Culminating Projects in English   Department of English

10-2017

Content Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Language Teaching Strategies

Alexandra Badger
St. Cloud State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/engl_etds

Content Teachers' Perceptions of Effective Language Teaching Strategies

by

Alexandra Yarbrough Badger

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of

St. Cloud State University

in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

in English: Teaching English as a Second Language

2017

Thesis Committee:
James Robinson, Chairperson
Michael Schwartz
Hsueh-I Lo

Abstract

This study investigated the perceptions of content teachers about language teaching and serving EL students. Using survey instruments and semi-structured interviews, content teachers were asked to express their beliefs about best language teaching practices. Quantitative data from surveys were analyzed in order to determine where content teachers' beliefs of language teaching practices coincided or differed with research-based TESL pedagogy. Content and EL teachers were both interviewed in order expand on teachers' reported perceptions and allow for a comparison between the two population groups. Content teachers' perceptions of effective teaching practices mostly coincided with educational and TESL theory especially on questions that were specifically related to SIOP and constructivist practices. Teachers did not have strong beliefs about corrective feedback, the role of grammar instruction, and procedures related to the natural acquisition hypothesis. Additionally, though content teachers reported their beliefs about the importance of parity in co-teaching relationships, data from the qualitative portion of the study directly contradicted content teachers' reported beliefs. Implications for ELLs, teachers, and teacher education programs are discussed.

Table of Contents

Chapter   Page

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Within the broad field of education and second language acquisition (SLA), there are still an incredible amount of questions about what contributes to effective teaching and learning. Educators and researchers alike are constantly working to discover what exact classroom behaviors are equivalent with tangible student gains. These questions continue to confound educators on a daily basis.

Despite the abundance of these questions, educators and researchers have been able to attribute some general principles of effective teaching pedagogy that result in learning regardless of the subject. Frequently, research has looked at the practices in the classroom that result in learning gains. However, given that beliefs and actions are quite inseparable in teaching, it is also imperative to understand teachers' perceptions.

An individual's perceptions are indicative of his or her subjectively held beliefs, motivations, attitudes, and cultures. These beliefs can be derived from a wide variety of sources including but not limited to, an individual's personality, their prior experiences, and their educational background (Kagan, 1992). Such beliefs can vary incredibly from individual to individual and, as it relates to education, from teacher to teacher. More research is beginning to focus on how these perceptions translate into classroom procedures (Richardson, 1996). As Clark and Peterson (1986) note, such perceptions provide the foundations for teachers' planning processes, classroom behavior, and decision-making, and teachers' personal philosophies of teaching. A philosophy of teaching is the framework that teachers use, whether consciously or unconsciously, to guide their own educational practices. Teachers

may build upon this philosophy of teaching as their own perceptions of teaching and education develop.

Within the broad field of education, perceptions are beginning to reemerge in second language research in order to best understand what motivates second language teachers (Richardson, 1996). Insight into the perceptions of teachers about language learning practices is particularly necessary at this time in history given that English Language Learners (ELLs) are the fastest growing student population in the United States (Grantmakers for Education, 2013). In the last decade alone, ELLs grew by 60% as compared with the general student population which only grew by 7%.

Learning English as an additional language is certainly a primary objective for ELLs in the USA. However, these students are also tasked with mastering grade-level content simultaneously. ELLs are frequently enrolled in such content classes before achieving proficiency in the native language. Therefore, ELLs are not interacting with English language teachers exclusively. ELLs are also receiving considerable instruction from content teachers. Content teachers teach courses other than English as an additional Language including subjects such as math, science, and social studies. Though content teachers are primarily concerned with educating students in their given subject areas, content teachers are also now partly responsible for the language acquisition of ELLs. It is therefore necessary to focus not only on the perceptions that these EL teachers hold, but also the perceptions and belief systems of content teachers. The perceptions of teachers can be drastically influenced by prior experiences, including teacher preparation and previous experience working with ELLs.

Understanding the various levels of teacher preparation for content teachers is important to understanding the belief systems and perceptions those teachers may hold. The quality and quantity of TESOL preparation that teachers receive directly influences the perceptions and belief systems that teachers have when later serving this population (Song & Samimy, 2015). While EL teachers have received explicit certification and training to work with this demographic, it is possible that content teachers have received varying degrees of preparation for what is a rapidly expanding group of students (DelliCarpini & Alonso, 2014). It is even possible that teachers in mainstream classrooms may have had no pre-service training in TESOL pedagogy (DelliCarpini & Alonso, 2014). As it relates to perceptions, there needs to be a greater focus on the level of preparation that content teachers receive.

As previously stated, prior education is not the only variable that can influence teachers' beliefs about education. Experiences working with ELs, personal experiences, and even personality differences can shape the perceptions that teachers have about education and language learning. These beliefs and perceptions that content teachers have are vital to understanding what practices teachers are using and why they are using them. While there is research available on the perceptions of EL teachers concerning the best language teaching practices, there is little research available about what perceptions content teachers have about language acquisition.

Perception is a broad term and, for the purposes of this study, it will be operationalized to encompass other, similar facets that contribute to a teacher's personal belief system as it relates to teaching. Specifically, perceptions will be used to indicate what teachers believe are

best language teaching strategies while working with ELLs. The purpose of this study is to better understand what perceptions content teachers have with regard to working with ELLs.

As teachers develop, their belief systems may change, which is assumed to be beneficial for the students' learning (Song & Samimy, 2015). However, in order for these belief systems to develop, teachers must first be able to explicitly state their belief system, for this is where the process of learning truly begins (Song & Samimy, 2015).

Research Question

How do content teachers' perceptions of language teaching practices coincide or differ from best known practices in TESL and co-teaching?

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

This study will focus on the perceptions of content teachers and how those beliefs

relate to research-based TESL pedagogy. The study focuses on secondary level content in a

public school district in central Minnesota. In order to ascertain what perceptions these

teachers hold, it is necessary to understand who these teachers are, the settings in which they

operate, and what current teaching protocols are being utilized by the district. This literature

review will provide background on who the ELLs are in the K-12 public schools in central

Minnesota; how standards are currently expressed and interpreted, which determines the

scope and sequence of content that all teachers use in the classroom; and the program models

that are providing the current structures for how teachers interact with ELLs. All of these

components influence who, what, and how educators are teaching and all can influence the

perceptions of the best practice when working with ELLs.

ELLs in the K-12 Public Schools

As of 2009, English Language Learners (ELLs) accounted for approximately 10.8% of

the K-12 student population nationally (National Clearinghouse for English Language

Acquisition, 2011). This percentage is expected to reach nearly 40% by 2030 (U.S.

Department of Education & the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development,

2003).

Given the increasing number of English Language Learners (ELLs) in the United

States, districts across the USA are creating program models to meet the needs of these

students. Districts are also providing in-service professional development opportunities for

educators working with this growing population (including content teachers). Under current

federal legislation including the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 and the amendments of Lau

v. Nichols, (decided January 21, 1974) ELLs are entitled to receive appropriate educational

accommodations related to their limited English proficiency (DelliCarpini & Alonso, 2014).

Though the federal government has mandated that ELLs are entitled to such services, the

decisions about how to enact these policies is ultimately a state-based right (DelliCarpini &

Alonso, 2014).

According to the Minnesota Minority Education Partnership (2012), 7% of the

Minnesota student population in 2011 were classified as English Language Learners. In

Minnesota, the most common home languages of these students were Spanish, Hmong, and

Somali (MNEP), which indicates that as of 2011, the ELL population was not a homogenous

group. However, within Minnesota, certain districts may have a more homogenous population

while others may have a more heterogeneous mix. Depending on the number of students,

these ELs may contribute to a larger or smaller portion of the student population. Certain

districts may also have a greater proportion of Students with Limited or Interrupted Formal

Education (SLIFE). Therefore, policy makers and educators across various districts in

Minnesota have begun introducing differing program models to best meet the needs of these

students depending on the demographics of the ELL population in the given district.

In central Minnesota, some districts are utilizing the Sheltered Instruction Observation

Protocol (SIOP) and co-teaching models (Baisch, 2015) in an effort to help EL students

access grade-level content courses while also receiving legally mandated EL services.

Districts in Minnesota currently use ACCESS standards to determine students' proficiency

and abilities to express and process information across the various content areas. Districts are

utilizing program models like these because of statewide pressures to have all students, regardless of language ability, achieve at grade-level standards across content areas.

      Standards movement in Minnesota. In Minnesota, ELLs are challenged with simultaneously achieving in academic content areas while attaining proficiency in English (Kibler, Valdes, & Walqui, 2014). Much of the pressure to achieve in both areas derives from the current initiatives of the standards movement (Kibler et al. 2014). These academic content standards are written in English and thus students are expected to demonstrate their knowledge of those concepts in English. As Kibler et al. state, "the standards movement has become omnipresent in contemporary education, impacting English teaching" (2014, p. 433). It is unsurprising that ELLs are entering content area classes before achieving proficiency in English as determined by ACCESS scores and other exit criteria (teacher recommendations, MCA scores, etc.).

      In Minnesota, state assessment data drives many of the decisions made about district policy. Additionally, this same data can also define a district's or school's success (MN Department of Education, Why Statewide Test Results Matter, 2015). Minnesota reports the data not only to the public, but also to the U.S. Department of Education, which determines how Minnesota students are performing as compared to the national averages. ELLs are among one of the population groups in St. Cloud who are included in this data. (Baisch, 2015).

      The MCAs (Minnesota Comprehension Assessments) are the state assessments used to measure students' progress in reading, mathematics, and science (MN Department of Education). ELLs are required to take the MCAs after being in the USA for 1 year, regardless

of language proficiency. Districts can use this data to address achievement gaps between student groups. As previously stated, this data is used to measure the success of districts and schools. Therefore, districts have a particular interest in ensuring that ELLs are not only acquiring English, but are also achieving in academic content areas. In an effort to help ELLs be successful in those content areas, in which success is defined by the MCAs, some districts in central Minnesota have begun implementing Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) and co-teaching models (Baisch, 2015).

Both program models include content teachers for instruction for ELLs. The SIOP model provides an outline for how content teachers can best accommodate for ELLs while still teaching the standards as outlined by the Minnesota Department of Education. In addition to any TESOL specific coursework or training these content teachers may have received, the training they have received in SIOP may significantly affect how they teach and view the best teaching practices for working with ELLs. In the co-teaching model, an EL teacher is paired with a content teacher to work together to meet the needs of ELLs. In co-teaching there are several frameworks for how teachers can choose to implement their classes. As with SIOP, the content teachers using the co-teaching model may have had varying experiences and preparation in working with ELLs. In both models, ELLs are receiving instruction from content teachers. It is imperative to understand where the content teachers' perceptions are based (Baisch, 2015).

Both sheltered instruction and co-teaching models are approaches in which ELLs are introduced into content classrooms prior to achieving proficiency in English. Students receive their English instruction through these content mediums. There has been an increasing focus

on how these program models impact the learning of ELLs and whether or not these are effective with regard to language acquisition and content mastery. The following subsections review the research regarding the structures and implementations of sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP) and co-teaching (Baisch, 2015).

ELL Program Models

As previously stated, EL students are still accountable to Minnesota State Standards in content areas. There is, therefore, a demand for ELLs to receive instruction in content areas (math, science, social studies, language arts) and to close the achievement gap between these students and their English speaking peers. Certain districts in central Minnesota are now integrating ELLs into mainstream classrooms, provided that they have the language support in place to ensure their success in these new environments (Baisch, 2015). As previously mentioned, among the various models of support available, some districts are electing to use either sheltered instruction and/or a co-teaching to achieve this.

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP). As previously stated, the standards movement has created pressure and opportunities for ELLs to achieve in content areas as well. During these courses, content teachers and ELLs communicate "between two different orders of discourse: the current levels of learners' knowledge and L2 abilities, and the broader knowledge and specialist language" of the content classroom (Gibbons, 2011). The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol is a series of steps and practices that are designed to increase ELL's comprehension when learning with teachers who may not be licensed in TESL.

The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model was developed through a 7-year research study funded by the U.S. Department of Education (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013). SIOP is an approach where content teachers provide instruction in academic contexts for students who are learning an additional language (Short, Fidelman, & Louguit, 2012). According to Short et al. (2012), this instruction is generally provided by the content teacher who has training in SIOP procedures and pedagogical practices. These teachers provide accommodations and modify their instruction to make the material more accessible to ELLs.

Hansen-Thomas (2008) expanded upon this definition to include the synthesizing of materials and instruction as to best meet the academic needs of learners. The synthesizing of materials is an important aspect of SIOP. During the synthesis stage, materials are modified to be more accessible to ELLs. Finally, one of the primary objectives of the SIOP framework is to "help teachers integrate academic language development into their lessons, allowing students to learn and practice English as it is used in the context of school, including vocabulary used in textbooks and lectures in each academic discipline" (SIOP, 2009, p. 1).

The SIOP framework covers eight areas of instruction including preparation, building background, comprehensible input, strategies, interaction, practice and application, lesson delivery, and review and assessments (SIOP, 2009). Generally, teachers receive professional development in SIOP instructional practices before implementing these modifications in lessons (SIOP, 2009).

Components of SIOP. There are eight main components of SIOP and these will be discussed in this section. Preparation is the first component of SIOP. This component assumes that students may not yet have the language skills required to communicate their needs. The

preparation component encourages teachers to explicitly teach the vocabulary and phrases that students might need in order to ask for clarification, examples, expansions on a subject, or other questions necessary to be successful in the classroom. Teaching this vocabulary enables students better communicate their needs (SIOP, 2009).

Building background is the second component of SIOP and is one of the most crucial elements. Building background allows students to make connections to their prior learning and experiences. This stage is particularly important for ELLs in the United States because these students have limited experience with the target language and they may also be unfamiliar with the American culture. Frequently, these students have had little experience with the content being taught and therefore need personal connections to make the information more relevant and tangible. Helping students make these connections increases the relevance of the lesson and heightens students' motivation (Vidot, 2011).

The third component of SIOP is comprehensible input. Comprehensible input is defined as presenting the information in a lesson at a level and using an approach in which students are able to understand the concepts. Making lessons more comprehensible implies that teachers are using interventions and accommodations that increase student understanding. Some of the interventions and accommodations include using pictures, videos, modeling, and gestures. Additionally, Echevarria, Short, and Vogt (2008) observed that best practice for achieving comprehensible input involves using clear and concise speech that was at the students' proficiency levels.

Strategies are an important component of SIOP in that they focus on the cognitive skills that learners need to comprehend the concepts (Echevarria, Short, & Vogt, 2010). Some

of these strategies include predicting, self-assessment, and self-questioning. According to

Echevarria et al. (2010), some of these cognitive skills may be difficult for learners and

therefore recommend that scaffolding be used during instruction. For example, rather than

asking students to take notes, which can be considered a cognitive strategy, teachers might

provide outlines and graphic organizers so that students are more successful (Echevarria et al.,

2010).

Interaction is another key component of SIOP and Second Language Acquisition

(SLA) theory in general (McKeon, 1994). According to SIOP guidelines, teachers should use

varied interaction patterns so that students are interacting with each other while they process

the concepts. Using small-group and pair work increases the amount of time that students are

using the target language and applying the new concepts (McKeon, 1994). Teachers who have

a more interactive style already are generally more at ease with this component of SIOP

(Curtin, 2005).

The lesson delivery component provides guidelines as to how the material should be

conveyed. The SIOP model recommends clearly stating the content and language objectives at

the beginning of class. SIOP further recommends that the lesson be structured in a way that is

comprehensible for the students and encourages engagement throughout the class (SIOP,

2009)

Practice and application can be a difficult component of SIOP to implement

effectively. According to Echevarria et al. (2010), ELL students need additional time to apply

the concepts and process the information. Students may be trying to process the information

in both English and their home language. The practice tasks given to ELLs should be relevant,

based on real-life experiences, and provide opportunities to practice the new concepts (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Finally, the review and assessment component of SIOP states that teachers should be consistently and continually reviewing previous concepts and vocabulary terms. When students are finally assessed on the content of a lesson it should be at a level that would enable EL students to demonstrate mastery of the subject (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Co-teaching. In addition to the sheltered model, schools can elect to offer content classes with two teachers: a language specialist and a content teacher. Co-teaching became popularized with the rise of progressive education in the 1970s (Villa, Thousand, & Nevin, 2013). Co-teaching was primarily used in the field of special education to provide accommodations for students with extraordinary needs (Darragh, Piccano, Tully, & Hennig, 2011). The special education teacher was able to support content teachers working with these students. In the 1990s, following studies of collaborative based activities, schools began utilizing co-teaching models more frequently to meet the needs of a growingly diverse population (Villa et al., 2013). Co-teaching can be essentially defined as two teachers working cooperatively to deliver a lesson. However, there are actually several variations for how co-teaching can be executed (Aliakbari & Bazyar, 2012).

For example, Cook and Friend (1995) define co-teaching as two teachers delivering material to a diverse group of students within a single space. Others contend that in order to have true co-teaching, the outcome must achieve what neither teacher could have achieved individually (Wenzlaff et al., 2002).

According to Aliakbari and Bazyar (2012), a co-teaching model is effective when the two co-teachers have a "positive, collegial relationship" (p. 56). In a co-teaching model both teachers have full responsibility for the education of 100% of the students in the classroom (Aliakbari & Bazyar, 2012). This means that the teachers work collaboratively to plan, present, manage, and evaluate. In this model, the content teachers are able to provide a rich understanding of their content area while the ELL teacher provides language support for ELLs.

One of the key terms associated with co-teaching is *parity*. As defined by Villa et al. (2013) "parity occurs when co-teachers perceive that their unique contributions and their presence on the team are valued" (p. 7). In order to achieve parity, co-teachers must have previously agreed on learning outcomes for the students as well as roles for the each of the teachers (Villa et al., 2013). Furthermore, the ideal co-teaching team should be an entirely cooperative pair. According to Villa et al. (2013) the two teachers should be meeting face-to-face outside of class for planning purposes, be interdependent, have interpersonal skills, monitor and assess co-teaching progress, and hold themselves accountable to the team.

As previously stated, a true partnership and cooperation were among the key ingredients to success in a co-taught classroom. Bacharach, Heck, and Dahlberg (2008) expanded that cooperating teachers also believed that sharing leadership, planning together for instruction, respect, trust, and honest communication were critical components of co-teaching.

Efficacy of SIOP and Co-teaching

SIOP and co-teaching are both educational models designed to increase ELLs' access to course material and lesson objectives. While both of these models are currently being utilized in central Minnesota, some research suggests that the efficacy of these program models is not significantly advantageous. Other research has found that these program models may offer significant gains for ELLs.

Program models provide no significant advantages to language acquisition. Two perspectives exist regarding the efficacy of program models used to provide services for ELLs. One perspective argues that the program model used does not influence the ELLs' reading, writing, listening, and speaking abilities (Aliakbari & Bazyar, 2012; Mamantov, 2013). Mamantov's (2013) research compared the efficacy of three program models for students in twelve elementary schools in an urban school district. The program models compared included the pullout model, the co-teaching model, and the inclusion model in which the content teacher is also certified in ESL instruction. He found that the program model used did not significantly impact students' pre and post TELPAS scores, which are a Texas level language proficiency assessment. It should be noted that the study only focused on scores in English proficiency and did not track progress in content areas (Mamantov, 2013).

Aliakbari and Bazyar (2012) studied and reviewed the efficacy of parallel teaching (a manifestation of co-teaching) as compared to traditional single-teacher instruction in an EFL setting. Aliakbari and Bazyar, (2012) found that the parallel teaching model did not lead to significantly higher test results than those from single-teacher instruction. The researchers did

note that their study was limited in a number of ways. They conceded that it was possible that the study did not yield significant results because the teacher participants involved were relatively new to co-teaching. They commented that their research should be replicated with more experienced co-teachers. Future studies may yield different results (Aliakbari & Bazyar, 2012).

These studies indicate that a program model does not significantly impact the rate at which ELLs acquire language. Conversely, some studies (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013; Settlage, Madsen, & Rustad, 2005; Vidot, 2011) contend that there are certain program models which significantly affect ELLs' language acquisition. These studies found that ELLs are able to achieve in mainstream content areas while acquiring English as a second language. In these studies, teachers were using either SIOP or co-teaching models to provide accommodations as ELLs acquired English as an additional language through academic content courses.

SIOP and co-teaching provide significant benefits to language acquisition. While the aforementioned studies and literature purport that the program model does not affect the outcomes of learning and language acquisition, there were several studies that indicated that the inclusion of SIOP or co-teaching did contribute to gains for ELLs.

SIOP. The SIOP model has recently become more popular in the United States for two reasons. First, the increasing numbers of ELLs has meant that content teachers must find ways to make academic subjects more comprehensible to this group (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013). Secondly, because ELLs take state assessments, districts have been researching models which close the achievement gap (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013). Kareva and Echevarria (2013) found

that teachers who have used the SIOP models saw significant gains in their students' content knowledge while students acquired.

Kareva and Echevarria (2013) followed a school in Boston, Massachusetts where 90% of the students spoke Spanish as their first language and more than 50% of the students were classified as Limited English Proficiency (LEP). The school implemented a SIOP training initiative, whereby teachers received training, observations, and feedback as they introduced these protocols. After three years, student performance improved significantly. According to Kareva and Echevarria (2013), this school's scores on state assessments increased from 20 points below the state average to .2 points above the state average. The school saw similar gains in math as students' scores rose from 28 points below the state average to 20 points above the state. They contend that the SIOP model certainly provides teachers with the framework to help content teachers "improve their instruction and use the kinds of practices that will assist these students in learning both content and academic language" (Kareva & Echevarria, 2013, p. 245).

Vidot (2011) examined teacher perceptions' of SIOP as well as the efficacy of SIOP instruction in mathematics achievement. He reported that teachers who implemented SIOP procedures perceived a heightened awareness of vocabulary in math. Teachers believed that students were more aware of the vocabulary being used in math and recognized the importance of vocabulary. Vidot found that the SIOP procedures benefited students. However, he conceded that it was difficult to distinguish whether this success derived from the culture that emphasized vocabulary in math, which was a latent result of SIOP procedures, or the direct result of the instructional strategies used in SIOP.

The SIOP model does not give specific instructions for teachers in each content area like math or science (Settlage et al. 2005). Rather, teachers are advised to blend their own contents' pedagogical models with the instructional guidelines recommended by SIOP. Settlage et al. (2005) researched the efficacy of SIOP procedures in science classrooms and found that some particular SIOP guidelines were misaligned with the inquiry method that has been shown effective in science classrooms. Settlage et al. (2005) found that there were "considerable discrepancies between the inquiry approach... and the SIOP model" (p. 51).

Teachers who use the inquiry approach in a science class allow students to "construct experience-based understandings" (Settlage et al., 2005, p. 51) and these concepts are not given concrete names until the students fully understand them at the conclusion of the lesson. This methodology is at odds with SIOP where students are given a list of concepts and vocabulary at the outset of the lesson. However, Settlage et al. (2005) noted that these discrepancies were not insurmountable. With careful reflection and planning, teachers would be able to use the inquiry approach of science classrooms with the SIOP guidelines that support vocabulary acquisition.

Co-teaching. Previously, there was little data available on the efficacy of co-teaching models for teaching ELLs. Most of the research available focused on the outcomes of co-taught classes for students with disabilities, not ELLs. This is unsurprising given that co-teaching originally began in the field of special education. Originally, this program model existed so that a special education teacher could work with a mainstream teacher to meet the needs of students with exceptionalities in an inclusive setting (Darragh et al., 2011).

However, districts in central Minnesota have begun using the co-teaching model for teaching ELLs in a content classroom. Zehr (2006) found that schools in St. Paul that were using collaborative, co-teaching methods to educate ELLs. The St. Paul school district used this method to "help educators go beyond teaching students conversational skills to teaching 'academic English'" (Zehr, 2006). According to Zehr (2006), schools are closing achievement gaps between native English-speakers and ELLs in academic content. Zehr did not comment on the specific co-teaching models being utilized in St. Paul.

Honigsfield and Dove (2010) also discussed the benefits of co-teaching for ELLs. Some of the benefits listed included: diverse materials, more authentic assignments adapted to the specific needs of students, fewer times when students are pulled out of class to receive instruction, greater exposure to grade-level materials and content, increase of ELL engagement and participation, and alignment of content curriculum with ESL standards.

St. Cloud State University (SCSU), located in central Minnesota, conducted a series of studies designed to determine the effects of co-teaching. Bacharach, Heck, and Dahlberg (2007) focused on the reading and math skills of two populations of students: those who were educated in co-taught classrooms and those who were in non-co-taught classrooms. The study found that the co-teaching model led to an increase in achievement for students in co-taught classrooms.

Another study investigated student teaching and how universities can prepare future teachers for co-teaching. SCSU "studied the impact of shifting from a traditional to a co-teaching model of student teaching" (Bacharach & Heck, 2012, p. 51). This study collected quantitative and qualitative data on "the impact of a co-teaching model of student teaching on

teacher candidates, cooperating teachers and students in the classroom" (2012, p. 51).

Bacharach and Heck also focused on students' math and reading scores (as assessed through

MCAs) and also found that students in co-taught classrooms had significant increases as

compared to students in a non-co-taught classroom (2012). Bacharach and Heck also found

that according to the summative assessment that teacher candidates undergo, "co-teaching

candidates outscored their peers at a level that nears statistical significance in… reflection and

professional development, and partnerships" (2012, p. 52). Bacharach and Heck reflected that

the SCSU co-teaching model "provides a proven alternative to the traditional student teaching

experience" (2012, p. 59).

SIOP and co-teaching models are used across the district in St. Cloud, Minnesota.

Regardless of the model used, ELLs now receive a considerable amount of their education

from content and mainstream teachers. As previously stated, the objective of this study is to

understand the perceptions of teachers in Central Minnesota who are utilizing these program

models. Specifically, this research will focus on the intersection of content teachers' and EL

teachers perceptions.

Teachers' Perceptions During and after Teacher Education

Sheltered instruction and co-teaching models alike are dependent on content teachers

who are prepared to provide instruction and accommodations for ELLs. Song and Samimy

contend that teachers' perceptions of effective teaching practice vary considerably depending

on teachers' educational background and prior experiences (2015). However, depending upon

the state in which a teacher completes his or her pre-service education, teachers may or may

not have received comparable training in ESL instructional strategies (DelliCarpini & Alonso, 2014).

The quality and quantity of language pedagogy training that teachers receive prior to working with ELLs is an important and well researched topic, as it relates to teacher perceptions. Several studies (Borg, 2011; Busch, 2010; Curtin, 2005; Song & Samimy, 2015; Youngs & Youngs, 2001) found that a professional development as well as formal education had a significant and positive influence on teachers' beliefs.

One study (Busch, 2010) presented compelling evidence for the importance of education and professional development as it relates to teacher perceptions. Busch (2010) investigated the effects of an SLA course on the beliefs and perceptions of pre-service teachers. It can be assumed that pre-service teachers are among the most malleable of the teacher population because they are in the beginning stages of their career and presumably have the most potential for learning experiences. Busch (2010) found that these pre-service teachers' perceptions evolved most dramatically with regard to the following topics: time it takes to learn a second language, the necessity of learning about the target culture, the necessity of immersion for acquisition, and the most important subcategories for language learning (e.g., grammar, vocabulary, etc.).

In Busch's study (2010), there was one particularly important aspect of the course that participants considered to be decisive in the evolution of their beliefs. During the SLA course, pre-service teachers participated in a tutoring program where they worked with an ESL student for 10 hours over a period of the course. Busch (2010) noted this was one of the first avenues "through which many of the teachers were able to examine their beliefs, and this

tutoring was instrumental in helping teachers make connections between course content, real-life language learning, and their own beliefs" (p. 332). She surmised that if this group of pre-service teachers was representative of other teachers in the United States, then there should be an increased importance on the education in SLA and other language courses (Busch, 2010).

Though the participants in Busch's study (2010) were all pre-service language teachers, this study presents persuasive evidence for the importance of providing such programs for content teachers. It might be assumed that these pre-service language teachers in the program had approximately equivalent experience and educational coursework to many content teachers.

Song and Samimy (2015) also found that education in ESL strategies could significantly impact teachers' perceptions about language learning and teaching. They investigated the impact of a year-long educational TESOL program on the perceptions of content teachers. As other studies (Busch, 2010) had shown, teachers beliefs were previously based on past experiences and personal histories. However, the implementation of this educational program had a significant and positive impact on teachers' perceptions. After the program, "teachers attributed their belief changes to three major factors: (1) teacher education coursework, (2) action research with ELLs, and (3) peer coaching." (Song & Samimy, 2015, p. 12).

Curtin's study (2005) focused on the instructional methods used by content teachers and found that teachers who had not "received formal training in second-language learning demonstrated inadequate teaching strategies for ESL students" (p. 36). Though one of the objectives was to investigate the instructional methods teachers were using, Curtin (2005) also

explored teachers' perceptions and beliefs about language teaching. She found that teachers who had an interactive teaching style were able to more easily cope with ELLs in the classroom. These same teachers were more aware of the instructional and learning needs of ELLs. She found that novice teachers were those who struggled most (Curtin, 2005).

Finally, in a longitudinal study that investigated the impact of an in-service education program, Borg (2011) found that the program had a significant impact on teachers' perceptions. One of the most interesting findings of the study was that teachers became explicitly aware of their previously held beliefs and were able to experience transformations during the education program. Again, a common important precursor to this transition was the explicit knowledge of these held beliefs and perceptions (Borg, 2011).

As teacher education and service hours of language teaching strategies increase, teachers generally changed their perceptions about language learning and teaching (Song & Samimy, 2015; Youngs & Youngs, 2001). As the aforementioned studies have shown, teacher preparation programs can have significant influence on teachers' beliefs regarding effective teaching practices of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. Youngs and Youngs (2001) further expanded that those teachers who had at least a modicum of training with ELLs had more positive attitudes about working with this population than those teachers who had none. They found that teachers who had coursework in multicultural education, prior experience working with ELLs, and a personal experience abroad were more likely to report that they had a neutral or a slightly positive attitude towards teaching ELLs. Further research from García-Nevarez, Stafford, and Arias (2005) has corroborated the findings of Youngs and Youngs

(2001). As Trueba, Chang, and Ima (1993) expressed, teachers who do not have an ESL background or training can be ill equipped to work with this diverse student group.

Given much of the literature, it can be assumed that the teacher preparation and coursework related to language instruction and accommodations for ELLs becomes increasingly important as the numbers of ELLs continue to grow. However, due to the wide array of state practices with regard to teacher training programs, licensure requirements, and professional development practices, the quality and focus of the education that a teacher candidate will receive can vary from state to state (DelliCarpini & Alonso, 2014).

As DelliCarpini and Alonso note (2014), only a few states have teacher certification programs that include specific coursework related to teaching ELLs. Given these variations in teacher preparation programs, Kareva and Echevarria (2013) purport that the dramatic increase of ELLs in public schools has resulted in a shortage of qualified teachers to work with these students.

The education and specific pre-service training that teachers receive prior to working in public schools is important as this education can affect a teacher's perceptions not only about their personal teaching philosophy, but about their beliefs with regard to teaching ELLs (Song & Samimy, 2015).

Content and EL Teachers' Perceptions of EL Students and Language Teaching

As the aforementioned studies (Busch, 2010; Curtin, 2005; Song & Samimy, 2015; Youngs & Youngs, 2001) found, education has a profound impact on how prepared teachers are to work with ELLs. While the belief systems of EL teachers regarding best language

teaching practice has been researched, there is little research available with regard to content teachers' perceptions are of effective language teaching.

One of the studies that focused on the perceptions of content teachers was Tan's study (2011) of math and science teachers' beliefs about language instruction through content mediums. The study focused on content teachers in Malaysia and used a variety of methods to collect data about teachers' perceptions. Tan (2011) found that math and science teachers were not able to systematically incorporate language instruction strategies into their classrooms nor did they believe it was their role to do so. These content teachers believed that their roles were separate from the language teachers in that language should be a separate entity from their academic areas. It is also important to note that these content teachers did not receive any training in language pedagogy. As Tan (2011) noted, the repercussions of this lack of training was that science and language were not effectively integrated in the classroom. Additionally, teachers who lacked formal EL training were more likely to have negative attitudes about working with EL students.

Though Greenfield's study followed elementary school teachers instead of secondary teachers, many of the demographics of elementary teachers overlap with secondary. For example, Greenfield's study found that many elementary teachers lack sufficient formal training in EL pedagogy and methodology (2013). As previously discussed, this lack of formal preparation extends into the secondary level as well (Tan, 2011). In Greenfield's study, elementary school teachers who educate linguistically diverse students were asked to report their perceptions (2013). Greenfield asked nine elementary school teachers to respond to a case study about a linguistically diverse student.

During the study, six of the teachers used deficit language to describe the case study student and his family. Teachers used words like "struggling" and "pretty delayed" (p.10). Teachers reported that the ELL was "not really going anywhere" while the other students were moving on. Other teachers reported the difficulty the language barrier creates when trying to identify students to special education (p. 10). Participants also commented about the various practices they believed would be important to better serve the student. For example, some teachers spoke about the importance of "conducting assessments, communicating with families, accessing their colleagues and garnering support outside the classroom" (p. 12). Additionally, teachers reported that they would use various grouping practices to meet the needs of students. The majority of teachers "suggested using partner or collaborative work" (p. 14). Finally, the teachers in these studies said that they would use "visuals and leveled literacy materials" (p. 14).

Another study investigated teachers' secondary teachers' attitudes about including ELLs in mainstream classrooms. As Reeves (2006) describes, "ELLs, particularly those in schools with small ELL populations, typically spend the majority of the school day in mainstream classes" (p. 131). Reeves found that teachers mostly held a welcoming attitude toward the inclusion of ELLs in their classrooms. Most teachers (75%) also reported that "the inclusion of ELLs created a positive educational atmosphere in their classrooms" (p. 136). Despite the general attitude that ELLs contribute positively to the educational environment, 40% of teachers did not believe that all students benefitted from the inclusion of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. Additionally, 75% stated that ELLs should not enter mainstream

classrooms until students have reached proficiency in English and approximately 70% of teachers reported that they had insufficient time to work successfully with ELLs.

Reeves (2006) also surveyed teachers' attitudes about best teaching practice for accommodating EL students. Just more than half of teachers stated that simplifying assignments and decreasing the amount of work was not best practice for working with ELLs. However, teachers did mostly agree that allowing ELLs more time to complete assignments was an appropriate accommodation. With regard to language and language learning, the overwhelming majority of teachers stated that they "would support legislation making English the official language of the United States" (p. 137). Despite teachers' attitudes about English as an official language, most teachers disagreed that students should not use or avoid using their L1 at school. One final interesting perception about language learning was that over 70% of mainstream teachers believed that "ESL students should be able to acquire English within 2 years of enrolling in U.S. schools" (p. 137). Although the term 'acquire' may be ambiguous in its definition, it was still striking that mainstream teachers believed that acquisition of English could occur in under 2 years.

Brown (2009) also studied the perceptions of teachers who work with ELLs. Brown researched language teachers' perceptions as they compare to their students' beliefs about language teaching and language learning. The participants in Brown's study were EL teachers with the required formal educational preparation to work with ELLs. Brown found that the teachers in his study "appeared to value communicative approaches to L2 pedagogy where information exchange takes precedence over discrete-point grammar practice" (p. 53).

Değirmenci Uysal and Aydin (2017) also conducted a study about the perceptions of EL teachers. Değirmenci Uysal and Aydin researched EL teachers' perceptions of error correction in a speaking class. They found that teachers generally "focused on repetitious and meaning distorting errors" (p. 129). The EL teachers in the study cited four main reasons that they generally make error corrections: 1) to contribute to students' accuracy (across grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation), 2) to help students create habits of self-correction, 3) to guide students in the appropriate use of English, and 4) to assist with students' fluency. Teachers believed that explicit error correction was necessary to help the students "use the language appropriately and accurately" (p. 130).

Assuming that content teachers' perceptions impact how content teachers instruct and interact with ELLs, there should be greater focus on understanding and even changing the beliefs of content teachers. Given the current variation of TESOL instructional strategies in educational programs (DelliCarpini & Alonso, 2014), it is entirely conceivable that content teachers may hold erroneous beliefs about language learning and teaching. These beliefs, however mistaken, directly translate into teaching practices.

Acknowledging a teacher's perceptions is a fundamental step in understanding how the teacher conducts a lesson. In order for teachers to adapt and transform their beliefs and practices about language teaching, teachers must first be able to explicitly state what those beliefs are. This study will attend to mainstream content teachers' perceptions by analyzing their beliefs of language teaching strategies. This study is mostly investigative as it intends to discover the perceptions of this group of teachers.

The objectives of this study will be to 1) identify content teachers' perceptions of successful teaching practices to ELLs, and 2) discover where these perceptions coincide or differ with research-based TESL theory and pedagogy.

Chapter 3: Methodology

The primary objective of this study is to explore the perceptions of content teachers and observe where their perceptions coincide with current language teaching practices. Content teachers are instrumental in the role of second language acquisition of their students (Gibbons, 2011). In order to gain insight as to the perceptions of content teachers, two methods were utilized to collect both quantitative and qualitative data. Two questionnaires used to collect quantitative data include the Background Information Questionnaire and the Effective Teaching Questionnaire. The Background Information Questionnaire provided information as to whether there were any significant variables that may have affected a teacher's perception of teaching ELLs. The Effective Teaching Questionnaire identified teachers' perceptions of effective teaching practice as it relates to SLA and the various district initiated ELL protocols. The questions in the Effective Teaching Questionnaire were founded in current and past ESL theory, strategies from the SIOP model, general guidelines from co-teaching protocol, and general educational philosophy strategies. These questions were used because they offered insight as to what foundations teachers might derive their personal philosophies of teaching with regard to second language acquisition and learning. Following the questionnaires, the researcher interviewed 10 teachers that included 7 content teachers and 4 EL teachers. The interviews provided further insight and allowed teachers to offer justifications, theories, backgrounds, and examples for why they held any perceptions and belief systems. Four EL teachers were also interviewed in order to provide a comparison for the responses of the content teachers.

Participants

The participants from this study included 38 content teachers from two public high schools in central Minnesota. All teachers at the two high schools in the district who were concurrently employed at the time of the study were invited to participate. While it is true that the sample size of the study was small, the response rate was as expected. Survey research, particularly that which uses mailed questionnaires, generally has a low response rate (Brown, 2001). It was not wholly unexpected that approximately 30% of educators completed the questionnaires. The effects of the sample size will be further discussed in the limitations section.

All of the teachers interviewed were selected from the same secondary schools in the same district in central Minnesota. The researcher selected these particular secondary schools for their 1) high percentage of ELLs and 2) ease of access to participants. The teachers participating in this study were all employees of these schools. These secondary schools serve students in grades 9-12. The teachers surveyed in this study may have contact with students from all grades present in the high school. As previously stated, both high schools have a significant ELL population. Over 20% of the students in both the high schools are classified as English Language Learners.

Tables 1-8. Teacher information questionnaire participant responses.

Table 1

Years Taught

n = 38	How many years have you been teaching?				
	1-5	**6-10**	**11-15**	**16-20**	**21+**
Number	14	4	5	7	8
Percent	37%	11%	13%	18%	21%

Table 2

Current Level of Education

n = 38	What is your current level of education?					
	BA/BS	**BA + 15**	**MA**	**MA+15**	**MA + 60**	**Ph.D**
Number	6	5	6	19	1	1
Percent	16%	13%	16%	50%	2.5%	2.5%

Table 3

Subject

n = 38	What subject do you teach?							
	Language Arts	**Tech Ed**	**Foreign Language**	**Math**	**Science**	**Social Studies**	**Special Education**	**Academic Coach**
Number	9	1	3	10	5	5	4	1
Percent	24%	2.5%	8%	26%	13%	13%	11%	2.5%

Table 4

Years Lived in Another Country

n = 38	How long have you lived in another country?					
	Never	1-3 Weeks	1-6 Months	7 months-1 year	1-2 Years	2+ years
Number	20	9	2	0	1	6
Percent	53%	24%	5%	0%	3%	16%

Table 5

Proficiency in an Additional Language

n = 38	If you speak an additional language, what is your level of proficiency?					
	None	Elementary	Limited Working Proficiency	Minimum Professional Proficiency	Full Professional Proficiency	Native/Bilingual
Number	9	1	3	10	5	5
Percent	24%	2.5%	8%	26%	13%	13%

Table 6

EL Specific Coursework at University

n = 38	How many university courses related to EL have you taken				
	0	1-2	3-5	6-8	9+ Native/Bilingual
Number	15	13	5	1	3
Percent	39%	34%	13%	3%	8%

Table 7

Classes with ELs

n = 38	How many classes do you teach that have Els? (out of 5 possible classes)					
	0	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Number	1	1	5	6	9	16
Percent	3%	3%	13%	16%	23%	42%

Table 8

Percent of Students Who are ELs

n = 38	What percentage of your students are Els?				
	0-20%	**21-40%**	**41-60%**	**61-80%**	**81-100%**
Number	15	13	7	1	2
Percent	40%	34%	18%	3%	5%

The teachers who participated in this study were asked to complete a Teacher Information Questionnaire (see Appendix A) in order to provide information about their previous academic experience, additional teaching qualifications, years of service, prior experience working with ELLs, foreign language proficiency, time spent living outside of the United States and other information that may have affected a teacher's perceptions. The Teacher Information Questionnaire is further explained in the materials section of the methodology.

Content teachers. For the purposes of this study, content teachers are defined as teachers who teach subjects other that EL-including but not limited to- math, science, and social studies. Of the 38 content teachers who participated in this study, 9 taught Language Arts, 1 Tech Ed, 3 Foreign Languages, 10 Math, 5 Science, 5 Social Studies, 4 Special Education, and 1 Academic Coach. All of the content teachers are teachers currently employed at one of two secondary schools in central Minnesota.

Though these participants are considered content teachers, a considerable amount of the teachers surveyed indicated that they are working with EL students on a regular basis. Of the classes that content teachers taught, an average of 4 classes, out of 5 possible classes, had at least 1 EL student. All but one of the teachers who participated indicated that they have some contact with EL students throughout the day. A total of 25 of the content teachers said that they have 4 or 5 classes (out of a total of 5 classes during the day) with at least 1 EL student present. Over 26% of teachers said that EL students contributed to 40-100% of their student population in their classes. Thirty-four percent of teachers said that EL students contributed to 21-40% of the student population in their classes. This indicates that even though these teachers are not considered EL teachers, a considerable amount of the students and classes they teach include Els.

Of the content, teachers who participated in this study 53% responded that they had never lived abroad, 24% said they had lived abroad for 1-3 weeks, and 5% said they had lived abroad for 1-6 months. Nineteen percent of content teachers indicated that they had lived abroad for a year or more. Though the majority (77%) of content teachers indicated that they had lived abroad for fewer than 3 weeks, 71% of content teachers indicated that they had at

least an elementary level of proficiency in an additional language. It is clear that though many teachers may have had the opportunity to live abroad and learn/use an additional language while living abroad, most teachers learned their language through language classes offered in various scholastic settings. A teacher's experience learning an additional language can have great influence about what that a teacher believes about language learning or teaching. Similarly, a teacher's own experience living abroad may provide insight as to the experience of EL students. As previously stated, a teacher's prior experiences can have great influence on his or her belief systems with regard to teaching.

When asked how many TESL related university courses they had taken, 73% of content teachers responded that they had taken 2 or fewer courses specifically related to TESL (39% indicated they had never taken a TESL course and 34% stated they had taken 1 TESL course). Nine teachers specified that they had taken 3 or more university classes related to teaching English as a second language. As previously noted in the literature review, the quality and quantity of education can significantly influence teachers' perceptions as it related to teaching Els. This is noteworthy because though content teachers have had relatively little EL specific coursework, they certainly have a sizable group of Els in their classes.

One particularly interesting demographic feature of this teacher population was the education level as it compared to the number of years teaching. The teachers who participated in this study had experiences ranging from 1 year to 30 with a mean of 11.8, a mode of 3, and a median of 10.8. Though the mean was 11.8, approximately 37% of the content teachers in the study indicated that they had been teaching for 5 years or less. This is striking because though 37% of those surveyed said they have been teaching for less than 5 years, 71% said at

least a Master's degree and 50% had an MA+15. This indicates that despite the relative inexperience the teachers in the surveyed schools, they are, conversely, a well-educated group.

Interview participants. In addition to collecting information through the questionnaires, interviews were also utilized in order better understand experiences and justifications that supported the participants' answers. All participants who completed surveys were invited to participate in the interview procedure. Of those teachers, 10 content teachers indicated that they were available and willing to participate in the interview. Due to scheduling conflicts, only 7 of the available teachers were able to complete the interview.

The specific content areas of the teachers included: math (2), world languages (1), social studies (2), language arts (1), and science (1). All of the content teachers indicated that they had regular contact with EL students in their classes and had been working with this population for several years (ranging from 3-14).

EL teachers were also invited to participate in the interview process in order to provide a comparison for the content teachers' responses. For example, many content teachers offered their beliefs and perceptions about the co-teaching protocols they used. In order to understand both co- teachers' roles and perceptions, EL teachers were offered a chance to share their beliefs.

There were four EL teachers who participated in this interview process. EL teachers are hereby defined as teachers whose license is in English as a Second Language and who primarily teach EL classes. Several of the EL teachers in this study also hold licenses in other areas (particularly licenses in world languages such as Spanish or French). However, for the

purposes of this study they will still be classified as EL teachers because they are currently teaching EL classes and not classes related to their other licensing areas.

 EL teachers' years of teaching experience ranged from 1-11 years. Similar to the content teachers though, 75% of EL teachers in the interview indicated that they had been teacher for 3 or fewer years, 75% indicated that they had at least a Master's degree. It appears that even relatively new teachers (teachers who have not yet attained tenure) are relatively more educated. It was also unsurprising that all EL teachers in this study indicated that they had taken nine or more university courses related specifically to EL. When compared to the population of content teachers, only 8% of content teachers had taken as many EL specific university courses (with 39% indicating they had taken 0 classes regarding EL).

All of the EL teachers who participated in the interview indicated that they had at least a minimum proficiency level in an additional language. It is not altogether unsurprising that EL teachers would have some level of proficiency in another language given the nature of their subject. The Teacher Information Questionnaire did not inquire about a teacher's decision to teach a given subject. However, again it would be unsurprising to find that teachers who choose to teach additional languages probably are interested in learning languages themselves.

Materials

Both quantitative and qualitative collection methods were used in this study. Quantitative data were collected through two surveys: The Teacher Information Questionnaire and the Effective Teaching Questionnaire. Qualitative data were collected through semi-

structured interviews with teachers from the surveyed population. EL teachers were also interviewed to provide a comparison between the content teachers' responses.

Questionnaires. The researcher used two questionnaires to collect 1) demographic information about the participants and 2) data about content teachers' perceptions of effective methods to serve ELL students. Both survey instruments were in closed-response formats because this generally generates more consistent data. A notable disadvantage of the closed-response format is the lack of range and depth in potential responses. In order to counterbalance this limitation, an interview process was included following the surveys in order to provide greater scope to the responses. The interview process will be discussed below.

There were two survey instruments used in this research study: a Teacher Information Questionnaire and an Effective Teaching Questionnaire.

The teacher information questionnaire. The teachers who participated in this study were asked to complete a Teacher Information Questionnaire (see Appendix A). This survey was used in order to provide demographic and background information. The demographic information has been used to analyze existing trends across potential moderating variables and gain insights as to how these existing variables could potentially affect teacher perceptions. The variables included in the Teacher Information Questionnaire include: their years lived abroad, proficiency in a language other than English, current level of education, the number of additional courses related to English as a second language that teachers had taken, number of other professional development opportunities related to English as a second

language, number of years teaching, how many the teacher's classes contained EL students, and what percentage of the teacher's students were EL students.

These questions will be vital in establishing whether there are any differences among teachers with regard to the previously listed variables.

Effective teaching questionnaire. The Effective Teaching Questionnaire was adapted from the questionnaire in Brown's 2006 study, which researched students' and teachers' perceptions of effective teaching in the foreign language classroom. Considering that Brown's survey instruments had to be mutually intelligible to both student and teacher groups, Brown avoided the use of educational jargon. Given that the participants in this study were all educators, it was possible to use educational jargon. However, the majority of the participants in the study were not EL teachers so it was necessary to avoid technical, pedagogical terms related to second language acquisition. Additionally, some questions included brief examples so as to clarify the intent of the pedagogical theory being applied.

The Effective Teaching Questionnaire included 6 categories of questions: 1) the role of corrective feedback, 2) SIOP components, 3) the role of form instruction, 4) general education pedagogy, 5) theories of second language acquisition, and 6) co-teaching operations. These questions were placed randomly throughout the survey, their placement only known to the researcher, with the exception of co-teaching which had its own subsection. For example, some of the categories that were used included topics on the use of error correction and feedback, the use of pair and group work, rate of speech that teachers use during instruction, the importance of co-planning, and necessity of communicating with cooperating teachers.

The Effective Teaching Questionnaire was subdivided into two sections: those related to classes led by a single teacher and those questions related to co-teaching. The two sections of questionnaire provided sentence frames for the 33 Likert-scale questions. The survey instrument asked, "When teaching English Language Learners, effective teachers should…" for the section about singular teaching and "When teaching English Language Learners in a co-teaching situation, effective co-teachers should…". The participants indicated on a 4-point scale to what extent they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Participants could choose the following: strongly agreed, agreed, disagreed, or strongly disagreed with each of the statements on the survey. A complete version of the Effective Teaching Questionnaire can be located in Appendix B.

As previously stated there were 6 general categories of questions on the Effective Teaching Questionnaire. The following is a further exploration of those categories and their questions.

Questions pertaining to the role of corrective feedback. Questions 7 and 10 address the teachers' beliefs about error correction and feedback in the classroom. These questions are included because of how teachers deal with student errors, with regards to directness and timing, reveals the teachers' perceptions about the importance of error correction and how it can impact language acquisition. According to a study done by Carroll and Swain (1993), which examined the use of correction and feedback in language acquisition, those groups which received explicit feedback outperformed the control groups. The questions will gauge the teachers' beliefs as to how and when errors should be addressed.

Questions pertaining to the 8 components of SIOP. The first component of SIOP is preparing students for the classroom. According to the model, teachers should provide students with the language they need in order to ask questions or for clarification (SIOP, 2009). Question 23 will determine whether or not teachers believe it is important to explicitly teach such language.

Next, the importance of building background is addressed in the SIOP model. The process of building background to increase learning is also based in ESL theory and is known as Schema Theory (Johns, 1986). Questions 4, and 13 are all related to the building background module of SIOP. As previously stated, building background allows teachers to discover whether there are any current gaps in students' knowledge. Building background also allows teachers to link the lesson's concepts to students' previous experiences, everyday lives, and real-world situations (Johns, 1986). Building this background and establishing links to students' own experiences increases the relevance of the material and allows students to process the information in greater capacity (SIOP, 2009). Schema theory asserts that any text does not have true meaning by itself, but that the text "provides direction for listeners or readers as to how they should retrieve or construct meaning from their own, previously acquired knowledge" (Carrell, 1984).

Creating input that is comprehensible to language learners is both a component of SIOP as well as a hallmark of SLA theory (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). How teachers make their input comprehensible is a considerable question. Teachers may alter their rate of speech, selection of vocabulary, structure of language, use of models and gestures, etc. Question 24 addressed whether or not teachers are electing to provide visuals, models, or gestures to make

the information more comprehensible to learners, which is recommended SIOP accommodation.

Questions 9, 16, and 26 reveal teachers' perceptions about the importance of cognitive strategies in the classroom. According to the SIOP model, teachers are recommended to explicitly teach and demonstrate the use of these strategies because they underscore the cognitive skills that students need in order to understand the concepts in the content areas (Echevarria et al., 2010). However, as Echevarria et al. (2010) noted, many of these cognitive strategies are new to ELLs. They believed that these strategies can be introduced with scaffolding.

Questions 5, 19, and 22 pertain to the role of interaction in the classroom. Question 6 asks about how the teacher uses individual work, pair-work, and group-work in class. These questions illuminate to what extent the teacher considers interaction to be vital to language acquisition. Interaction is an important component of SIOP and language acquisition in that interaction increases the amount of time that students are processing the new concepts in the target language (McKeon, 1994). Question 12 probes teachers about the amount of time for students to answer questions from teachers and their peers. According to the SIOP model, the extended wait time allows for students to generate longer and more frequent responses (SIOP, 2009).

Question 3 asks teachers about whether they state the learning objectives at the beginning of the lesson. Informing students of the lesson's learning objectives is a component in SIOP (SIOP, 2009) and helps students focus on where the lesson is going.

Practicing is an important component of the SIOP model. According the SIOP model, students need opportunities to apply the content learned in class while integrating the four domains of communication. SIOP also recommends using hands-on materials for such practice especially when students are using their listening, reading, writing, and speaking skills (SIOP, 2009). Questions 14 and 21 ask teachers about the role of practice in the classroom as well as the teacher's use of realia and other tangible materials and manipulatives.

Finally, the last component of the SIOP model is related to review and assessment. The SIOP model encourages teachers to deliberately and consistently review vocabulary and key concepts taught during the lesson. The model indicates that teachers should scaffold the material to the learners' levels. (SIOP, 2009). The importance of review and assessment will be addressed by question 27.

Questions pertaining to the importance of form in second language acquisition. The role of grammar instruction in second language acquisition has been a controversial topic in SLA. Questions 1 and 17, and 18 ask teachers to reveal to what extent explicit grammar instruction should take precedent during lessons. Some researchers (Krashen, 1982) believe that providing comprehensible input without direct, intervention is sufficient for language acquisition to occur. Others found (Rosa & O'Neil, 1999), that after providing explicit grammar instruction, students outperformed the groups that had received none.

Questions pertaining to general educational pedagogy and theories second language acquisition. Scaffolding is an important component to both the ESL and content classrooms. In the ESL classroom, scaffolding helps the language and content become more accessible to

learners. Teachers create initial supports that make the information more attainable and slowly release those supports over time to increase autonomy. The same technique is used in content areas like math and science to ensure that the content itself is more readily accessible to students. Scaffolding is based on the theories of Vygotsky, who argued that learning occurred through social interactions (Hammond, 2001). This strategy is not exclusively an ESL theory and can be found in content courses as well. Scaffolding also focuses learners on the task at hand and helps students remain motivated as they complete the task because the objective is attainable with the teacher's assistance (Hammond, 2001). Questions 12 and 20 reveal the teachers' beliefs about the importance of scaffolding in the classroom.

Questions 2, 8, 11, 15, and 25 attend to the teachers' beliefs about comprehensible input and how to teach vocabulary and content during a class. Some of the questions will reveal whether the teachers believe it is best practice to give clear and concise instructions that match the proficiency levels of the students, which is recommended by both the SIOP model and ESL Input theory (Echevarria et al., 2008; Krashen & Terrell, 1983). Comprehensible Input plays an enormous role in both ESL theory and practice. Due to its important role in both ESL theory and the SIOP model, several questions are used to identify teachers' beliefs about making the content more comprehensible.

Question 6 pertains to the role of computer assisted technology in the classroom. The use of computers has allowed students to interact with authentic language through new mediums, including video and graphic media (Brown, 2006). Such technology has the added benefits of providing authentic language and connections for more reserved students (Kern, 1995).

Questions pertaining to co-teaching. According to Loeser (2015), communication, collaboration, and planning are key ingredients for success in the classroom. As recommended by Aliakbari and Bazyar (2012), such collaboration should be continual, positive, and ensure that both teachers are responsible for 100% of the students in the classroom. Thus, question 29 pertains to the role of collaboration for co-teaching.

An additional study by Villa et al. (2013) found that parity was invaluable for the success of a co-taught classroom. In order to achieve parity, teachers must know and understand their roles in the classroom. Co-teachers should also respect the unique contributions that their co-teachers are able to make. These roles and contributions should be agreed upon before the start of a class and leave no doubt as to the roles and responsibilities of each teacher. Questions 29-33 are designed to illuminate the teacher's belief about the importance of parity as well as the ideal structures and teaching designations in the co-taught classroom.

Interview materials. As previously stated, one of the limitations of survey instruments is that they do not offer the scope and depth that interviews and other qualitative methods can obtain. Interviews were used in order to gather information about *why* teachers held the beliefs they did rather than simply what the beliefs were. The researcher used a list of 9 open-format questions designed to elicit experiences from participants about working with EL students and their beliefs about co-teaching. The interview process illuminated how teachers developed their belief systems and how they are adapting their perceptions based on their current exposures. A full list of questions can be found in Appendix C.

Procedure

In order to distribute survey instruments at the secondary schools, the researcher first obtained permission from the building principals at both locations. Receiving their consent, the researcher was then able to commence with data collection during the 2016 calendar year.

The surveys were given to teachers through inter-school mailing system. The teachers were able to retrieve the surveys from their mailboxes at their convenience. In conjunction with the surveys, teachers also received a brief email explaining the purpose of the surveys and how the surveys could best be returned to the researcher. The surveys included a cover page indicating that by returning the survey to the researcher, the participants had understood the study and had given their consent for their data to be used in the research. The teachers were able complete the surveys at their convenience and were able to return the surveys to the mailbox of the researcher, who also works in the same secondary school. The surveys were completed in a written format. The researcher's rationale for giving teachers the surveys in this manner is to allow teachers ample time to complete the survey independently and retain anonymity as they complete the surveys.

Following survey collection, the researcher met with 11 teachers (both from the content and ELL sector) to discuss the reasoning for their responses for the interview portion of the research project. For further explanation of the interview process, please see the interview section of the methodology section.

Interview procedure. A semi-structured interview procedure was used, whereby the researcher could use a standard set of interview questions as a guide but could ask participants to elaborate. The researcher was also able to deviate from the set of questions where

appropriate. Each interview was conducted individually and in a private setting and a location chosen by the participant. This environment was created in order to encourage the participants to feel comfortable in their surroundings and speak freely with the researcher. Each interview was digitally recorded with the consent of the participants.

Chapter 4: Results

The purpose of this study is to establish the extent to which content teachers' beliefs about language teaching coincide or differ with current ESL pedagogy. Teachers' responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics. Then each question was considered and compared to current research-based TESL and educational theory.

Research Question

How do content teachers' perceptions of language teaching practices coincide or differ from best known practices in TESL?

In order to generalize teachers' perceptions, all responses were analyzed using descriptive statistics. After finding the mean and standard deviation for content teachers' responses, the means were banded into three groups: agree, unsure or ambivalent, and disagree. Questions that had a mean response of 2.8-3.9 signified participants' agreement with the statement , those with a mean response of 2.3-2.7 were considered to be unsure or ambivalent, and those means that were below 2.2 were considered to represent an answer of disagree. The band 2.3-2.7 was used to represent uncertain and ambiguous responses because based on the mean, there was not a strong consensus to disagree or agree.

On the Effective Teaching questionnaire, content teachers agreed with several questions. For the purposes of this study, 'agree' will be defined as those questions that had an average score of 2.8-3.9. These questions included the following: 1 (teachers should explicitly teach and explain grammar points as they arise in the classroom), 3 (explicitly stating the lesson objective at the beginning of the class), 4 (ask questions that help link the lesson's concepts and vocabulary to students personal experiences), 8 (teachers should be

using methodologies like TPR so that students are using physical responses while learning language), 9 (providing students with graphic organizers), 10 (teachers should only be correcting students indirectly when making errors), 12 (teachers should offer extensive wait time for EL students), 13 (providing materials and resources that are culturally and linguistically responsive), 14 (teachers should use realia and other activities that mimic real-life scenarios), 15 (model activities and tasks before assigning them), 16 (providing cognitive strategies for students to use independently), 18 (teachers should focus mostly on content), 19 (teachers should use predominantly pair or group work during the class), 20 (appropriate scaffolding the material to the needs of the learners), 21 (the class should be taught through having students complete tasks), 23 (provide students with the language they would need to ask for help or clarification), 24 (using word walls and concept map), 25 (students should respond with movement)s), 26 (allow students to create their own strategies for retention), 27 (deliberately review vocabulary and content that are at the students' current language level), and 29 (students should be allowed to create their own strategies for retention) . When asked about their beliefs on co-teaching, content teachers agreed with question 30 (having designated roles and responsibilities for both teachers in a co-teaching environment). Several of the aforementioned 'agreed' responses had means of 3.6 and above. These questions are items that teachers more strongly agreed with. Within the 'agreed' band (those responses that had a mean of 2.8-4.0), questions that had means of 3.6 and higher included: 3, 4, 13, 15, 24, 29, and 30.

There were also several questions that had means between 2.3 and 2.7. Because these averages are so close to the middle between agree and disagree, it is most likely that these are

questions that teachers did not have strong feelings about, were ambivalent about, believed that their response was situationally dependent, or that they did not understand. Items within this range included: 2 (teachers should simplify how they communicate so that students can better understand them), 6 (teachers should be frequently using computer-based technologies in their classrooms), 7 (not correct students immediately after they make a mistake in speaking), 11 (teachers should <u>not</u> simplify how they speak so that Els hear natural speech), 17 (only correct students' work for content because grammar use will appear over time), and 28 (teach EL students at English speaking peers' level so that students are held accountable to the content objectives for their grade level). With regard to co-teaching, mean responses between 2.3-2.7 included: 32 (the class should be divided into small groups while teachers teach simultaneously) and 33 (the class should be structured where students move through stations). Because there was no clear consensus on whether teachers agreed or disagreed with the statement, it is impossible to determine whether or not content teachers' responses coincided or diverged from TESL practices.

As previously stated, questions that teachers disagreed with are defined as items that had a mean response of 2.2 or lower. There were few items included in this range. These questions included: 5 (students should do predominantly individual work throughout the class time) and 22 (students should complete worksheets as the primary method of demonstrating their mastery of a concept). With regard to co-teaching, content teachers disagreed on question 31 (that one teacher should be allocated as the lead teacher while another supports).

The following table represents the mean scores and standard deviations of content teachers' responses. The sentence frames are listed in the first and third columns. The average

score and standard deviation is listed in columns two and four. In order to quantify the results,

strongly agree was given a value of 4, agree = 3, disagree = 2, and strongly disagree = 1.

Scores that are higher than 3.5 indicate that the content teachers strongly agreed with the

statement as a group.

Table 9

Response Means of Content Teachers on the Effective Teaching Questionnaire

"When teaching English Language Learners, effective teachers should…"	Response Means (n=38)	Standard Deviations (n=38)
1. explicitly explain grammar points as they appear in texts, audios, and other real-life examples.	3.1	0.6
2. simplify how they speak so that students can understand every word being said.	2.7	0.7
3. inform students about the learning objectives at the start of the lesson.	3.6	0.5
4. ask questions that help link the lesson's concepts and vocabulary to students personal experiences.	3.7	0.5
5. use predominantly individual work to complete activities in class.	2.0	0.6
6. frequently use computer-based technologies (internet, DVDs, CDs, Smartboard).	2.6	0.6
7. not correct students immediately after they make a mistake in speaking.	2.6	0.8
8. give commands to students where students can respond with whole body actions	3.1	0.6
9. provide students with graphic organizers that help them organize their notes or understand the text/video/etc.	3.5	0.6
10. only correct students indirectly when students make English errors. (e.g. repeating back to them the corrected phrase).	2.9	0.8

11. not simplify or alter how they speak so that students hear natural speech.	2.7	0.7
12. offer extensive wait time for students to respond to questions.	3.2	0.7
13. strive to make materials that students understand and have a personal connection to. (word problems about things in the classroom as opposed to events/objects unfamiliar to ELLs).	3.6	0.5
14. use mostly real-life materials (e.g. music, pictures) in teaching both the language and the content, rather than the textbook.	3.1	0.7
15. model activities and tasks before assigning them.	3.7	0.5
16. teach students how to use cognitive strategies to help students understand the concept (predicting, evaluating, self-assessing).	3.4	0.5
17. only correct students' work for content because grammar use will appear over time.	2.5	0.8
18. focus mostly on the content/meaning so that students have a basis for what they are learning.	3.1	0.5
19. use predominantly small group or pair work to complete activities in class.	2.9	0.6
20. scaffold the materials to match the pace and level of ELLs in the class.	3.5	0.6
21. teach the language primarily by having students complete tasks (e.g. observe and label the properties of rocks) rather than grammar-focused exercises (gap-fill for verb tenses).	3.0	0.7
22. use mostly worksheets with fill in the blanks and short answer questions so that students can easily demonstrate their knowledge of a subject.	2.2	0.6
23. provide students with the language they would need to ask for help or clarification.	3.4	0.6
24. use word walls, graphic organizers, and other visuals to support vocabulary learning.	3.6	0.5
25. ask students to respond with movement to illustrate concepts or check for comprehension.	3.3	0.7

26. allow students to create their own strategies for retention (students use their own strategies to take notes or listen during class).	3.0	0.7
27. deliberately review vocabulary and content that are at the students' current language level.	3.3	0.7
28. teach EL students at English speaking peers' level so that students are held accountable to the content objectives for their grade level.	2.5	0.8
When teaching English Language Learners in a co-teaching situation, effective co-teachers should…	**Response Means (n=38)**	**Standard Deviations (n=38)**
29. collaborate with ESL or content specialist to develop lessons, create curriculum, and share teaching philosophies.	3.7	0.5
30. have designated roles and responsibilities for both teachers in a co-teaching environment.	3.6	0.6
31. allocate one teacher to be lead teacher and one to provide support.	2.2	0.8
32. divide the class into smaller groups with both co-teachers teaching the same content simultaneously.	2.8	0.5
33. structure the class so that students move from stations; with each co-teacher teaching one portion of the content to one group and then repeating the instruction for the other group.	2.8	0.6

Convergence and Divergence of Perceptions and Theory

As previously stated, one of the principle goals of this study was to establish where content teachers' perceptions of effective language teaching practices coincided with current TESL theory. The following section presents where teachers' perceptions diverged or converged with current research. Table 10 displays the specific items and topics where content teachers' perceptions aligned with TESL theory.

Table 10

Convergence and Divergence of Content Teachers' Perceptions with Current TESL Theory

Convergence	Ambiguous/No Opinion	Divergence
1. explicitly explain grammar points as they appear in texts, audios, and other real-life examples.	2. simplify how they speak so that students can understand every word being said.	10. only correct students indirectly when students make English errors. (e.g. repeating back to them the corrected phrase).
3. inform students about the learning objectives at the start of the lesson.	6. frequently use computer-based technologies (internet, DVDs, CDs, Smartboard).	26. allow students to create their own strategies for retention (students use their own strategies to take notes or listen during class).
4. ask questions that help link the lesson's concepts and vocabulary to students personal experiences.	7. not correct students immediately after they make a mistake in speaking.	
5. use predominantly individual work to complete activities in class.	11. not simplify or alter how they speak so that students hear natural speech.	
8. give commands to students where students can respond with whole body actions	17. only correct students' work for content because grammar use will appear over time.	
9. provide students with graphic organizers that help them organize their notes or understand the text/video/etc.	28. teach EL students at English speaking peers' level so that students are held accountable to the content objectives for their grade level.	
12. offer extensive wait time for students to respond to questions.	32. divide the class into smaller groups with both co-teachers teaching the same content simultaneously.	
13. strive to make materials that students understand and have a personal connection to. (word problems about things in the classroom as opposed to events/objects unfamiliar to ELLs).	33. structure the class so that students move from stations; with each co-teacher teaching one portion of the content to one group and then repeating the instruction for the other group.	
14. use mostly real-life materials (e.g. music, pictures) in teaching both the language and the content, rather than the textbook.		
15. model activities and tasks before assigning them.		
16. teach students how to use cognitive strategies to help students understand the concept (predicting, evaluating, self-assessing).		

18. focus mostly on the content/meaning so that students have a basis for what they are learning.		
19. use predominantly small group or pair work to complete activities in class.		
20. scaffold the materials to match the pace and level of ELLs in the class.		
21. teach the language primarily by having students complete tasks (e.g. observe and label the properties of rocks) rather than grammar-focused exercises (gap-fill for verb tenses).		
22. use mostly worksheets with fill in the blanks and short answer questions so that students can easily demonstrate their knowledge of a subject.		
23. provide students with the language they would need to ask for help or clarification.		
24. use word walls, graphic organizers, and other visuals to support vocabulary learning.		
25. ask students to respond with movement to illustrate concepts or check for comprehension.		
27. deliberately review vocabulary and content that are at the students' current language level.		
29. collaborate with ESL or content specialist to develop lessons, create curriculum, and share teaching philosophies.		
30. have designated roles and responsibilities for both teachers in a co-teaching environment.		
31. allocate one teacher to be lead teacher and one to provide support.		

As Table 3 demonstrates, content teachers held beliefs about language teaching that coincided frequently with current TESL theory. Several of the questions (5, 22, 31) were written so that teachers needed to disagree with the statement in order to align with TESL theory. For example, question 5 asked whether teachers thought it was best to use predominantly individual work during class time. Current TESL and education theory

supports the role of interaction in the classroom. McKeon found that group and pair interaction increases the amount of time that students spend processing information (1994). If the interactions are appropriately scaffolded and structured, students also have more time to communicate using the target language.

The following paragraphs will summarize teachers' responses and how they converge or diverge from TESL theory. The discussion section will elaborate on potential reasons why teachers may have held these perceptions and how their responses in the interview supported or undermined their responses in the survey.

Teachers' answers converged with TESL theory. Teachers' responses overwhelmingly corresponded with current TESL theory. There were some questions that teachers felt more strongly about, others that teachers were more ambiguous about, and finally some questions that are still controversial topics in TESL theory where it is difficult to say what the presiding current philosophy is. This section will look at individual questions, teachers' responses, and how those responses relate to current research.

Question 1: Explicitly explain grammar points as they appear in texts, audios, and other real life examples. As discussed in the literature review, the role of grammar instruction is still a contested point in current TESL theory. There are some who advocate for comprehensible input as Krashen does in his natural acquisition hypothesis (Krashen, 1982). The traditional model of grammar instruction was frequently decontextualized and taught through the manipulation of form. This model is no longer supported by research. However, a focus on forms approach emphasize the need for explicit instruction in a communicative context (Nazari, 2012).

Rosa and O'Neil (1999) and Nazari (2012) found that providing explicit grammar instruction positively affected students' performance. Nazari (2012) found that "students who were taught under the explicit conditions generally outperformed those who had been exposed to implicit presentation of the grammar structure" (p. 160). Nazari also added that these students were "more precise in detecting and correcting ungrammatical sentences" (p. 160). Content teachers appeared to believe in the importance of grammar instruction, specifically if it was pertinent to the lesson as it appeared.

Question 3: Inform students about the learning objectives at the start of the lesson. Content teachers strongly agreed with this item on the survey as the mean response for this question was 3.6. The SIOP model recommends introducing lesson objectives clearly and visually at the start of lessons so that students understand where the lesson is going and what they will know or be able to do by its termination (SIOP, 2009).

Question 4: Ask questions that help link the lesson's concepts and vocabulary to students' personal experiences. Content teachers strongly agreed with this item as their mean response was 3.7. Creating connections between the lesson and the students' personal experiences is one of the components supported by SIOP. Creating such connection helps students see where the information of the lesson fits in with their own life (Johns, 1986). Additionally, Jones and Brader-Araje (2002), investigated the roles of constructivism on education and reported that in order "for understanding to take place, teachers must not only *elicit* students' prior concepts, but must also *build* on these concepts during instruction" (p. 4). Additionally, Jones and Brader-Araje concluded that "prior knowledge has been shown to significantly influence the ways individuals make meaning out of instruction" (2012, p. 7).

Question 5: Use predominantly individual work to complete activities in class. As stated above, question 5 was a question that required a negative response from teachers in order to align with current TESL theory. Content teachers responded that they disagreed with the above statement with a mean of 2.0. This indicates that teachers value activities where students are working more collaboratively. Collaborative activities have offer more time for ELLs to process information and use the target language with peers (McKeon, 1994). Collaborative practices have also received greater attention since the diminished presence of behaviorist practices in the classroom. As constructivist practices begin to take more precedent, teachers are beginning to use peer-peer interactions and community learning.

Question 8: Give commands to students where students can respond with whole body actions. Question 8 refers to the use of Total Physical Response (TPR) in the classroom. TPR is a strategy which can increase comprehensible input and connect concepts to physical actions. Teachers agreed with this item, though more moderately with a mean of 3.0. Teachers may or may not have had an understanding of what the question was referring to or how TPR can be used to increase comprehensible input. Nonetheless, content teachers believed that physical response could be a valuable activity in the classroom. Fahrurrizi (2017), Sariyati (2013), and Asher (2009), among others, support TPR as a TESL approach and have found it to be an effective model. Asher (2009) described how TPR replicates and takes advantage of how children learn their first language. Asher (2009) describes the three critical elements of language learning to be: 1) that listening skills are developed before speaking, 2) under-standing can and should be "developed through movements of a student's body" (pp. 2-4), and 3) that teachers should not attempt to force production from students. TPR capitalizes on

these features of language learning by using students' observations and receptive skills as they respond with movement.

Question 9: Provide students with graphic organizers that help them organize their notes or understand the text/video/etc. The average teachers' response was 3.5. The use of cognitive strategies is a component of SIOP. The SIOP model recommends that teachers both explicitly teach the desired cognitive strategies, as well as provide supports to help students use them independently. Graphic organizers provide much needed scaffolding for students learning to use such strategies (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Question 12: Offer extensive wait time for students to respond to questions. This is another question that is related to the SIOP model. Content teachers believed that offering and extending wait time was important. Teachers' average response was 3.2. SIOP recommends that teachers offer extensive wait time so that students can generate longer and more frequent responses during the lesson (SIOP, 2009).

Question 13: Strive to make materials that students understand and have a personal connection to. Teachers responded with a mean score of 3.6. As previously stated, helping students connect to the material increases personal meaning and comprehension. Students are better able to see where the content fits into their world views (Johns, 1986). Additionally, constructivist theories place great emphasis on the role of prior knowledge shaping the learning process (Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002). As Jones and Brader-Araje discuss, "students bring with them a rich array of prior experiences, knowledge and beliefs that they use in constructing new understandings" (2002, p. 3). Students' prior knowledge can affect how teachers approach a given concept and how students understand the lesson.

Question 14: Use mostly real-life materials (e.g., music, pictures) in teaching both the language and the content, rather than the textbook. The use of visuals, especially tangible, real-life materials can help convey the meaning of a concept or vocabulary term. Visuals and realia can be used in conjunction with TPR. Visuals also decrease the processing workload that students' have as they listen and read in the target language. Visuals are heavily advised by SIOP theory and TESL theory. The use of visuals increases comprehension as well as engagement during practice portions of the lesson (SIOP, 2009).

Question 15: Model activities and tasks before assigning them. Content teachers strongly agreed that best teaching practice includes modeling instructions and tasks before assigning them to students. Teachers' average response was 3.7. As previously stated, visuals increase comprehension. Modeling is another component of TPR. As teachers describe an activity, they use movement to convey the meaning of their instructions. Modeling is an important visual tool for students to see both the process and the product during a class.

Question 16: Teach students how to use cognitive strategies to help students understand the concept (predicting, evaluating, self-assessing). Teachers responded with a mean score of 3.4 The use of cognitive strategies is a component of SIOP. The SIOP model specifically recommends that educators explicitly teach and model various cognitive strategies for students to use (Echevarria et al., 2010).

Question 18: Focus mostly on the content/meaning so that students have a basis for what they are learning. The average score for question 18 was 3.1. This question was also designed to survey teachers' perceptions about grammar instruction. As previously stated, the role of grammar instruction is still a controversial topic in TESL. According to Nazari (2012),

a focus on meaning approach "gives no attention to the forms and the focus of the classroom is on communication of meaning only" (p. 156). Several studies have suggested that a focus on form within contextualized circumstances results in better performance from students (Nazari, 2012). However, focusing on meaning and content has been supported by those who use the natural acquisition theory to guide practices (Krashen, 1982). Interestingly, teachers responded that they believed it was best practice to teach grammar as features arose in lessons but they also stated that they believed in the importance of meaning-focused communication and practice. It is possible that content teachers did not reflect on this nuance while completing the survey. The phrasing of this question does not directly omit the instruction of form, but rather states that teachers usually focus on meaning. Given that teachers' also stated their belief in a contextualized focus on form, a general focus on meaning would not be misaligned with current TESL theory.

Question 19: Use predominantly small group or pair work to complete activities in class. This question was also about the role of interaction in the classroom. Teachers only moderately agreed with the statement with a mean response of 2.9. It is striking that teachers more strongly disagreed with the use of individual work than they agreed with the use of collaborative pairing. This indicates that teachers probably use both interaction patterns to some extent. As previously stated, group and pair work are beneficial for ELLs in that they allow students more time for processing information and using the target language with peers (McKeon, 1994). Group and pair work are also classroom approaches that have arisen from the paradigm shift to constructivism in education (Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002).

Question 20: Scaffold the materials to match the pace and level of ELLs in the class. Teachers strongly agreed that scaffolding materials was an appropriate practice for working with ELLs. Teachers' mean response was 3.5. Scaffolding lesson materials is a practice supported by educational theory and the SIOP model (Hammond, 2001; Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002; SIOP, 2009; Vygotsky, 1978). Vygotsky described a zone of proximal development as the learning potential for students when they are provided with support from a more knowledgeable adult. Teachers scaffold the lesson to create initial supports to make the lesson more attainable. Overtime, teachers gradually release the supports so that students begin working more autonomously.

Question 21: Teach the language primarily by having students complete tasks. Content teachers responded with an average score of 3.0, indicating that teachers agreed with the statement. The SIOP model promotes using hands-on materials in the practice component (SIOP, 2009). In addition to the SIOP model, project-based learning has roots in constructivist theory. Constructivism has helped shift the emphasis "from knowledge as a product to knowing as a process (Jones & Brader-Araje, 2002, p. 7). There are several working definitions of constructivism. One definition states that learners must construct their own knowledge and that each "learner has a tool kit of concepts and skills with which he or she must construct knowledge to solve problems presented by the environment (Davis, Maher, & Noddings, 1990, p. 3). Providing students with opportunities to learn through problem-solving supports the approach that knowing is a process through which students are the active agents.

Question 22: Use mostly worksheets with fill in the blanks and short answer questions so that students can easily demonstrate their knowledge of a subject. Teachers disagreed with

this statement with an average response of 2.2. Here, the word 'worksheets' may have a possible negative connotation, indicating that students are completing all work independently, in a paper-based form whereby they are most probably writing short, simple, finite answers. In reality, worksheets may be used to provide scaffolding for a larger project, they may provide structure for group interaction, or even directions for a project-based activity. It is most likely that teachers responded based on the most traditional concept of worksheets. Given the traditional definition of 'worksheets', the use of other activities in place of worksheets is mostly aligned with education and TESL theory. As previously stated, ELLs do well in group interactions and with hands-on learning opportunities (McKeon, 1994; SIOP, 2009).

Question 23: Provide students with the language they would need to ask for help or clarification. This is specifically a SIOP based recommendation (SIOP, 2009). Teachers indicated that they agreed with a mean score of 3.4. SIOP recommends explicitly teaching any language students might need to participate more fully in class. This includes language for clarifying concepts and classroom procedures (SIOP, 2009).

Question 24: Use word walls, graphic organizers, and other visuals to support vocabulary learning. This is another recommendation from SIOP. The SIOP model recommends using these visual aids so that students can more easily process information and access previous information (SIOP, 2009).

Question 25: Ask students to respond with movement to illustrate concepts or check for comprehension. This question is directly related to question 8. As previously stated, using TPR provides students with an opportunity to clarify and comprehend language through

movement (Asher, 2009). TPR is recommended by TESL theory because it increases comprehensible input, heavily relies on receptive skills, focuses on receptive skills until students are ready to produce, and increases engagement and motivation (Asher, 2009). Like question 8, teachers agreed that these activities would be beneficial with ELLs with an average response of 3.3.

Question 27: Deliberately review vocabulary and content that are at the students' current language level. Teachers agreed that the deliberate revision of vocabulary was best practice for working with ELLs. Their average response was 3.3. The frequent and explicit revision of previous concepts and vocabulary is a recommendation from SIOP as well as educational theory. Researchers define 'testing effect' as the increased comprehension and retention of a concept after students have attempted to access the information from their own memories. Formative assessments can discern gaps in students' knowledge so that students and teachers can adjust their trajectory. Frequent formative assessments and revisions offer students the opportunity to consolidate their learning and understand where the various concepts connect with one another (Chang & Wimmers, 2017).

Question 29: Collaborate with ESL or content specialist to develop lessons, create curriculum, and share teaching philosophies. The mean score for question 29 was 3.6. Question 29 was an item specifically designed to better understand content teachers' beliefs about co-teaching. Content teachers stated that they strongly believed that collaborating with an ESL specialist in planning stages was an important component of co-teaching. This belief was supported with teachers' responses during the interviews which will be discussed later. Several teachers even lamented that they did not have sufficient time to collaborate with EL

teachers. Collaboration and co-planning has been recommended by several studies and resources that provide guidance for co-teaching (Loeser, 2015). This collaboration ensures that both teachers feel responsible for the students and content of the classroom.

Question 30: Have designated roles and responsibilities for both teachers in a co-teaching environment. Content teachers also agreed that each co-teacher should have designated responsibilities. Their mean was response was 3.6, indicated that they also had strong beliefs about this item. A study by Villa et al. (2013) found that parity and equality were essential for a co-teaching relationship. Villa et al. (2013) also recommended that teachers know and understand their roles in the relationship. This topic yielded some interesting discussions in the interview portion. Content and EL teachers did seem to know and understand their various designated roles. However, there were several occasions where though teachers had distinct roles, they were not equal roles.

Question 31: Allocate one teacher to be lead teacher and one to provide support. Current TESL and educational theory recommends that both teachers be equal partners in the classroom. Therefore, content teachers' disagreement with the above statement (with a mean of 2.2) is aligned with current theory and practice. However, this answer on the Effective Teaching Questionnaire was not supported by several of the interviewees' responses. Several of the interviewees responded with examples and anecdotes that indicate that frequently the content teachers are the lead teacher while the EL teacher supports the class. This will be discussed further in the discussion section.

Teachers' responses were ambiguous. There were several questions that teachers did not agree nor disagree with. There are several possibilities for the more ambiguous answers.

The following section will comment on teachers' responses. Commentary on why teachers' responses may have been ambiguous will be analyzed in the discussion section.

Question 2: Simplify how they speak so that students can understand every word being said. Teachers responded with an average score of 2.7. According to comprehensible input theory (Krashen, 1982), the level of input should be just beyond the students' current level of proficiency (I + 1). Simplification and careful use of vocabulary is one way to ensure that students understand the input. For example, the phrase 'check out' can be understood to mean 'to reserve' and additionally, 'to observe'. Rather than using 'check out', teachers can use 'observe' or 'reserve' instead. Even though 'observe' and 'reserve' are more academics terms, they may be more comprehensible to students because of their narrower and more concrete definitions.

Question 6: Frequently use computer-based technologies (internet, DVDs, CDs, Smartboard). Teachers responded with an average score of 2.6. The use of computers allows students to interact with authentic language through more mediums (Brown, 2006). More reserved students also benefit from an additional source of authentic language that does not require peer interaction (Kern, 1995).

Question 7: Not correct students immediately after they make a mistake in speaking. Teachers responded with a mean of 2.6. The role of corrective feedback has long been explored in TESL. There are certainly specific activities where delayed or omitted corrective feedback is best practice. However, according to Carroll and Swain (1993), groups of students who received explicit feedback outperformed control groups. Interestingly, teachers responded that they generally agreed that indirect corrective feedback, such as recasting, was

best practice. However, teachers' response on question 10 was only 2.9 and is therefore nearly classified as an ambiguous answer.

Question 11: Not simplify or alter how they speak so that students hear natural speech. There were two questions about how teachers alter their speech patterns in order to increase comprehension for ELLs. This second question asked teachers if they should speak using their usual cadence, vocabulary, speed, and register. Teachers responded ambiguously to this question with a mean response of 2.7. Teachers also had the same reported mean score for question 2 which also probes teachers' beliefs about speech patterns.

Question 17: Only correct students' work for content because grammar use will appear over time. This was another question designed to probe teachers' beliefs about corrective feedback and the role of form in the classroom. This question asks if teachers believe best practice is to offer no feedback at all. Teachers responded with a mean score of 2.5. This is the second of 3 questions about corrective feedback where teachers responded ambiguously. As previously stated, Carroll and Swain (1993) found that students who received corrective feedback outperformed the control groups. As for the role of form in the classroom, Nazari (2012) did find that explicit instruction of grammar points led to students being more precise with their language and an increased ability to detect ungrammatical language.

Question 28: Teach EL students at English speaking peers' level so that students are held accountable to the content objectives for their grade level. The average score for question 28 was 2.5. Like question 11, question 28 was designed to investigate teachers' beliefs about teacher speech patterns. Strikingly, all three items about teacher speech patterns resulted in ambiguous answers from teachers. This will be explored further in the discussion section.

Question 32: Divide the class into smaller groups with both co-teachers teaching the same content simultaneously. This question was meant to ask teachers about classroom procedure in co-taught classrooms. Teachers responded with a mean score of 2.8. There are several models that co-teachers can elect to use in a classroom. Models like parallel teaching, to which question 32 refers, are proposed as one model to meet the needs of groups of students in a co-taught classroom.

Question 33: Structure the class so that students move from stations; with each co-teacher teaching one portion of the content to one group and then repeating the instruction for the other group. The mean score for question 33 was 2.8. This final question about co-teaching also refers to the procedures and models that teachers can elect to use in a co-taught setting. Question 33 refers to a model known as 'station teaching', which could allow for the 2 educators to teach mini lessons in their area of expertise, thus maximizing on the individual skills of each teacher.

Teachers' beliefs diverged from TESL theory. There were only two questions where teachers' beliefs diverged from current TESL theory. A large proportion of the population reported that they had little to no TESL specific training or coursework. Despite this apparent lack of formal training, there were very few questions where teachers' responses digressed from current TESL and educational theory. Reasons for these digressions will be discussed in the discussion section.

Question 10: Only correct students indirectly when students make English errors. (e.g., repeating back to them the corrected phrase). As previously discussed, corrective feedback is an important component of language learning. Content teachers moderately agreed, with a

mean score of 2.9, that corrective feedback should be used but only if it is indirect rather than explicit. Carroll and Swain (1993) found that explicit feedback resulted in greater performance. Other questions about corrective revealed that teachers held ambiguous or uncertain beliefs about error correction. This will also be discussed further in the discussion section.

Question 26: Allow students to create their own strategies for retention (students use their own strategies to take notes or listen during class). Teachers appeared to agree that students should be using cognitive strategies in classes. Teachers' average response was 3.0. However, question 26 is not asking about whether or not teachers and students should be using cognitive strategies, it is attempting to understand whether educators believe that students should be generating their own strategies or if these should be teacher led initiatives. The SIOP model recommends that teachers explicitly teach cognitive strategies for students to use and create opportunities and scaffolding for students to utilize them (2009).

Teacher Interviews

As previously stated, the teacher interviews were conducted with volunteers from both population groups. The teacher interviews were administered in order to ascertain the underlying values and experiences that could have contributed to a teacher's perception about effective language teaching. The semi-structured nature of the interview allowed teachers to respond to open-ended questions that revealed variables that could not be collected from the Teacher Information Questionnaire.

The participants' responses are presented below based on the domains. The interviews were transcribed and coded for common ideas and patterns. These ideas and patterns were

then grouped together based on theme. Finally, analyses (Spradley, 1979) were used to identify domains and taxonomy within the data. The table below displays the domains and patterns found in the interviews.

Table 11

Teacher Interview Domains

Domains		Responses
Traditional teaching	Building background	Assume nothing
		Importance of background building
		Connect content to present
	Practices and procedures	Collaborative grouping
		Manipulatives and visuals
		Modified speech
		Formative assessments
	Scope and sequence	Breaking down activities
		Repetition of content and practice
		Flexibility

Co-teaching	Co-teaching roles	EL teachers as experts of ELLs
		Co-teaching models
		Dividing responsibilities between co-teachers
Challenges of working with Els	Challenges of teaching Els	Difficulty of differentiation
		Building background and connections
		Language barrier
	Challenges of co-teaching	Lack of common planning time

The interview responses are presented here. The results can be separated into three main patterns: 1) perceptions related to traditional teaching, 2) perceptions related to co-teaching, and 3) perceived challenges of working with ELLs.

Traditional teaching. During the interview, several teachers spoke about their various practices, procedures, challenges, and beliefs about teaching ELLs when they are the only teacher present. The teachers' responses can be grouped into their beliefs about 1) building background, 2) daily practices and procedures, and 3) the scope and sequence teachers use when working with ELLs.

Building background. Building background denotes the explicit instruction of events, context, facts, vocabulary, and other factors that contribute to students' understanding of a

given topic. Often, building background also includes opportunities for students to connect

the lesson material to their own personal experiences (Vidot, 2011). Several participants

explicitly talked about the importance of building background in order to make material more

relevant to ELLs. As stated earlier, building background is one of the core components of

SIOP. One EL teacher stated,

> Don't assume they have any sort of base knowledge. And not that they're lacking
> knowledge, they are incredibly smart, but just you never know what they have and
> don't have. So you can't assume, oh everyone knows this. You have to assume
> nothing and then build from there.

A math teacher also expressed his beliefs about the importance of not assuming. When asked

what advice he had for new teachers, he stated, "Don't assume things, learn their culture, ask

them, don't be afraid to make mistakes, and ask them and they usually know."

A science teacher also expressed the difficulties with assuming that ELLs had prior or

common background knowledge. She explained that teachers should, "Start from the

beginning and get to know them. Do a variety of activities to figure out what their strengths

are and what works best for them." This same science teacher spoke about a time when she

assumed that students had background knowledge about a cartoon character she was using on

one of her exams. She reflected that she had never done anything in class with the cartoon and

when one of her EL students asked for clarification about what the cartoon was, she reflected

that she would "try to be more thoughtful and make sure the context is there."

One social studies teacher recounted his experience of trying to use a crossword

puzzle to review a chapter. He said,

> The things that I assume, not just EL, but that students should grasp, I'm always
> learning that that doesn't work. For example, last week I handed out a crossword
> puzzle, thinking that EL students have done this in other classes. Well no. I had

some students that were going from the bottom to the top. We found a word bank is helpful. It was a very humbling day.

This same social studies teacher spoke about the how much comprehension increases when students can connect the content to their present lives. He stated that he believed, "the students realized that the stuff that was being built back here was influencing buildings in Washington DC and things. We talked about the past and connected it to the modern times." He expanded that he, "just started to see students have this 'ah-ha moment'."

One EL teacher spoke at length about her newcomer class. She said that,

the class seems really lost on days when I try to zoom through my lesson. My first year of teaching, I was so concerned with trying to cram in all the content that I actually think my students were understanding less. The days when I slow down, pre-teach vocabulary and do things like show maps, videos, and pictures to set the scene. Those days seem like to students are more engaged.

Practices and procedures. All of the teachers interviewed, discussed the various practices, procedures, and modifications they make when working with ELLs. Five teachers discussed the importance of using visual aids when working with ELLs. A social studies teacher said that when teaching history, they had "pictures on the screen, lots of visuals. The attentiveness and the ability to retain information is much greater when you can put both of those together." Four teachers talked about their success of using manipulatives and realia with ELLs. Both math teachers interviewed stressed the importance of hands-on materials and projects. One math teacher said that he had "them try a lot of the stuff themselves." He gave an example about teaching fractions where they, "did Lego manipulatives last year and that went really well." He added that students, "can actually see it, feel it. And it's easier to understand." The other math teacher told a story about going outside to place students on a

graph in the grass. She explained that this was a class where all of her students, including ELLs, were engaged and understanding the lesson.

Teachers also spoke about the various interactive models they use with ELLs. Six teachers indicated that they think pair and group work is beneficial for students. Only one teacher gave a specific example of a time when he used group work with ELLs. This social studies teacher explained that he had groups of students working on a timeline together which they had to display on poster paper. He added that he felt students displayed creativity and pride in their work.

Several teachers spoke about how they modify their pace and speech patterns when teaching ELLs. Two teachers spoke about the necessity of repeated practice and instruction. Other teachers spoke about how they modify their explanations to ELLs. One language arts teacher said that she aims for "simplicity, not only fine tuning verbal delivery but in print as well." She added that she tries to do a lot of rewording and using synonyms. Some content teachers stated that they relied on their co-teachers for modified explanations. One history teacher explained that the "co-teacher can slow things down and help with examples."

One EL teacher spoke about a lesson that she changed at the last minute for the better. She said that she had planned for students to look at pictures of different rocks in a textbook and classify them to practice vocabulary of colors, shapes, and sizes. She said that the day of the lesson she went to the science department and asked to borrow some rocks and fossils that students could touch and feel. She said that she believed that the students were more engaged when they were working in groups and had actual rocks to observe rather than pictures of rocks.

Finally, when asked how teachers ensure that EL students are accessing the lesson and achieving lesson objectives, 8 teachers reported that they use some form of formative assessments. Formative assessments are included in the SIOP framework. One math teacher indicated that she uses daily homework and exit slips to ensure that students are comprehending the lesson. A social studies teacher indicated that he does frequent check-ins using a 'thumbs-up' to signal understanding. A language arts teacher said that she checks in with students and provides feedback wherever possible.

Scope and sequence. Scope and sequence includes the amount of content included in a class and the pace at which students progress through the lesson. Two teachers indicated that repeating activities and content provided an opportunity for review and mastery of the content. One EL teacher explained that she believes that students comprehend the most after several days of repetition. She said that, "students are most engaged on the days when it's the 3rd or 4th day in a row of doing the same topic or same idea or same practice." A math teacher said that "modeling and practicing, extra practice, spending more than one day" increases students' comprehension.

These same teachers also added that flexibility was imperative when working with ELLs. A social studies teacher spoke about adjusting the pace for his class. He said, "I've learned to be flexible with where things are at. At this day we should be at this particular topic, uhm no." Another teacher spoke about taking additional time to scaffold lessons and break down activities into smaller, more manageable pieces. One social studies teacher said, "When I'm doing graphing, we're doing supply and demand, and I'm doing graphing, supply

and demand talking about the curve and what shifts the curve using a lot of vocabulary, things like diminishing margin of utility. I might break things down but I do it quickly."

Co-teaching. Several of the questions in the interview asked participants to describe their beliefs about co-teaching. Several teachers described how they planned with a co-teacher, how they divided the responsibilities between teachers, and what they believed the ideal co-teaching model to be.

EL teachers as experts. When asked about the roles of co-teachers, several content teachers described how their EL co-teachers were a resource for the classroom. Three content teachers said they would seek out EL co-teachers to ask for input about modifying lessons for EL students. One math teacher said he asks his co-teachers for "input and feedback about the language in the lesson." One teacher specifically recommended that any teacher who is new to working with ELLs should seek out an EL teacher for support. She said new teachers should, "Use EL teachers as a resource, to learn strategies to help those students." She also added that she believed EL strategies should be included in new teacher training.

When asked about what recommendations he would have for a teacher newly working with EL students, one EL teacher recommended that teachers, "consult your EL teacher. It would be really good to get as much information as you can on those EL students, probably from your EL teacher. And understand that the information is going to be in ACCESS scores and understanding what that means, that even a student who is very fluent orally may not have any idea what's going on in class."

Dividing responsibilities. When asked about co-teaching relationships, all teachers responded that they divide the responsibilities between the content and EL teacher. Some

teachers divided responsibilities based on content and language areas. A math teacher said he is in charge of math content and his co-teacher provides input about modifying the lesson. One science teacher stated that she would recommend what they, "need to do as far as the science part goes" and then ask her co-teachers where they see this going and "how can we piece this together."

Other teachers discussed dividing their responsibilities based on strengths rather than content area. One EL teacher stated, "I may be a better reader. If we're reading out loud to our students and my co-teacher may be better at examples and explanations from history, some of the things that I don't have." A social studies teacher also discussed dividing the class based on strengths. He said, "I'll do some of the reading from the chapter, and then my co-teacher will kind of explain things. It's kind of like being married, you just finish each other sentences. I don't bring all the content because my co-teacher is very very knowledgeable in world history."

Co-teaching models. There were several mixed and conflicting responses when teachers were asked about what co-teaching model they use and what they thought would be best practice. Interestingly, EL teachers and content teachers appeared to have disparate views about co-teaching. Both groups discussed the 'one teach, one support' approach. However, only the EL teachers believed that this was less effective. One math teacher discussed how he is "in charge of the math lesson" but that he asks his co-teacher for input: A social studies teacher said that her co-teacher is "good about suggesting ways that might be beneficial." The world languages teacher stated that the content teacher should, "take the lead" while the EL teacher, "is there, kind of helping out." A language arts teacher said that she generally

defaults to a model in which she teaches and her co-teacher, "circulates and augments, or supports those students who need more support." She also stated that, "it's nice to have another able body" in the classroom. It's clear that from the language that these teachers use that they value their co-teacher's expertise and assistance but still believe that the role of their co-teachers is to augment their own teaching.

In contrast, EL teachers asserted that they believed the 'one teach, one support' model to be less effective. One EL teacher said, "ideally, most of the time it should be a true pair-teaching. So both teachers, directly in front of the students, directly teaching the lesson back and forth transferring between skill sets." Another EL teacher stated,

> I think probably the least effective, and maybe what happens most often is one teacher leads and the other teacher observes or just circulates. I think it's probably the least effective because it's not utilizing the skills, the real benefit of having two teachers in the room is to truly have two teachers in the room. Not a teacher and a helper.

When asked what model might be preferable, one EL teacher replied, "If possible, some parallel teaching can be a really good strategy. Pulling out a small group, working with individual students on skills."

Challenges of working with Els. Several teachers discussed their perceived challenges of working with ELLs. Some teachers used explicit, deficit-based language to describe their students' abilities while others reflected on ways in which they had to adapt their own teaching style.

Language barrier. Teachers also discussed the difficulty of explaining concepts when students did not understand the vocabulary terms being used. One social studies teacher commented, "they don't have that strong vocabulary so when we put the words together I'm not seeing the connections. They're not connecting to the vocab. I lose them." A math teacher

said that, "When there's a language barrier it's harder to demonstrate what the math concept is." A science teacher reflected that, "students have the hardest time understanding during the beginning of the class, there's a lot of terminology."

One EL teacher spoke about students who may have challenges accessing the material because of their literacy skills. He said that grade-level material is sometimes problematic because, "students can't understand grade level English. So they can't really participate at all."

Building background and connections. Two teachers used spoke about their experiences in trying to convey an idea to EL students who did not have prior background knowledge about a given concept. One math teacher stated that it was harder to demonstrate what the concept was when students didn't have prior knowledge. He discussed the barrier to comprehension "when they don't have any prior knowledge to it." An EL teacher recommended that new teachers should not, "assume they have any sort of base knowledge and not that they're lacking knowledge, they are incredibly smart but just you never know what they have and don't have."

Class sizes. Three teachers discussed the difficulties of working with large groups of students with diverse need. Teachers specifically referenced their co-taught content classes. One social studies teacher said that she frequently does not have time to check in with students to ensure comprehension. She said, "when you have a class that's 40 students, I'll be honest I have to rely on them to come and talk to me. I'll be honest, it's a struggle. I know they're not getting it. And I'm torn with all the different abilities in one class." Another social studies teacher added,

sometimes they will put more students in a co-taught class just because there are 2 teachers, and I find that to be a total incorrect assumption. There's 2 of us, 40 students, and just the abilities. Some grasp it but then you get some that are just like 'woah what does this word mean?'.

One EL teacher commented that his more successful lessons happen in a small group setting with students who were generally identified as being approximately the same proficiency level.

Challenges of co-teaching. Several teachers discussed some of the challenges that had arisen because of co-teaching. A common comment was the lack of common planning time. All teachers agreed that planning with their co-teacher was important but difficult. One math teacher recommended that new teachers should, "seek out their co-teacher, they know more of what the students need than we do." However, she added, "It's not always that easy, because we don't have shared time to do that." A science teacher also discussed the importance of common planning time. When asked about how to utilize a co-teaching model effectively, she replied, "we'd have to make sure that we had time to meet."

One EL teacher spoke about her co-teaching relationship. She said that she didn't feel like the relationship was built on mutual trust and respect. This teacher stated,

> my co-teacher almost always leads the lesson and she usually just lectures students from the front of the class while they take notes. I've tried to recommend alternative groupings, activities, and speaking patterns that might work well for EL students. But she usually gives me some reason for why we can't do that. Like she doesn't want to do parallel teaching because maybe students will be distracted. She doesn't want me to do small groups with students who are significantly behind the rest of the class because what grades would those students get if they're not doing the same thing as the rest of the class. Eventually, I kind of give up trying to suggest ideas.

Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter will interpret the results that were previously presented and discuss some of the potential implications of the study. The limitations of the study will also be presented. Finally, recommendations for future research will be included.

The results section displayed what content teachers' perceptions of language teaching were and if their beliefs corresponded with current TESL theory and pedagogy. Here, the potential reasons and implications of content teachers' perceptions will be discussed.

This discussion will look at the categories of questions and discuss how content teachers' perceptions coincided with TESL theory as well as the potential reasons that their beliefs might have may or may not have coincided. Qualitative data from the teacher interviews will also be used to support the suppositions written here.

Convergence with TESL theory. On the Teacher Information Questionnaire, 73% of content teachers stated that they had taken 0-1 TESL related courses (39% indicated they had never taken a TESL course and 34% stated they had taken only 1 TESL course). Despite this apparent lack of formal education, content teachers appeared to hold beliefs that mostly coincided with TESL theory. On Effective Teaching Questionnaire, teachers' responses corresponded with TESL theory on 70% of items. As Song and Samimy (2015) found, prior educational experiences significantly impact teachers' perceptions of working with ELLs. Therefore, teachers either held these beliefs intrinsically or there were other extenuating circumstances and experiences that affected teachers' perceptions.

The materials section described the various themes and theories that were included in the Effective Teaching Questionnaire. Of these themes, teachers seemed most likely to

coincide with TESL pedagogy on questions that covered SIOP components and established educational practices (derived from constructivism).

There were 15 questions related to SIOP. These questions were not exclusively about SIOP given that there is considerable overlap between SIOP components, educational theory, and TESL pedagogy. Of the 15 SIOP related questions, teachers responded appropriately to 14 of them. It is entirely possible that content teachers in these schools had received SIOP specific training or that there is such an overlap between SIOP and educational theory, that teachers were able to make judgments on these items based on other educational coursework. The only SIOP related question that teachers did not respond to appropriately was question 26 (allow students to create their own strategies for retention (students use their own strategies to take notes or listen during class). Teachers may have agreed that the use of cognitive strategies was beneficial but not understood the necessity of explicitly teaching those cognitive strategies.

Teachers also responded appropriately to questions that were based in educational theory. As previously discussed, many of the SIOP related questions overlapped with accepted educational theory. Teachers responded appropriately to both questions about educational theory, which included references to constructivist practices like scaffolding.

Ambiguous, inconsistent, or incorrect responses. There were several questions to which teachers responded inconsistently or ambiguously (with an average score that revealed no firm platform). The themes to which content teachers responded ambiguously or inconsistently include topics of role of grammar instruction, corrective feedback, natural acquisition hypothesis, and specific classroom procedures.

As previously summarized, grammar instruction is still a contested topic in the field of TESL. It is therefore unsurprising that teachers who reported little to no formal education in TESL would not be fully aware of the complexities of grammar instruction. As previously stated, natural acquisition hypothesis asserts that direct grammar instruction is not needed when the focus of the classroom is on meaning and communication. Such explicit instruction is not necessary for language acquisition. However, Rosa and O'Neil (1999) and Nazari (2012) found that providing explicit grammar instruction can positively affect students' performance. Content teachers may be unaware of the reported benefits of grammar instruction or unsure how to include grammar instruction in their content classrooms. Teachers stated that they believed grammar instruction to be best practice but did not disagree that a focus on content would result in correct grammar use over time.

Corrective feedback is an important component of language learning. Carroll and Swain (1993) found that students who received corrective feedback, outperformed the control groups. Content teachers responded ambiguously to both questions about corrective feedback indicating that there was no real consensus on its use in the classroom. Like grammar instruction, content teachers may be unaware of the research on reported benefits of corrective feedback. Corrective feedback is likely a topic covered in TESL courses rather than educational courses. Teachers who may not have been exposed to ELLs or TESL specific courses may not be aware of the role of corrective feedback in the classroom.

Krashen (1982) has long defended the importance of comprehensible input in the classroom. According to Krashen, the target language that students are exposed to should be just beyond their current capabilities. There are several strategies to achieve this

recommended level of language including speech rate, chosen vocabulary, register, and inclusion of visual and other aids. Teachers working with ELLs may alter their speech patterns so as to be more comprehensible to students. However, content teachers had no clear opinion about how they could alter their speech to be more comprehensible. There was no clear consensus on questions like should teachers simplify how they speak or should teachers speak naturally without modifications.

There were three questions about specific classroom procedures where teachers responded ambiguously. Teachers had no clear consensus about the role and use of various technologies in the classroom. There may have been teachers who believed that the role of computers plays an integral part of the class (keyboarding) or others who believed that technology may not augment the class meaningfully. It is also possible that teachers believed that the use of technology is dependent on the specific lesson being taught.

There were also two questions about specific procedures and models that could be utilized in a co-taught classroom. Teachers responded ambiguously when asked about parallel teaching and station teaching. It could be that teachers were unaware of these procedures, unsure how to utilize them, or believed their use to be contingent upon the lesson and activities of the day.

Finally, there was one item where content teachers responded appropriately but their stated beliefs were not supported by their answers in the qualitative portion of this research. Teachers stated that they believed it was important for both co-teachers to have parity and equality. Content teachers believed it was not best practice to designate one lead teacher and one supporting teacher. However, there were several comments in the interview process that

illuminated the actual roles that teachers have in a co-taught setting. For example, one history teacher stated that her co-teacher is "good about suggesting ways that might be beneficial, like she talked about small groups." This same history teacher also described one of her co-teacher's roles as slowing things down and helping with examples. While she does not explicitly state that she is the lead teacher, the implication is that her EL co-teacher assists rather than co-plans. A math teacher also said that when planning a lesson, he asks his "co-teacher for input and feedback about the language in the lesson." Not only does this suggest that his co-teacher is not an equal partner in the planning portion of the class, but that his co-teacher's input is limited to the language used in the classroom. An EL teacher commented that her "co-teacher frequently plans and leads the lesson" because of the dynamics of the relationship. This EL teacher said that her co-teacher seemed uncomfortable with letting her lead a lesson or suggest alternative classroom activities and interaction models.

In summary, content teachers' beliefs coincided with current educational theory and district initiated models like SIOP. There appeared to be some confusion or uncertainty about some TESL specific theories like natural acquisition theory, the role of grammar instruction, and corrective feedback. Finally, though teachers reported that they believed in parity in co-teaching, their responses in the interview portion undermine their responses in the survey.

Limitations

As with any study, there were limitations across various aspects which will be discussed in this section. These limitations will unfortunately restrict the scope of generalizability. One of the principal limitations of the study was sample size. As previously stated, survey research typically has a low response rate (Brown, 2001). Only 25% of the

invited participants responded to the survey. Given that the possible population was only approximately 160 teachers at both high schools, it was not entirely unexpected to have 38 teachers agree to participate. Despite the natural low response rate associated with survey research, there may have been other compounding factors that led to the small sample size. The surveys were submitted in teachers' mailboxes in hard copy form. This was originally done so that teachers could complete the survey at their leisure and to avoid inundating teachers with emails, given how many emails teachers generally respond to in a day. However, if the survey had been presented in an online format, the response rate may have been higher.

Secondly, the surveys were sent to Secondary School B through the inner-school mailing system. The researcher does not work at the other Secondary School B and therefore did not have a personal connection with the teachers being asked to participate. The response rate from Secondary School A was considerably higher than at Secondary School B indicating that lack of personal connection and ease of submission may have been factors that contributed to Secondary School B's low response rate.

The purpose of this study was to analyze the perceptions of content teachers at the secondary level. Therefore, the researcher chose to limit the participants to the two high schools in the area. However, the study could certainly be expanded to include middle schools, which are also considered secondary schools because teachers may specialize in a specific content. In order to expand the study even further, elementary schools can be included to consider the differences between classroom teachers (those who primarily work with students) and EL teachers (who are primarily working within the confines of co-teaching

rather than sheltered EL classes). Assuming the same rate of response, the sample size of the study would grow considerably and encompass the perceptions of the entire district.

Another limitation of the study were the instruments used to collect data. The objective of the study was to understand where content teachers' beliefs about language teaching coincide or differ with current best practice. A closed-response, Likert-scale survey was used to gather information about what these perceptions were. Further interviews were conducted to understand why teachers held these perceptions. Although the survey instruments were adapted from a previous study (Brown, 2001), the wording of the instruments may have been misleading or confusing to the participants. Pilot testing was done on a small scale for both of the questionnaires. During pilot testing, the survey received some feedback and adjustments were made. However, certain items on the two survey instruments still created some confusion. The researcher received questions from participants about the intent of those items.

For example, some teachers asked about item 11, which asked if teachers believed it was effective practice to not simplify or alter how they speak so that students hear natural speech. The average response of item 11 was 2.6 stating that teachers moderately agreed that speaking in their natural speed and register was best practice for EL students. However, teachers also responded 2.7 for item 2. Item 2 asked if teachers believed it was best practice to simplify how they speak so that students can understand every word being said. If teachers really believed that speaking at a natural rate and register was best practice, then teachers should not have also responded that they believed it best practice to simplify their speech.

The conflicting results indicate that teachers either did not understand the concept being surveyed or that the questions themselves were inappropriately phrased. Perhaps the word 'simplify' in question 2 was concerning to teachers who envisioned using ungrammatical phrases in order to communicate. A term like modify could have been used in place of simplify. Perhaps teachers would view modifying their speech, rather than simplifying, as a more effective teaching practice. Or perhaps question 11 was confusing for participants as they tried to parse the negative phrase included in the survey question. The item could have been reworded to state that teachers should speak at their normal tempo and register so that students hear natural speech. This would have still conveyed the same content while avoiding negative phrases. Both of those questions were included to ensure that teachers were responding consistently in accordance with their perceptions. Teachers who believe that modifying speech is best practice should have disagreed that speaking at a normal rate and register was also best teaching practice.

There were several concepts in the Effective Teaching Questionnaire that referred to the same concept from opposite perspectives. Their inclusion was meant to ask teachers to reflect on each item individually and ensure consistency throughout the survey.

Recommendations for Future Research

The results lead to two particular findings which should be studied further: 1) if and how the cooperation (and co-teaching relationships) between EL teachers and content teachers leads to a greater understanding of EL pedagogy, and 2) how teachers' perceptions of language teaching are manifested in the classroom setting. More research is needed to explore these two questions.

As mentioned previously, content teachers' responses overwhelmingly coincided with current TESL best practices. Content teachers appeared to understand and agree with current TESL theory despite the apparent lack of formal education in EL theory and practice. In order to understand why there was considerable overlap between the perceptions of these two groups, it is necessary to understand teachers' rationale for these beliefs. Do content teachers hold these perceptions irrespective of their background in EL? Do content teachers' beliefs develop as they teach EL students? Do content teachers' beliefs develop as they work and co-teach with EL teachers? Do content teachers' perceptions about language teaching remain the same despite interaction with EL students and EL teachers? This research might require extensive qualitative research over a long period of time.

Additionally, more research is required to determine if and how teachers' perceptions are manifested in the classroom. The research must first analyze what teachers' perceptions are about language teaching and learning. Then a well-designed study may allow researchers to determine the correspondence between perception and practice. This study might include observations of the classroom, interviews with the teachers, and a survey to determine what teachers' perceptions are. Additionally, the researcher could ask content teachers to modify a given lesson plan to meet the needs of EL students. This could also be included with the aforementioned collection methods or as a separate study.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

Perceptions are the foundations which guide teachers' practices. Perceptions can and should develop over time with new experiences and educational opportunities. As Song and Samimy (2015) found, education and prior experiences have a significant impact on the perceptions that teachers hold. Given that perceptions provide teachers with a guiding structure for their day-to-day educational practices, Researchers can and should continue to examine teachers' perceptions of effective teaching practices.

This is particularly true of content teachers' perceptions of effective language teaching. The number of ELLs continue to grow and current educational policies encourage ELLs to move into grade-level, content classes before and while the target language is being acquired. As these ELLs enter content classes, more and more content teachers will find themselves, at least partially, responsible for language acquisition. As previously stated, perceptions are intricately related to how teachers educate their students.

As found, content teachers appear to hold beliefs about language teaching practices that coincide with TESL theory where that theory overlaps with educational theories like constructivism. Content teachers also appear to believe in instructional practices that align with models like SIOP, which have roots in educational and TESL theory. However, content teachers appear to be unfamiliar with TESL specific theories like the natural acquisition hypothesis, the role of grammar instruction, and corrective feedback. Content teachers did not hold views that strongly opposed these theories and methods; their responses were mostly noncommittal. As previously stated, education was an important factor in teacher perceptions (Song & Samimy, 2015). It is possible that with specific exposure to these theories and

practices, that content teachers could alter their perceptions and perhaps their own educational practices.

Additionally, co-teaching is a model that is used in all educational levels (elementary and secondary) in this district. Effective co-teaching is contingent on the relationship between the co-teachers. Research recommends that there be mutual respect and parity between the two teachers. Content teachers appeared to understand the importance of parity. They reported that assigning one teacher to assist another was not an effective teaching strategy for co-teaching. However, several teachers' responses during the interview process suggest that EL teachers are relegated to assisting and helping the content teacher. Further study of co-teaching practices is necessary to discover if co-teaching relationships have parity and what does parity look like. Further research could also illuminate why content teachers are frequently the lead teacher by default.

Finally, future research projects may begin to illuminate how perceptions relate to actual teaching practices. This study can better be used to understand how education and experiences shape the fabric of the classroom.

References

Aliakbari, M., & Bazyar, A. (2012). Exploring the impact of parallel teaching on general language proficiency of EFL learners. *Journal of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics, 16*(1), 55-71.

Asher, J. J. (2009). Learning another language through actions (7th ed.). Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions, Inc.

Bacharach, N., & Heck, T. (2012) Voices from the field: Multiple perspectives on a co-teaching in student teaching model. *The Renaissance Group, 1(*1), 49-61.

Bacharach, N., Heck, T., & Dahlberg, K. (2007). *Collaboratively researching the impact of a co-teaching model of student teaching*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Bacharach, N., Heck, T., & Dahlberg, K. (2008). What makes co-teaching work? Identifying the essential elements. *College Teaching Methods & Styles Journal, 4*(3), 43-48.

Baisch, M. (2015). *Growth and proficiency report to Board of Education*. St Cloud, MN.

Borg, S. (2011). The impact of in-service teacher education on language teachers' beliefs. *System, 39*(3), 370-380. Doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1016/j.system.2011.07.009

Brown, J. D. (2001). Using surveys in language programs. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, A. (2006). *Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective teaching in the foreign language classroom: A comparison of ideals and ratings*. (Unpublished dissertation), University of Arizona.

Brown, A. (2009). Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective foreign language teaching:

    A comparison of ideals. *The modern Language Journal, 93*, 46-60.

Busch, D. (2010). Pre-service teacher beliefs about language learning: The second language

    acquisition course as an agent for change. *Language Teaching Research, 14*(3), 318-

    337. Doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.stcloudstate.edu/10.1177/1362168810365239

Carrell, P. L. (1984). Schema theory and ESL reading: Classroom implications and

    applications. *Modern Language Journal, 68*(4), 332-343.

Carroll, S., & Swain, M. (1993). Explicit and implicit negative feedback: An empirical study

    of the learning of linguistic generalizations. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,*

    15, 357-386.

Chang, E., & Wimmers, P. (2017) Effect of repeated/spaced formative assessments on

    medical school final exam performance. *Health Professions Education, 3*(1), 32-27.

Clark, C. M., & Peterson, P. L. (1986). Teachers' though processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Eds.),

    Handbook of research on teaching (3rd ed., pp. 255-296). New York: Macmillian.

Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching: Guidelines for creating effective practices.

    Focus on Exceptional Children, 28(3), 1-16.

Curtin, E. (2005). Instructional styles used by regular classroom teachers while teaching

    recently mainstreamed ESL students: Six urban middle school teachers in Texas share

    their experiences and perceptions. *Multicultural Education, 12*(4), 36.

Darragh, J., Piccano, K., Tully, D., & Hennig, S. (2011). When teachers collaborate, good

    things happen: Teacher candidate perceptions of the co-teach model for the student

teaching internship. *Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges of Teacher Education Journal, 8*, 83-103.

Davis, R., Maher, C., & Noddings, N. (1990). *Introduction: Constructivist views on the teaching and learning of mathematics.* In R. Davis, C. Maher, & N. Noddings (Eds.), Constructivist views on the teaching and learning of mathematics (pp. 7-18). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.

Değirmenci Uysal, N., & Aydin, S. (2017). Foreign language teachers' perceptions of error correction in speaking classes: A qualitative study. *The Qualitative Report, 22*(1), 123-135. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.nova.edu/tqr/vol22/iss1/7.

DelliCarpini, M., & Alonso, O. B. (2014). Teacher education that works: Preparing secondary-level math and science teachers for success with English language learners through content-based instruction. *Global Education Review, 1*(4), 155-178.

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Vogt, M. (2008). Making content comprehensible for non-native speakers of English: The SIOP model. *International Journal of Learning, 14*(11), 41-49.

Echevarria, J., Short, D., & Vogt, M. (2010). *The SIOP model for teaching mathematics to English learners*. Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Fahrurrozi. (2017). Improving students' vocabulary mastery by using total physical response. *English Language Teaching, 10*(3), 118-127.

Garcia-Nevarez, A. G., Stafford, M. E., & Arias, B. (2005). Arizona elementary teachers' attitudes toward English language learners and the use of Spanish in classroom instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal, 29*(2), 295-316.

Gibbons, P. (2011). Mediating language learning: Teacher interactions with ESL students in a

content-based classroom. *TESOL Quarterly. 37*(2), 247-273

Grantmakers for Education. (2013). *Educating English language learners: Grantmaking*

strategies for closing America's other achievement gap. Retrieved from https://

edfunders.org/sites/default/files/Educating%20English%20Language%20Learn.

Greenfield, R. (2013). Perceptions of elementary teachers who educate linguistically diverse

student. *The Qualitative Report, 18*(47), 1-26. Retrieved from http://nsuworks.

Nova.edu/tqr/vol18/iss47/2.

Hammond, J. (2001). *Scaffolding: Teaching and learning in language and literacy education.*

Marrickville, New South Wales, Australia: Primary English Teaching Assoc.

Hansen-Thomas, H. (2008). Sheltered instruction: Best practices for ELLs in the mainstream.

Kappa Delta Pi Record, 44(4), 165-169.

Honigsfield, A., & Dove, M. (2010). *Collaboration and co-teaching strategies for English*

learners. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Johns, A. M. (1986). The ESL student and the revision process: Some insights from schema

theory. *Journal of Basic Writing, 5*(2), 70-80.

Jones, M., & Brader-Araje, L. (2002). The impact of constructivism on education: Language,

discourse, and meaning. *American Communication Journal, 5*(3), 1-9.

Kagan, D. (1992). Implications of research on teacher beliefs. *Educational Psychologist,*

27(1), 65-90.

Kareva, V., & Echevarria, J. (2013). Using the SIOP model for effective content teaching with second and foreign language learners. *Journal of Education and Training Studies, 1*(2), 239-248.

Kern, R. (1995). Restructuring classroom interaction with networked computers: Effects of quantity and characteristics of language production. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*, 457-476.

Kibler, A., Valdés, G., & and Walqui, A. (2014). What does standards-based educational reform mean for English language learner populations in primary and secondary schools? *TESOL Quarterly, 48*(3), 433-453.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Krashen, S., & Terrell, T. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*. New York: Pergamon.

Loeser, J. (2015). *Team teaching.* Massachusetts: Salem Press.

Mamantov, T. J. (2013). *An investigation of English as a second language models (pullout, co-teaching, and inclusion) on the Texas English language proficiency assessment system.* (Unpublished dissertation), Texas A&M University.

McKeon, D. (1994). When meeting "common" standards is uncommonly difficult. *Educational Leadership, 51*(8), 45-49.

Minnesota Department of Education. (2015). *Why statewide test results matter*. Roseville, MN: Author.

Minnesota Minority Education Partnership. (2012). *English learners in Minnesota schools: Key policy issues to accelerate academic achievement for more English learners in Minnesota*. St. Paul, MN: Author.

Nazari, N. (2012). The effect of implicit and explicit grammar instruction on learns' achievements in receptive and productive modes. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences, 70*(2013) 156-162.

National Clearing House for English Language Acquisition. (2011). *The growing number of English learner students: 1998/99-2008/09*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Reeves, J. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131-142.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan Library Reference.

Rosa, E., & O'Neill, M.D. (1999). Explicitness, intake, and the issue of awareness: Another piece to the puzzle. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 511-556.

Sariyati, I. (2013). The effectiveness of TPR (Total Physical Response) method in English vocabulary mastery of elementary school children. *Journal of Linguistics and Education, 3*(1), 50-64.

Settlage, J., Madsen, A., & Rustad, K. (2005). Inquiry science, sheltered instruction, and English language learners: Conflicting pedagogies in highly diverse classrooms. *Issues in Teacher Education, 14*(1), 39-57.

Sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP). (2009). *WWC intervention report.*

   Princeton, NJ: What Works Clearinghouse.

Short, D. J., Fidelman, C. G., & Louguit, M. (2012). Developing academic language in

   English language learners through sheltered instruction. *TESOL Quarterly: A Journal*

   for Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages and of Standard English as a

   Second Dialect, 46(2), 334-361.

Song, S., & Samimy, K. (2015). The beliefs of secondary content teachers of English

   language learners regarding language learning and teaching. *International Journal of*

   TESOL and Learning, 4(1), 3-19.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The ethnographic interview*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and

   Winston.

Tan, M. (2011). Mathematics and science teachers' beliefs and practices regarding the

   teaching of language in content learning. *Language Teaching Research, 15*(3), 325-

   342.

Trueba, H. T., Cheng, L., & Ima, K. (1993). *Myth or reality: Adaptive strategies of Asian*

   Americans in California. Washington DC: The Palmer Press.

U. S. Department of Education (USDOE), Offices of Special Education and Rehabilitation

   Services and English Language Acquisition, and the National Institute of Child and

   Health Human Development (NICHD). (2003). *National symposium on learning*

   disabilities in English language learners: Symposium summary. Washington, DC:

   Author.

U.S. Department of State. (n.d.). *Language proficiency definitions*. Retrieved from

http://careers.state.gov/gateway/lang_prof_def.html.

Vidot, J. L. (2011). *The efficacy of sheltered instruction observation protocol (SIOP) in*

mathematics instruction on English language learner students. (Unpublished

dissertation), Walden University. Available from ERIC. (1140130690; ED534603).

Villa, R., Thousand, A., & Nevin, A. (2013). *A guide to co-teaching: New lessons and*

strategies to facilitate student learning (3rd ed.). London, UK: Corwin Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*.

Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wenzlaff, T., Berak, L., Wieseman, K., Monroe-Baillargeon, A., Bacharach, N., & Bradfield-

Kreider, P. (2002). In E. Guyton & J. Ranier (Eds.), *Walking our talk as educators:*

Teaming as a best practice. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt Publishing.

Youngs, C. S., & Youngs, G. A., Jr. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes

toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*(1), 97-120.

Zehr, M. A. (2006). Team-teaching helps close language gap. *Education Week, 26*(14), 26-29.

Appendix A: Teacher Information Questionnaire

What are the 4 digits of your birth month & day and the first 3 letters of your mother's name? e.g., 0513-JEN

_ _ _ _ - _ _ _

Personal Data:

1. What is your gender?

2. What is your age?

3. How long have you lived abroad consecutively in a country where a language other than English was primarily spoken?

Never	1-3 wks.	1-6 mos.	7 mos.-1 year	1-2 years	2+ years

    4. If you speak an additional language, which term defines your proficiency in that language? (circle one)

Elementary Proficiency	Limited Working Proficiency	Minimum Professional Proficiency	Full Professional Proficiency	Native/Bilingual
Able to satisfy routine travel needs.	Able to satisfy routine social demands and limited work requirements.	Able to speak the language with sufficient accuracy to participate in most conversations on social, and professional topics.	Able to use the language fluently and accurately related to professional needs.	Equivalent to that of an educated native speaker.

*Definitions of proficiency adapted from the U.S. Department of State (n.d.)

Training and Prior Education:

5. Which term indicates your current level of education?

B.A./B.S.	B.A. + 15 credits	M.A.	M.A. + 15 credits	Ph.D

6. How many university courses related to teaching ESL have you completed? (e.g., Second Language Acquisition, ESL reading, etc.)

0	1	3-5	6-8	9+

7. Other than university courses, what other professional development or formal courses related to teaching ESL have you completed. (Please list them)

<u>Previous Teaching Experience</u>:

8. Overall, how many years have you been teaching in public schools?

9. In those years, how many years have you had English Language Learners (ELLs) in your classroom?

<u>Current Teaching Responsibilities</u>:

10. What subject do you currently teach?

ESL	Math	Science	Language Arts	Social Studies	Physical Education	Arts/ Music	Language(s)
Other (please list):							

11. How many of your classes currently have ELLs?

12. Of the students you teach, approximately what percentage are ELLs?

0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	60-80%	80-100%

Appendix B: Effective Teaching Questionnaire

Instructions: Please reflect on <u>your personal beliefs</u> with regard to teaching English Language Learners (ELLs) whether this be in an academic content class (math, science, etc.) or in an ESL class. Read each statement and put an **X** in the box to signify the extent to which you agree or disagree. There are **no** right or wrong answers, only your sincere opinions. **<u>Thank you!</u>**

When teaching English Language Learners, effective <u>teachers</u> should…	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. explicitly explain grammar points as they appear in texts, audios, and other real-life examples.				
2. simplify how they speak so that students can understand every word being said.				
3. inform students about the learning objectives at the start of the lesson.				
4. ask questions that help link the lesson's concepts and vocabulary to students personal experiences.				
5. use predominantly individual work to complete activities in class.				
6. frequently use computer-based technologies (internet, DVDs, CDs, Smartboard).				
7. <u>not</u> correct students immediately after they make a mistake in speaking.				
8. give commands to students where students can respond with whole body actions				
9. provide students with graphic organizers that help them organize their notes or understand the text/video/etc.				
10. only correct students <u>indirectly</u> when students make English errors. (e.g., repeating back to them the corrected phrase).				
11. <u>not</u> simplify or alter how they speak so that students hear natural speech.				
12. offer extensive wait time for students to respond to questions.				
13. strive to make materials that students understand and have a personal connection to. (word problems about things in the classroom as opposed to events/objects unfamiliar to ELLs).				
14. use mostly real-life materials (e.g. music, pictures) in teaching both the language and the content, rather than the textbook.				
15. model activities and tasks before assigning them.				
16. teach students how to use cognitive strategies to help students understand the concept (predicting, evaluating, self-assessing).				
17. only correct students' work for content because grammar use will appear over time.				

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
18. focus mostly on the content/meaning so that students have a basis for what they are learning.				
19. use predominantly small group or pair work to complete activities in class.				
20. scaffold the materials to match the pace and level of ELLs in the class.				
21. teach the language primarily by having students complete tasks (e.g., observe and label the properties of rocks) rather than grammar-focused exercises (gap-fill for verb tenses).				
22. use mostly worksheets with fill in the blanks and short answer questions so that students can easily demonstrate their knowledge of a subject.				
23. provide students with the language they would need to ask for help or clarification.				
24. use word walls, graphic organizers, and other visuals to support vocabulary learning.				
25. ask students to respond with movement to illustrate concepts or check for comprehension.				
26. allow students to create their own strategies for retention (students use their own strategies to take notes or listen during class).				
27. deliberately review vocabulary and content that are at the students' current language level.				
38. teach EL students at English speaking peers' level so that students are held accountable to the content objectives for their grade level.				
When teaching English Language Learners in a co-teaching situation, effective <u>co-teachers</u> should…	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
29. collaborate with ESL or content specialist to develop lessons, create curriculum, and share teaching philosophies.				
30. have designated roles and responsibilities for both teachers in a co-teaching environment.				
31. allocate one teacher to be lead teacher and one to provide support.				
32. divide the class into smaller groups with both co-teachers teaching the same content simultaneously.				
33. structure the class so that students move from stations; with each co-teacher teaching one portion of the content to one group and then repeating the instruction for the other group.				

*This survey is adapted from Brown, A. (2006). *Students' and teachers' perceptions of effective teaching in the foreign language classroom: A comparison of ideals and ratings* (Ph.D)

Appendix C: Interview Questions

.

1. Tell me about a time when you felt that the EL students were understanding everything that you were teaching. What was the lesson? What activities were involved? How did you teach it? What are some activities that you do well with ELs in your class?

2. List 5 activities that ELs do well in your classes. (Give an example of each item)

3. Describe a time when you felt that the EL students did not understand what you were teaching? What was missing from the class? What would you do differently? What are some activities/aspects that you find challenging when ELs are present in your class?

4. List 5 activities that ELs find challenging in your classes. Give an example of each item?

5. How do you make sure the EL students understand the lesson and achieve the lesson objectives? Can you describe an example of your methods?

6. What are some ways that you have adapted your teaching practice to work with ELs either during the planning stage or during the lesson itself?

7. If you work with a co-teacher, how do you plan lessons with the teacher? How do you divide up the responsibilities?

8. If you don't work with a co-teacher, what do you think would be the optimal teaching strategy for co-teaching?

9. What recommendations would you have for a teacher who is newly working with ELLs?

Appendix D: Beliefs about Best Teaching Practices when Working with ELLs

YOU ARE INVITED to participate in this study to better understand teachers' perceptions about working with English language learners. You were selected as a possible participant because of your potential contact with this population and experience as an educator. This research is being conducted by Alexandra Yarbrough Badger, for a graduate thesis under the supervision of James Robinson, PhD.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
The purpose of this study is to understand teachers' perceptions about what is best practice when working with English language learners.

PROCEDURES
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a two-part survey (one part to obtain demographic and background information about you and another which will ask you a series of questions about what you believe is best teaching practice for working with this population.) This survey is completely anonymous so no one will be able to identify a specific individual's form. You may also be asked to participate in a follow up interview after participating in the survey. The interview is also completely anonymous and entirely voluntary.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study

BENEFITS
The beliefs and perceptions that teachers hold with regard to language teaching is critical. Understanding this data will make the current perceptions of both mainstream and language teachers explicit, which is vital to the eventual transformation, development, and growth of these belief systems.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your information will be confidential and no answers that could identify a specific individual will be used.

RESEARCH RESULTS
If you are interested in learning the results of the study, please feel free to contact the principal investigator at yaal1401@stcloudstate.edu.

CONTACT INFORMATION
If you have any additional questions, please contact the researcher at yaal1401@stcloudstate.edu or the advisor James Robinson PhD at JHRobinson@stcloudstate.edu.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION/WITHDRAWAL
Participation is voluntary. Your participation will not affect your present or future relationship with SCSU, Apollo High School, District 742, or the researcher. If you decide to fill out the survey and there are any questions you are not comfortable answering, you do not need to answer them. Participants may withdraw at any point of time. Please remember that this information is confidential.

ACCEPTANCE TO PARTICIPATE

There are several convenient ways to submit this survey. You can give this survey to your administrator or building secretary who will send the documents in an interschool envelope to the researcher (Alexandra Badger). Or you can put the survey directly in Alexandra Badger's school mailbox. By completing this survey and returning it to the investigator in her mailbox, you are indicating that you are at least 18 years of age and you consent to participation in the study.

Appendix E: Beliefs about Best Teaching Practices when Working with ELLs Interview

YOU ARE INVITED to continue to participate in this study to better understand teachers' perceptions about working with English language learners. You were selected as a possible participant because of your previous participation in this study. This research is being conducted by Alexandra Yarbrough Badger, for a graduate thesis under the supervision of James Robinson, PhD.

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE
The purpose of this study is to understand teachers' perceptions about what is best practice when working with English language learners.

PROCEDURES
If you decide to participate, you will be asked to answer a series of discussion questions regarding your perceptions about teaching English Language Learners. Your answers will be recorded and transcribed. However, any information that can be used to identify you will not be published in this study. Your answers during this interview will be <u>completely anonymous</u>. If there are any questions with which you feel uncomfortable or do not understand you may choose not to answer and you may stop at any time.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study

BENEFITS
The beliefs and perceptions that teachers hold with regard to language teaching is critical. Understanding this data will make the current perceptions of both mainstream and language teachers explicit, which is vital to the eventual transformation, development, and growth of these belief systems.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Your information will be confidential and no answers that could identify a specific individual will be used.

RESEARCH RESULTS
If you are interested in learning the results of the study, please feel free to contact the principal investigator at <u>yaal1401@stcloudstate.edu</u>.

CONTACT INFORMATION
If you have any additional questions, please contact the researcher at yaal1401@stcloudstate.edu or the advisor James Robinson PhD at <u>JHRobinson@stcloudstate.edu</u>.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION/WITHDRAWAL
Participation is voluntary. Your participation will not affect your present or future relationship with SCSU, Apollo High School, District 742, or the researcher. If you decide to participate in the interview and there are any questions you are not comfortable answering, you do not need to answer them. Participants may withdraw at any point of time. Please remember that your answers are <u>confidential</u>.

ACCEPTANCE TO PARTICIPATE

Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age, you have read the information provided above, and you have consent to participate. You may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty after signing this form.

Subject Name (Printed) _____

Subject Signature _____

Date _____