

Student Work

4-1-2014

Elementary and Secondary Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Education of English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom in Rural Schools

Adam N. Sempek
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

 Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE

Recommended Citation

Sempek, Adam N., "Elementary and Secondary Teachers' Attitudes Towards the Education of English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom in Rural Schools" (2014). *Student Work*. 3605.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/3605>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE
EDUCATION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN THE MAINSTREAM
CLASSROOM IN RURAL SCHOOLS

By

Adam N. Sempek, Ed.D., Ed.S., NCSP

Presented to the Faculty of

The Graduate College at the University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements

For the Degree of Doctor of Education

Major: Educational Administration

Omaha, Nebraska

April, 2014

Supervisory Committee:

Jeanne L. Surface, Ed.D.

Peter J. Smith, Ed.D.

Kay A. Keiser, Ed.D.

Nealy F. Grandgenett, Ph.D.

UMI Number: 3618069

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI 3618069

Published by ProQuest LLC (2014). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ABSTRACT

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY TEACHERS' ATTITUDES TOWARDS THE EDUCATION OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS IN THE MAINSTREAM CLASSROOM IN RURAL SCHOOLS

Adam N. Sempek, Ed.D., Ed.S., NCSP

University of Nebraska at Omaha, 2014

Advisor: Jeanne L. Surface, Ed.D.

This study sought to examine the attitudes of elementary and secondary teachers towards the education of English Language Learners within the mainstream classroom. Attitudes towards the inclusion of ELL students, professional development concerning the education of ELL students, modification of class work for ELL students, all within the mainstream classroom, along with teachers understanding of language acquisition were the focuses of the study. These four focuses were examined in two rural school districts in the Midwest, through the use of the questionnaire, *English-as-a-second-language (ESL) Students in Mainstream Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers* (Reeves, 2006).

This study examined and attempted to answer these specific questions which were based on a review of the relevant literature:

1. What were teacher's beliefs for each of the domains: Inclusion; Coursework Modification; Professional Development; Language Acquisition? Did mainstream classroom teachers have consistent beliefs across the four domains of Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development, and Language Acquisition?
2. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the inclusion of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher

level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

3. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?
4. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning professional development for the education of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?
5. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning language acquisition different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While in the process of compiling research and data, and giving birth to this document, many people would inquire as to the status. I would respond that though it is a gargantuan endeavor, things were going well. But now as I look back I realize, wistfully at times, that I did not make it clearer that this journey was mine, but not mine alone. So now, where I have failed in the spoken word to thank everyone that has helped me along the way, I will solidify my gratitude in writing where it can be seen by all who come across this document. Even if they choose to read no further than this section, they will understand my gratitude and how I am, to those around me, forever beholden.

First and foremost I thank my wife Amy for graciously and maybe a little skeptically, for standing by me on my decision to pursue a doctorate in education. Without Amy I would not be where I am and I would with most certainty, not have completed this dissertation and earned my doctorate. My wife has kept me afloat throughout this process, through the good, bad, ugly, and beautiful times and never once told me I should stop, though maybe the idea had crossed my mind.

Thank you to my parents, Dr. Louis and Nancy Sempek, for instilling in me a passion for learning and a never-ending drive to succeed, and to my brother and sister Erin and Kyle Sempek for being an ear and shoulder when I needed someone with whom to speak and lean against when I was tired. To my daughters, Sayge and Rylyn I say thank you for filling my life with mirth and understanding when daddy needed to finish a section of his dissertation prior to playing Pretty Pretty Princess. I must also thank all of my friends and family for checking in on me during my journey.

I would also like to thank Dr. Robert H. Woody for sending me an email many moons ago, when I was struggling with where to go next in my educational career, asking me if I had ever considered pursuing my doctorate. Dr. Robert H. Woody has been my colleague, mentor, and friend for some time and has always been there to guide me in a positive direction, and never afraid to inform me when I was going off course. Finally, thank you to the faculty of the Educational Administration and Supervision department, in particular, Drs. Surface, Keiser, Smith, Hayes, and Christie for their guidance and support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	ix
CHAPTER 1.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose Statement.....	2
Research Questions.....	3
Method.....	6
Definition of Terms.....	8
Assumptions.....	12
Limitations.....	12
Delimitations.....	12
Significance of the Study.....	13
Outline of Study.....	13
CHAPTER 2.....	15
Review of the Literature.....	15
Introduction.....	15

Background	16
Teacher Attitudes, Expectations, and Beliefs Concerning the Education of English Language Learners	18
Variation in Teacher Attitudes, Expectations, and Beliefs.....	18
Impact of Teacher Attitude on Student and Teacher Performance	21
Teacher Attitudes Concerning Coursework Modification for English Language Learners.....	22
Purposes of Homework and Level of Academic Achievement for ELL Students	22
Examples of Teacher Attitudes Concerning Curriculum Modification for ELL Students	23
Teacher Attitudes Concerning Professional Development for the Education of English Language Learners	24
Expression for the Need of Professional Development.....	24
Expression for More Adequate Professional Development	24
Language Acquisition and Teacher Beliefs Concerning Language Acquisition	25
Teacher Questions Concerning the Process of Language Acquisition.....	25
Aspects and Issues Concerning Language Acquisition.....	26
Examples of Law Concerning the Education of ELL Students.....	29
Issues Concerning English Language Learners in Rural Settings.....	29
Lack of Resources	29
Example of Teacher Attitudes Concerning ELL Students	30
CHAPTER 3	31

Methodology	31
Background	31
Purpose	32
Significance of the Study	33
Participants	37
Data Collection Procedures	38
Instrumentation	38
Data Analysis	40
CHAPTER 4	42
Results	42
Purpose of Study	42
Analysis of Research Questions	42
Research Question 1:	42
Research Question 2:	43
Research Question 3:	44
Research Question 4:	46
Research Question 5:	48
Examination of Open Ended Questions Concerning Inclusion	49
CHAPTER 5	75
Conclusion and Discussion	75

Conclusion.....	76
Discussion	80
Implications for Practice	83
Implications for Further Research.....	84
Summary	85
REFERENCES	86
Appendix A.....	93
Appendix B.....	94
Appendix C	102
Appendix D.....	104
Appendix E	105
Appendix F.....	106

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	
Participant Demographics.....	52
Table 2.	
Descriptive Data Based on Teachers Attitudes Across the Four Domains: Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development and Language Learning.....	53
Table 3.	
Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Averages of the Scores Across the Four Domains.....	54
Table 4.	
Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students with Different Models of Instruction.....	55
Table 5.	
Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students with Different Levels of Teaching.....	56
Table 6.	
Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students Across Genders.....	57
Table 7.	
Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students Between English or Non-English as a Native Language.....	58

Table 8.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students Between Knowing or Not Knowing a Second Language.....59

Table 9.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with Different Models of Instruction..60

Table 10.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with Different Levels of Teaching.....61

Table 11.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students Across Genders.....62

Table 12.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with English or Non-English as a Native Language.....63

Table 13.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with Knowing or Not Knowing a Second Language.....64

Table 14.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students with Different Models of Instruction.....65

Table 15.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students with Different Levels of Teaching.....66

Table 16.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students Across Genders.....67

Table 17.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students with English or Non-English as a Native Language.....68

Table 18.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students with Knowing or Not Knowing a Second Language.....69

Table 19.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition with Different Models of Instruction..70

Table 20.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition with Different Levels of Teaching.71

Table 21.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition Across Genders.....72

Table 22.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition with English or Non-English as a Native Language.....73

Table 23.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition with Knowing or Not Knowing a Second Language.....74

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The question followed me through the halls of the College of Education awaiting an answer like a hungry dog would a scrap of meat. *'Do I?'* I thought to myself. *'Do I wake up every morning and realize I am a white man?'* When the speaker in my class asked this question, preceded by the comment, *'I awake every morning and realize I am a black man.'*, the first thought that crossed my mind was *'Of course I do, why would I not realize that I was a white man.'*

As I continued to walk out the doors and towards the parking lot another appendage of the conversation flexed in my mind and I heard the speaker ask, *'Have you ever had someone harbor feelings of hate towards you because of the color of your skin?'* To this question I could answer with a definite and resounding *'Yes'*. More times that I would care to admit I could recall children and adolescents at the Residential Treatment Center, Group Home, and Inpatient Floor verbally and physically threaten and attack me and my Caucasian co-workers, admittedly because we were white and "white people were all the same". I was at times hated because I resembled people who some of the non-Caucasian children and adolescents believed had, or who truly had, wronged them during their lives.

The answer to the first question came to me as I got into my car and shut the door. When I worked with those children and adolescents who harbored ill feelings towards me based upon the color of my skin, I did wake up and realize that I was a white man. However, when I was done with work, the realization tended to simmer on the back burner. Not to downplay the experiences of members of other races, or to say my experiences hold a proverbial candle to others experiences, but, perhaps my experiences in those settings have given me a glimpse into

how members of other races and cultures think and feel when they are the minority in a predominately White culture. Perhaps they did, if only for a moment.

To add fuel to the fire, during a handful of Multidisciplinary Team meetings, I have had the opportunity to work with families who speak very little English and need translators during the meeting. The only experience in my repertoire that I can remotely liken this too is driving back across the border from Mexico to the United States, for this is truly the only time that I was surrounded by people speaking a completely different language than myself and having no idea what was being said and not knowing how to communicate. This was truly the only time I was in the minority racially, culturally, and linguistically. Now I think to myself, *'Is this how the parents at the MDT meetings feel, or the English Language Learner students feel within the mainstream classroom?'* Do English Language Learners feel as though they do not fit into the community of the school, or that their English speaking peers and teachers view them as a burden in the classroom? Do mainstream teachers harbor negative attitudes towards educating English Language Learners, or is there a lack of confidence and misunderstanding when it comes to best practices concerning the education of English Language Learners and the acquisition of language? As the number of English Language Learners in the classroom increases (NCELA, 2011; NCES, 2012), the examination of teacher attitudes towards the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom, teachers understanding of Language Acquisition process and teachers preparedness to teach ELL students within the mainstream classroom become more prevalent.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of mainstream classroom teachers concerning the education of English Language Learner students in the mainstream classroom,

teachers understanding of Language Acquisition, teacher's attitudes towards Coursework Modification, and ELL Professional Development.

Research Questions

This study examined and attempted to answer these specific questions which were based on a review of the relevant literature:

6. What were teacher's beliefs for each of the domains: Inclusion; Coursework Modification; Professional Development; Language Acquisition. Did mainstream classroom teachers have consistent beliefs across the four domains of Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development, and Language Acquisition?
7. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

Sub Question 2a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 2b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 2c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 2d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 2e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

8. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

Sub Question 3a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 3b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 3c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 3d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 3e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

9. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language and whether or not the teacher knows a second language?

Sub Question 4a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 4b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 4c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 4d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 4e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

10. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

Sub Question 5a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 5b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 5c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 5d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 5e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

Method

The study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The study used *English-as-a-second-language (ESL) Students in Mainstream Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers* (Reeves, 2006). The survey was broken down into four sections. Section A consisted of 16 questions concerning ELL Inclusion, knowledge of Language Acquisition, Professional Development, and Coursework Modification on a four-point Likert scale (strongly disagree; disagree; agree; strongly disagree). At the end of section A were three questions asking teachers if they have

ever had ELL students in their class, how many were enrolled in the current year and how many were enrolled in their entire career.

Section B consists of three subsections concerning classroom practices, impact of Inclusion, and teacher support. These 11 questions are rated on a three-point Likert scale (seldom or never; some of the time; most or all of the time). Part C asks two open-ended questions to list the greatest “benefits” and “challenges” for including ELL students in subject-area classes. Part D is a demographic section.

The surveys will be distributed to elementary and secondary teachers to gauge their thoughts on the above mentioned questions. Race, ethnicity, gender, age, years of teaching, etcetera will not be an exclusionary factor from the study. The surveys will be coded and no names (i.e., teacher, school, district) will be used. The study will be conducted in rural and urban school districts. The data will be analyzed using a univariate analysis of the four questions. The qualitative portions of the survey will be analyzed for common themes.

The following is a breakdown of the first 16 questions and how they fit into the four separate domains of the study:

Inclusion:

1. The Inclusion of ESL students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes creates a positive educational atmosphere.
2. The Inclusion of students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes benefits all students.
3. ESL students should not be included in general education classes until they attain a minimum level of English proficiency.

6. Mainstream/Subject area teachers do not have enough time to deal with the needs of ESL students.
15. I would welcome the Inclusion of ESL students in any class.

Coursework Modifications:

7. It is a good practice to simplify coursework for ESL students.
8. It is a good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ESL students.
9. It is a good practice to allow ESL students more time to complete coursework.
10. Teachers should not give ESL students a failing grade if the students display effort.
11. Teachers should not modify assignments for the ESL students enrolled in mainstream/subject area classes.
12. The modification of coursework for ESL students would be difficult to justify to the other students.

Professional Development:

13. I have adequate training to work with ESL students.
14. I am interesting in receiving more training in working with ESL students.

Language and Language Learning:

4. ESL students should avoid using their native language while at school.
5. ESL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools.
16. I would support the legislation making English the official language of the United States.

Definition of Terms

The following operational definitions were used throughout this study. (The definitions without citation indicate working definitions constructed by the researcher).

Attitudes. Richardson (1996) defined attitudes as “learned predispositions to respond to an object in a favorable or unfavorable way” (p. 103).

Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). BICS refers to the day-to-day conversational language needed to interact socially with other people. BICS is usually developed within two years (Cummins, 1979).

Beliefs. Beliefs differ from attitudes as they focus on what should be done with the object the teacher harbors a favorable or unfavorable attitude towards. According to Pajares (1992), belief is a judgment that is not necessarily based on fact and as Richardson (1996) says does not “require a truth condition” (p. 104).

Bilingual Program. Bilingual Program is defined as a program model. It designates an instructional delivery format that calls for instruction in English as well as instruction in a primary language by a certified teacher. Bilingual programs are characterized by instruction delivered in dual languages.

Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). CALP refers to formal academic language essential to be successful in school. CALP is usually acquired in five to seven years (Cummins, 1979).

English as a Second Language. English as a Second Language is defined as a program model. It designates an instructional delivery format that calls for direct instruction in English by an ESL endorsed or certified teacher.

English as a Second Language, Pull Out. English as a Second Language, Pull Out is defined as a variation of the English as a Second Language program model. It designates a delivery format that calls for direct instruction in English by an English as a Second Language endorsed or certified teacher. The English as a Second Language student in this program leaves

his general education classroom for a portion of time during the regular school day to attend English as a Second Language class. The goal of the Pull Out English as a Second Language classroom remains direct instruction in English.

English as a Second Language, Push In. English as a Second Language Push In is defined as a variation of the English as a Second Language program model. It designates a delivery format that calls for direct instruction in English by an English as a Second Language endorsed or certified teacher. The English as a Second Language students in this program remain in the general education classrooms and the English as a Second Language teacher spends a portion of time in the classroom supporting the English as a Second Language students during regular instructional time. The goal of the Push In English as a Second Language classroom remains direct instruction in English.

English Language Learners (ELL). ELL students are students whose primary language is not English and they are in the process of learning English (NCELA, 2006).

Expectations. An expectation is an “anticipation of future consequences based on prior experience, current circumstances, or other sources of information” (Oliver, 1996, p.68).

Inclusion. Inclusion is the practice of serving students with special needs within the mainstream classroom (Platt, Harper, & Mendoza, 2003).

Language. Language, in Merriam-Websters Online Dictionary (2014), is defined as *1 a* : the words, their pronunciation, and the methods of combining them used and understood by a community

Language Acquisition. “Developing ability in a language by using it in natural communicative situations” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 18).

Language Learning. “having a conscious knowledge about grammar” (Krashen & Terrell, 1983, p. 18).

Mainstream. The term mainstream refers to a teacher and setting that is concerned with a certain content area such as math, social studies, and English that is taught in an English only method (Pettit, 2011).

Rural. Is defined as either an urbanized area or places with populations of more than 2,500 outside urbanized areas (U. S. Department of Commerce, 1992).

Second Language Acquisition (SLA). Second Language Acquisition is the process by which one learns a second language. SLA can also incorporate how we learn subsequent languages after the second. SLA specifically refers to how the student learns the language, not how the language is taught. In short, SLA is the internal process by which the student learns a second language (Krashen, 1988).

Separation. Separation is the practice of serving students with special needs outside of the mainstream classroom as the students needs differ from the mainstream students (Platt et al, 2003).

Sheltered English Instruction. Sheltered English Instruction is defined as an instructional format used for English language development. It requires content instruction in English be delivered by an endorsed or certified teacher in the content area. Objectives for language development are accomplished through the use of the content itself whether it is math, science, literacy, or social studies curricula. Sheltered English Instruction is used in the content classroom and can also be used as an approach in English as a Second Language classroom to deliver a format called Content English as a Second Language. The goal of Sheltered English Instruction is learning content knowledge as well as language development.

Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) Model. The Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol Model was developed to facilitate high quality instruction for English language learners (ELLs) in content area teaching. The SIOP Model is often viewed as an umbrella under which other best practices and programs developed for improving instruction for ELLs resides. It can also be viewed as a framework that can bring together a school's ELL instructional program by organizing methods and techniques to ensure that effective practices are implemented (Echevarria, Short, & Powers, 2006).

Assumptions

An underlying assumption of this study was that teachers would be able to reflect honestly upon their beliefs, perceptions, and expectations concerning the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, towards Coursework Modification for ELL students, towards Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom, and their beliefs concerning Language Acquisition.

Limitations

Some limitations to this study could have been the number of participating districts and participating teachers within said districts, the teacher's amount of time, effort, and honesty invested in the survey, and lastly the duration of the study.

Delimitations

The study was based on a convenience sample of volunteer teachers from two rural school districts in the Midwest. It is possible that the beliefs, expectations, and perceptions found in this study are not to be representative of teachers in other states or nationally. The selection of teachers for this study did not take into account subject area classes (i.e., all subject areas were eligible for the study). Participants of any age, gender, race, ethnicity, and years of teaching were

eligible for the study. Another delimitation to the study could have been the limited use of qualitative data to corroborate the quantitative information provided by the teachers.

Significance of the Study

This study provided teachers with an opportunity to gauge their beliefs, perceptions, and expectations concerning the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, towards Coursework Modification for ELL students, towards Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom, and their beliefs concerning Language Acquisition. This study could provide rural school district administrators with ideas on how teachers view the education of ELL students and provide insight on methods of providing assistance to teachers based upon the results of the study. The results will not only be beneficial for the participating districts but might also be applicable and generalizable for other districts. Finally this study may prompt other studies to examine these questions across the nation in both a quantitative and qualitative manner.

Outline of Study

In summary, Chapter 1 presented the problem and related background information. The research questions, significance of the study, delimitations, limitations, assumptions, and definition of terms were presented. Chapter 2 provides a review of the relevant and significant research literature on teacher beliefs, expectations, and perceptions concerning the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, towards Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students, towards the Coursework Modification for ELL students, and the knowledge and understanding of Language Acquisition between rural and urban school districts. The methodology used in the study is presented in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 contains the results of the surveys given to the teachers. Chapter 5 presents answers to the research questions and

describes themes between this study and the relevant literature contained in Chapter 2. Chapter 5 also discusses implications and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER 2

Review of the Literature

Introduction

The discussion and examination of teacher's perceptions, expectations, and beliefs concerning the education of English Language Learners (ELL) in the mainstream classroom is nothing new. This does not, however, dissuade from the importance of continuing said discussion and examination, particularly as the influx of students into the American education setting, whose primary language is not English, is continuing to grow in numbers and expand to all areas of the country. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the number of students who were ELL increased from 8% (3.7 million) in 2000 to 10% (4.7 million) in 2010 (NCES, 2012). The increase in ELL students, though the numbers vary, are corroborated by the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2011) who recorded that the increase in ELL students from 1997 to 2009 increased by 51% (3.5 to 5.3 million).

This influx is also playing into a growing cultural gap between students and teachers. The majority of teachers are white females, whereas the student body is becoming more diverse (Lawrence, 2005; Walker-Dalhouse, Sanders, Dalhouse, 2009). Within their research Walker-Dalhouse, Sanders, and Dalhouse (2009), discuss that 45% of teachers feel comfortable and competent in their abilities to adjust curriculum to meet the needs of ELL students. The majority of the teachers were well intentioned; however, their lack of confidence and knowledge concerning the education of ELL students may impact their attitudes towards educating ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and the performance and self-esteem of ELL students.

Background

Within the literature, the attitudes, expectations, and beliefs concerning the education of English Language Learners runs the gamut from positive and welcoming, (Harklau, 2000; Reeves, 2004, 2006; Verplaetse, 1998) to negative and unwelcoming (Fu, 1995; Olsen, 1997; Valdes 2001). Fu (1995) discusses in her book, *My Trouble Is My English*, that ELL students are misunderstood by their peers and teachers. She presents the story of four Asian students which corroborate this idea of the misunderstanding of ELL students and how said misunderstanding effects perceptions, expectations, and beliefs.

Fu (1995), talks about how it is not only, or in some cases even, the fact that these students primary language is not English, but that their culture and past experiences in education and society are vastly different than their peers whose primary language and culture is English. One such example concerned a student named Tran, who did have struggles with English, but who did not interact in the same manner with his peers and teachers, as his peers whose primary language and culture was English, because it was seen as a form of disrespect to interrupt the teacher unless he was specifically called upon to answer a question. Thusly, he did not participate in discussions, of his own volition, not because he was unable due to his language differences, but because he was new and not acculturated to the English culture, which in turn exacerbated his feeling, his peer's feelings, and his teacher's feelings that he was not participating appropriately.

Olsen (1997) presents a similar discussion concerning the changes in ELL numbers in a California High School, and the affects these changes had on the community and school. She begins by discussing how the number of immigrants in Bayview increased from the 1960's to the 1980's. Approximately 99% of the population was White in 1960, and by 1980 25% of the

population did not speak English as a primary language. On page 39 of Olsen's book, there is the presentation of the phrase, "taking off the turban" which the ELL student's used to symbolize the culture of feeling pressured to assimilate to the English community of the school.

The book also discusses that fluency in English is not the only factor affecting the ELL student's attitudes and feelings towards his or her school, nor the only factor affecting the attitudes and perceptions of the English speaking peers and classroom teachers. One powerful chapter talks about a Brazilian girl's presentation on her homeland that begins with her telling her fellow ELL students that she is Brazilian, not White like many of them think, and not Latino like many of the White students think. She feels isolated, in a manner of speaking she is placed in a track where she never truly feels like she fits in with any of her peers. The chapter ends with commentary from a few students saying they need to, "To find your race and your place, to make peace there, and then you can get along with everyone else" (p. 120).

The feeling of isolation in the school and community affects many ELL students (Valdes, 2001). The ELL students are primarily in the ELL classroom, and at times, not taught by a teacher trained in ELL education. The students in Valdes's book, as with the previous two books, feel like they are in a separate school within a school. They are placed in an ELL track. They feel like their language differences are not the only factor exacerbating the feeling of isolation and affecting their peers and teachers attitudes, expectations and beliefs concerning their education. However, not all of the stories concerning the experiences of ELL students in and English speaking school are negative, nor are the stories concerning the attitudes, expectations, and beliefs of teachers on the education of ELL students.

In her 2006 study, Reeves not only examined mainstream teachers attitudes towards the Inclusion of ELL students, but also their attitudes towards the modification of curricula for ELL

students, their attitudes towards Professional Development to help them in the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and teacher perceptions towards second Language Acquisition. The majority of the teachers in the study were found to harbor positive and welcoming attitudes towards the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom. Where there was variation was in the attitudes towards modification and Language Acquisition. The teachers differed on their beliefs in the modification of curricula for ELL students, and their understanding of how a second language is acquired. The majority of the teachers reported that they did not feel prepared to educate ELL students in the mainstream classroom and expressed a desire for Professional Development to increase their level of comfort and ability to educate ELL students.

Teacher Attitudes, Expectations, and Beliefs Concerning the Education of English Language Learners

Variation in Teacher Attitudes, Expectations, and Beliefs

Perhaps it is not that mainstream teachers hold negative attitudes and beliefs concerning ELL students, but that they have a misunderstanding of the cultural differences and Language Acquisition (Harklau, 2000; Reeves, 2004, 2006; Verplaetse, 1998). This misunderstanding of cultural differences and Language Acquisition may affect the type and level of expectations the mainstream teacher holds for the ELL student. The hope of placing ELL students in the mainstream classroom, as opposed to keeping them grouped and tracked in the ELL program, is to not only help facilitate the acquisition of language, but the feeling of belonging and recognition that the ELL student is part of the entire school community and culture, not just a member of his or her culture of origin and the ELL culture of the school.

In a study conducted by Verplaetse (1998) the interactions between content teachers and ELL students in the mainstream classroom was examined. During the study it became apparent that the mainstream teachers were using more “directives” with the ELL students and more “questions” with the rest of the students in the classroom. While the teachers were promoting the use of deductive and inductive reasoning and problem solving in the non-ELL students they were, in a manner, not allowing the same of the ELL students. When presented with the results, the teachers were surprised. They talked about how they were not trying to segregate the ELL students and did not hold negative beliefs towards the ELL students, but that they knew the ELL students did not have the same understanding of the material as the non-ELL students and they were trying to help the ELL students get through the material and lessons.

This notion of trying to help the student through the material because the teacher feels the student does not have the same understanding as his or her non-ELL counterparts is seemingly innocent. However, the impact of using directives in lieu of questioning can lead to the continuation, if not exacerbation, of the ELL student’s lack of understanding of the material as they are not asked to use reasoning and problem solving skills. Harklau (2000) continues on the theme of misunderstanding by teachers of ELL students’ knowledge and ability. Harklau (2000) discusses how teachers, in secondary and post-secondary, inadvertently treat ELL students differently than non-ELL students, not because they harbor negative attitudes towards the students, but because they hold different expectations for the ELL students than they do for the non-ELL students. Some teachers expect the ELL student knows less about the certain content area than his or her non-ELL counterpart and some teachers expect the ELL student to know more about the content area than his or her non-ELL counterpart.

Reeves (2004, 2006) corroborates the idea that while attitudes may be positive and welcoming, expectations and misunderstandings contribute to the varying education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom. Reeves (2004), presents the story of three different mainstream classroom teachers and their varying style of educating ELL students within their classroom. The three teachers did not hold negative attitudes towards ELL students, but did vary in their expectations of classroom performance through the use or non-use of accommodations for ELL students. One teacher expected the ELL students to do the same amount and quality of homework as the non-ELL students and did not believe in providing accommodations for the ELL students. The second teacher provided some accommodations, and the final teacher provided even more accommodations. Said accommodations included extra time and modification of homework expectations.

Another issue that plays into teacher attitudes, perceptions and beliefs of ELL students and the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, is the way in which teachers approach the idea of race within the classroom (Liggett, 2008; Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007). In an examination of various studies concerning teacher expectations of students, Tenenbaum and Ruck (2007), found that teachers tended to have higher academic expectations of White students than those students in the racial minority and use more neutral and positive speech with White students than students of the racial minority. This does not indicate blatant racism on the part of the teacher. Interestingly enough, it may be that the teacher is attempting to downplay race (Liggett, 2008). The teacher may be trying to treat everyone the same, which does not always equal fair, and in turn make it seem like everyone is of the same race so as not to appear racist. The article discusses that Caucasians do not consider themselves a part of any race as they see themselves as the norm and thus can down play the impact of race (Liggett, 2008). However,

blatant racism is most likely not the motive behind the development of certain attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs concerning ELL students and the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom, but the lack of knowledge, training, and confidence in the teachers education of ELL students.

Impact of Teacher Attitude on Student and Teacher Performance

Teacher attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs concerning ELL students and the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom are varied. The impact of these attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs on the ELL student is more black and white, particularly when ELL students have been shown to have lower academic achievement rates and higher dropout rates than non-ELL students (LeClair, Doll, Osborn, & Jones, 2009). There is an interaction between the attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs of the teachers and the academic and behavioral performance of the ELL student (Lawrence, 2005; Pettit, 2011; Walker-Dalhouse et al, 2009). Teacher's beliefs and perceptions hold great weight upon a student's achievement, both academically and behaviorally. When teachers hold positive attitudes and beliefs towards ELL students the students self-efficacy increases; the students feel that they fit better into the school culture when they are viewed positively by their teachers (Lawrence, 2005; Walker-Dalhous et al, 2009). Teacher's beliefs concerning their competence to educate ELL students also plays a role in the achievement and behavior of the ELL student, where the more positive the teacher's beliefs in his or herself links to more positive behaviors and academic achievement (Pettit, 2011).

Similarly, teachers beliefs, attitudes, and perceptions concerning ELL students, not only affects how the students perform, but how other teachers may perform. Lawrence (2005), presents a discussion on how the attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs of the majority of the teacher

body, can affect the school climate, and in turn affect the attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of teachers who were not once in agreement with the majority when it came to ELL students and the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom. A teacher who is in non agreement with the majority of the teacher body may find it difficult to argue their ideas for the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom. In a way, these teachers who do not agree with the majority may feel as isolated as the ELL student within the same school culture. These self perceptions can affect teacher's practices and how they design their classroom (Lewis, Maerten-Rivera, Adamson, & Lee, 2009). The attitudes can mirror the classroom design which can both affect the attitudes and achievement of the ELL students.

Teacher Attitudes Concerning Coursework Modification for English Language Learners

Purposes of Homework and Level of Academic Achievement for ELL Students

Bang (2011) discusses the purposes of homework, homework design, and accommodations, and homework facilitators and impediments. Bang (2011) reports that in the literature, the purposes of homework range from preparing students for upcoming material to helping students develop their character. Homework that is designed where students are provided support and an appropriate setting has shown increases in completion and accuracy. Impediments discussed are students not having adequate mastery over their first language and thus can struggle with homework in English. In Bang's (2011) study, teachers reported using visual aids, simplifying vocabulary and breaking the homework into smaller, perceivably more manageable sections. The use of peer groups to modify homework was also an option discussed (Bang, 2011; Oortwijn, Boekaerts, & Vedder, 2008). The results of these modifications varied.

The level of academic achievement for ELL students has been behind that of their English speaking peers and possible modifications may benefit the ELL student. However, it is

important to keep in mind, that just like their English speaking peers, each ELL student is different (Echevarria & Short, 2006; Echevarria et al, 2000). A question that comes up in Reeves (2006) is that the teacher's attitudes towards the modification of curriculum for ELL students may be linked to the modification's equability, or perceived equability.

Examples of Teacher Attitudes Concerning Curriculum Modification for ELL Students

Reeves (2004) discussed how three teachers viewed homework modification for ELL students. One teacher believed that ELL students were cheated by modifications as the fix was only temporary. The teacher did not lessen the quantity or quality of the homework given to the ELL students and was quoted as saying, "I realize you run the risk of frustrating the student, but it seems to me it would be frustrating functioning in a society where you don't know the language anyway, so you better get it over while you're in school rather than later (p. 54).

Another teacher treated her students equally, but allowed her ELL student to utilize her text book and L1-English dictionary (L-1 meaning first language). As all the students were required to do the same work the teacher did not feel these modifications disrupted the equability of the homework.

The third teacher allowed her ELL student to use the L1-English dictionary, but also allowed the student extra time, and modified the language of the homework similar to the SIOP model method. Echevarria et al, (2000) used what they termed the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model which helped build ELL language proficiency by linguistically modifying the homework of grade-level content. The SIOP model helped build language proficiency and academic ability, and showed promising results. All in all, teacher's perceptions of homework modification and their methods of homework modification varied.

Teacher Attitudes Concerning Professional Development for the Education of English Language Learners

Expression for the Need of Professional Development

As the population of ELL students increases (NCES, 2012), the need for teacher Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom comes into question. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2002), only 13% of the teachers who have ELL students in their room receive training to educate said students. In a study by O’Neal, Ringler, and Rodriguez (2008) discussed that a significant amount of teachers taught ELL students but few felt adequately prepared to teach ELL students. The results of a questionnaire revealed that 100% of the teachers in the study wanted to participate in Professional Development, and 100% feel responsible for ELL students in the mainstream classroom. Is more training needed? How do teachers feel about said training? The attitudes towards the training ranged from seeing the training as inappropriate (Clair, 1995) to more positive (Reeves, 2006). The teacher may have a positive and welcoming attitude towards Inclusion, but consider him or herself under qualified, due to a lack of knowledge, to educate students with disabilities; regardless, August and Calderon (2006) suggest that all staff be involved in Professional Development programs.

Expression for More Adequate Professional Development

Cameron and Cook (2007), Glazzard (2011), and Rose (2001) present a discussion on the teacher’s desire for more training to improve their competence, confidence, comfort, and ability to educate students with disabilities in the mainstream classroom. Teacher’s descriptions of their training was negative in both Glazzard (2011) and Rose (2001). Some teachers described their training as appalling and that it was “Sink or swim a lot of the time” (Glazzard, 2011, p. 60). The

teachers in Rose (2001) stated, “I think specific problems need specific training so you can understand and cope with it.”, and “I do not feel at all well prepared” (p. 152). The training of teachers is imperative, particularly as the mainstream teacher is called upon to widen his or her spectrum of skills, as the classroom becomes more diversified (Bowden Carpenter & Dyal, 2007). The state of Florida has required that all high school social studies teachers take a minimum of 60 hours of training in ELL education (O’Brien, 2011). However, in the study, O’Brien (2011) found that many of the teachers were not satisfied with the training and felt it did not help provide them with adequate knowledge and resources to properly educate ELL students.

If the teacher harbors negative attitudes, or harbors a positive attitude but does not feel comfortable with his or her own knowledge and ability to educate children with disabilities within the general education classroom, his or her attitudes and performance may be compromised, as may the attitudes and performance of the students. Thus the assessing and addressing of teacher attitudes and preparedness concerning the Inclusionary education of students with disabilities within the general education classroom is important for any and all administrators.

Language Acquisition and Teacher Beliefs Concerning Language Acquisition

Teacher Questions Concerning the Process of Language Acquisition

There has been many times when the following questions have been heard, “It should not take that long to learn English, right?”, “They seem to speak English ok when they are with their friends but they are struggling in my class, why is that?”, or “It would be easier if they just knew English before they came to class wouldn’t you agree?” Well, in a nutshell, the answers to those questions would sound like this, “It can take years to acquire a strong understanding and use of the English language”, “There is a difference between the English being learned and used in a

social setting and an academic setting”, and finally, “Maybe, but it would only be easier in the sense that you all spoke the same language, but other issues, like comprehension, would surely arise.” The issue is not that the questions are asked, but why they are asked. More often than not it may be that people, and in this instance educators, do not have a solid understanding of the Language Acquisition process, specifically for second Language Acquisition.

The acquisition of a language has various components and factors, and one does not necessarily have the language acquired simply because one can speak the language. Some of those factors include the environment of which the student is a part, the age of the student, the personality of the student, and the student’s proficiency of his or her first language (Larsen-Freeman & Long, 1991). Reyes-III (2007) echoes the previous statement when he says, in discussing learning, “As an aspect of social practice, learning involves the whole person; it implies not only a relation to specific activities, but a relation to social communities – it implies becoming a full participant, a member, a kind of person” (p. 625). Simplified, and likened to Language Acquisition, this means that there is more to Language Acquisition than merely learning words. So how is a language learned?

Aspects and Issues Concerning Language Acquisition

One aspect of Language Acquisition is that Language Acquisition is universal, natural, and does not require formal instruction. What this means in so many words is that every child within a certain language environment will learn the language of the environment by trying to make sense of what they hear, and they can do this without grammar class (Levine & McCloskey, 2012). Levine and McCloskey (2012) continue on and describe first language as contextualized (i.e., parents pointing to a cat to teach the word kitty), a tool with a purpose (i.e., satisfy wants and needs), one of immersion (i.e., parents and children begin communicating

before birth), one that is physically active (i.e., learning words through play), social (i.e., learned through interactions with parents and peers), and emotionally embedded (i.e., language is learned through humor, sorrow, love, etc).

Another aspect of Language Acquisition is the difference between social language and academic language. Cummins (1980, 1999) describes social language as basic interpersonal communication skills, or BICS and academic language as cognitive academic language proficiency, or CALP. The BICS may be learned at a quicker rate and understood better than CALP as the learner uses BICS in a contextualized setting (i.e., play). The CALP on the other hand may take longer for the learner to acquire as it involves more formalized reading, writing, and grammar used within the academic setting. Cummins (1999) discusses that while BICS may appear to be learned quicker than CALP, in references to learning a second language; this is not always the case. So how is a second language learned?

According Valdes (2001), the acquisition of a second language is not exactly the same as the acquisition of a first language. One reason there is a difference between first language and second Language Acquisition is the different environment, teaching, and purpose behind and the acquisition of the second language. In reference to the academic setting, it may take an ELL student approximately seven years to have a fairly solid understanding and usage of the English language (Cummins, 1979; Pettit, 2011).

This echoes back to one of the questions at the beginning of the section where the teacher asked, "It should not take that long to learn English, right?" Teachers may believe that it should only take an ELL student a few years to learn English (Pettit, 2011; Reeves, 2006). In a study conducted by Reeves (2006), 71.7% of teachers thought that students should be able to learn English within two years. This again may reflect the misunderstanding between BICS and

CALP, in particular how second language BICS is learned in a similar fashion to the learning of a first language (i.e., contextualized, social).

Another misconception that teachers may harbor concerning second Language Acquisition is the use of the first language alongside the second language during learning. Pettit (2011) and Reeves (2006), discuss that some teachers believe it is not useful to use the first language alongside the second language when learning the second language. However, the use of the first language has been shown to be beneficial to the learning and acquisition of the second language (Cummins, 1981; Krashen, 2003; Wong Fillmore, 1991). These misunderstandings may affect teacher beliefs concerning Language Acquisition.

There is a vast discrepancy between native English speakers and ELL students. On average, by first grade, native English speakers know approximately six-thousand words and have an understanding of the tenses. ELL students just coming into school know very little if any English and need scaffolding (Carlo et al., 2004; de Jong & Harper, 2005). ELL students lack the depth and breadth of their native English speaking classmates and struggle when words are not used in context. However, teachers often worry about students not being able to speak English in the classroom and view bilingualism as a barrier to achievement (English, 2009; Gitlin, Buendia, Crosland & Doumbia, 2003). Some teachers may feel that ELL students should be excluded until they have a mastery of the English language and may correlate English proficiency with cognitive ability.

There is promotion of “English Only” classes, but this can be damaging for various reasons, one reason being teachers may still feel the student should be able to acquire the language quickly, particularly because they are strictly speaking English, but a year or two is not enough time (Mitchell, 2005; Valdes, 1998). The use of all English does not take into account

that the use of the first language is beneficial in learning a second language (Cummins, 1981; Krashen, 2003; Wong Fillmore, 1991) and cannot be learned in a year or two (Pettit, 2011; Reeves, 2006). Many dual language programs take between four and six years to show success (Paciotto & Delany-Barmann, 2011). Fu (1995) and Valdes (2001) discuss that the classroom should echo a natural environment however school work does not always encourage students to socialize and maybe use language in context with peers which is important in learning language (Levine & McCloskey, 2012).

Examples of Law Concerning the Education of ELL Students

Within the law there are various court cases discussing and determine the future of ELL education. Two such Supreme Court cases are *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) and *Castaneda v. Pickard* (1981). *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) discusses the rights of students learning English and presents the argument that the immersion of a student learning English into the mainstream classroom without support of any kind is a violation of his or her rights. *Castaneda v. Pickard* (1981) presents the argument that schools cannot ignore students whose primary language is not English and that the school must properly identified and provided the appropriate education.

Issues Concerning English Language Learners in Rural Settings

Lack of Resources

Rural areas have been affected by an increase in immigrant families and students, and have had to reexamine their English Language Learner programs and resources (Conroy, Rude, & Phillips, 2006; Farmer et al., 2011; Marrs & Eccles, 2009). There is a concern in rural areas as they appear to have a lack of resources (i.e. teachers trained to educate ELL students, administrative support, contact with professionals trained to educate ELL students, training opportunities in educating ELL students) (Conroy, Rude, & Phillips, 2006; Farmer et al., 2011;

Marrs & Eccles, 2009). The teachers struggled with modifying class work for ELL students, having ELL students and special education students within the same classroom, a lack of administrative support and a lack of training to properly educate ELL students.

The lack of resources also applies to the school psychologist in a rural district or school (Marrs & Eccles, 2009). McCloskey and Athanasiou (2000) found that school psychologist tests were not always appropriate for ELL students. In their study, Marrs and Eccles (2009) found that the rural district did not have any school psychologists trained to work with ELL students nor did they have contact with peers who did have said training. Conroy, Rude, and Phillips (2006) examined the issues the teacher in a rural district or school might have concerning ELL students and found the following.

Example of Teacher Attitudes Concerning ELL Students

Farmer et al., (2011) examined the risk for drop-out for students with and without disabilities across ELL students and students with learning disabilities (LD). The study had four groups to describe and classify students who were at risk for dropping out: maladjusted; quiet; disengaged; low achievers. Maladjusted drop out students have many behavioral and academic concerns and tend to associate with peers who engage in deviance. Quiet drop out students are those who experience academic problems but few behavioral issues. Disengaged drop out students have similar social risk factors but fewer academic and behavioral issues than maladjusted students. Low achievers do not display externalizing issues and fall between maladjusted and quiet students as far as social risk factors are concerned. The study revealed that the rural teachers involved viewed ELL students as having similar adjustment issues as students with a learning disability.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

Chapter 3 describes the specific procedures employed in the study. The description includes the rationale for selecting a quantitative/qualitative study, descriptions of the population and sample selected the data procedures and data analysis approach.

Background

The discussion and examination of teacher's perceptions, expectations, and beliefs concerning the education of English Language Learners (ELL) in the mainstream classroom is nothing new. This does not dissuade, however, from the importance of continuing said discussion and examination, as the influx of students into the American education setting whose primary language is not English is only continuing to grow in numbers and expand to all areas of the country. According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the number of students who were ELL increased from 8% (3.7 million) in 2000 to 10% (4.7 million) in 2010 (NCES, 2012). The increase in ELL students, though the numbers vary, are corroborated by the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2011) who recorded that the increase in ELL students from 1997 to 2009 increased by 51% (3.5 to 5.3 million). Henceforth, the topic is still valid and will continue to only become more prominent and imperative. Reeves (2006) found similar stories among teachers when asked about their attitudes and expectations of ELL students in the mainstream classroom.

In the educational arena today, there is a growing cultural gap between teachers and students. The majority of teachers are white females, whereas the student body is becoming more diverse (Lawrence, 2005; Walker-Dalhousie et al, 2009). Within their research Walker-Dalhousie et al, (2009), discuss that 45% of teachers feel comfortable and competent in their abilities to

adjust curriculum to meet the needs of ELL students. The majority of the teachers were well intentioned; however, their lack of confidence and knowledge concerning the education of ELL students may impact their attitudes towards educating ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and the performance and self-esteem of ELL students.

In her 2006 study, Reeves not only examined mainstream teachers attitudes towards the Inclusion of ELL students, but also their attitudes towards the modification of curricula for ELL students, their attitudes towards Professional Development to help them in the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and teacher perceptions towards second Language Acquisition. The majority of the teachers in the study were found to harbor positive and welcoming attitudes towards the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom. Where there was variation was in the attitudes towards modification and Language Acquisition. The teachers differed on their beliefs in the modification of curricula for ELL students, and their understanding of how a second language is acquired. The majority of the teachers reported that they did not feel prepared to educate ELL students in the mainstream classroom and expressed a desire for Professional Development to increase their level of comfort and ability to educate ELL students.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine mainstream classroom teacher's perceptions and beliefs concerning the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, Coursework Modification, Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and understanding of Language Acquisition. Do English Language Learners feel as though they do not fit into the community of the school, or that their English speaking peers and teachers view them as a burden in the classroom? Do mainstream teachers

truly harbor negative attitudes towards educating English Language Learners, or is there a lack of confidence and misunderstanding when it comes to best practices concerning the education of English Language Learners and the acquisition of language? As the number of English Language Learners in the classroom increases (NCELA, 2011; NCES, 2012), the examination of teacher attitudes towards the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom, teachers understanding of Language Acquisition process and teachers preparedness to teach ELL students within the mainstream classroom become more prevalent.

Significance of the Study

This study provided teachers with an opportunity to gauge their beliefs, perceptions, and expectations concerning the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, towards Coursework Modification for ELL students, towards Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom, and their beliefs concerning Language Acquisition. In the future, this study could provide rural school district administrators with ideas on how teachers view the education of ELL students and provide insight on methods of providing assistance to teachers based upon the results of the study. The results will not only be beneficial for the participating districts but might also be applicable and generalizable for other districts. Finally this study may prompt other studies to examine these questions across the nation in both a quantitative and qualitative manner.

Research Design

The research in the current study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The study examined teacher's perceptions and beliefs concerning the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, Coursework Modification, Professional Development concerning the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and understanding of Language

Acquisition. The study allowed teacher's to rate their perceptions and beliefs on a Likert scale and expand upon these perceptions and beliefs through open ended questions. The open ended survey questions were examined for themes.

Research Questions

1. What were teacher's beliefs for each of the domains: Inclusion; Coursework Modification; Professional Development; Language Acquisition? Did mainstream classroom teachers have consistent beliefs across the four domains of Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development and Language Acquisition?
2. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

Sub Question 2a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 2b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 2c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 2d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 2e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

3. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

Sub Question 3a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 3b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 3c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 3d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 3e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

4. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners different depending on English Language

Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language and whether or not the teacher knows a second language?

Sub Question 4a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 4b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 4c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 4d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 4e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

5. Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language?

Sub Question 5a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction?

Sub Question 5b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers?

Sub Question 5c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between male and female teachers?

Sub Question 5d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English?

Sub Question 5e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers who did or did not know a second language?

Participants

The participants consisted of 83 mainstream classroom teachers in two rural school districts in the Midwest. Within the population of the study, there were 15 males and 65 females (three did not report gender). Of the 81 participants who reported their teaching level 37 taught Elementary, 19 taught Middle/Junior High, and 25 taught Senior High. Sixty-five participants reported the model their district employed with English Language Learner students. Six reported their district used a Dual Language model, five reported Sheltered Instruction, 21 reported English Only and 33 reported Pull-Out. When inquired as to their native language 81 reported that English was their native language and two reported that English was not their native language. Seventy-two of the participants did not know a language other than English and ten reported they knew a language other than English (one participant did not report).

Data Collection Procedures

The surveys were distributed to elementary and secondary teachers to gauge their thoughts on the above mentioned questions. Race, ethnicity, gender, age, years of teaching, etcetera were not exclusionary factors from the study. The surveys were coded and no names (i.e., teacher, school, and district) were used. The study was conducted in two rural Midwestern school districts.

Instrumentation

This study was both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The study used *English-as-a-second-language (ESL) Students in Mainstream Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers* (Reeves, 2006). The survey was broken down into four sections. Section 'A' consisted of 16 questions concerning ELL Inclusion, knowledge of Language Acquisition, Professional Development, and Coursework Modification on a four-point Likert scale (strongly disagree; disagree; agree; strongly disagree). At the end of section 'A' there were three questions asking teachers if they have ever had ELL students in their class, how many were enrolled in the current year and how many were enrolled in their entire career. The reliability coefficients for the four domains were as follows; ELL Students/Inclusion (.82), Language (.85), Instructional Strategies/Class Work Modification (.72), and Support/Professional Development (.86), and follow up questions presented by Reeves were strong predictors of the instruments content validity (Reeves, 2006; Younce, 2011). The follow up questions from Reeves (2006) are as follows: 1. Which, if any, items on the survey were unclear to you? Explain. 2. Which, if any, items did you find difficult to answer? Explain. 3. This survey uses a 4-point Likert-type scale, 1 (strongly agree), 2 (agree), 3 (disagree), and 4 (strongly disagree). While completing the survey, did you feel that this scale

adequately allowed you to express your opinion? If not, explain. 4. In your opinion, which, if any, items on the survey display a bias on the part of the research? Explain. 5. Provide any additional comments that you would like to make.

Section ‘B’ consisted of three subsections concerning classroom practices, impact of Inclusion, and teacher support. These 11 questions were rated on a three-point Likert scale (seldom or never; some of the time; most or all of the time). Part ‘C’ asks two open-ended questions of teachers to list the greatest “benefits” and “challenges” for including ELL students in subject-area classes. Part ‘D’ was a demographic section.

The following is a breakdown of how the first 16 questions of the survey fall into each of the domains in the study:

Inclusion:

1. The Inclusion of ESL students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes creates a positive educational atmosphere.
2. The Inclusion of students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes benefits all students.
3. ESL students should not be included in general education classes until they attain a minimum level of English proficiency. (Reverse Scoring)
6. Mainstream/Subject area teachers do not have enough time to deal with the needs of ESL students. (Reverse Scoring)
15. I would welcome the Inclusion of ESL students in any class.

Coursework Modifications:

7. It is a good practice to simplify coursework for ESL students. (Reverse Scoring)

8. It is a good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ESL students. (Reverse Scoring)
9. It is a good practice to allow ESL students more time to complete coursework.
10. Teachers should not give ESL students a failing grade if the students display effort. (Reverse Scoring)
11. Teachers should not modify assignments for the ESL students enrolled in mainstream/subject area classes. (Reverse Scoring)
12. The modification of coursework for ESL students would be difficult to justify to the other students. (Reverse Scoring)

Professional Development:

13. I have adequate training to work with ESL students. (Reverse Scoring)
14. I am interested in receiving more training in working with ESL students.

Language and Language Learning:

4. ESL students should avoid using their native language while at school. (Reverse Scoring)
5. ESL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools. (Reverse Scoring)
16. I would support the legislation making English the official language of the United States. (Reverse Scoring)

Data Analysis

The data analysis followed the methods laid out in Reeves (2006). The survey was analyzed in a descriptive manner. The analyses were used to identify the participants' attitudes and beliefs on the four research questions and compared these across English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and

whether or not the teacher knew a second language. Percentages, measures of central tendency, standard deviations, and the strength of the teacher's agreement and disagreement on the research questions were included in the study. The study employed a one-way ANOVA to compare teacher attitudes and beliefs across the four domains (Inclusion; Coursework Modification; Professional Development; Language Acquisition) and across English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language. Post Hoc tests were employed, if a significant difference was found, to determine the location of the difference. The open ended survey questions were examined by themes. The themes found and utilized were "Academic", "Social", and "Cultural".

CHAPTER 4

Results

Purpose of Study

The studies dependent variable was the *English-as-a-second-language (ESL) Students in Mainstream Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers* (Reeves, 2006). The teacher's responses to the 16 items in Section 'A' of the survey were grouped into four domains (a) Inclusion, (b) Coursework Modification, (c) Professional Development, and (d) Language Learning. All study survey data was retrospective and collected for understanding teachers' attitudes towards ELL education and services within the mainstream classroom. Permission was obtained from the appropriate districts and schools prior to data being collected and analyzed. See Table 1 for demographic data.

Analysis of Research Questions

Research Question 1:

What were teacher's beliefs for each of the domains: Inclusion; Coursework Modification; Professional Development; Language Acquisition? Did mainstream classroom teachers have consistent beliefs across the four domains of Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development, and Language Acquisition?

A comparison of means for the 83 participants indicated the following for each of the four domains. On the Inclusion Domain (Questions 1, 2, 3, 6 & 15) the mean score was 2.73 ($SD = 0.34$). On the Coursework Modification Domain (Questions 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, & 12) the mean score was 2.42 ($SD = 0.28$). On the Professional Development Domain (Questions 13 & 14) the mean score was 2.58 ($SD = 0.55$). On the Language Learning Domain (Questions 4, 5, & 16) the mean score was 2.47 ($SD = 0.53$). The total mean score was 3.12 ($SD = 0.53$). See Table 2.

A One Way ANOVA was used to find the significant difference between the average scores of the 83 participants across the four domains $F(3, 328) = 8.44, p < .001$ as seen in Table 3. The ANOVA revealed a significant difference between the participants average scores across the four domains so a Post Hoc test was used to determine where the significant difference was. According to the Post Hoc test the significant difference was between the Inclusion domain and the Coursework Modification and Language Acquisition domains. See Table 3.

Research Question 2:

Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language and whether or not the teacher knew a second language.

Sub Question 2a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English and English Only models of instruction? As seen in Table 4 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicate that there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion across models of instruction. Dual Language ($M = 2.67, SD = .043$), Sheltered Instruction ($M = 2.68, SD = .023$), English Only ($M = 2.75, SD = 0.43$), Pull Out ($M = 2.79, SD = .027$), $F(3,64) = 0.32, p = .81$.

Sub Question 2b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High and, Senior High teachers? As seen in Table 5 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicate that there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion across teacher's level of instruction. Elementary ($M =$

2.77, $SD = 0.37$), Middle/Junior High ($M = 2.80$, $SD = .023$), Senior High ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.36$), $F(2,80) = 1.95$, $p = .15$.

Sub Question 2c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between male and female teachers? As seen in Table 6 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicate that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion between genders. Male ($M = 2.64$, $SD = 0.51$) and Female ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.30$), $F(2,80) = 0.95$, $p = .39$.

Sub Question 2d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English? As seen in Table 7 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicate that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion between teachers having English or Non-English as a native language. English as a native language ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 0.33$) and Non-English as a native language ($M = 2.30$, $SD = 0.42$), $F(1,82) = 3.39$, $p = .07$.

Sub Question 2e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the Inclusion of English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language? As seen in Table 8 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicate that there is no significant in teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion between teachers who did or did not know a second language. Yes ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 0.35$), and No ($M = 2.74$, $SD = .034$), $F(1,80) = 0.03$, $p = .861$.

Research Question 3:

Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language.

Sub Questions 3a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction? As seen in Table 9 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicate that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification across models of instruction. Dual Language ($M = 2.40, SD = .024$), Sheltered Instruction ($M = 2.40, SD = .062$), English Only ($M = 2.36, SD = 0.33$) and Pull Out ($M = 2.45, SD = 0.20$), $F(3,64) = 0.429, p = .733$.

Sub Question 3b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers? As seen in Table 10 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's belief concerning Coursework Modification across teacher level of instruction. Elementary ($M = 2.40, SD = 0.28$), Middle/Junior ($M = 2.50, SD = 0.21$) and Senior High ($M = 2.40, SD = 0.33$), $F(2, 78) = 0.68, p = .51$.

Sub Question 3c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between male and female teachers? As seen in Table 11 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification between genders. Male ($M = 2.35, SD = 0.29$) and Female ($M = 2.43, SD = 0.03$), $F(2,80) = .068, p = .51$.

Sub Question 3d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English? As seen in Table 12 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification

between teachers having English or Non-English as a native language. Yes ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 0.28$) and No ($M = 2.30$, $SD < .001$), $F(1,82) = .037$, $p = .55$.

Sub Question 3e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning the modification of coursework for English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language? As seen in Table 13 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification between teachers who did or did not know a second language. Yes ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 0.26$) and No ($M = 2.43$, $SD = 0.28$), $F(1,81) = .052$, $p = .48$.

Research Question 4:

Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knows a second language.

Sub Question 4a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction? As seen in Table 14 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development across model of instruction. Dual Language ($M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.27$), Sheltered English ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 0.45$), English Only ($M = 2.43$, $SD = 0.64$) and Pull Out ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.49$), $F(3,64) = 1.54$, $p = .21$.

Sub Question 4b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers? As seen in Table 15 there is a significant difference in teacher's beliefs

concerning Professional Development across teachers level of instruction. Elementary ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 0.43$), Middle/Junior High ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.65$), and Senior High ($M = 2.34$, $SD = 0.53$), $F(2,80) = 5.72$, $p < .001$. The follow up Post Hoc test indicate that there was a significant difference in teacher attitudes between Elementary teachers and Senior High teachers with Elementary teachers having a more positive attitude towards Professional Development.

Sub Question 4c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between male and female teachers? As seen in Table 16 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development between genders. Male ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.18$) and Female ($M = 2.61$, $SD = 0.06$), $F(2,80) = 0.25$, $p = .78$.

Sub Question 4d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English? As seen in Table 17 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development between teachers having English or Non-English as a native language. Yes ($M = 2.59$, $SD = 0.55$) and No ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 0.71$), $F(1,82) = 0.05$, $p = .83$.

Sub Question 4e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of English Language Learners between teachers who did or did not know a second language? As seen in Table 18 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development between teacher's who did or did not know a second language. Yes ($M = 2.85$, $SD = 0.34$) and No ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 0.56$), $F(1,80) = 2.85$, $p = .10$.

Research Question 5:

Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition different depending on English Language Learner model of instruction, teacher level of instruction, teacher gender, teacher's native language, and whether or not the teacher knew a second language.

Sub Question 5a: Were mainstream teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition different across Dual Language, Pull-Out, Sheltered English, and English Only models of instruction? As seen in Table 19 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition across models of instruction. Dual Language ($M = 2.50, SD = 0.36$), Sheltered Instruction ($M = 2.40, SD = 0.44$), English Only ($M = 2.55, SD = 0.44$) and Pull Out ($M = 2.44, SD = 0.56$), $F(3,64) = 0.25, p = .86$.

Sub Question 5b: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition across Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High teachers? As seen in Table 20 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is a significant difference in teacher beliefs concerning Language Acquisition across teacher's level of instruction. Elementary ($M = 2.43, SD = 0.43$), Middle/ Junior High ($M = 2.72, SD = 0.62$) and Senior High ($M = 2.34, SD = 0.56$), $F(2,80) = 0.84, p = .05$. A follow up Post Hoc test indicated that there was a significant difference in teacher attitudes concerning Language Acquisition between Senior High and Middle/Junior High where Senior High teachers held more positive attitudes towards Language Acquisition.

Sub Question 5c: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between male and female teachers? As seen in Table 21 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs between genders. Male ($M = 2.50, SD = 0.51$) and Female ($M = 2.46, SD = 0.54$), $F(2,80) = 0.02, p = .922$.

Sub Question 5d: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers whose native language was English versus Non-English? As seen in Table 22 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers who have English or Non-English as a native language. Yes ($M = 2.45$, $SD = 0.52$) and No ($M = 3.00$, $SD < .001$), $F(1,81) = 2.14$, $p = .147$.

Sub Question 5e: Was there a difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers who did or did not know a second language? As seen in Table 23 the results of the One Way ANOVA indicates that there is no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition between teachers who did or did not know a second language. Yes ($M = 2.18$, $SD = 0.54$) and No ($M = 2.51$, $SD = 0.52$), $F(1,81) = 3.50$, $p = .07$.

Examination of Open Ended Questions Concerning Inclusion

Part C of the *English as a Second Language (ESL) Students in Mainstream Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers* contained two open-ended questions concerning the benefits and challenges of educating English Language Learners in the mainstream classroom. The first questions asked teachers to "Please list what you consider to be the greatest benefits of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes" and the second asked teachers to "Please list what you consider to be the greatest challenges of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes". Sixty-six of the total 83 participants completed portion C. The participant's responses to the two questions were summarized to identify patterns within the areas of "Social", "Academic" and "Cultural".

1. Please list what you consider to be the greatest benefits of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes:

- a. Social
 - i. Teachers discussed the importance of ELL students being around English speaking students to help “build respect and acceptance”, and form “relationships and friendships”.
 - ii. Teachers discussed that the English speaking students would benefit by learning how to “socialize” with students of various cultures.
 - iii. The Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom will give everyone a “real world” feeling as they will have to live and work alongside of peoples of various backgrounds, ethnicities, cultures, etcetera.
 - b. Academic
 - i. Inclusion will help increase the ELL student’s Language Acquisition and help them as academically as they go along in school.
 - ii. Inclusion helps “build vocabulary” (academic/social) for the ELL student.
 - c. Cultural
 - i. Inclusion fosters and “understanding” of others cultures.
 - ii. Inclusion helps with “enculturation”.
2. Please list what you consider to be the greatest challenges of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes:
- a. Social

- i. Not wanting to make them feel “overwhelmed”
- ii. Keeping them “interested”
- b. Academic
 - i. “State testing pressure”
 - ii. “Modification of lessons” and “Ensuring they are understanding all you are trying to teach them”.
 - iii. “Slows the pace of the class”
- c. Cultural
 - i. “Language barrier”
 - ii. Having trouble speaking with parents
 - iii. Not sure of “proper methods” to help them

Table 1.

Participant Demographics

Factor	<i>N</i>	%
Gender		
Male	15	19
Female	65	81
Level of Instruction		
Elementary	37	46
Middle/Junior High	19	23
Senior High	25	31
Native Language		
English	81	98
Other	2	2
Second Language		
Yes	10	12
No	72	88
ELL Model		
Dual Language	6	9
Sheltered Instruction	5	8
English Only	21	32
Pull-Out	33	51

Table 2.

Descriptive Data Based on Teachers Attitudes Across the Four Domains: Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development, and Language Learning

Factor	<i>N</i>	<i>Sum</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Inclusion	83	226.59	2.73	.34
Coursework Modification	83	200.86	2.42	.28
Professional Development	83	214.14	2.58	.55
Language Learning	83	205.01	2.47	.53
Total Score	83	259.79	3.13	.53

Table 3.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Averages of the Scores Across the Four Domains

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Inclusion	83	226.59	2.73	0.34	
Coursework Modification	83	200.86	2.42	0.28	
Professional Development	83	214.14	2.58	0.55	
Language Learning	83	205.01	2.47	0.53	
Total Score	83	211.65	2.55	.45	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	4.85	3	1.62	8.44	< .01
Within Groups	62.85	328	.19		
Total	67.70	331			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 4.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students with Different Models of Instruction

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Dual Language	6	16.00	2.67	0.43	
Sheltered Instruction	5	13.40	2.68	0.23	
English Only	21	57.65	2.75	0.43	
Pull Out	33	92.00	2.79	0.27	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.11	3	0.04	0.32	.81
Within Groups	7.17	61	0.12		
Total	7.28	64			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type I errors.

Table 5.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students with Different Levels of Teaching

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Elementary	37	102.49	2.77	0.37	
Middle/Junior High	19	53.20	2.80	0.23	
Senior High	25	65.50	2.62	0.36	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.45	2	0.22	1.94	.15
Within Groups	8.93	78	0.12		
Total	9.38	80			

Note. An F ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 6.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students Across Genders

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Male	15	36.90	2.64	0.51	
Female	65	178.75	2.75	0.30	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.23	2	0.11	.95	.39
Within Groups	9.21	78	0.12		
Total	9.43	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 7.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students Between English as a Native Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	81	221.94	2.74	0.33	
No	2	4.6	2.30	0.42	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.38	1	0.38	3.39	.07
Within Groups	9.09	81	0.11		
Total	9.47	82			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 8.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Inclusion of ELL Students Between Knowing a Second Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	10	27.20	2.72	0.35	
No	72	197.28	2.74	0.34	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	>0.01	1	>0.01	.03	.86
Within Groups	9.45	80	0.12		
Total	9.45	81			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 9

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with Different Instruction Models

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Dual Language	6	14.40	2.40	0.24	
Sheltered Instruction	5	12.00	2.40	0.62	
English Only	21	49.56	2.36	0.33	
Pull Out	65	159.25	2.45	0.20	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.11	3	0.38	.429	.73
Within Groups	5.37	61	0.88		
Total	5.49	64			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 10.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with Different Teaching Levels

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Elementary	37	88.80	2.40	0.28	
Middle/Junior High	19	47.5	2.50	0.21	
Senior High	25	60	2.40	0.33	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.11	2	0.05	0.68	.51
Within Groups	6.19	78	0.08		
Total	6.30	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 11.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students Across Genders

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Male	15	35.25	2.35	0.29	
Female	65	157.95	2.43	0.03	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.11	2	0.05	0.68	.51
Within Groups	6.12	78	0.08		
Total	6.23	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 12.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students with English as a Native Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	81	196.02	2.42	0.28	
No	2	4.6	2.30	0.00	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.03	1	0.03	0.37	.55
Within Groups	6.29	81	0.08		
Total	6.32	82			

Table 13.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Coursework Modification for ELL Students Between Knowing a Second Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	10	23.60	2.36	0.26	
No	72	174.96	2.43	0.28	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.04	1	0.04	0.52	.48
Within Groups	6.27	80	0.08		
Total	6.31	81			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 14.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students with Different Models of Instruction

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Dual Language	6	16.50	2.75	0.27	
Sheltered English	5	13.50	2.70	0.45	
English Only	21	51.03	2.43	0.64	
Pull Out	33	90.09	2.73	0.49	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1.28	3	0.43	1.54	.21
Within Groups	16.86	61	0.28		
Total	18.14	64			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 15.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students with Different Teaching Levels

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Elementary	37	102.86	2.78	0.43	
Middle/Junior High	19	47.50	2.50	0.65	
Senior High	25	58.50	2.34	0.53	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	3.10	2	1.55	5.72	<.01
Within Groups	21.13	78	0.27		
Total	24.23	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 16.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students Between Genders

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Male	15	37.50	2.50	0.18	
Female	65	169.65	2.61	0.06	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.15	2	0.07	.25	.78
Within Groups	23.75	78	0.30		
Total	23.90	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 17.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students Between English as a Native Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	81	209.79	2.59	0.55	
No	2	5	2.50	0.71	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.02	1	0.02	.05	.83
Within Groups	24.40	81	0.30		
Total	24.41	82			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 18.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning Professional Development for Educating ELL Students Between Knowing a Second Language or Not

Instructional Model					
ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	10	28.50	2.85	0.34	
No	72	182.88	2.54	0.56	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.84	1	0.84	2.85	.10
Within Groups	23.40	80	0.29		
Total	24.24	81			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 19.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition with Different Instruction Models

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Dual Language	6	15	2.50	0.36	
Sheltered English	5	12	2.40	0.44	
English Only	21	53.55	2.55	0.44	
Pull Out	33	80.52	2.44	0.56	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	.19	3	0.06	.25	.86
Within Groups	15.45	61	0.25		
Total	15.64	64			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 20.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition with Different Teaching Levels

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Elementary	37	89.91	2.43	0.43	
Middle/Junior High	19	51.68	2.72	0.62	
Senior High	25	58.50	2.34	0.56	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	1.68	2	0.84	3.13	.05
Within Groups	20.91	78	0.27		
Total	22.59	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 21.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition Across Genders

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Male	15	37.50	2.50	0.51	
Female	65	159.90	2.46	0.54	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.05	2	0.02	.08	.92
Within Groups	22.52	78	0.29		
Total	22.56	80			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 22.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition Between English as a Native Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	81	198.45	2.45	0.52	
No	2	6	3.00	0.00	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.58	1	0.58	2.14	.15
Within Groups	22.06	81	0.28		
Total	22.65	82			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

Table 23.

Single Classification Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Determining Differences Between Beliefs Concerning the Understanding of Language Acquisition Between Knowing a Second Language or Not

Instructional Model ANOVA:Single Factor					
Groups	Count	Sum	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	
Yes	10	21.80	2.18	0.54	
No	72	180.72	2.51	0.52	
ANOVA					
Source of Variation	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Between Groups	0.95	1	0.95	3.50	.07
Within Groups	21.67	80	0.27		
Total	22.62	81			

Note. An *F* ratio was calculated and an alpha level of .05 was utilized to control for Type 1 errors.

CHAPTER 5

Conclusion and Discussion

Within the literature there is a need to examine rural mainstream classroom teacher's attitudes towards the Inclusion of ELL students. Along with Inclusion the examination of teacher's attitudes towards Coursework Modification for ELL students, professional training concerning the education of ELL students in the mainstream classroom and teachers understanding of the Language Acquisition process is important.

The purpose of this post-test only comparative study was to examine possible differences in teacher's attitudes concerning Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development, and Language Acquisition across various factors. The factors are as followed: (a) ELL instruction model (Sheltered English, English Only, Pull-Out, Dual Language); (b) teacher's level of instruction (Elementary, Middle/Junior High, Senior High); (c) teacher's gender (Male, Female); (d) teacher's native language (English, Other); and (d) teacher's ability to speak another language (Yes, No).

The studies dependent variable was the *English-as-a-second-language (ESL) Students in Mainstream Classrooms: A Survey of Teachers* (Reeves, 2006). The teacher's responses to the 16 items in Section 'A' of the survey were grouped into four domains (a) Inclusion, (b) Coursework Modification, (c) Professional Development, and (d) Language Learning. All study survey data was retrospective and collected for understanding teachers' attitudes towards ELL education and services within the mainstream classroom. Permission was obtained from the appropriate districts and schools prior to data being collected and analyzed.

Conclusion

The following conclusion can be drawn from Research Question #1: The results of the comparison of means of teachers total scores across the four domains indicated that the teacher's beliefs ranged from 2.42 (Coursework Modification) to 2.73 (Inclusion) or between disagree (2) and agree (3). The results of the One Way ANOVA revealed a significant difference in the average of the teacher's total scores across the four domains. The significant difference was between the Inclusion domain and Coursework Modification and Language Acquisition domains. Teacher's beliefs were more positive concerning Inclusion than they were to Coursework Modification and Language Acquisition.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the study of sub questions (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of Research Question 2: The results of the One Way ANOVA indicated that while teacher's whose schools employ a Pull-Out method of ELL instruction had more positive beliefs concerning Inclusion than teacher's whose school employed Dual Language, Sheltered Instruction or English Only there was no significant difference between the four models of instruction. No significant difference was found between teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion based on the teacher's level of instruction. While the One Way ANOVA did show that Middle/Junior High teachers beliefs about the Inclusion of ELL students within the mainstream classroom was higher than Elementary and Senior High teachers, these differences were not statistically significant. While females had a slightly more positive belief about the Inclusion of ELL students in the mainstream classroom, the gender of the teacher did not display a significant difference according to the One Way ANOVA. The teacher's native language or their ability to speak another language did not provide a significant difference, according to the One Way ANOVA. However, teachers whose native language was English had more positive beliefs than

teachers whose native language was not English. There was very little difference between teachers who could and could not speak a language other than English.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the study of sub questions (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) of Research Question 3: The results of the One Way ANOVA revealed that while teacher's whose schools employed a Pull-Out model of instruction as compared to those whose schools used Sheltered English, English Only or Dual Language, there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification. There was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification across teacher's level of instruction with all of the levels, Elementary, Middle/Junior High, and Senior High being within one tenth. The results of the One Way ANOVA revealed that across genders there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification; though there was no significant difference between the genders females held a slightly more positive view of Coursework Modification. The teacher's native language or the ability to speak another language did not show a significant difference in beliefs concerning Coursework Modification. Teachers whose native language was English held a slightly more positive view than did teacher's whose native language was not English. Likewise, the teacher's who did not speak a language other than English held a slightly more positive view of Coursework Modification than teacher's who did speak another language.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the study of sub question (b) of Research Question 4: The results of the One Way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development for the education of ELL students within the mainstream classroom across teacher's level of instruction. The significant difference occurred between Elementary teachers and Senior High teachers where Elementary teachers held

a more positive view of Professional Development. The following conclusions can be drawn from the study of sub questions (a), (c), (d), and (e) of Research Question 4: While teacher's whose school employed a Dual Language program held a slightly more positive view of Professional Development than those employing Sheltered English, English Only, or Pull Out programs, there was no significant difference between the programs. While females had a slightly more positive view towards Professional Development there was no significant difference between genders. The teacher's native language or the ability to speak another language did not show a significant difference in beliefs concerning Professional Development. Teachers whose native language was English held a slightly more positive view than did teacher's whose native language was not English. Likewise, the teacher's who did speak a language other than English held a slightly more positive view of Professional Development than teacher's who did speak another language, but the difference was not statistically significant.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the study of sub question (b) of Research Question 5: The results of the One Way ANOVA revealed that there was a significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Language Acquisition across teacher level of instruction. Senior High teachers held a more positive understanding of Language Acquisition than Middle/Junior High teachers. The following conclusions can be drawn from the study of sub questions (a), (c), (d), and (e) of Research Question 5: The results of the One Way ANOVA revealed that there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs across ELL program of instruction though English Only was slightly higher than the other three programs. According to the One Way ANOVA male and female teachers held very similar beliefs concerning Language Acquisition that were not significantly different. The teacher's native language or the ability to speak another language did not show a significant difference in beliefs concerning Language Acquisition. Teachers

whose native language was not English held a slightly more positive view than did teacher's whose native language was English. Likewise, the teacher's who did speak a language other than English held a slightly more positive view of Language Acquisition than teacher's who did speak another language, but the difference was not significantly significant.

In Part C of the survey the teachers were asked to answer two open-ended questions: "Please list what you consider to be the greatest benefits of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes"; "Please list what you consider to be the greatest challenges of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes". The responses to the two questions were placed into three categories: Social; Academic; Cultural.

The following is a study of the responses to the first question, "Please list what you consider to be the greatest benefits of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes" across the three categories of Social, Academic, and Cultural. Teachers reported that some of the social benefits of including ELL students in the mainstream classroom included not only benefits to the ELL student but the English speaking students. Teachers reported that Inclusion would help build respect and form relationships/friendships between ELL students and English speaking students as it would give the student's time to socialize with others whose native language was different from their own. Similarly, the Inclusion of ELL students will give everyone, ELL students, English speaking students, and the teacher are more realistic "real world" feeling as it will prepare them to interact and work with people of various cultures and backgrounds. When it came to academics, teachers felt that Inclusion would help student's Language Acquisition and build vocabulary which would help them academically in school. The understandings of other cultures for all students and "enculturation" for the ELL students were grouped into the culture category.

The following is a study of the responses to the second question, “Please list what you consider to be the greatest challenges of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes” across the three categories of Social, Academic and Cultural. The concern about making the ELL students feel “overwhelmed” and not knowing how to “keep them interested” were themes for challenges to the Inclusion of ELL students under the social category. Themes under the academic category included concerns about state testing scores where the teachers felt the language issue would affect scores. Teachers were also concerned about how the pace of the class might slow down which might affect the English speaking students. “Modification of lessons” and “Ensuring that they are understanding all you are trying to teach them” also troubled the teachers. Those concerns placed in the cultural category were the “language barrier” or having trouble communicating with the students and the students communicating with the teachers. Likewise, the teachers were concerned about communicating with the students’ parents. An overall sense of concern about not knowing “proper methods” to help the students was seen in the teacher’s responses.

Discussion

All participants in this study were mainstream classroom teachers from two Midwestern school districts teaching grades Kindergarten through twelve. Both districts had an ELL population between 60 and 80 and used various programs of instruction for their ELL students including Dual Language, Sheltered English, English Only, and Pull Out. The results of the current study differs from those similar to Reeves (2006) by examining the teacher’s beliefs concerning and understanding of Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development and Language Acquisition across various factors including ELL instruction model,

teacher's level of instruction, teacher's gender, teachers native language and whether the teacher spoke a language other than English.

In the literature there are examples of teacher's harboring positive and negative beliefs about the Inclusion of ELL students within the mainstream classroom (Fu, 1995; Harklau, 2000; Reeves, 2006, 2004; Valdes, 2001; Verplaetse, 1998;). Some of the explanations as to why teacher's might have a more negative view of ELL students could be the cultural difference (Fu, 1995) and language difference (Olsen, 1997). Within the current study there some concerns, presented through the open ended questions, about language and cultural barriers hindering the pace of the class and communication between teacher and student/parents. On average teachers held a more positive view of Inclusion across the five factors. Across the five factors there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion. While the lack of a significant difference shows that none of the factors significantly increase a teacher's beliefs concerning Inclusion simultaneously shows that none of the factors significantly impacts the teacher's beliefs in a negative manner.

Teacher's responses to the questions concerning the appropriateness of Coursework Modification ranged from positive to negative, however overall the teacher's held a more positive view towards Coursework Modification for ELL students. This mixed bag, like Reeves (2006, 2004) may be due to the teacher's believing that modifications will hinder the student's progress. Perhaps the teachers believe only certain modifications are appropriate for ELL students. Within the open-ended questions there were a few concerns about the modification of coursework taking too much time. Also some teacher's felt like they would be unsure if the students were learning. Across the five factors there was no significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification. While the lack of a significant difference shows

that none of the factors significantly increase a teacher's beliefs concerning Coursework Modification it simultaneously shows that none of the factors significantly impacts the teacher's beliefs in a negative manner.

Overall the teacher's held a positive view towards Professional Development for the education of ELL students. The average rating of the teacher's stating they believed they had received adequate Professional Development was lower than the average rating of the teacher's stating they would like more Professional Development. These results are similar to those found by O'Neal et al, (2008) where 100% of the surveyed teachers stated they wanted more adequate Professional Development. Similarly, to Glazzard (2011) and Rose (2001) who presented commentary by teachers who said they felt unprepared to teach ELL students in the classroom, teacher's in the current study reported that they were concerned about keeping the students engaged and were not sure how best to help the students. The current study found a significant difference in teacher's beliefs concerning Professional Development across teacher's level of instruction. Elementary teacher's held a more positive belief and desire for professional training than did Senior High teachers.

Overall the teacher's held a positive view towards and understanding of Language Acquisition or ELL students. This result differs slightly from studies conducted by Pettit (2011) and Reeves (2006) which indicated that teachers may believe that ELL students should take only a few years to learn English. In Reeves (2006) over 70% of the teachers surveyed believed that ELL students should be able to learn English within two years. This result may or may not mean that the teachers have a better understanding of Language Acquisition than the participants in Pettit (2011) and Reeves (2006). What is meant by the previous statement is that the teachers in the current study may believe or understand that the acquisition of a second language differs

from the acquisition of a second language (Valdes, 2001), the difference between BICS and CALP (Cummins, 1980, 1999) and that the usage of one's first language is important and beneficial to the acquisition of a second language (Cummins, 1981; Krashen, 2003; Wong Fillmore, 1991).

Teachers in the current study believed the language barrier would negatively impact the ELL students academics and slow the pace of the class down similar to the results of English (2009) and Gitlin, et al., (2003). Other teachers reported that the Inclusion of ELL students would benefit all students as it would increase socialization. This idea is similar to one presented by Reyes-III (2007), "As an aspect of social practice, learning involves the whole person; it implies not only a relation to specific activities, but a relation to social communities – it implies becoming a full participant, a member, a kind of person" (p. 625). Even some of the teachers who believed the language barrier would negatively impact the ELL students grades commented on the positive social aspects of Inclusion. The study found a significant difference in teacher beliefs and understanding of Language Acquisition depending on a teacher's level of instruction. Overall it was found that Senior High teacher's held a more positive belief and understanding concerning Language Acquisition.

Implications for Practice

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the number of students who were ELL increased from 8% (3.7 million) in 2000 to 10% (4.7 million) in 2010 (NCES, 2012). The increase in ELL students, though the numbers vary, are corroborated by the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2011) who recorded that the increase in ELL students from 1997 to 2009 increased by 51% (3.5 to 5.3 million). This quick increase of

ELL students raises questions concerning teacher's readiness to educate the ELL students in the mainstream classroom.

In the educational arena today, there is a growing cultural gap between teachers and students. The majority of teachers are White females, whereas the student body is becoming more diverse (Lawrence, 2005; Walker-Dalhouse et al, 2009). Within their research Walker-Dalhouse et al, (2009), discuss that 45% of teachers feel comfortable and competent in their abilities to adjust curriculum to meet the needs of ELL students. The majority of the teachers were well intentioned; however, their lack of confidence and knowledge concerning the education of ELL students may impact their attitudes towards educating ELL students in the mainstream classroom, and the performance and self-esteem of ELL students.

Taking into account the influx of ELL students and the cultural gap between teacher's and student's the issue of the understanding of Language Acquisition and Professional Development. The current study examines teacher's attitudes towards Language Acquisition and Professional Development, and while on average teachers attitudes were typically positive there were indications within the open ended questions that teacher's may not have a solid understanding of Language Acquisition or were provided adequate Professional Development. The answers provided to the type of Professional Development the teacher had received varied from in-services, college classes, and some conferences. The definition of "adequate" is relative and was not solidified within the current research; however, trainings on Language Acquisition and Professional Development would benefit the teachers.

Implications for Further Research

This study is the product of two rural Midwestern school districts, both with an ELL population of between 60 and 80, thus, the results may vary in a rural district with a smaller ELL

population and a rural district with a larger ELL district. The survey varied on how many questions it had for the four domains and, if modified, could delve deeper into the attitudes of teacher's across the domains. More studies, similar to this one, would provide a more solid baseline on teacher's feelings across the four domains within a rural district. Likewise, a comparison between rural and urban would provide information on whether there are resources variables that impact the teacher's responses. It could be that the resources, or lack thereof, are impacting the teacher's answers to a veritable degree, on which the survey alone cannot detect. Delving deeper into each of the domains, separately, could provide information of greater depth on teacher's attitudes. Lastly, on the flipside, studying both the teacher's attitudes across the four domains and the attitudes of the ELL students concerning the school climate and culture may provide a picture of how teacher's attitudes impact student's attitudes and vice versa.

Summary

The understanding of teacher's attitudes concerning Inclusion, Coursework Modification, Professional Development and Language Acquisition concerning English Language Learner students is important in providing the appropriate resources to the district. This understanding of attitudes and provision of resources is amplified when research concerning the influx of ELL students, cultural gaps between students and teachers, teacher misunderstanding of Language Acquisition and lack of adequate Professional Development are taken into account. The various factors are similar to legs, if one is injured, the rest must make up the slack and are more susceptible to injury themselves.

REFERENCES

- August, D., & Calderon, M. (2006). Teacher beliefs and Professional Development. In D. August & T. Shanahan (Eds.), *Culture in the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (p 139-152).
- Bang, H.J. (2011). Promising homework practices: Teachers' perspectives on making homework work for newcomer immigrant students. *The High School Journal*, 3-29.
- Bowden Carpenter, L., & Dyal, A. (2007). Secondary Inclusion: Strategies for implementing the consultative teacher model. *Education*, 127(3), 344-350.
- Cameron, D. L., & Cook, B. G. (2007). Attitudes of preservice teachers enrolled in an infusion preparation program regarding planning and accommodations for included students with mental retardation. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*, 42(3), 353-363.
- Carlo, M.S., August, D., McLaughlin, B., Snow, C., Dressler, C., Lippman, D., Lively, T.J., & White, C.E. (2004). Closing the gap: Addressing the vocabulary needs of English-language learners in bilingual and mainstream classrooms. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39(2), 188-215.
- Castaneda v. Pickard. (1981). 648 F.2d 989.
- Clair, N. (1995). Mainstream classroom teachers and ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 189-196.
- Conroy, P.W., Rude, H., & Phillips, J.S.(2006). Rural challenges to educating English language learners with visual impairments. *Rural Special Education Quarterly*, 25(4), 16-24.
- Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive-academic language proficiency, linguistic-interdependence, optimal age, and some other matters. *Working Papers in Bilingualism*, 19, 197-205.

- Cummins, J. (1980). The construct of language proficiency in bilingual education. In J. E. Alatis (Ed.), *Georgetown University roundtable on languages and linguistics* (pp. 76–93). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Cummins, J. (1981). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In California State Department of Education (Ed.), *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework* (p. 3-49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination, and Assessment Center, California State University.
- Cummins, J. (1999). BICS and CALP: Clarifying the distinction. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 438 551).
- de Jong, E.J. & Harper, C.A. (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-language learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 32(2), 101-124.
- Echevarria, J., Short, D.J., & Powers, K. (2006). School reform and standards-based education: A model for English language learners. *Journal of Educational Research*, 99, 195-210.
- Echevarria, J., Vogt, M.E., & Short, D.J. (2000). Making content comprehensible for English language learners: The SIOP model. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- English, B. (2009). Who is responsible for educating English language learners? Discursive construction of roles and responsibilities in an inquiry community. *Language and Education*, 23(6), 487-507.
- Farmer, T.W., Hall, C.M., Weiss, M.P., Petrin, R.A., Meece, J.L., & Moohr, M. (2011). The school adjustment of rural adolescents with and without disabilities: Variable and person-centered approaches. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 20, 78-88.

- Fu, D. (1995). *My trouble is my English: Asian students and the American dream*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Gitlin, A., Buendia, E., Crosland, K., & Doumbia, F. (2003). The production of margin and center: Welcoming-unwelcoming of immigrant students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(1), 91-122.
- Glazzard, J. (2011). Perceptions of the barriers to effective Inclusion in one primary school: Voices of teachers and teaching assistants. *British Journal of Learning Support*, 26(2), 56-63.
- Harklau, L. (2000). From the 'good kids' to the 'worst': Representations of English language learners across educational settings. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 34-67.
- Krashen, S. (1988). *Second Language Acquisition and second language learning*. New York: Prentice-Hall International.
- Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in Language Acquisition*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Krashen, S. D., & Terrell, T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language Acquisition in the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Alemany.
- Language [Def. 1a]. (2014) *Merriam-Webster Online*. In Merriam-Webster. Retrieved March 1, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/language>.
- Larsen-Freeman, D., & Long, M.H. (1991). *An introduction to second Language Acquisition research*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Lau v. Nichols. (1974). 414 U.S. 563.
- Lawrence, S. M. (2005). Contextual matters: Teachers' perceptions of the success of antiracist classroom practices. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 98(6), 350-365.

- LeClair, C., Doll, B., Osborn, A., & Jones, K. (2009). English language learners' and non-english language learners' perceptions of the classroom environment. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*(6), 568-577.
- Levine, L.N., & McCloskey, M.L. (2012). *Teaching English language and content in mainstream classes: One class, many paths*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson.
- Lewis, S., Maerten-Rivera, J., Adamson, K., & Lee, O. (2009). Urban third grade teachers' practices and perceptions in science instruction with english language learners. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 20*(3), 263-286.
- Liggett, T. (2008). Frames of reference: The impact of race on teaching strategy and classroom discussion. *Urban Review, 40*, 386-402.
- Marrs, H., & Eccles, D.(2009). Assessment of limited English proficient students in a rural Midwestern state. *Special Education Quarterly, 28*(2), 22-31.
- McCloskey, D. & Athanasiou, M.S. (2000). Assessment and intervention practices with second-language learners among school psychologists. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 209-225.
- Mitchell, C. (2005). English only: The creation and maintenance of an academic underclass. *Journal of Latinos and Education, 4*(4), 253-270.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). Meeting the highly qualified teachers challenge: The secretary's annual report on teacher quality. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. (2006). *How many school-aged English language learners are there in the U.S.?* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

- NCES. (2012). *Indicator 8: English language learners in public schools*. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/indicator_ell.asp
- O'Brien, J. (2011). The system is broken and it's failing these kids: High school social studies teachers' attitudes towards training for ELLs. *The Journal of Social Studies Research*, 35(1), 22-38.
- O'Neal, D.D., Ringler, M., & Rodriguez, D. (2008). Teachers' perceptions of their preparation for teaching linguistically and culturally diverse learners in rural eastern North Carolina. *The Rural Educator*, (?), 5-13.
- Oliver, R. L. (1996). *Satisfaction: A behavioral perspective on the consumer*. McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America: Immigrant students in our public schools*. New York: The New Press.
- Oortwijn, M., Boekaerts, M., & Vedder, P. (2008). The impact of the teacher's role and pupils' ethnicity and prior knowledge on pupils' performance and motivation to cooperate. *Instructional Science*, 36, 251-268.
- Paciotto, C. & Delany-Barmann, G. (2011). Planning micro-level language education reform in a new diaspora sites: Two-way immersion education in the rural Midwest. *Language Policy*, 10, 221-243.
- Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 307-332.
- Pettit, S. K. (2011). Teachers' beliefs about English language learners in the mainstream classroom: A review of the literature. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, 5, 123-147.

- Platt, E., Harper, C., & Mendoza, M. B. (2003). Dueling philosophies: Inclusion or separation for florida's english language learners?. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(1), 105-133.
- Reeves, J. (2004). 'Like everybody else': Equalizing educational opportunity for English language learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 38, 43-66.
- Reeves, J. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 99, 131-142.
- Research Center: English Language Learners. (2012, June 16). *English language learners*. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/english-language-learners/>
- Reyes – III, R. (2007). A collective pursuit of learning the possibility to be: The camp experience assisting situationally marginalized Mexican American students to a successful student identity. *Journal of Advanced Academics*, 18(4), 618-659.
- Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In J. Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp 102-119). New York, NY: Macmillian.
- Rose, R. (2001). Primary school teacher perceptions of the conditions required to include pupils with special educational needs. *Educational Review*, 53(2), 147-156.
- Tenenbaum, H. R., & Ruck, M. D. (2007). Are teachers' expectations different for racial minority than for european american students: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 99(2), 253-273.
- United States Department of Commerce. (1992). *Defining Rural School Districts and Schools*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/pubs/OSEP95AnlRpt/ch7a-1.html>.
- Valdes, G. (1998). The world outside and inside the schools: Language and immigrant children. *Educational Researcher*, 27(6), 4-18.

Valdes, G. (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools*.

New York: Teachers College Press.

Verplaetse, L. S. (1998). How content teachers interact with English language learners. *TESOL*

Journal, 2, 24-28.

Walker-Dalhouse, D., Sanders, V., & Dalhouse, A. D. (2009). A university and middle school

partnership: Preservice teachers' attitudes toward ell students. *Literacy Research and*

Instruction, 48, 337-349.

Wong Fillmore, L. (1991). When learning a second language means losing the first. *Early*

Childhood Research Quarterly, 6, 323-346.

Younce, E. F. (2011). *Middle school teacher attitudes toward the achievement of English*

language learners. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from NC Docs.

Appendix A



IRB PROTOCOL # 379-13-EX

Page 1 of 2

Title of this Research Study
Elementary and Secondary Teachers Attitudes Towards the Education of
English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom in Rural Schools

July 31, 2013

Dear Educator:


I would like you to take part in a study that will examine mainstream classroom teacher's perceptions and attitudes concerning the inclusion of ELL students, the modification of coursework for ELL students, the desire for professional training for working with ELL students, and language acquisition.

This study is being conducted with the direction and approval of my Doctoral Committee at the University of Nebraska. If you decide to take part, you will complete a survey. The survey will be given to all mainstream classroom teachers, both elementary and secondary. The survey will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes and is completely voluntary. No identifiers (i.e., names, schools, school districts) will be included on the survey. I would appreciate your help in furthering this research by completing the survey. I look forward to the information you can provide from your experiences and thoughts. You have the right to withdraw your permission at any time. There is no compensation for participating in the study. Completing the survey is implied consent.

If you have any questions regarding any aspect of this study, please feel free to contact me, Adam Sempek at (402) 672-1649, or adamsempek@hotmail.com. The study has been approved by the University of Nebraska Medical Center Institutional Review Board.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,


Adam N. Sempek, Ed.S., NCSP
EDAD Graduate Student

Version 1

IRB Approved
Valid until 06/28/2018

July 28, 2013

Appendix B

Dear Educator:

I request permission to include in a study entitled Elementary and Secondary Teachers Attitudes Towards the Education of English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom in Rural Schools. This study will examine mainstream classroom teacher's perceptions and attitudes concerning the Inclusion of ELL students, the modification of coursework for ELL students, the desire for professional training for working with ELL students, and Language Acquisition.

This study is being conducted with the direction and approval of my Doctoral Committee at the University of Nebraska. Your permission to include you in this study would be very much appreciated. My research involves exploring mainstream classroom teacher's perceptions and attitudes concerning the Inclusion of ELL students, the modification of coursework for ELL students, the desire for professional training for working with ELL students, and Language Acquisition. The survey will be given to all mainstream classroom teachers, both elementary and secondary. The survey will take approximately 5 to 10 minutes and is completely voluntary. No identifiers (i.e., names, schools, school districts) will be included on the survey. I would appreciate your help in furthering this important research by signing and returning the form below.

Your permission is very much appreciated and you have the right to withdraw your permission at any time. I look forward to the information you can provide from your experiences and thoughts. There is no compensation for participating in the study. Your name and school will be withheld and responses are completely confidential.

Please sign the brief form below. If you have any questions regarding any aspect of this study, please feel free to contact me Adam Sempek at (402) 672-1649, or adamsempek@hotmail.com.

The study has been approved by the University of Nebraska Omaha/University of Nebraska Medical Center Institutional Review Board.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Adam N. Sempek, Ed.S., NCSP
EDAD Graduate Student
Phone: 402-672-1649
adamsempek@hotmail.com

Signature _____

Section A:

Please read each statement and place a check in the box that best describes your opinion.

Strongly
Disagree

Disagree

Agree

Strongly
Agree

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The Inclusion of ESL students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes creates a positive educational atmosphere.				
2. The Inclusion of students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes benefits all students.				
3. ESL students should not be included in general education classes until they attain a minimum level of English proficiency.				
4. ESL students should avoid using their native language while at school.				
5. ESL students should be able to acquire English within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools.				
6. Mainstream/Subject area teachers do not have enough time to deal with the needs of ESL students.				
7. It is a good practice to simplify coursework for ESL students.				
8. It is a good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ESL students.				
9. It is a good practice to allow ESL students more time to complete coursework.				
10. Teachers should not give ESL students a failing grade if the students display effort.				
11. Teachers should not modify				

assignments for the ESL students enrolled in mainstream/subject area classes.				
12. The modification of coursework for ESL students would be difficult to justify to the other students.				
13. I have adequate training to work with ESL students.				
14. I am interesting in receiving more training in working with ESL students.				
15. I would welcome the Inclusion of ESL students in any class.				
16. I would support the legislation making English the official language of the United States.				

1. Have you ever had an ESL student enrolled in your classes? Yes No (If no, please skip to section C.)
2. How many ESL students were enrolled in your classes during this (2012-2013) school year? _____
3. Approximately how many ESL students have enrolled in your classes throughout your teaching career? _____

Continued On The Next Page

Section B:

Which, if any, of the following are descriptive of your classes when ESL students are enrolled?

Please indicate the extent to which each of the following apply in your classes.

Classroom Practices	Seldom Or never	Some of the time	Most or all of the time
1. I allow ESL students more time to complete their coursework.			
2. I give ESL students less coursework than other students.			
3. I allow an ESL student to use his/her native language in my class.			
4. I provide materials for ESL students in their native language.			
5. Effort is more important to me than achievement when I grade ESL students.			

Impact of Inclusion

6. The Inclusion of ESL students in my classes increases my workload.			
7. ESL students require more of my time than other students require.			
8. The Inclusion of ESL students in my class slows the progress of the entire class.			

Teacher Support

9. I receive adequate support from school administration when ESL students are enrolled in my classes.			
10. I receive adequate support from the ESL staff when ESL students are enrolled in my classes.			
11. I conference with the ESL teacher.			

Continued On The Next Page

Section C:

1. Please list what you consider to be the greatest benefits of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes:

2. Please list what you consider to be the greatest challenges of including ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes:

Continued On The Next Page

Section D:

Please answer the following questions. Your answers will assist in the categorization of the responses.

1. Please indicate which grade level you teach.

Elementary Middle School High School

2. What grade/subject area(s) do you teach? (if more than one, please list your primary first. If you teach Elementary just put the grade you teach)

3. How many years have you been a private or public school teacher (including this year)?

4. Please indicate your gender. Male Female

Yes No

5. Is English your native language?

6. Do you speak a second language?

7. Indicate which ESL teaching model your school employs.

Dual Language Sheltered Instruction English Only Pull-Out

Other

If other please indicate the type of model used in your school. _____

8. Have you ever received training in teaching language-minority/ESL students?

If yes, please describe the type of training (i.e., inservice workshop, college coursework)

Comments: Please write any additional comments you may have concerning the

Inclusion of ESL students in mainstream/subject area classes on the back of this page.

Thank you for completing this survey.

Appendix C

Breakdown of Survey Questions across the Four Domains

Inclusion:

1. The Inclusion of ESL students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes creates a positive educational atmosphere.
2. The Inclusion of students in the mainstream classroom/subject area classes benefits all students.
3. ESL students should not be included in general education classes until they attain a minimum level of English proficiency.
6. Mainstream/Subject area teachers do not have enough time to deal with the needs of ESL students.
15. I would welcome the Inclusion of ESL students in any class.

Coursework Modifications:

7. It is a good practice to simplify coursework for ESL students.
8. It is a good practice to lessen the quantity of coursework for ESL students.
9. It is a good practice to allow ESL students more time to complete coursework.
10. Teachers should not give ESL students a failing grade if the students display effort.

11. Teachers should not modify assignments for the
ESL students enrolled in mainstream/subject area classes.
12. The modification of coursework for ESL students would be difficult to justify to the other
students.

Professional Development:

13. I have adequate training to work with ESL students.
14. I am interesting in receiving more training in working with ESL students.

Language and Language Learning:

4. ESL students should avoid using their native
language while at school.
5. ESL students should be able to acquire English
within two years of enrolling in U.S. schools.
16. I would support the legislation making English the official language of the United States.

Appendix D

Dr. Reeves,

Dr. (name) spoke to you a while ago about my interest in examining teachers attitudes towards including English language learners in the mainstream classroom. I have begun initial work on a dissertation concerning this topic and I would like to ask you if I would be able to utilize the survey from the below mentioned article as part of my research. Reeves, J. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English language learners in mainstream classrooms. The Journal of Educational Research, 99, 131-142. I would greatly appreciate your knowledge and help.

Thank you very much.

Adam Sempek

Hi Adam,

Yes, you're welcome to use my survey for your own research. Please cite my research where appropriate. And, I look forward to hearing what you find out!

Best of luck! Jenelle

Appendix E

Superintendent District A

My name is Adam Sempek and I am a school psychologist for ESU 2 who is working on his Doctorate in Education. For my dissertation I am examining mainstream classroom teachers attitudes towards the education of English Language Learners in the mainstream classroom (i.e., Coursework Modification, Professional Development needed to educate ELL students, and Language Acquisition). The survey is voluntary and anonymous. I was hoping to hand out the surveys at in-services prior to school starting or maybe during the year ,so I was emailing all of you to find out when you might have in-services, or if there was a time to bring the surveys down, or if you think mailing you surveys would be best. I would rather be there in person.

Please let me know.

Thank you for your help on this project thus far.

Adam N. Sempek, Ed.S., NCSP

From District A

August (day) would work to hand them out. Just let me know what would work for you.

Superintendent District A

Appendix F

To the Curriculum Director of District B

My name is Adam Sempek and I am a school psychologist for ESU 2 who is working on his Doctorate in Education. For my dissertation I am examining mainstream classroom teachers attitudes towards the education of English Language Learners in the mainstream classroom (i.e., Coursework Modification, Professional Development needed to educate ELL students, and Language Acquisition). The survey is voluntary and anonymous.

I have corresponded with (name) and the principals in (district b) and (name) said you were the person to contact as far as when inservices would be for the schools. I was hoping to hand out surveys in person at an inservice if it was possible with my schedule, otherwise I was hoping that someone could pass out the surveys during an inservice if I cannot make it down.

Would you mind letting me know the date of the first inservice for (district b)?

Thank you

Adam N. Sempek, Ed.S., NCSP

From District B

Hi Adam,

Would the morning of August (day) work? We'll have district wide in services that morning.

Let me know.

Curriculum Director District B