of the non-tenured there were four females and one male. The participants taught in the areas English, math, science, physical education and art. These teachers were asked to verbally respond to common myths about ELLs. The purpose was to see how teachers would respond as well as if there was any difference between tenured and non-tenured teachers. The survey asked the teachers to respond to myths with either yes or no as well as provide any anecdotal evidence to affirm or refute their answer. After the data was collected and transcribed the responses were graphed. The anecdotal information was examined in order to discover any patterns across subjects.

Below are the questions in the order they appear in the survey as well as on the graphs.
Survey Questions

Myth 1. ELL students can and will acquire their L2 solely through interaction and exposure to the target language.

Myth 2. ELLs should be able to acquire English within 2 years.

Myth 3. ELLs with high levels of verbal proficiency are ready for grade level mainstream classes.

Myth 4. ELLs learn at the same rate and manner.

Myth 5. Learning two or more languages will impede a child’s fluency in both languages.

Myth 6. Many children from non-English speaking backgrounds have learning disabilities rather than problems with the language.

Myth 7. Effective instruction means non-verbal support.

Myth 8. Parents of ELL students do not want to be involved in their children’s education.

The following graphs illustrate the participants’ responses.
Figure 1: Participant Responses Questions 1-4
This graph shows the responses to questions 1-4. In question 1, 40% (2 out of 5) of tenured teachers responded yes, while 40% (2 out of 5) responded no, and 20% (1 out of 5) were unsure. For the same question, 40% (2 out of 5) of non-tenured teachers responded yes, and 60% (3 out of 5) of them replied no. In question 2, only 20% (1 out of 5) of tenured teachers responded yes, and only 20% (1 out of 5) responded no. 60% of tenured teachers were unsure. For the same question, only 20% (1 out of 5) of non-tenured teachers responded yes, and 40% (2 out of 5) responded no. For question 3, 40% (2 out of 5) of tenured teachers responded yes, and 20% (1 out of 5) responded no. Twenty percent (1 out of 5) of the non-tenured teachers responded yes and 80% (4 out of 5) responded no. For question 4, 100% (5 out of 5) of both tenured and non-tenured teachers responded in the negative.
Figure 2: Participant Responses Questions 5-8
This graph shows the responses to questions 5-8.

In question 5, 100% (5 out of 5) of both tenured and non-tenured teachers responded with a no. In question 6, 100% (5 out of 5) of tenured teachers responded no, while 40% (2 out of 5) of non-tenured teachers responded no. The other 60% of non-tenured teachers were unsure. In question 7, 100% (5 out of 5) of tenured teachers responded yes and 40% (2 out of 5) of non-tenured teachers responded yes. The other 60% (3 out of 5) of non-tenured teachers replied no. In question 8, 80% (4 out of 5) of tenured teachers responded no and the other 20% (1 out of 5) were unsure. One hundred percent (5 out of 5) of non-tenured teachers responded in the negative.
Chapter 5: Findings

The following results demonstrated that responses were consistent across both test groups with the exception of question 7. Results for each question will be presented in the order in which they appear in the survey.

Myth 1: ELL students can and will acquire their L2 solely through interaction and exposure to the target language.

Myth 1 had an almost even number of participants who answered both “yes” and “no”. These responses were equal across the tenured and non-tenured groups. Only one participant responded that they were “unsure”. Five of the 10 participants added to their response that in their opinion, the success of acquiring the target language depended a lot on the student’s educational background and their desire to want to learn the language. These types of responses were divided almost evenly between both groups and those who responded “yes” or “no”. This same response was seen by the participant who answered “unsure”. Another two participants responded by adding that interaction and exposure were not enough to acquire the target language, but that explicit instruction in the target language was critical to the success of the student. The two participants stated that in their experience,
exposure and interaction were not enough for their students to be able to understand the content or complete class assignments. Their responses seem to suggest an awareness of the differences between communicative language and academic language. Further evidence of this awareness in comes from one of the participant’s response to Myth 3 which asks whether a student who demonstrates high a level of verbal proficiency is ready for grade level mainstream classes. Their response, although not explicitly stating that there was a difference between BICS and CALP, reflected that in their experience ELL students who were able to interact conversationally in the class often floundered when it came to class readings and assignments. This suggests not only a difference between communicative and academic language, but also the need for explicit instruction in the target language. One participant who answered no to this myth added that in his experience students could acquire the target language solely through interaction if it was the only language that they were being exposed to. However, the participant also stated that in his experience students seem to struggle acquiring the target language because they were having to use one language at home and another at school. It is important to note that this same participant, when asked whether learning two or more languages
would impede fluency in both languages (Myth 5), answered in the negative. This response seems to suggest that the participant is affirming the need for explicit instruction and not that learning multiple languages is impossible or unrealistic.

**Myth 2: ELLs should be able to acquire English within two years.**

This myth had more participants respond with either “depends” or “maybe” than any other in the survey. Only 2 out of the 10 total participants said “yes” (1 tenured/1 non-tenured) and 3 out of 10 said “no” (1 tenured/2 non-tenured). The other half of the participants, 5 out of 10 or 50% (3 tenured/2 non-tenured), responded ambivalently. The most common reason given among the participants who gave extended responses (2 tenured/3 non-tenured) was that acquisition within a 2-year time span depends largely on the child’s motivation (20%) to learn the target language and any prior academic experiences that they may have had in their home country (30%).

Of the participants who answered “no” (3 out of 10), one provided no anecdotal evidence (tenured), another believed motivation on the part of the student was a key factor (non-tenured) and one believed that a two year time span was enough
time to acquire a communicative level of the target language, but in order to also acquire academic language more time would be needed (non-tenured). This participant was the only one who stated the difference between communicative and academic language. Of the participants who responded yes (2 out 10), one responded so based on experiential evidence. This participant noted that the students that were able to acquire enough of the language to succeed in the classroom demonstrated high levels of motivation and desire to do well academically.

It is interesting to note that of the ten participants, 5 out of 10 or 50% of the responses given reflected some awareness of the legitimate factors that influence language acquisition.

**Myth 3: ELLs with high levels of verbal proficiency are ready for grade level mainstream classes.**

Five out of 10 participants responded “no” (1 tenured/ 4 non-tenured), 3 out of 10 responded “yes” (2 tenured/ 1 non-tenured) while another two were unsure (2 tenured). The pattern that emerged in this myth was that out of the total group, those who responded either “yes” or “no,” (8 out of 10 or 80%, not those who responded with “unsure”) participants made a distinction between the students’ speaking proficiency
and their ability to comprehend both the written and spoken form of the target language. Of that same group of eight participants, three mentioned that in their experience, students with high levels of verbal proficiency often struggled with the academic language needed to succeed in the classroom. Participants who taught math or science specifically noted that the biggest struggle for ELLs in their classroom was that they simply had no understanding of the vocabulary being used in the class. As one participant stated, if they cannot understand the written content in the class, their verbal skills would not be enough for them to be successful. What is interesting about the responses to this myth was that 80% or 8 out of 10 participants responded in such a way as to allude to some knowledge of research on ELLs.

**Myth 4: ELLs learn at the same rate and manner.**

All participants in both groups answered “no”. Six out of 10 participants answered unequivocally no without giving any anecdotal evidence for their response. Four participants who answered “no” added that in their experience this was not the case. The pattern among these four participants was that rate and manner were different for every student ELL or otherwise. Two of the four noted that their prior experience was extremely important when it came to the rate in which an ELL
learned. Both participants stated that prior education was a key factor in how fast the student was able to learn as well as how their ability to comprehend the content in the class. The other two participants simply stated that learning rates and a child’s proclivity to learn in a particular manner varied among ELLs just as it would among non-ELLs. Only 20% of the participants responded in a way that reflected some knowledge of ESL research.

**Myth 5: Learning two or more languages will impede a child’s fluency in both languages.**

All participants answered “no” to this myth. Six out of 10 participants gave no reason or rationale to their response. The other four participants responded with a variety of answers that contained no apparent pattern. However, their responses correspond directly with research on ELLs. Twenty percent or 2 out of 10 referred to the observed fluency of bilingual and trilingual students, and another 20% noted research that shows learning two or more languages is actually more beneficial than detrimental. It was apparent that of the 60% who responded no and did not give any anecdotal evidence, that they in no way agreed with the statement, but gave no extended response due to a lack of knowledge in the field of language acquisition. However, I would posit that if probed
further many of the participants would have cited evidence relating to the observed fluency in bilingual students at the school as well as the fact that foreign language is a requirement in the majority of public schools across the United States and the world.

**Myth 6: Many children from non-English speaking backgrounds have learning disabilities rather than problems with the language.**

Seven out of 10 participants responded “no” to this myth (5 tenured/ 2 non-tenured). The remaining three responded with “possibly”. All those who answered with this response were non-tenured participants. No rationale was given by the seven participants who responded “no”. However, the three that responded with “possibly” said that it was possible or they did not know enough to really say anything definitive.

Apart from the three participants who said “possibly,” no real reason was given for the rejection of this myth. Knowing that many ELLs are underrepresented as SPED, it is interesting that only 30% of the participants said it was merely “possible”. The data becomes even harder to analyze when there is no anecdotal evidence given to support their response. However, given that ELLs are not assessed for SPED until they have acquired a significant amount of English or at least
enough to do the assessment, it may stand to reason that many of the participants answered with no simply because they do not see these students being classified as having a possible learning disability. Even though many may be candidates for such programs, they are unable to be assessed due to a deficiency in the target language and thus unable to be classified.

**Myth 7: Effective instruction means non-verbal support.**

Myth 7 showed a disparity between tenured and non-tenured participants. Five out of the five tenured participants responded “yes” to the statement where only 2 out of 5 non-tenured teachers said “yes” and the other 3 said “no”. Two participants who answered “yes” (1 tenured/1 non-tenured) gave no anecdotal evidence and one participant answered “no” but gave no rationale for their response. Across both test groups two themes emerge. The first theme, which was mentioned by 4 out the 5 tenured participants and 1 of the non-tenured participants (5 out of 9 of the total number of participants who said “yes”) was that pictures and other physical representation of the content (i.e., manipulatives, videos, labs, etc.) are an effective means of language support. Two participants (both tenured) also answered in the affirmative. They too said that non-verbal support was an effective method
so long as it was paired with other representations of the target language, i.e., speaking, direct instruction, one on one help etc.

**Myth 8: Parents of ELL students do not want to be involved in their children’s education.**

Nine out of 10 participants answered “no” to the myth that parents of ELLs do not want to be involved in their child’s education. One participant replied “depends” (tenured). His reasoning was that he did not feel that parents of ELLs were any different in terms of their desire to be involved in their child’s education any more than parents of non-ELLs. Among the other 9 participants who answered “no”, 7 (4 tenured/3 non-tenured) referenced that some of their most involved parents are those of ELLs. One particular participant stated when it comes time for conferences, it is the parents of ELLs who consistently show up. Furthermore, this participant stated that unlike the majority of non-ELL parents, who might only inquire about their child’s grades or behavior, the parents of ELLs often ask about those things and more. In one particular example the participant stated that a parent once asked not only about his child’s grades, but how he could improve and what measures could be taken at home in order to increase the child’s chances of success in the
classroom. This anecdote was ended by the participant stating that this was not an isolated event, but that many parents of ELL students inquire about ways they can help their children outside of the classroom.

Within that same group, two participants (non-tenured) stated that they felt that parents of ELLs may give the illusion that they do not want to be involved because they often appear withdrawn or may not show up to conferences or school events. Her opinion was that language and not knowing how or what it means to be involved in a child’s education is the reason for giving the illusion of being uninterested, not for lack of a desire to do so.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

Of the eight total myths that were surveyed, four out of the eight or 50% were completely rejected by both groups. Those that were completely rejected were myths 4, 5, 6, and 8. The remaining myths (1, 2, 3, and 7) were all partially rejected by both groups. The only exception was Myth 7 where tenured teachers answered 100% in the affirmative. In contrast, 60% percent of the non-tenured group answered in the negative with 40% answering in the affirmative. Overall, myth 7 was the only noticeable outlier with 70% or 7 out of 10 of the total participants answered in the affirmative.

Looking at all the participants’ responses, two prevailing themes emerge. One, participants believe that the child’s prior academic experience or experience with the target language has an effect on his/her ability to acquire the target language. Second, the child’s motivation to learn the target language is a significant element in determining how successful the child will be in acquiring the target language. These patterns are based on responses given for the first two myths in the survey (5 out of 10 in Myth 1 and 5 out of 10 in Myth 2). These particular myths specifically look at language acquisition.
The results of the survey do suggest that many of the participants have some understanding of the research on ELLs. This is evident through data collected, which shows that the participants in this study either outright rejected or partially rejected every myth.
Chapter 7: Discussion

Conclusions

The data indicate that the teachers in this study, tenured and non-tenured, do not believe or refute many of the common myths about ESL. Participants’ responses either directly stated or through their anecdotal responses indicated that each statement was untrue. There is no noticeable difference between tenured and non-tenured teacher responses. The participants demonstrated a basic understanding of some of the challenges that ELLs face. However, there was significant emphasis on motivation and not on the challenges immigrant students face: SLIFE, PTSD, literacy in their first language. Their knowledge of ELLs seemed to be based upon empirical observation and experience working in classrooms with ELLs rather than a deep knowledge of the research done of ELLs. That data also demonstrates that professional development is needed in many area of ESL education for teachers working in this district. It cannot be overstated that teachers will teach in the way that they perceive is the most effective and beneficial for their students. Therefore, it should be a priority for any district with a high population of ELLs to provide teachers with the support needed to effectively teach this population of students.
The only myth showing any discrepancy between the two groups is myth 7 (Effective instruction means non-verbal support). In this myth, 5 out of 5 or 100% of tenured teachers responded in the affirmative saying that non-verbal support is an effective means of language support, whereas only 2 out of 5 non-tenured teachers affirmed the myth with 3 out of 5 refuting it. The pattern amongst both groups who affirmed this myth points out that using manipulatives or other visual aides as well as hands-on instruction are effective tools in language learning. Two participants mentioned that non-verbal support is effective only in combination with verbal support. They added that explicit instruction as well as one-on-one help is the more effective approach and that non-verbal support without explicit instruction is less effective. This result is significant for instructional practice. First, if directions are only communicated verbally without modeling, it is likely that ELLs will not understand and further diminish their chances executed the activity or assignment correctly. Second, as teachers introduce new material, ELLs are more likely to understand the content if is presented in multiple formats. Third, teachers need to be aware of the fact that many of their ELs will not understand the content the first
time it is presented and that strategies need to be in place in order to combat their non-comprehension.

**Implications for Teachers**

The data collected in this study demonstrates that teachers from this school have at least some understanding of the ELL population in their classrooms. It is evident by looking at the participants’ responses that prior professional development concerning or experience working in classrooms with ELLs has certainly impacted teachers’ beliefs about ELLs.

Three main takeaways from this research that should be addressed via professional development are: factors that influence language acquisition (i.e., SLIFE, PTSD, motivation, time in country, exposures to the target language, prior education in their L1), the difference between social and academic language, and the use of explicit instruction in the target language. The first two take-aways are based on participants’ responses in Myths 1, 2, and 3 that specifically deal with language acquisition while the last take away is in response to answers given for myth 7. This myth is concerned with ESL pedagogy.

The first take-away focuses on language acquisition. Teachers must be made aware of the processes as well as the factors that go into language acquisition. As research has
suggested, there are many factors that contribute to a learner’s ability to acquire a second language. These factors include but are not limited to aptitude, motivation (extrinsic and intrinsic), personality, the curriculum being used, the pedagogy of the teacher, etc. (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013). For example, regarding myths 1 and 2, many participants responded that acquisition was influenced by a student’s motivation and desire to learn the target language. The belief that a student is not progressing in the target language due to his or her motivation diminishes the intricacies of the acquisition process and leaves little room for helping the student apart from using positive or negative reinforcement to motivate him or her. This also appears to put the blame on the student and does not seek to find the explanation in order to truly find out what needs to be done in order to improve student achievement. Research done on motivation’s impact on language learning suggests that although many successful language learners display a high level of motivation, it is agreed that their motivation was one of perhaps many factors that led to their achieving a high level of proficiency and not the sole factor (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013, p. 78). The participants’ responses also suggest that teachers may feel that they are not responsible for motivating their ELL students or that
motivating is part of good teaching. Teachers have a great deal of influence when comes to motivating their students. Teachers who provide an environment where a student feels welcomed and where they feel they are being supported often see higher levels of motivation from their students (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013).

Again, it is important to note that although motivation is an important factor in language acquisition, it must be stressed that it is only one of many factors that play a role in determining the linguistic success of the learner.

The second takeaway, which is based on responses from myth 3, looks at the difference between social language (BICS) and academic language (CALP). The pattern that emerges from the responses to this myth shows that many teachers allude to a distinction between the two types of language but never explicitly state what that difference is. Empirically, many teachers seem to see a disconnect in their students with very high verbal skills and their struggle understanding classroom content. However, no one mentioned the need for emphasis on teaching academic English in their classroom. As research has shown, academic language takes significantly more time to acquire than social language (Lightbrown & Spada, 2013). This being the case, teachers need to be cognizant that more often
than not the ELLs that are walking into their classrooms likely do not have the academic language needed to do well in their class. This is especially true at the secondary level where content is much more rigorous and assumes the student has some background knowledge of the content as well as a mental lexicon that will help guide them through new vocabulary.

These responses strongly suggest that professional development is needed to assist mainstream teachers in understanding the fact that students will naturally acquire social language before academic language. Therefore, the needed professional development is that which teaches strategies that show teachers how they can bolster the students’ acquisition of academic language.

The third takeaway has to do with the belief that nonverbal instruction is an effective tool in learning another language. As the responses to myth 7 indicate, two possible conclusions can be drawn. First, teachers believe that nonverbal support in the target language is an effective strategy and does not need to be accompanied by direct instruction in the target language. If this is the case, then certainly professional development on this subject is needed. However, participants who responded with an unqualified “yes,”
did so possibly because of the way the statement was read, and felt that either no qualifier was needed or that it was obvious and did not need to be said. However, if this is not the case, then professional development would be needed to show teachers how on its own, nonverbal support is not as effective as when paired with direct instruction. Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2000) point out that it is important that teachers provide visual support to help with the conceptual complexity of the content. However, this alone is not enough. Explicit language support is also needed to help the students navigate content when visual aids are not available. Nonverbal support is only the start of making the content easier for ELLs to conceptualize. These types of accommodations, however helpful in making content more comprehensible, are only part of what is necessary to helping ELLs fully comprehend academic content. Teachers need to find other ways of reducing the language demands on their ELL students. This can be done by providing texts and other content material that better suit the student’s linguistic level as well as find ways for their students to develop the language skills needed to succeed in classroom (Harper & De Jong, 2004).
Final Thoughts

Along professional development the district should consider providing the means for at least one teacher from each subject area to receive ESL training from an accredited institution. This training would enable teachers to train and assists their subject area colleagues to better serve their ELL students. Teachers would not only be able to bring a subject area specific perspective to ESL pedagogy, but hopefully use the training to provide uniquely tailored instruction to their ELL students. The more we can educate our teachers on the populations that they serve the better they can ultimately serve those students academically.

Limitations of the Study

It is important to note that this research has limitations in generalizing the results to all mainstream classroom teachers’ views of such myths. There are several shortcomings in this study.

First, this study was conducted in only one school district at one school. In order for this research to be seen as more conclusive, many schools, both primary and secondary, in many districts throughout the country must be surveyed.

Second, other ethnic groups must be included in the research. This study took place in a district where the vast
majority of the ELL students are Somali with a much smaller population of Latino and Karen students. Given that a large number of the students struggle with having no prior academic experiences and/or whose education experience was interrupted due to turmoil in their home country, answers to myths that look at acquisition may be different based on different ELL populations. For example, in many districts ELLs are from Western Europe where students have easy access to education and are literate in their L1, so teachers may see acquisition taking place faster as compared to those who are not literate. Therefore, the response to the myth “ELLs should be able to acquire English within two years” may look much different since we know that literacy in a student’s L1 is certainly a factor in acquiring their L2.

Another limitation in the research is the sample size. This research deals with a relatively small sample size, only 10 participants. In order to get a more accurate picture of teachers’ beliefs about these myths, the sample size must be much larger.

**Future Research**

Clearly more research needs to be done on this topic in order to obtain more definitive results. Research conducted in different districts with different ELL populations, as well as
a larger sample size, would help to provide more generalizable results. Another suggestion may be to follow each question of the survey with a follow-up question that could be used to glean more anecdotal information, thus providing more overall information to be used in the analysis.
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Appendix A: Interview Questions

Procedure

Tell the informants that they will be read a list of statements about EL students and their education, and that they should tell you both what they think of the statements and if they could give examples that would support or refute these statements.

1. ELL students can and will acquire their L2 solely through interaction and exposure to the target language.
2. ELLs should be able to acquire English within two years.
3. ELLs with high levels of verbal proficiency are ready for grade level mainstream classes.
4. ELLs learn at the same rate and in the same manner.
5. Learning two or more languages will impede a child’s fluency in both languages.
6. Many children from non-English speaking backgrounds have learning disabilities rather than problems with language acquisition.
7. Effective instruction means nonverbal support.
8. Parents of ELL students do not want to be involved in their children’s education.
Appendix B: Demographic Information

1. What is your gender? Male/Female

2. What is your licensure area?
Appendix C: Consent to Participate in Interview

You are invited to participate in a research study about mainstream teachers’ knowledge of ESL.

If you agree to be part of the research study, you will be asked to answer questions pertaining to your knowledge of ESL. Your responses will be recorded and used in my master’s thesis.

The benefit of the research is that the information received in this study will help the district provide more adequate professional development for mainstream teachers who teach ELLs.

Data collected will remain anonymous. Responses will be kept strictly confidential, your name will not be disclosed nor will identified direct quotes be used. During the interview you may refuse to answer any questions. After the completion of the interviews, you will receive your transcribed interview if requested. Upon completion of the study all raw data will be erased.

Participating in this study is completely voluntary. Your decision whether or not to participate will not affect your current or future relations with St. Cloud State University, or the researcher. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty.

If you have questions about this research study, you may contact Nickolas Castiglione at nickolascastiglione@gmail.com. Or from my faculty sponsor Dr. James H. Robinson at JHRobinson@stcloudstate.edu or 320-308-4956. Results of the study can be requested from the researcher or the St. Cloud State University Repository.

Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age, you have read the information provided above, and you consent to participate.

_________________________________________   ________________
Signature                                      Date
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Final Report and Continuing Review/Project Continuation, please answer the following:

1. How many participants have participated in your study? 10

2. Have any adverse events (complaints, unexpected reactions, discomfort, or problems) occurred during this research project?

☐ No

☐ Yes, explain:

3. Have any participants withdrawn from the research, either voluntarily or at the researcher's request?

☐ No

☐ Yes, explain:

4. Has any new information been identified that may affect the willingness of subjects to participate in this research project?

☐ No

☐ Yes, explain:

5. Have any changes been made to your research project (changes in subject recruitment, informed consent documents, design, methodology, and procedures, etc.) since it was approved by the IRB?

☐ No

☐ Yes, explain:

Principal Investigator's Signature ________________________________ Date 6/21/17
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