English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for English learners

by

Silvina Aznar-Mojica

B.S., New York University, 1990
M.A., New York University, 1995

AN ABSTRACT OF A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2020

Abstract

Teachers are expected to meet academic, linguistic and cultural needs of English learners (ELs) in general education classrooms. Teachers receive preparation for teaching ELs through pre-service coursework or in-service professional development. The Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy, Inc. (META) Consent Decree, in the state of Florida, requires elementary teachers to obtain an English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement to prepare with knowledge and skills to support ELs. The purpose of this study was to examine ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' self-reported knowledge and practices, and the relationship between knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs in general education classrooms. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was administered to eighty-three teachers from nine schools in a Florida public school district. Using a mixed methods approach, quantitative findings revealed teachers reported they were sufficiently knowledgeable about all, excepting one, of the principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching. Similarly, teachers reported they regularly practiced all, excepting one, of the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies. A positive statistical relationship was evidenced between teachers' knowledge and practice, excepting knowledge about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable to learn and grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning. Findings revealed areas of knowledge and practice that could benefit from enhancement, mainly using ELs native language as a resource in teaching and learning. Qualitative findings revealed ESOL endorsed teachers were culturally sensitive, valued linguistic diversity, scaffolded instruction, and applied strategies for second language acquisition to provide ELs access to learning.

Keywords: English learners, culturally and linguistically responsive, ESOL endorsed teachers.

English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for English learners

by

Silvina Aznar-Mojica

B.S., New York University, 1990
M.S., New York University, 1995

A DISSERTATION

submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

2020

Approved by:

Major Professor
Socorro G. Herrera

Copyright

Abstract

Teachers are expected to meet academic, linguistic and cultural needs of English learners (ELs) in general education classrooms. Teachers receive preparation for teaching ELs through pre-service coursework or in-service professional development. The Multicultural Education, Training, and Advocacy, Inc. (META) Consent Decree, in the state of Florida, requires elementary teachers to obtain an English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) endorsement to prepare with knowledge and skills to support ELs. The purpose of this study was to examine ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' self-reported knowledge and practices, and the relationship between knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs in general education classrooms. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was administered to eighty-three teachers from nine schools in a Florida public school district. Using a mixed methods approach, quantitative findings revealed teachers reported they were sufficiently knowledgeable about all, excepting one, of the principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching. Similarly, teachers reported they regularly practiced all, excepting one, of the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies. A positive statistical relationship was evidenced between teachers' knowledge and practice, excepting knowledge about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable to learn and grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning. Findings revealed areas of knowledge and practice that could benefit from enhancement, mainly using ELs native language as a resource in teaching and learning. Qualitative findings revealed ESOL endorsed teachers were culturally sensitive, valued linguistic diversity, scaffolded instruction, and applied strategies for second language acquisition to provide ELs access to learning.

Keywords: English learners, culturally and linguistically responsive, ESOL endorsed teachers.

Table of Contents

List of Figures x
List of Tables xi
Acknowledgements xii
Dedication xiv
Preface xv
Chapter 1 - Introduction 1
Overview of the Issues 3
The Florida Context 6
Statement of the Problem 9
Research Questions 11
Significance of the Study 11
Methodology 12
Research Design 12
Population 13
Instrumentation 13
Procedures 15
Data Analysis 16
Definition of Terms 18
Chapter 2 - Review of the Literature 23
Theoretical Framework 23
Theoretical Foundations of Effective Pedagogy 24
CREDE Standards for Effective Pedagogy and Learning. 25
Theoretical Foundations of Culturally Responsive Instruction 29
Theoretical Foundations of Linguistically Responsive Instruction 31
Framework for Linguistically Responsive Teaching. 32
Orientations of Linguistically Responsive Teachers. 33
Knowledge and Skills of Linguistically Responsive Teachers 36
Review of Empirical Literature 41
Preparation of Preservice Teachers of ELs 42

Development of In-service Teachers of ELs 44
Summary of Empirical Literature 49
Chapter 3 - Methodology 52
Research Questions 52
Method 53
Research Design 53
Participants 55
Procedures 57
Data Collection 59
Survey 60
Data Analysis 65
Quantitative Data Analysis 65
Qualitative Data Analysis 67
Researcher's Role and Subjectivities 68
Limitations of the Study 70
Summary 71
Chapter 4 - Analysis of Data 73
Data Analysis 73
Participant Background Characteristics 73
Participants' Teaching Experience. 74
Grade, Subjects, and Number of ELs Taught by Participants. 74
Participants' College Preparation and Path to ESOL Endorsement. 78
Participants' Primary Language, Other Languages, and Cross Cultural Experience. 81
Summary of Participants' Background Characteristics 84
Research Questions One 85
Quantitative Data. 85
Qualitative Data. 93
Research Question Two 96
Quantitative Data. 97
Qualitative Data. 106
Research Question Three 108

Quantitative Data. 109
Pair 1: Using ELs' Home Language in Teaching 109
Pair 2: Using ELs' Home Language in Teaching 111
Pair 3: Using Cultural Backgrounds as Resource in Teaching 112
Pair 4: Fostering Successful Interaction with English-dominant Peers 113
Pair 5: Building on ELs' Background Knowledge. 115
Pair 6: Making ELs' Comfortable to Facilitate Learning. 117
Pair 7: Making ELs Comfortable to Facilitate Learning 118
Pair 8: Addressing Language Objectives 119
Pair 9: Teaching Content Area Vocabulary. 121
Pair 10: Addressing Content Area Grammar. 122
Pair 11: Modifying Teacher Speech. 124
Pair 12: Modifying Teacher Speech. 125
Pair 13: Lowering the Language Difficulty of Instruction 126
Qualitative Data. 130
Summary 134
Chapter 5 - Findings, Discussion, and Implications 135
Summary of the Study 135
Findings and Discussion 137
Research Question One 137
Research Question Two 142
Research Question Three 146
Implications 149
Implications for ESOL Endorsement Teacher Preparation 149
Implications for ESOL Endorsed Teachers' Practice 151
Implications for School and District Administrators 153
Limitations of the Study 153
Recommendations for Future Research 154
Conclusions 155
References 159
Appendix A - Letters Soliciting Participation and Approval 189

Appendix B - Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers 193
Appendix C - Informed Consent Letter 197
Appendix D- Kansas State University IRB Approval 198

List of Figures

Figure 1. Framework for Linguistically Responsive Teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2011) 33
Figure 2. Themes Derived from Survey Item 43: Knowledge Participants Gained During ESOL Endorsement Preparation 96
Figure 3. Themes Derived from Survey Item 44: Effective Instructional Practices Participants Learned During ESOL Endorsement Preparation..... 108
Figure 4. Themes Derived from Survey Item 45: Participants' Experiences Teaching ELs 133

List of Tables

Table 1. 59
Table 2. 74
Table 3. 75
Table 4. 75
Table 5. 76
Table 6. 77
Table 7. 77
Table 8. 78
Table 9. 78
Table 10. 79
Table 11. 80
Table 12. 80
Table 13. 81
Table 14. 82
Table 15. 82
Table 16. 83
Table 17. 83
Table 18. 85
Table 19. 92
Table 20. 93
Table 21. 104
Table 22. 105
Table 23. 128
Table 24. 129

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank God for giving me the strength, knowledge, ability, and opportunity to undertake this study and to persevere and complete it satisfactorily. Without His blessings, this achievement would not have been possible.

In my journey towards this degree, I have found a teacher, a friend, an inspiration, a role model, and a pillar of support in my Guide, Dr. Socorro G. Herrera. Without her patience and able guidance, this dissertation would not have been possible, and I shall eternally be grateful to her for her assistance.

I have great pleasure in acknowledging my gratitude to my committee members, Dr. Alisa Garni, Dr. Della Perez, and Dr. Suzanne Porath. Their support, encouragement and insightful ideas have been great contributors in the completion of the dissertation. I am so blessed to have had this brilliant cadre of women on my committee.

I would also like to express my gratitude to my dear friends Dr. Valerie Mann-Grosso and Dr. Amy Davis, who lit the path before me. Thank you for sharing your knowledge, and most of all for being there at times when I required motivation and for helping me stay on course.

I take pride in acknowledging all the friends who have encouraged me and assisted me as per their abilities, in whatever manner possible throughout this journey.

My acknowledgement would be incomplete without thanking the biggest source of my strength, my family. The love and care of my mother Noemi Ferreyra and my children Arielle and Noah, have all made a tremendous contribution in helping me reach this goal in my life. They had faith that I could accomplish this, even when I doubted myself, and allowed me the time to pursue my dream of obtaining this degree. This would not have been possible without their unselfish love

and support. I would also like to acknowledge the blessings of my late stepfather, Peter Pereyra, who celebrated my academic endeavors since I was a child.

It would be inappropriate if I omit to mention the assistance of administrators who permitted the study to take place at the school sites, and the teachers who took time from their busy lives to take part in this research. I am forever grateful to them.

Dedication

This work is lovingly dedicated to my mother, Noemi Ferreyra, who always instilled in me the importance of education.

Esta disertación se la dedico con cariño a mi madre, Noemi Ferreyra, quien siempre me inculcó la importancia de la educación.

Preface

"The researcher's positionality affects all aspects of the research process—from the articulation of a research question to the analysis and presentation of the data" (McCorkel & Myers, 2003, p. 199). This statement applies to this research in that my positionality shaped the structure and the substance of the study. Many factors related to my experience as a student and an educator led me to conduct this research. Upon the completion of this work, I had the realization that research is like a "Cinderella slipper". This research fits me perfectly because somehow it encompasses all my personal and professional understandings. Principally, I was an English learner as a child. At the age of ten, I arrived to the United States without speaking any English, and my schooling experience was like that of many English learners today. My teachers did not have any training on how to teach English learners. Moreover, they did not speak a language other than English, which meant I learned English and academic content through the "sink or swim approach." Metaphorically speaking, I was thrown into the educational pool and told to swim (learn) with native English-speaking students who had been taking years of swim classes, and I had not. Growing up in New York City, the microcosm of the world, I developed an interest in languages and cultures. I studied political science and Latin American studies in college and became conscious about the rich history as well as the plight Latin Americans. Upon graduation, I became a bilingual Spanish teacher at the height of the support of bilingualism in our public schools. The joy of teaching children like me propelled a career which has spanned 27 years. In that interim, I have had opportunities to work as ESOL teacher K-university, Spanish teacher K-university, director of a dual language school, professional developer of teachers of English learners, and instructional coach. All these experiences have shaped my perspective about the importance of multilingualism, what English learners need in their education, and what teachers

of English learners should know and implement in the instruction of English learnrrs. These components of my identity have certainly influenced this research. In the process of writing this dissertation I continued to make sense of the subtle and complex assumptions I make of my experiences in the field of education, in my life as a bilingual and bicultural person, and in the relationship between myself and the participants and the focus of the study. I was aware of my specific lens throughout this research process, and I strived to contribute to the field from a place of integrity.

Chapter 1 - Introduction

In the current era, immigration has become a regular topic of conversation in discourse and debates, touching a range of public policy areas - including education. The lion's share of the newest American immigrants does not speak English as a native language. The term EL refers to an individual who, due to any of the reasons listed below, has sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to be denied the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms where the language of instruction is English or to participate fully in the larger U.S. society. Such an individual (1) was not born in the United States or has a native language other than English; (2) comes from environments where a language other than English is dominant; or (3) is an American Indian or Alaska Native and comes from environments where a language other than English has had a significant impact on the individual's level of English language proficiency (Education Commission of the States, 2014b). ELs constitute 4.9 million students or 9.6 percent of public school students in the United States (McFarland, Hussar, Zhang, Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, Diliberti, Forrest Cataldi, Bullock Mann, & Barmer, 2019), thus representing one in ten of the student population.

Throughout U. S. history educational language policies have shifted over time based largely on prevailing attitudes toward immigration and linguistic diversity (Rumbaut, Massey, & Bean, 2006). Language policies have alternated from allowing languages other than English to be used in schools, to providing bilingual education, to eliminating languages other than English in most schools. Starting in the late 1970s, ELs were largely separated from native English speakers with their own sheltered classrooms that prioritized English instruction. They were typically placed in bilingual and English as a second language (ESL) programs. They were taught by teachers who were specifically prepared to teach students from linguistically diverse backgrounds.

In recent decades, there have been changes in federal policies and an increase of 1.1 million ELs from 2000 to 2016 (McFarland, J., et al., 2019). In the early 2000s, schools began to place ELs in linguistically diverse classrooms where they received integrated academic instruction alongside native English speakers. Today, more than 76% of urban and rural public schools throughout the United States serve ELs in linguistically diverse classrooms (Taie & Goldring, 2017). This practice has consequently created an increasing demand for teachers prepared to teach the growing segment of ELs.

Effective instruction is a topic of concern for many educators working with ELs who are both culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) learners. English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) preparation programs are attempting to catch up with the demographic trends surrounding ELs by availing teachers ESOL preparation. Some states require all elementary teachers to complete specific course work (Arizona, California, Florida, Pennsylvania, and New York) (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008), others make a general reference to the special needs of ELs (17 states), and several states (15 states) have no requirement for general education elementary teachers whatsoever (Education Commission of the States, 2014a; Samson & Collins, 2012). Through ESOL endorsement courses educators are exposed to the pedagogical knowledge and complementary instructional practices needed to teach ELs in diverse classrooms.

In response to the challenges posed by the growing EL population, culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy has been developed (Banks & Banks, 2007; Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lucas & Villegas, 2013). Culturally responsive pedagogy is partly a collection of teaching practices that reflect and connect closely with learners' cultures to enhance the academic success of students who are culturally different in general classroom settings (Gay, 2010; Ladson-Billings, 1994, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). It integrates well with linguistically

responsive teaching, a direct effort to support ELs through educating preservice and in-service teachers regarding theory and application of second language learning principles (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008). This approach has been found to benefit ELs (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, 2013) as it reconciles theory-to-practice that may serve educators working with ELs in culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms.

Current ESOL endorsement preparation focuses on instruction for ELs from the perspectives of both culture and language. ESOL endorsement preparation exposes teachers to the same foundational principles that form culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. After completing ESOL endorsement preparation, ESOL endorsed teachers should possess the knowledge and skills needed to meet the needs ELs. This study seeks to understand ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs and the implementation of this knowledge in their instructional practice.

Overview of the Issues

This section provides an overview of the issues related to education of ELs and teacher preparation to work with ELs. From 2009 to 2015, the percentage of ELs in K-12 public schools increased in more than half of the states, with increases of over 40% in five states (U.S. Department of Education, 2018b). From 2000 to 2014, the growth of the EL population was greatest in Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee, North Carolina and South Carolina. The state with the most ELs is California with 29% of all ELs nationwide, followed by Texas with 18%, then Florida with five percent and New York with four percent (Migration Policy Institute, 2015). Approximately five million school-aged children are identified as ELs (U.S. Department of Education, 2018b), and their numbers are steadily increasing. These demographics point out that

across the country, and especially in states with large numbers of ELs, teachers can expect to have ELs in their classroom.

In the past decade, school districts throughout the United States have been challenged to improve the academic outcomes of ELs and reduce the achievement gap between ELs and their English-proficient peers. Schools may utilize a variety of instructional models and programs to meet the diverse needs of ELs. Currently, English-only instruction is the default approach to EL instruction in most states (Sugarman, 2018). In English-only models, English is the language of instruction for all subject areas. ELs taught in English-only settings are placed in general education classrooms composed of ELs and fluent English-speakers. In the English-only instructional model, grade level teachers are charged to provide language and content instruction in a manner that allows ELs to access the curriculum equitably. ELs "require instructional support in order to fully access academic content in their classes" (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008, p. 6) as well as instructional support to develop proficiency in the English language. Given the prevalence of such programs, there is an increased awareness about the preparation of teachers for supporting the academic achievement of ELs.

School districts have an obligation to provide the personnel necessary to effectively implement their chosen EL programs. This responsibility includes having highly qualified teachers to meet the academic and linguistic needs of ELs. At a minimum, every school district must ensure that teachers who work with ELs have mastered the skills necessary to effectively teach in the district's program for ELs. In *Castañeda v. Pickard* (1981), the court set forth standards for the education of ELs. To meet the Castañeda standards, school districts are responsible for ensuring that there is an adequate number of teachers to instruct ELs. In addition, these teachers must master the skills necessary to effectively teach in the district's program for ELs. Lastly, school districts

must evaluate whether their training adequately prepares teachers to implement the EL program effectively. Many policies require schools to prepare teachers to meet the needs of ELs in their classrooms, yet these teachers are often underprepared to meet the needs of ELs in their classrooms, (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008; Reeves, 2006; Rodriguez, Manner, & Darcy, 2010). Thus, ELs continue to receive instruction from educators who do not have sufficient knowledge to practice effective pedagogy for culturally and linguistically diverse students in general education classrooms.

Despite legislative endeavors to support ELs' academic progress and growth towards language proficiency, ELs' perform significantly below their English proficient peers in reading and math. Proficiency in core academic subjects such as reading and math is a key indicator that students are learning what is expected at their grade level. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the largest continuing and nationally representative measure of academic achievement of U. S. elementary and secondary students in select subjects. Evidence from The Nation's Report Card (2017) shows many ELs are not performing academically at grade level on NAEP. In 2017, while 40% of English dominant students were proficient in math in grade 4, just 14% of ELs attained this level. Similarly, 37% of English dominant students scored proficient in reading in grade 4, yet only 9% of ELs attained this level. There was a small increase in the percentage of ELs reaching proficiency in grade 4 mathematics and reading between 2009 and 2017. At the national level, EL scores rose by 2 percentage points in grade 4 mathematics and 3 percentage points in grade 4 in reading (NCES, 2017c, 2017d). Overall, for each subject assessed by NAEP, ELs at the elementary level were far behind the proficiency rate for English dominant peers.

The lower academic performance of ELs compared to their English proficient peers draws attention to the level of knowledge and practices of teachers who educate ELs. ELs require an understanding on part of their teachers of how to effectively address their language, literacy, and core content needs. Engaging ELs in cognitively demanding work is supported by drawing on the many resources and funds of knowledge that ELs bring to the classroom (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 1992). Therefore, teachers of ELs must have the capacity to recognize and build upon their students' assets (Herrera, 2016). The capacity and understanding needed to teach ELs requires knowledge of teaching and learning of CLD students.

The Florida Context

The state of Florida exhibits patterns regarding the demographics and education of ELs that are of particular interest to this study; it is a "strategic case study" (Merton, 1987). It resembles the national scenario with a growing population of ELs and the educational programs to serve these students. However, Florida has a higher than average number of ELs, ranking third in number of ELs with 288,921 identified students in 2015-16, constituting 10.3% of total student enrollment (Migration Policy Institute, 2015). Florida offers instruction to ELs through both English-only programs and bilingual programs, but the inclusion model of instruction is prevalent in Florida schools. In this setting, elementary teachers provide ELs with instruction of English language arts and core/basic subject areas in English.

Unlike most states, Florida has formal training requirements for elementary general education teachers of ELs. The components of Florida's state requirements are a result of the 1990 *League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) et al. v. the State Board of Education (SBE) Consent Decree* (FLDOE, 1990) and the 2003 *Modification of the Consent Decree* (FLDOE, 2003). Florida elementary general education teachers who are responsible for the English/language

arts instruction of ELs are required to have ESOL endorsement or ESOL K-12 certification in addition to subject area certification. The former, an ESOL endorsement, requires a bachelor's or higher degree with certification in another subject and 15 semester hours or 300 in-service points. ESOL in-service or coursework must include the following: Methods of Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages, ESOL Curriculum and Materials Development, Cross-cultural Communication and Understanding, Testing and Evaluation of ESOL, and Applied Linguistics. The latter, an ESOL K-12 certification, requires subject area coverage, a passing score on ESOL subject area test, and 120 hours/points in ESOL or bachelor's or master's degree in TESOL and subject area coverage. As per the Consent Decree (1990), elementary teachers in Florida are required to obtain ESOL endorsement met through in-service professional development or state-approved teacher education programs at a college or university. The Florida Department of Education allows beginning or experienced teachers six years for completion of ESOL endorsement. Per Florida Department of Education administrative code 6A-1.0503, "A teacher out of field in ESOL shall complete at least three (3) semester hours of college credit or the equivalent in-service toward the ESOL requirements within the first two (2) calendar years from date of initial assignment to a class with limited English proficient (LEP) students and three (3) semester hours or the equivalent in-service during each calendar year thereafter until all requirements for certification in ESOL are completed" (Florida Department of State, 2018).

Florida's formal guidelines requiring elementary teachers to hold an ESOL endorsement have resulted in a significant number of teachers who receive preparation to teach ELs. As a result of Florida's formal training guidelines for teachers of ELs, Florida ranks second nationwide with 49,667 teachers currently holding ESOL credentials (U. S. Department of Education, 2017). Through ESOL endorsement preparation, Florida teachers receive training intended to increase

English proficiency and academic achievement of ELs. In addition, Florida school districts offer continuing professional development to its 176,537 teachers (Public education in Florida, 2013) to enhance their skills and knowledge to support ELs in their classrooms. In 2016, a total of 19,083 teachers and school professionals participated in professional development activities provided by school districts related to the teaching and learning of ELs (U. S. Department of Education, 2017). Professional development topics included: instructional strategies for ELs, understanding and implementation of assessment of ELs, students, understanding and implementation of English language proficiency (ELP) standards and academic content standards for ELs, alignment of the curriculum in language instruction educational programs to ELP standards, and subject matter knowledge for teachers.

Although most elementary teachers of ELs in Florida possess the ESOL credentials required by the state, ELs are not making sufficient gains in mastery of academic content. Since 2009, the state-level data reveals a decrease of 3.1% in EL proficiency rates in mathematics and 6.8% in reading (U. S. Department of Education, 2018a). Furthermore, an achievement gap exists between ELs and their English dominant classmates. In example, on the 2017 NAEP. only seven percent of fourth-grade ELs scored at or above proficiency in reading compared to 44% of English dominant classmates. Similarly, only 16% percent of fourth grade ELs scored proficient in mathematics compared with 50% of English dominant students (NCES, 2017a, 2017b).

The data which appear in the Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) report (FLDOE, 2018) show that while 56% of all students in grades 3-5 achieved at or above grade level (level 3) on the English Language Arts assessment, only 23% of ELs scored on grade level in 2018. Moreover, 46% of ELs scored a non-passing score (level 1). The same report shows that 62% of all students in grades 3-5 achieved at or above grade level on the mathematics assessment, while only 37% of

ELs did. Moreover, 39% of ELs scored a level 1 on the math assessment. The percentage of ELs scoring at level 3 has slightly increased from 19% to 23% in ELA and 29% to 37% since 2015. In Florida, the achievement gap between ELs and English proficient peers is still prevalent, thus resembling the national scenario.

The information above shows the state of Florida did not reach the academic benchmarks set for ELs in demonstration of proficiency on state content tests in reading and math. Unlike in other states, most Florida elementary teachers who instruct ELs are ESOL endorsed. Yet, ELs continue to perform poorly in academics. This scenario signals an urgency to examine teachers' knowledge and practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs.

Statement of the Problem

The problem studied was ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs and the possible relationship between their knowledge and instructional practices. Teachers' knowledge and practices for teaching ELs has profound implications for the academic outcomes of these students. Studies about non-ESOL endorsed teachers of ELs suggest that without ESOL preparation, teachers may have negative perceptions of ELs and use inappropriate accommodations to teach them due to their lack of knowledge in EL education (Guler, 2018). Educators, often already involved in meeting core expectations, found themselves with no theoretical or practical background for teaching ELs (Hutchinson, 2013). Even after undergoing preparation for teaching ELs through their teacher education programs, most teachers perceived that they were not prepared (Corell, 2016). Coady, de Jong, & Harper (2016) found that teacher graduates of a teacher preparation program that included second language training, used some generic accommodation and scaffolding techniques in teaching ELs, yet rarely implemented specific practices to foster their English language

development. In some cases, (Durgunoglu & Hughes, 2010) preservice teachers demonstrated a sense of preparedness by means of the performance on an ESOL related knowledge test, but classroom observations indicated that they were not well prepared to teach ELs. These studies seem to point to the lack of preparation, knowledge, and effective practice of general education teachers of ELs.

Unlike in other states, where teachers may be lacking opportunities to prepare to work with ELs, Florida has implemented an ESOL professional development mandate, specified as part of a federal court order resulting from a lawsuit filed against the Florida Department of Education. Since 1990, Florida Department of Education has required teachers to prepare to work effectively with ELs. Elementary teachers in classrooms with ELs must earn an ESOL endorsement equivalent to 300 hours of in-service work (or five graduate-level university courses). They receive training on the knowledge and skills that teachers ought to possess to meet the educational needs of those who are learning English in their classroom (Lucas, 2011). Despite preparation to understand the linguistic and cultural influences on learning of ELs (Lee, Deaktor, Enders, & Lambert, 2008) and obtaining ESOL endorsement, Florida teachers have not been able to promote ELs' English language literacy and academic achievement in content areas at the level of English-dominant students. The performance of ELs in Florida indicates that there are wide achievement disparities between ELs and English-proficient peers.

Although most Florida elementary educators who teach ELs have ESOL training and endorsement, ELs still lag behind their grade-level peers in academic achievement. These gaps signal a need to address teachers' knowledge and practices in meeting ELs' language, literacy, and core content needs. The focus of the study was to examine the knowledge ESOL endorsed teachers claim to possess about teaching ELs and if they claim to implement that knowledge into practice.

Research Questions

The purpose of this research was to gain an understanding of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. The study addressed the following research questions:

1. To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?
2. To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?
3. To what extent is there a relationship between ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

Significance of the Study

The research is significant because it contributes valuable insight to the field of ESOL. The growing number of ELs in public schools in the United States and the shift towards including ELs in classrooms have increased the need for teachers to provide effective academic content and English language development instruction. To this end, states such as Florida, have formal guidelines for teachers of ELs to obtain ESOL endorsement credentials, where they learn foundations and best practices for teaching ELs. A policy of full-time placement of ELs in general education classrooms has been officially endorsed by the Florida Department of Education since the 1990's (MacDonald, 2004; Platt, 2007). The encouragement of inclusion, the full-time placement of ELs in general education classes, led to the predominance of the inclusion model for ESOL through language arts instruction (de Jong, Naranjo, Li, & Ouzia, 2018). This programmatic

trend has resulted in general education ESOL endorsed teachers being accountable for integrating content and language instruction for ELs.

Although they are trained to teach ELs, Florida's ESOL endorsed teachers have not been able to promote ELs' English language literacy and academic achievement in content areas at grade level. Within the substantial and growing body of research on the professional knowledge and skills of teachers of ELs, not much of the research centers on ESOL endorsed teachers. This study fills a gap in the literature by exclusively addressing ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs in diverse elementary classrooms. The findings may provide teacher educators with a better understanding of what ESOL endorsed teachers know, what they practice, and if knowledge translates into instructional practices for the academic and language development of ELs. This study may avail "practical and useful knowledge for action" (Patton, 2002, p. 78) among teacher educators who plan ESOL content in teacher education programs. In addition, the results of this study may offer ESOL endorsed teachers' insights about ways they can use culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for instructing ELs. Although the findings of this study refer to ESOL endorsed teachers in Florida, they may also highlight relevant issues that have implications for the preparation of teachers of ELs and the education of ELs beyond the Florida context. These findings may improve the instruction of ELs in today's prevalent culturally and linguistically diverse classrooms.

Methodology

Research Design

For this study, a mixed methods research approach was conducted to examine the knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers with regards to culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs. Denzen (1978) defines the mixed methods approach as

"the combination of methodologies in the study of the same phenomenon" (p. 291). Analyzing a study from multiple viewpoints allows for greater accuracy which captures a more complete portrayal of the phenomenon under investigation (Jick, 1979). Although this study was quantitative-dominant, it also confidentially gathered qualitative data through a survey instrument. The rationale for using mixed methods design was to obtain a better understanding of the research problem than using only one approach.

Population

The population of this study consisted of in-service elementary teachers who have an ESOL endorsement in the state of Florida. A sample size of 90 teachers was determined appropriate for this study based on approximately a total population of 1,315 ESOL endorsed elementary teachers in the school district. The potential participants currently teach at one of nine selected elementary schools in a school district in the state of Florida, United States.

Instrumentation

The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B) was used to gather data needed to investigate the knowledge and practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy of ESOL endorsed teachers. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B) is a quantitative and qualitative survey used to meet the research questions of this study. Surveys must be tailored to a target population in order to produce "accurate information that reflects the views and experiences of a given population" (Dillman, Smyth, & Christian, 2009, p. 16). Quantitative and qualitative data was collected via the forty-five questions included in the survey, with item 1 requesting participant consent to participate.

Project DELTA Survey of Elementary Teacher Preparation Program Graduates and DELTA Observation Protocol (Project DELTA, 2014) served as the foundation for the Survey of

ESOL Endorsed Teachers. Project DELTA instruments were designed by staff at the University of Florida to study ESOL endorsed graduates' preparedness for and efficacy in working with ELs in general education classrooms. The development of Project DELTA instruments involved a rigorous process to maximize its content validity. Project DELTA faculty reviewed and revised multiple drafts, consulted national professional standards documents, piloted the instruments, obtained feedback from experts in the field, and incorporated their recommendations in the finalized instruments. With permission from Project DELTA creators, the researcher of this study designed The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers, which contains specific items from Project DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol (Project DELTA, 2014) related to cultural and linguistically responsive teaching to inquire about participants' knowledge and practice.

Project DELTA Survey items were selected to create Part I of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers. Part I of the survey elicited teacher background characteristics as well as school and student demographics through eighteen open-ended, yes/no, and multiple choice questions. Teachers' personal variables were analyzed to add to the understanding of their knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Part II of the survey consisted of ten statements of ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. Project DELTA Survey items were extrapolated for this part because they encompassed the social, cultural and linguistic conceptual domains that aligned with the theoretical framework of this study. This section of the survey gathered quantitative data related to teachers' knowledge of key principles for teaching ELs. The data was analyzed to answer Research Question One asking teachers to report on their knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs.

Project DELTA Observation Protocol (Project DELTA, 2014) was chosen as the basis for Part III of Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers because it addressed the concepts, pedagogy, and attitudes associated with effective teaching of ELs in the professional literature. It presented indicators of behavior that demonstrate effective teaching of ELs. This portion of the survey provided data to answer Research Question Two inquiring about ESOL endorsed teachers self-report on their culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices for teaching ELs.

Parts II and III of the survey presented quantitative data via numerical value Likert–type scale. Data obtained from Parts II and Part III were used to answer Research Question Three regarding the relationship between ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practice. The data was used to draw correlations between teachers' knowledge and practice.

Finally, qualitative data was collected from open-ended questions on Part IV of survey. The three questions on the last part of the survey gave participants the opportunity to present additional comments and to be able to share their views. Multifaceted tailored survey procedures suit "the many different survey populations and situations that arise in an effort to achieve optimal data quality" (Dillman et al., 2009, p. 400). Results from the qualitative data were analyzed for significance and incorporated into the research question responses.

Procedures

Permission from the IRB at Kansas State University, the Deputy Superintendent of the selected public school district, and the administrators of nine elementary schools in the school district were sought to conduct research on ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was provided to the respective representatives from each of these institutions. An Informed Consent Letter was delivered to school sites to be placed in teachers' mailboxes. The Informed Consent

Letter indicated the link and QR code to access the online survey. Teachers were asked for their participation in the study by completing the survey. Detailed procedures for instrumentation are discussed in the methodology chapter.

Data Analysis

The quantitative analyses of data were based upon the Likert scale ratings of Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers. The items address ESOL endorsed teacher knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. For survey items 2-42, quantitative data were obtained, and statistical analyses were calculated.

Descriptive statistics (frequency, mode, mean, median) were calculated and reported for the information elicited on teacher background. A descriptive statistic (in the count noun sense) is a summary statistic that quantitatively describes or summarizes features of a collection of information, while descriptive statistics (in the mass noun sense) is the process of using and analyzing those statistics (Mann, 1995). Additionally, multiple regression analyses were conducted with teacher background variables. Multiple linear regression is used to explain the relationship between one continuous dependent variable and two or more independent variables (Rubinfeld, 2011). These data were used in the analysis of association of teacher background variables and teachers' ratings of their levels of knowledge and practice.

To answer Research Question One, which addressed the extent to which ESOL endorsed elementary teachers self-reported their knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs, descriptive statistics were applied to the items on Part I of the survey. The frequency, mode, mean, and median were computed for responses to items 20-29 enabling the presentation of the data in a meaningful way. The analysis of the data was conducted to interpret the data in relation to the first research question.

For Research Question Two, addressing the extent to which ESOL endorsed elementary teachers self-reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs, descriptive statistics were applied to summarize the information for items 30-42 on the survey. Descriptive statistics were utilized for analysis of the data to describe the data and any emergent patterns that answer Research Question Two.

For Research Question Three, which probes about the relationship between ESOL endorsed teachers' self-reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs, survey items from Part II and Part III were analyzed. First, survey items 20-42 were analyzed with descriptive statistics (frequency, mode, median, and mean) to summarize the data. Then items 20 and 30, 20 and 31, 21 and 32, 22 and 33, 23 and 34, 24 and 35, 24 and 36, 25 and 37, 26 and 38, 27 and 39, 28 and 40, 28 and 41, and 29 and 42 were paired for statistical analysis using the correlation Pearson *r t*est (Table 24). The Pearson *r* was calculated to measure the relationship between teacher knowledge and practice. Pearson *r* is the appropriate correlation coefficient to use "when the data for both variables are expressed in terms of quantitative scores" (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012, p. 208).

Qualitative data were obtained from open-ended questions in Part IV of the survey. Questions 43-45 asked teachers to discuss their personal experiences learning about teaching ELs in their ESOL preparation, instructional practices they found to be effective for teaching ELs, and teaching ELs in general. The qualitative data were inductively chunked into small analytical units of meaning, then clustered into categories by identifying patterns and themes. Finally, the qualitative data were analyzed for importance and incorporated into the research question responses. Detailed procedures for data analysis are discussed in chapter three, the methodology chapter.

Definition of Terms

The following definition of terms is used to clarify terminology in this research.

1. Bilingual approach: Models under the bilingual approach incorporate students' native language into instruction—some models use native language to support and scaffold students' development of English, and then gradually phase it out; others pursue full bilingualism and biliteracy as program goals (Bahamonde & Friend, 1999).
2. Culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD): Holistic description of students from homes where English is not the primary language and who come from diverse social, cultural, and economic backgrounds. The term is used to recognize that the needs of diverse students include learning English as well as other facets of culture (González, Pagan, Wendell, & Love, 2011).
3. Culturally and linguistically diverse classroom: Grade-level general education classroom in which a heterogeneous group of students including ELs and native English speakers are placed (Enright, 2011). In this document, such classrooms are also referred to as general education, heterogeneous, and inclusive classrooms.
4. Culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy: "The validation and affirmation of the home culture and home language for the purposes of building and bridging the student to success in the culture of academia and mainstream society" (Hollie, 2012, p. 23).
5. Culturally responsive pedagogy: A pedagogy that recognizes the importance of including students' cultural references in all aspects of learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994).
6. English learner (EL): Refers to a student who has "sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language to deny him or her the opportunity to learn successfully in classrooms in which the language of instruction is English" (FLDOE, 2014,

p. 3) and “who requires instructional support in order to fully access academic content in their classes” (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008) as well as instructional support to develop proficiency in the English language and to develop an awareness of American cultural norms in order to enable him or her to fully participate in a democratic society.

7. ESL (English as a Second Language)/ ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) instruction: A program of instruction designed to support ELs (NCTE, 2017). The models under this approach focus on teaching and learning the English language in or for itself. The two most common configurations for this kind of instruction are self-contained ESL classes that take place during the school day and during pull-out sessions, wherein language specialists work with ELs during other class periods to provide intensive language instruction and support (Diaz-Rico & Weed, 2006).
8. ESOL certification: In Florida, refers to a qualification earned through the successful completion of a bachelor's or higher degree with an undergraduate or graduate major in ESOL (FLDOE, 2019) or by passing a state approved ESOL certification examination and 120 hours of in-service training or continuing education ESOL approved courses within a three-year period of the date of their receipt of ESOL certification (FLDOE, 2003). This certification allows a teacher to teach ELs language arts in K-12 settings.
9. ESOL endorsement: A rider (earned through the completion of mandated coursework) on a teaching certificate in another subject area that allows a teacher to be qualified to teach language arts to ELs in the certificate subject area, such as elementary education (FLDOE, 2011).

10. ESOL inclusion: ESOL program model in which ELs are placed in general education classrooms where instruction is in English and where teachers are expected to promote English language development along with content knowledge (Samson & Collins, 2012).
11. ESOL infusion: Preservice teacher education program model in which ESOL content is integrated into program curricula to address ESOL teacher performance standards (Ballantyne et al., 2008). In the Florida infusion model, public universities must also provide at least two stand-alone ESOL courses in addition to ESOL infused regular curriculum coursework (Coady, de Jong, & Harper, 2011).
12. ESOL strategies: Methods, strategies, and techniques that promote English language development of ELs. These include activities such as activating and building background knowledge; providing demonstrations, diagrams, and clear directions to make instruction comprehensible; providing cooperative learning opportunities that foster student interaction; and allowing extended time for students to respond (Echevarria & Graves, 2010).
13. In-service teacher: A certified teacher who is currently providing classroom instruction in a school. In this document, such teacher is also referred to as professional educator and practicing teacher (Lucas, Strom, Bratkovich & Wnuk, 2018).
14. Instructional practices: Specific classroom-level practices that teachers may apply to support students' learning and comprehension. They are both more detailed and narrower than models. For example, they may refer to specific techniques for structuring a lesson or developing a certain skill (Faulkner-Bond, Waring, Forte, Crenshaw, Tindle, & Belknap, 2012).

15. Limited English proficiency (LEP): Term employed by the U. S. Department of Education to refer to ELs who lack sufficient mastery of English to meet state standards and excel in an English-language classroom. Increasingly, English Learner (EL) is used to describe this population, because it highlights learning, rather than suggesting that non-native English-speaking students are deficient (NCTE, 2017).
16. Linguistically responsive teaching: Teaching to meet the needs of ELs by utilizing expertise that includes particular orientations related to linguistic diversity, knowledge about second language learning, and pedagogical skills related to ELs' learning (Lucas, Villegas, & Freedson-Gonzalez, 2008).
17. Model: A specific set of instructional services or a fully developed curriculum designed to help ELs acquire English proficiency and meet high academic standards. It comprises a set of characteristics, principles and practices that have been developed based on theory and research, and serves as a rough blueprint that classrooms, schools and districts may follow as an implementation guide (Faulkner-Bond et al., 2012).
18. Monolingual: Person who speaks only one language (Enright, 2011). In this document, such person is also referred to as English dominant or English proficient.
19. Preservice teacher: A student in a teacher education program, at a college or university, preparing for professional-level teaching positions (Coady et al., 2011). In this document, such teacher is also referred to as teacher candidate.
20. Scaffolding: Instruction in which teachers guide student learning by providing structures or frameworks that are gradually removed (Dutro & Kinsella, 2010; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2007).

21. Teacher education program: Undergraduate or graduate educational program at a college or university that prepares preservice teachers for initial teaching certification (Villegas et al., 2018).

Chapter 2 - Review of the Literature

This study investigated ESOL endorsed teachers' self-reported knowledge and self-reported practice of effective culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. The purpose of the study was to gain an understanding of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs and the application of this knowledge in their instructional practice. The intent of this research was to raise awareness about the professional needs of teachers who are educating ELs in general education classrooms.

The first part of this chapter explores the theoretical framework, beginning with an overview of The Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence (CREDE) effective pedagogy for CLD learners. This section also delves into theories of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching as they relate to the expertise of teachers of ELs and their impact on effective instruction of ELs. For purposes of organization and clarity, the second part of the chapter reviews the body of literature related to preparation of general education teachers of ELs, effective instructional practices for teaching ELs in the general education classroom, and teachers' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and its relationship to instructional practices for ELs. Although there are studies on effective pedagogy and culturally responsive teaching, the literature on linguistically responsive teaching is emerging and limited with regards to its practice by ESOL endorsed teachers, thus providing a rationale for this study.

Theoretical Framework

The constructs of effective pedagogy as well as culturally and linguistically responsive teaching serve as the conceptual frameworks for this study. This study was based on the premise that effective teachers of ELs possess expertise (knowledge, skills, practices) grounded in key

principles of these theories. Teacher implementation of this expertise during instruction can impact EL academic experience. The next section discusses each of the frameworks, which incorporate fundamentals of culture and language in educating ELs in general education classrooms.

Theoretical Foundations of Effective Pedagogy

Due to the significant number of ELs in U. S. schools, statements of effective pedagogy must include teaching this population of students and the variety of settings in which they learn. A critical entry point for this study is a discussion of the theoretical foundations that undergird effective pedagogy for CLD learners, which includes ELs. *Pedagogy* involves the teacher's approach to instruction, how s/he interacts with learners, structures the classroom, and delivers content matter. The science of teaching requires the application of strategies, the implementation of assessment and evaluation, and the selection of curriculum. The art of teaching is what the teacher does with that information, how s/he relates to the students, her/his ability to affect students' engagement in learning, their hopes, and their access of quality education (Entz, 2006).

Teachers use many sources of professional knowledge, skill and experience at their disposal to engage the minds and hearts of children and youth by teaching and inspiring them (NBTS, 2016). Research suggests that students learn more from teachers who have stronger pedagogical content knowledge (Metzler & Woessmann, 2012). David Souza (2001) highlights the teacher's critical role in the active process of teaching in the classroom. "Whether what teachers present to students will be understood, remembered, and be useful to them depends largely on the teachers' knowledge base, on its use in designing plans and on the instructional techniques they select during the lessons" (Souza, 2001, p. 3). This statement points to a relationship between what teachers know and do and what students learn. Per Darling-Hammond (1997), in addition to teachers' knowledge about the content area, effective teaching that produces academic

achievement for all students requires pedagogy. Studies from a variety of disciplines indicate the role of pedagogy is significantly important to achieving educational goals (LeVine, 2002; Jensen, 2000; Tharp et al., 2000). These observations underscore the importance of pedagogy and the crucial role of the teacher in its implementation.

CREDE Standards for Effective Pedagogy and Learning. The seminal work of the CREDE focused on pedagogical practices that work with students at risk of educational failure due to cultural, language, racial, geographic, or economic factors (Tharp, 1997). CREDE's thirty years of federally funded research revealed teaching principles that, when implemented systematically in the classroom, resulted in improved educational outcomes regardless of the challenges that students faced (Tharp, Estrada, Dalton, & Yamauchi, 2000). The findings were organized into a set of principles, which were rigorously examined over a five-year period by other researchers, professional organizations, administrators, policy makers, and teachers. Presentations were made to focus groups, conferences, workshops, professional meetings, community forums, professional organization and all types of meetings (Tharp, 1999). A consensus on the critical role of these principles in the learning process was reached as conclusive and compelling. Tharp and Dalton (2007) describe *pedagogy* as a system of instructional activity, in which the teacher aids within a structure of classroom events. With CREDE's pedagogical system, teachers and students utilize elements of social and linguistic culture in a variety of teaching and learning activities.

CREDE's research uncovered critical elements of pedagogical practices common among successful programs with culturally and linguistically diverse students. CREDE's Standards for Effective Pedagogy and Learning: (1) joint productive activity between teacher and students (JPA); (2) literacy development (LLD); (3) contextualization of schooling in the individual and community lives of the students (CTX); (4) teaching for cognitive complexity (CT); and (5)

teaching through instructional conversation/dialogue (IC) are universals of teaching, regardless of context, that is sensitive to diverse cultures and languages (Hilberg, Doherty, Epaloose, & Tharp, 2004). Moreover, findings point to a "clear relationship between consistent use of the Standards for Effective Pedagogy and improved student success in the classroom and provide strong support for their instructional effectiveness" (Doherty, Hilberg, Pinal, & Tharp, 2003, p.1). These attributes make the framework a foundation of core pedagogical knowledge and competencies teachers need in order to teach CLD students, thus applicable to ELs.

The first standard, joint productive activity, entails teacher created opportunities for the teacher and students to work together to facilitate learning. Teacher and students aid each other to achieve a product or learning goal through collaboration. An example can be using science to solve practical, real world problems. By working together, students develop common systems of understanding with the teacher and with one another (Hilberg et al., 2004). Forming a common context is especially important in school when the teacher and the students are culturally and linguistically different.

CREDE's second standard of effective instruction addresses the language and literacy development needs of CLD students, including ELs. Language development is key to academic achievement and social interaction. Both school knowledge and thinking depend on language, making literacy the most essential competency necessary for school success (Hilberg et al., 2004). To develop language and literacy proficiency, ELs need ample opportunities during instruction of subject area material to practice reading, writing, speaking, and listening. Teachers of ELs need to foster language development via academic, problem solving, and informal topics. Effective strategies for ELs include allowing students' use of native language, in addition to English during learning, and encouraging students' verbal responses (de Jong & Harper, 2005). Reading and

writing should be taught systematically and integrated in all lessons. Teachers of ELs need to consider the culturally based ways that ELs use language and to build upon their native and English language strengths in content area instruction by creating learning contexts that draw from their linguistic strengths.

The third CREDE standard, contextualization, consists of making school and the curriculum meaningful by connecting it to students' lives (Hilberg et al., 2004). This is achieved by connecting classroom curriculum to students' culture and the skills they bring from their home and personal experiences. Teachers contextualize learning when they use students' funds of knowledge (Moll et al., 1992), the expertise that students have because of their roles in their families, communities, and culture, as the basis for acquiring new knowledge. For CLD students, it is important that concepts be taught in culturally meaningful contexts allowing them to apply what they already know to what they are learning. "Schema theorists, cognitive scientists, behaviorists, and psychological anthropologists agree that school learning is made meaningful by connecting it to students' personal, family and community experiences" (McInerney & Van Etten, 2003). Parental participation in their school community can reveal information about the CLD students' culture that helps the teacher make learning meaningful for them.

The fourth standard is teaching complex thinking (CT) by incorporating challenging activities. This standard involves challenging students toward cognitive development by encouraging students' thinking and analysis (Hilberg et al., 2004). Instructional tasks that encourage complex thinking and that build on student prior knowledge, aid student learning and successful performance (de Jong & Harper, 2005). Teachers of ELs might not expose ELs to the same academic rigor as they do with English dominant peers due to assumptions that ELs have limited abilities. This results in compromising their achievement. ELs' instruction should involve

higher-order thinking that is not overwhelming. Presenting ELs with cognitively complex learning means the teacher must provide the necessary assistance to encourage students to meet their academic goals.

Teaching via instructional conversations (IC) is the fifth standard. Teaching through conversation, is deemed to be effective with all students but especially with culturally and linguistically diverse students (Tharp et al., 2000). Through dialogue, students can express their thoughts and become engaged in the exchange of knowledge with the teacher and other students. Instructional conversation involves increased student conversations and reducing teacher talk, listening to EL responses to assess their learning, and questioning them to support their ideas with textual evidence. Through instructional conversations, teachers can link the student's academic knowledge with their family and community knowledge, thereby informing them of adjustments needed during instruction (Corell, 2016). These adjustments provide ways for ELs to develop language and content knowledge. Ideally, through instructional conversations, the teacher can incorporate contextualization, language development and cognitively challenging activities.

CREDE's standards set the conditions and frame effective practice in K-12 classrooms with CLD students, including ELs. CREDE's Five Standards address student engagement, as well as linguistic and cognitive processing, and the provision of teaching assistance, all key variables for the academic success of ELs. Furthermore, its indicators of effective practice emphasize the knowledge and skills associated with promising instructional practice for ELs (Dalton, 1998). Dalton notes that teachers using CREDE's standards transform their pedagogy to a system of instructional activity that "provides opportunities for every student to participate, to receive close teacher attention and interaction, and to live in a classroom where their experiences, ways of speaking, and cultures are respected and included" (Dalton, 1998, p. 37). This statement

accentuates the importance of considering the learner's background (linguistic, cultural and academic) in creating an effective pedagogy that benefits CLD students, particularly ELs.

Theoretical Foundations of Culturally Responsive Instruction

Studies reveal that culture (values, attitudes, and experiences) is a fundamental element of teaching and learning for CLD learners (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 2000). Banks proposes that all students are culturally diverse as "culture structures the default conditions of the everyday practices of being human (Banks, 2000, p. 53). Furthermore, he suggests that teachers of a different culture than that of their students can teach them effectively by learning about each other's cultures (Banks, 1995). Gloria Ladson-Billings (1994) finds that effective teachers of CLD students know the cultures, understand and have high expectations of their students. Hollins (1996) links culture and instruction through evidence that cultural practices shape thinking processes, which serve as tools for learning within and outside of school. Scholars (e.g., Ladson-Billings, 1994; Milner, 2006) studied the effective practices of educators working with CLD students and observed that successful teachers were skillful at embedding their students' culture throughout the teaching and learning process.

The idea that culture is central to student learning grounds the notion of culturally responsive teaching. Gay (2000) defines culturally responsive teaching as "using the cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant to and effective for them" (Gay, 2000, p. 29). Through this pedagogy, a teacher creates an inclusive classroom by using strategies that assists students in constructing knowledge, building on their cultural strengths, and looking at the academic content from multiple perspectives. Per Gloria Ladson−Billings (2009), "It is an approach that empowers students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using

cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills and attitudes" (p. 20). Culturally responsive teaching intentionally regards cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic factors that may impact students' academic success or failure and includes cultural elements during instruction. It entails differentiated practices according to how students learn, their existing background knowledge, and language appropriateness. Culturally responsive teachers understand and respect students' own cultures to create a positive classroom environment where students are accepted and respected (Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2007; Washburn, 2008).

Nieto (2000) points out that culturally responsive teaching recognizes, respects, and uses students' identities and backgrounds as meaningful sources for creating optimal learning environments. In the case of ELs, teachers must explicitly use and respect their students' languages, cultures, and life experiences to make the strongest connections between the expectations of the school and the culture of the students (Nieto, 2000). This type of instruction allows ELs to bridge the culture of the United States. Among the knowledge and skills of effective teachers of ELs are: "knowledge in first and second language acquisition, sociocultural and sociopolitical context of education, knowledge of specific cultural groups they serve, skill in adapting the curriculum for ELs, competence in pedagogical approaches suitable for different cultural groups, and effective communication with parents and families of diverse language backgrounds" (Nieto, 2000, p. 208). To support ELs in school, their teachers must have knowledge of their students, their families, their native language, their culture, their community. The teacher needs these skills to help bridge the cultural and linguistic gap that stands in the way of EL academic success. Researchers (Gay, 2002; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Irvine, 1990, 2001; Villegas & Lucas, 2002b) conclude that teachers must know and value students' identities and utilize their assets in the acquisition of knowledge.

Teacher educators have been concerned about preparing culturally responsive teachers to actively promote behaviors and attitudes among students that are inclusive and lead to their ability to partake equitable and successfully in a multicultural classroom (Cochran-Smith, Davis, & Fries, 2004; Gay, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2002a, 2002b, 2007). Teacher education programs whose mission is to prepare teachers for diverse classrooms, often seek to assist teachers in developing the knowledge and skills reflective of culturally responsive teachers (Siwatu, Chesnut, Alejandro, & Young, 2016). Research on preparation of teachers of ELs suggests that they should know their ELs to provide effective instruction (de Jong & Harper, 2008, 2011; Harper, de Jong, & Platt, 2008; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Tellez & Waxman, 2006; TESOL, 2010; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2000). This includes knowing about ELs' native language and how it affects their acquisition of English. Teachers of ELs must recognize that there is a connection between culture and language in terms of EL linguistic and academic development (Nieto, 2001). Understanding the linguistic diversity of ELs and the significance of language in teaching and learning is paramount in providing ELs a learning environment that is not only culturally responsive, but also linguistically responsive.

Theoretical Foundations of Linguistically Responsive Instruction

ELs face the challenge of learning in educational contexts where increasing student achievement is a national goal (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). The concept of linguistically responsive teaching has evolved as researchers have sought to understand what teachers should know about teaching ELs. Linguistically responsive teachers are those who can teach academic content in ways that are comprehensible while simultaneously attending to and furthering the development of students' language skills (Bratkovich, 2019). This means instruction is delivered within the language proficiency of ELs for the content to be learned more easily and thoroughly while and

intentionally developing their language skills. In order to do so, it is helpful for teachers of ELs to learn about the language and academic backgrounds of ELs in their classes to be able to anticipate the aspects of learning that are likely to be too difficult for them (Villegas & Lucas, 2007; Lucas et al., 2008). Linguistically responsive teaching recognizes the deep connections between culture, language, teaching and learning while emphasizing focus on linguistic issues in the teaching of ELs. It broadly requires educators to possess awareness and knowledge of language, to know the linguistic needs of ELs, and to appropriately scaffold ELs' needs in order to help them develop academic proficiency in English (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008).

Framework for Linguistically Responsive Teaching. Lucas and Villegas' framework (2011) for preparing linguistically responsive teachers of ELs highlights language-related aspects. Their framework is based on theories of language learning and second language acquisition, focusing specifically on linguistic issues in the teaching of ELs. Using the Tasks for Learning to Teach (Feiman-Nemser, 2001), Lucas and Villegas develop Tasks for Learning to Teach ELLs aligned with TESOL–NCATE standards for P–12 Teacher Education Programs (TESOL, 2010). Both the framework and the standards are meant to inform the preparation of general education teachers of ELs and ESL teachers. Lucas' and Villegas' (2011) Framework for Linguistically Responsive Teaching involves two major components (1) orientations; (2) knowledge and skills of linguistically responsive teachers. This conceptual framework is illustrated in Figure 1.

Orientations	Sociolinguistic consciousness understanding the connection between language, culture, and identity awareness of the sociopolitical dimension of language use and language education Value for linguistic diversity Inclination to advocate for ELs
Knowledge and Skills	Learning about EL language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies Identifying the language demands of classroom tasks Applying key principles of second language learning conversational language proficiency is different from academic language proficiency skills and concepts learned in the first language transfer to the second language anxiety about performing in second language can interfere with learning ELs need comprehensible input just beyond their current level of proficiency social interaction for authentic communicative purposes fosters EL learning Scaffolding instruction to promote EL learning (Lucas & Villegas, 2011, p. 57)

Figure 1. Framework for Linguistically Responsive Teaching (Lucas & Villegas, 2011)

Orientations of Linguistically Responsive Teachers. "Orientations" refer to inclinations or tendencies toward particular ideas and actions Lucas & Villegas, 2011). According to Lucas and Villegas' the three key orientations for linguistically responsive teaching are: (1) sociolinguistic consciousness (a) understanding the connection between language, culture, and identity, (b) awareness of the sociopolitical dimension of language use and education (teachers use effective communication and ways of interacting with CLD students so as to avoid inequality and conflict); (2) value for linguistic diversity; and (3) inclination to advocate for ELs (Lucas & Villegas, 2011).

The first step for teachers of ELs to develop these orientations is critical reflection. Critical reflection is the process by which adults identify the assumptions governing their actions, locate the historical and cultural origins of the assumptions, question the meaning of assumptions, and develop alternative ways of acting (Cranton, 1996). It helps people make meaning out of situations by using what they know from the past to consider the implications of their thinking and decision-making. Teachers' prior knowledge and experience influence what they learn about their students.

When they work with students who have different backgrounds and experiences from their own, effective teachers are able question their assumptions and practices to challenge the prevailing social, political, cultural ways of acting that frame the way they educate and interact with students. Effective teachers of ELs examine their thoughts to understand what shapes their students' values and attitudes toward learning (NBPTS, 2015). This understanding informs their practice.

Sociolinguistic consciousness is defined as (a) an understanding that language, culture, and identity are deeply interconnected; and (b) an awareness of the sociopolitical dimensions of language use and language education. To develop this mindset, linguistically responsive teachers of ELs examine and reflect on their beliefs and values about language as it relates to cultural identity, their views on bilingualism, and their beliefs about linguistic diversity (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, 2011).

Teachers of ELs who are linguistically responsive understand that learning a second language is a process affected by the relationship between cultural identity and home language (Norton, 2000). The values of a cultural group are passed on through language, and therefore a person's language is a marker of the person's sense of identity and their connections with social and cultural groups (Valdés, Bunch, Snow, & Lee, 2005). This identification one gets from speaking the home language enforces social patterns of acting and speaking. The home language shapes one's habits, conducts, values, virtues, customs, and beliefs. It is through language that one develops intellectually. Linguistically responsive teachers understand the complex role that language plays in learning. They respect the knowledge, perspectives, and experiences that ELs bring to the classroom and find ways to enhance learning environment. For example, teachers assist ELs by providing them with linguistic access to participate in learning situations. These teachers recognize that students possess different language practices and proficiencies based on

social or academic context, and they find ways to integrate these linguistic differences within instruction.

Linguistically responsive teachers are also aware of the perception of value placed on different languages. Typically, the language of the group with greater sociopolitical power is perceived as superior to the languages of speakers of the powerless group. Delpit's (1995) "culture of power" concept includes: (a) the enactment of power in classrooms; (b) linguistic rules and codes for participating in power; (c) the rules of the culture of power as a reflection of those who have power; (d) knowing the rules of the culture of power makes acquiring power easier, (e) those with power are unaware or unwilling to acknowledge its existence; and (f) those with less power are most aware of its existence (p. 24). Milner (2010) argues that cultural conflicts could occur between White monolingual teachers and CLD students. It's important for educators of CLD students to acknowledge that ELs' experience schooling differently than English dominant students and have differences in access to literacy and to education (Nieto, 2013). In order to help students deal with this culture of power, teachers must explicitly teach CLD students what the culture of power is, how it works, and how power can be achieved (Milner, 2010).

Secondly, linguistically responsive teachers view linguistic diversity as a valuable resource and their actions support the maintenance and growth of bilingualism. This perspective and accompanying actions foster students' trust in the teacher and teachers' increased expectations of their students (Villegas & Lucas, 2002a). Having contact with people of linguistically diverse backgrounds has been found to influence teachers' attitudes toward ELs. Youngs & Youngs (2001) report several predictors that positively affect CLD student learning; these include teachers' "completion of foreign language or multicultural education courses, ESL training, experience abroad, work with diverse ESL students and gender" (p. 97).

The third orientation of linguistically responsive teachers requires them to view themselves as advocates for ELs (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007). These teachers hold a perspective of advocacy and act towards the improvement of EL access to social, political and educational opportunities. Many classroom teachers see ELs as the ESOL teacher's responsibility (Hamann & Reeves, 2013) and easily accept EL lack of access to meaningful learning opportunities (de Jong & Harper, 2008). Teachers who are advocates for ELs speak up and "act on behalf" of their students (de Oliveira & Athanases, 2007, p. 206).

These three orientations are critical for teachers to be successful with their ELs. The path to becoming a linguistically responsive educator starts with teachers' beliefs, assumptions and prior socialization with regards language, culture, and linguistic diversity. Becoming a linguistically responsive teacher of ELs requires engaging in critical reflection about one's beliefs, assumptions, and attitudes towards linguistic diversity, EL students, and one's role as a teacher of ELs. Only then can teachers begin to develop the sociolinguistic awareness and advocacy stance necessary for becoming linguistically responsive teachers.

Knowledge and Skills of Linguistically Responsive Teachers. Lucas and Villegas' framework point to four types of pedagogical knowledge and skills for linguistically responsive teachers. These include: (a) knowledge of learners (language backgrounds, experiences, and proficiencies); (b) knowledge of language demands of the subject or content; (c) knowledge of key principles of second language learning; and (d) pedagogical skills to promote EL learning.

Per Feiman-Nemser (2001), an essential task for learning to teach is developing understanding of learners and learning. Lucas and Villegas (2011) suggest that linguistically responsive teachers learn about their ELs' linguistic and academic backgrounds, their academic experiences, and language proficiencies. Teachers of ELs need to understand that ELs' native

language as well as their English language proficiency, literacy skills and prior schooling experiences affect their academic learning. Teachers use strategies for getting to know ELs even though they may not speak English yet. Allowing ELs to use visuals to represent their experiences, writing in their native language and finding a translator or ways to translate to communicate and family are recommended strategies.

Teachers possess subject matter knowledge for teaching (Feiman-Nemser, 2001). In contexts with ELs, this pedagogical knowledge includes analyzing the linguistic features of their academic disciplines and the linguistic demands of classroom tasks. Since the language of school is fundamentally different from conversational language (Cummins, 2000), teachers are able to analyze the language demands of oral and written language used in classrooms that are likely to be challenging for ELs (Cummins, 2008; Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005). The linguistic demands include key vocabulary, confusing semantics, and complex sentence structures. Teachers of ELs are knowledgeable about grammar and about how to teach it (Wong-Fillmore & Snow, 2005). By identifying linguistic demands of the subject matter or content of the lesson, teachers of ELs can make language-related adjustments in their instruction to facilitate student learning.

According to the linguistically responsive teaching framework (Lucas & Villegas, 2011), linguistically responsive teachers know and apply fundamental principles of second language acquisition such as: (a) communicative language proficiency differs from academic language proficiency (Cummins, 1979); (b) skills and concepts acquired in the native language transfer to the second language (Cummins, 1979); (c) anxiety affects learning in the second language (Krashen, 1982); (d) ELs need comprehensible input just beyond their current level of proficiency (Krashen, 1982); and (e) social interaction for authentic communicative purposes aids ELs' learning (Ellis, 2005; Spada & Lightbown, 2008).

Linguistically responsive teachers possess the understanding that communicative language proficiency differs from academic language proficiency. Cummins (1981, 2008) coined the terms conversational language proficiency as Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS), and academic language proficiency as Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). Conversational fluency in a second language develops in one to two years**.** Academic language skills are estimated to take five to seven years. CALP requires knowledge of less frequently used words and more complex syntax structures (Snow & Uccelli, 2009). With knowledge about BICS and CALP, teachers of ELs can differentiate between these two forms of language proficiencies allowing them to identify predictable challenges of second language learning and atypical language difficulties. By knowing these concepts, linguistically responsive teachers can recognize when ELs have trouble with academic content and be able to assist them with academic language considering the appropriate time frames for this development (Lucas & Villegas, 2011; Lucas, 2011; Lucas et al., 2008; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008).

Teachers of ELs who are linguistically responsive comprehend that the skills and concepts their students learned in the first language transfer to the second language. Cummins' language transfer theory (Cummins, 1981) explains that skills and concepts acquired in the first language transfer to the second language. For example, ELs with native language literacy skills can more easily and quickly learn to read and write in a target language than those without literacy skills. This transfer between languages may account for the association found between strong academic language skills in native languages and successful second language learning and academic achievement in theories and research in the field of second language acquisition. Evidence of this comes from studies showing that students with strong reading skills in the home language also have strong reading skills in their second language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Riches & Genesee,

2006). The home language of ELs is perhaps their most valuable resource to attain overall academic success. Effective teachers of ELs recognize the value and incorporate the use of ELs' home language during instruction to foster academic achievement in English. Educators also understand that ELs need targeted instruction and extended practice in applying home language skills to English (de Jong & Harper, 2008).

Linguistically responsive educators recognize that anxiety about performing in second language can interfere with learning. Krashen (1982) proposes a theory of second language acquisition, in which he identifies a key factor impacting second language learning as *affective.* Krashen's (1982) affective filter hypothesis argues that a learner should have high motivation, self-confidence, self-esteem, and low anxiety for the successful acquisition of a second language. The implication for effective teachers of ELs is to keep student affective filter (anxiety level) low during instruction to foster ELs' language development.

Teachers of ELs with linguistically responsive knowledge are aware that ELs need comprehensible input just beyond their current level of proficiency. Krashen (1982) developed the input hypothesis: a learner learns a second language only when the input is understandable. When the language learner is provided with comprehensible input, that is, input is slightly beyond what the learner can fully understand, but contains structures that are not yet fully understood, it leads to new language learning. This concept represented as "*i* +1"; "*i*" stands for previously acquired linguistic competence, "+1" symbolizes new linguistic knowledge or structures. When ELs receive comprehensible input during instruction, they can understand the essence of what is being presented to them. This concept has clear implications for teachers of ELs; namely, that ELs need rich input through context clues, visuals, clarification, drawing on ELs experiences, interaction, and choosing vocabulary carefully to meet students' language needs. Effective teachers of ELs

know about their students' current stage of English language proficiency and design instruction tuned at the appropriate level for their learners.

Linguistically responsive teachers realize that social interaction for authentic communicative purposes fosters EL learning. Vygotsky's (1978) sociocultural theory proposes that learning occurs through social interaction. For ELs, actively engaging in meaningful social interactions in the classroom supports conversational communication as well as academic English (Lucas et al., 2008). Linguistically responsive teachers create learning environments and classroom conditions and situations that require social interaction for authentic communication purposes to promote EL student learning.

Feiman-Nemser (2001) suggests that effective teachers possess initial knowledge of pedagogical approaches that promote student learning. For linguistically responsive teachers, this means developing strategies for scaffolding instruction to make the curriculum accessible to ELs and promote their learning. Scaffolding is "a process that enables a child or novice to solve a problem, carry out a task or achieve a goal which would be beyond his unassisted efforts" (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1976, p. 90). Scaffolding is provided by a more experienced or knowledgeable person (a peer or teacher), and it is removed gradually until the learner is able to carry out the activities alone (Lucas et al., 2008; Peregoy, Boyle, & Cadiero-Kaplan, 2008). ELs need specific types of language-related scaffolding, including extralinguistic supports such as visuals and hands-on activities, and supports for written language such as study guides, supports for oral language such as repetition and clear and explicit instructions (Gibbons, 2002; Verplaetse & Migliacci, 2008). Using scaffolding strategies with ELs helps them learn content, progress in language learning and develop literacy (Peregoy et al., 2008). Scaffolding allows ELs to finish tasks more efficiently with less anxiety (Fitzgerald & Graves, 2004).

The theoretical foundations that underpin effective pedagogy for ELs situate the context for this study. The frameworks presented above explicitly address the pedagogical, cultural, and linguistic foundations for teaching ELs. To be effective with ELs, educators know essential principles for teaching and learning that encompass three broad dimensions: foundations of effective pedagogy, culturally responsive teaching, and linguistically responsive instruction. Furthermore, teachers systematically focus on the needs of ELs in practice through the application of theory through instruction that is consistent with the linguistic, academic, social and cognitive dimensions that influence EL learning.

Review of Empirical Literature

In the early 2000s schools began to place increasing numbers of ELs in general education classrooms (Polat, 2010). Placing ELs in general education settings has significantly changed the role of teachers by making them responsible for educating their linguistically diverse students. Consequently, teacher education programs are trying to catch up with this mainstreaming trend by increasing efforts to prepare a predominantly monolingual teacher population for the diverse linguistic makeup of classrooms. Teacher preparation and professional development programs offer preservice and in-service learning opportunities to general education teachers of ELs. In recent years, several these efforts have been studied and published in the professional literature.

This section reviews empirical, peer-reviewed studies on the preparation of preservice teachers of ELs. This is followed by a review of research on the development of in-service general education teachers of ELs. A summary of findings in the research related to teacher knowledge for instruction of ELs and teacher instructional practices that support academic and linguistic needs of ELs are discussed last. The central principles of effective, linguistically and culturally responsive pedagogy frame the selection of studies and analysis in this review.

Preparation of Preservice Teachers of ELs

Preparation for teachers of ELs often begins at the preservice level. In general, schools of education and school districts position ESOL certification as an add-on or an extra to general education (Ballantyne, Sanderman, & Levy, 2008). A handful of states, including Florida, require teachers graduating from approved teacher preparation programs to have completed specific coursework for teaching ELs. University-based teacher preparation programs typically incorporate ESOL preparation into the existing curriculum. Research indicates student achievement is directly related to the type of preparation teachers receive in teacher preparation years (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Diego, 2013). The studies discussed in this section of the chapter illustrate preservice responses to various learning opportunities intended to prepare them to teach ELs.

In line with principles of effective, culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, studies demonstrate that teacher beliefs and attitudes may be malleable with engagement in learning opportunities for teaching ELs, yet remain a challenge. Preservice teachers who learned about strategies for teaching ELs in their courses began to understand the importance of adapting instruction to help ELs succeed in general education classes (Hutchinson, 2013). Several studies (Hildenbrand & Schultz, 2015; Jimenez-Silva & Olson, 2012; Medina, Hathaway, & Pilonieta, 2015; Settlage, Gort, & Ceglie, 2014) addressed preservice teachers' views of ELs. Teacher candidates experienced language immersion designed to promote their sense of empathy and appreciation for ELs. Outcomes of these studies generally concluded that through the immersion experience, teacher candidates gained empathy for ELs and their challenges. Hutchinson's (2013) study indicated that some teacher candidates demonstrated positive attitudes about ELs by the end of the course. A few teachers continued to see ELs as "handicapped by their language deficiency". In a study conducted by Baecher and colleagues (2013), teacher candidates failed to recognize

students' linguistic assets, instead focusing on their difficulties with standard English writing conventions.

Becoming a culturally and linguistically responsive educator requires learning about ELs to inform their pedagogical decisions. Two studies involved preservice teachers in activities that exposed them to the learning difficulties ELs experience when learning through a second language (Baecher et al., 2013; Pu, 2012; Siegel, 2014). Through coursework, field-based observation, tutoring, or shadowing with ELs, participants gained insight about difference between BICS and CALP. A couple of investigations (Athanases et al., 2013; Zhang & Stephens, 2013) engaged preservice teachers in teaching ELs the subject matter in linguistically responsive ways. The study conducted by Athanases and colleagues (2013) reported on student teachers analyzing EL writing to identify areas where students needed academic support. The researchers showed how this process fostered teacher candidates' understanding of the writing abilities of ELs in their classes, allowing them to provide instruction to support EL learning.

During their preparation, teacher candidates participated in opportunities to develop skills for teaching ELs. Scaffolding utilizes strategies that allow the teacher to keep the cognitive demands of instruction high by providing students language support to help them access the content of the lesson (Gibbons, 2002). A study by Settlage and colleagues (2014) shows teacher candidates participating in a lesson taught in Spanish. During the lesson, scaffolding was used to support their language needs. The immersion experience provided teacher candidates an understanding of the importance of scaffolding EL learning.

Future teachers also had opportunities to conduct scaffolding strategies in teaching situations. In the study by Athanases and colleagues (2013), student teachers learned about the writing challenges experienced by their ELs and then predicted the type of scaffold that would

allow students to meet academic objectives. While teacher candidates showed growth in the ability to scaffold instruction for ELs, the researchers pointed out the challenges teacher candidates experienced in their investigation. While future teachers were able to identify and use a variety of scaffolding strategies, they did not understand how to apply scaffolding with particular ELs in specific situations. Per Pu (2012), the problems preservice teachers faced with scaffolding stemmed partly due to their general lack of familiarity with students' English language proficiency, which should guide their decisions about appropriate language supports. This type of instructional matching can be learned only in practice and with experience.

Development of In-service Teachers of ELs

Experienced teachers may go through different pathways than new teachers to obtain ESOL endorsement. Alternate routes to endorsement for experienced teachers may be provided through district professional development. Professional development can help teachers develop skills and understandings for facilitating EL learning and for becoming culturally and linguistically responsive educators (Lucas et al., 2008). In the state of Florida, elementary in-service teachers must satisfy the requirement of 15 semester hours or the equivalent to obtain the ESOL add-on certification (Florida Department of Education, 2011). The five, three semester hour courses consists of Methodology of Teaching ESOL; ESOL Curriculum Development; Cross Cultural Studies; Applied Linguistics; as well as, Testing and Evaluation of ELLs (Wilson-Patton, 2000).

This section of the paper encompasses recent empirical literature regarding in-service professional development for teachers of ELs. Studies included in this segment focus on elements of the pedagogical knowledge and skills highlighted in the theoretical frameworks of effective, culturally and linguistically responsive teaching for ELs. The current literature discusses learning

opportunities provided to novice and experienced teachers of ELs (e.g., workshops, professional learning communities, university courses, mentoring, coaching, and inquiry groups).

Linguistically responsive teaching highlights the importance of teachers' development of knowledge about language and language learning. To investigate this aspect of teaching ELs, Burstein et al., 2014 conducted a study of teachers who gained knowledge about the language barriers ELs face. Teachers in a study by Buxton, Kayumova, & Allexsaht-Snider (2013) acquired an appreciation of the importance of teaching vocabulary to ELs. Participants in the research conducted by Green, Gonzalez, López-Velásquez, & Howard (2013) obtained specific linguistic knowledge of the relationship between word forms in English and Spanish. Several studies reveal that participants learned about the significance of using students' native language in instruction (Adamson, Santau, & Lee, 2013; Burstein et al., 2014; Johnson, Bolshakova, & Waldron, 2016; Peercy, Martin-Beltrán, Silverman, & Nunn, 2015). Although these studies highlight the importance of knowledge about language and language learning for teaching ELs, they do not link the knowledge gained in professional development to teachers' practices.

Developing knowledge of ELs as individuals, curriculum, and school context is another essential feature of linguistically responsive teaching. This feature was salient in studies that examined teachers who became acquainted with their ELs (Brooks & Adams, 2015; Russell, 2015) and learned about EL abilities (Deaton, Deaton, & Koballa, 2014) and needs (Estapa, Pinnow, & Chval, 2016). In studies conducted by Russell (2014, 2015), ESOL teachers worked with general education teachers to provide them with information about individual ELs and encouraged general education to pay attention to ELs in their instruction. This knowledge led the general education teachers to better understand ELs' academic progress and to identify specific strategies for addressing their needs.

Effective teachers of ELs have knowledge about ELs' communities and develop strategies for connecting to ELs' families to the school context. A few studies reported that participants developed knowledge related to the school context (Brooks & Adams, 2015; Deaton et al., 2014). Participants in the study by Deaton, Deaton, & Koballa (2014) came to recognize that language and cultural differences affected their communication with parents of ELs. In a study (Johnson et al., 2016) designed to improve teaching for ELs, teachers participated in a professional development project that emphasized learning about their students, homes, and families. Teachers in the study reported that they gained insight of the importance of knowing their ELs and of knowing how "to incorporate their culture" into the classroom (p. 494).

Knowledge about the curriculum and ways to adapt and teach it to ELs is crucial for teachers of ELs. A novice teacher who was being coached by an ESOL teacher (Russell, 2015) learned about school structures (e.g., conferences between ESOL and mainstream teachers and oral defenses used as assessments) and strategies that support EL learning (e.g., checklists for assignments and classroom management strategies used by other teachers). Participants in other studies developed an understanding of the importance of considering EL background knowledge and experiences when choosing instructional materials (Deaton et al., 2014). The teachers in that study learned about ELs' home experiences to use related examples in instruction. Teachers in another study developed lessons and materials utilizing resources in ELs' communities to be able to "control the language choices and structures that would benefit ELs" (Chval et al., 2015, p. 117).

Linguistically responsive teachers deepen their subject knowledge (Lucas & Villegas, 2011). Two studies (Lee & Marten-Rivera, 2012; Chval et al., Pinnow, 2015) examined learning opportunities for teachers designed to support further development of subject knowledge for teaching ELs. In the former study, teachers received professional development in which experts

presented new material to teachers. Teachers in this study extended their subject area knowledge and implemented what they had learned in their own practice with ELs. Chval and colleagues (2015) examined teachers engaged in ongoing collaborative mentoring and coaching. The teachers in the study integrated language and content after learning about the connection between the two. With reverse results, Coady and colleagues (2016), found that two elementary teachers had been trained in how to integrate content and language learning; however, both valued content learning over language learning. Consequently, they failed to plan and teach ELs' explicitly for language development and cultural learning during math and reading.

In addition, three studies in which teachers engaged in opportunities to deepen their subject matter knowledge, found little or no evidence of teacher growth in subject area knowledge for assist ELs. The three studies (Adamson et al., 2013; Buxton et al., 2014; Johnson et al., 2016) of efforts to extend subject knowledge for teaching ELs reported that professional development did not impact teachers' instructional practice. It is possible that change in teachers' practice is influenced by other factors than the professional development interventions conducted in the studies. Therefore, it is important to consider that making a significant impact on teacher practice for ELs remains a challenge even after participating in learning interventions intended to deepen their subject areas knowledge.

A review of studies examining teachers' practices based on the pedagogical knowledge gained through the professional development provides more information. In one study, (Adamson et al., 2013) teachers developed skills for student-centered practices and created lessons with more hands-on activities. Other studies focused on teachers' ways to provide ELs with opportunities to talk and interact with their English-proficient peers during instruction (Choi & Morrison, 2014; Johnson et al., 2016; Peercy et al., 2015; Russell, 2014). In the study by Choi and Morrison (2014),

participants took part in an initiative about differentiated instruction, language acquisition, critical thinking, and sociocultural issues. The findings of this study revealed teachers' practices included more opportunities for ELs to practice the English language through discussions and participation in small group activities embedded in the lessons.

Several studies highlight teachers applying scaffolding as an instructional practice to support ELs: using media and visuals and connecting learning to real-world experiences (Adamson et al., 2013); incorporating EL background and interests and integrating language and culture into lessons (Johnson et al., 2016); providing multiple examples for students (Russell, 2015); providing comprehensible input and building background knowledge (Choi & Morrison, 2014); using technology (Chval et al., 2015; O'Hara, Pritchard, Huang, & Pella, 2013); integrating metacognitive activities to help students "think about their thinking" (Chval et al., 2015, p. 119); and differentiating instruction (Russell, 2015). These studies show teacher participants learned ways to provide supports suited to ELs' needs and then applied different approaches to scaffolding.

Using linguistic supports as a form of scaffolding was the focus of several studies (Deaton et al., 2014; Estapa et al., 2016; Russell, 2015). Scaffolds included students' use of scientific vocabulary and explicitly taught vocabulary to help with comprehension (Deaton et al., 2014), adjusting instruction for ELs by using gestures and visual cues, using EL home languages as a linguistic support (Johnson et al., 2016), encouraging the discussion of concepts and vocabulary in ELs' native languages (Adamson et al., 2013), and translating a text into Spanish to scaffold EL understanding (Burstein et al., 2014). This information highlights the importance of using students' home languages as linguistic support for ELs as part of an effective teacher's repertoire.

Summary of Empirical Literature

The studies reviewed illustrate the preparation of becoming a teacher of ELs through real field experiences as well as coursework. These studies showed future teachers of ELs observing, shadowing, teaching, participating in community projects and taking part in language immersion themselves. The recent literature regarding preservice mainstream teachers of ELs emphasizes learning about the process of second language acquisition and exploring candidates' beliefs about ELs.

Research about preservice teachers support the premise that linguistically responsive teachers of ELs need to know about the process of second language acquisition (Lucas et al., Villegas, 2008). Several studies identified essential principles of second language learning (e.g., distinguishing between BICS and CALP; the importance of comprehensible input) that make it possible for future teachers to develop an educated perspective on teaching and learning for ELs based on this knowledge (Baecher, Farnsworth, & Ediger, 2014; Fitts & Gross, 2012; Hutchinson, 2013; Markos, 2012; Pu, 2012; Zhang & Stephens, 2013). This knowledge is necessary for teachers to understand ELs, how they learn, and be able to design instruction for their students.

Many of the studies on future teachers of ELs focused on their beliefs about ELs. Lucas and Villegas (2013) emphasize the importance of teachers to get to know ELs to understand their experiences and knowledge. Teachers misperceptions of ELs as it relates to instruction arose while teachers were engaged in different learning opportunities. De Araujo, Smith, and Sakow (2016) examined a preservice elementary teacher with deficit views about ELs. Researchers found that the preservice teacher held deficit thinking about ELs: that they are homogenous in their language proficiencies, unable to communicate with teachers given their lack of language proficiency, average in their abilities, and likely to struggle with tasks in math due to their EL status. The

implications of deficit views can lead to instructional practices that are not cognitively demanding for ELs. Overall, not many studies in this review paid attention to preservice teachers learning about practice and receiving strategies for instructional practice. Aspects of pedagogy such as subject matter knowledge for teaching, skills for learning about students, and ways to engage ELs effectively in learning were minimally addressed.

In terms of the methodology of the research, almost all studies focused strictly on the learning that takes place in a single course or in a single semester. There is little known about the whether the knowledge about ELs candidates gained in college coursework impacts their instructional practices once they become teachers. Given the available evidence, it is not possible to determine the extent to which, if at all, what was learned in coursework about teaching ELs is later implemented in practice.

In this chapter, several studies on practicing teachers of ELs were also reviewed through the lens of Lucas and Villegas (2011) framework of linguistically responsive teaching to answer the question: What can be learned from the empirical literature about the knowledge and practice of in-service teachers of ELs? Studies focused on the development of teachers' pedagogical knowledge and skills; encouraging teachers to learn about their students; deepening their subject knowledge for teaching ELs; and analyzing and changing beliefs about ELs. Overall, the review of current literature on teachers of ELs reveals teachers gaining knowledge about language as it relates to instruction and learning about changes in instructional practice for teaching ELs. While these learning opportunities were explored in the literature, studies tended to focus on single professional development initiatives. Moreover, teachers' implementation of their overall foundational knowledge in the context of instructional practices with ELs were not widely examined in the studies.

In sum, the empirical research reviewed reflects a growing consciousness that all teachers will be teachers of ELs at some point in their career, and that they should be prepared to teach ELs effectively. The studies in this review illustrate a variety of preservice and in-service learning opportunities designed develop teachers' understanding of diversity and linguistic competencies to teach ELs. Although this body of research contributes to the knowledge base for preparing preservice and in-service teachers for teaching ELs, there is an absence of studies that focus on the culturally and linguistically responsive knowledge and practices of teachers who are ESOL endorsed. This study will address the gap in the literature by examining ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy gained through ESOL endorsement and their instructional practices to determine a link, if any, between teachers' pedagogical knowledge and their practices for teaching ELs.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

U. S. schools have been challenged to improve the academic outcomes of the growing numbers of ELs who are taught in inclusion classrooms composed of ELs and fluent English-speakers. Teachers are charged with providing ELs with language and content instruction in a manner that allows them to access the curriculum equitably. Due to the increasing number of ELs in inclusion settings, there is greater awareness regarding the preparation of general education teachers to support the academic achievement of ELs. Elementary teachers in Florida must attain the state required credentials to be prepared with the skills and knowledge to support ELs' learning. Florida teachers receive formal ESOL preparation on foundational knowledge and effective practices to assist ELs with language acquisition and content mastery. This scenario signals a need to understand ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practices in addressing the language and academic development of ELs. The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and instructional practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs and the possible relationship between the two. The following research questions guided this study:

Research Questions

1. To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?
2. To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?
3. To what extent is there a relationship between ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

Method

Research Design

For this study, a mixed methods research design was conducted to examine the knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers with regards to culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs. "Mixed methods research is the type of research in which a researcher combines elements of qualitative and quantitative research approaches (e. g., use of qualitative and quantitative viewpoints, data collection, analysis, inference techniques) for the broad purposes of breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration" (Johnson et al. 2007, p. 123). A mixed methods design allows for the "collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in the research process" (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007, p. 5). In mixed methods research, quantitative and qualitative data are not merely collected; they are "mixed" or combined in some way. The basic rationale for using mixed methods design is that a combination of both quantitative and qualitative approaches provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone.

To answer the research questions with validity, a mixed methods design was used to strengthen this study and its conclusions. This study was a quantitatively driven (dominant) mixed methods research in which the researcher" relies on a quantitative data, while concurrently recognizing that the addition of qualitative data and approaches are likely to benefit the research project" (Johnson et al. 2007, p. 124). This study prioritized quantitative data obtained via close-ended information collected on a survey instrument to answer the research questions related to teachers' knowledge and practices. It also included qualitative data consisting of information gathered via the same survey instrument to present the diversity of teachers' experiences learning about teaching ELs and their practices with ELs. A concurrent nested design was appropriate in

this study where the predominant method (quantitative) embeds the other less priority method (qualitative) seeking information from different levels. This concurrent and independent design collects data of both components simultaneously and analyses data independently.

The purpose of utilizing a mixed methods design for this study was to achieve complementarity. Per Greene (2007), *complementarity* seeks elaboration, enhancement, illustration, clarification of the results from one method with the results from the other method. Another rationale for combining methods was to include qualitative research to provide "contextual understanding coupled with either generalizable, externally valid findings or broad relationships among variables uncovered through the survey" (Bryman, 2006, p. 106). Lastly, the mixed methods design may reveal a diversity of views, by "uncovering relationships between variables through quantitative research while also revealing meanings among research participants through qualitative research" (Bryman, 2006, p. 106). The overall goal of combining qualitative and quantitative research component in this study was to expand and strengthen its conclusions by complementing the quantitative findings with the qualitative results.

This approach was best for addressing research questions aimed at seeking a description of current conditions or examining relationships (Gay, Mills, & Airasian, 2008, p. 21). A quantitative design allowed for an accurate description of the current knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers, which was the focus of this study. Quantitative questions are focused on the analysis of numerical data and related to determining how variables relate to one another (Gay et al., 2009). The questions addressed in this study were quantitative in nature and yielded data that were used to describe teacher knowledge and practices for ELs as well as examine the relationship between the two variables. The qualitative section of the research design was in the form of open-ended questions. This aimed to provide data about teachers' experience of learning to teach ELs

and their practice in the classroom in their own voice. The qualitative information elicited from participants was analyzed to complement the quantitative analysis of knowledge and practices for teaching ELs. By using the mixed methods research design, the researcher intended to increase knowledge and validity of the study.

Participants

The population of this study consisted of in-service elementary teachers who are ESOL endorsed by the state of Florida and currently teach at elementary schools in the state of Florida, United States. The population of teachers in this study are also credentialed to teach elementary education, Kindergarten through fifth grade. They provide instruction in the content areas to English dominant students and a combined total of 660 ELs in their general education classrooms. There is a minimum of 29 ESOL endorsed teachers at each school site and a population ranging from 37 to 175 ELs in the schools selected for this study. The teachers use Florida Standards to guide their instruction of academic subjects. The selected school district's mission focuses on ensuring that every student acquires the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to be productive citizens in society. This statement applies to the nearly 3,000 ELs currently enrolled in the selected school district (U.S. Department of Education, 2018b).

All teachers in the population of the study hold an ESOL endorsement. Per stipulations set forth by the Florida Department of Education and the META Consent Decree, elementary teachers in Florida are required to hold an ESOL endorsement. An ESOL endorsement requires completion of 300 hours of ESOL preparation though university coursework or professional development (Florida Department of Education, 2011). In Florida, ESOL endorsement preparation addresses foundational knowledge of language and culture, language structure, second language acquisition, curriculum development, sheltered content instruction, and teaching methods to support second

language and literacy. This preparation includes key principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching for ELs, which was the focus of this study.

The population consisted of 1,315 ESOL endorsed elementary teachers in the selected school district. A sample size of 90 teachers was determined appropriate for this study based on the number of the entire population and a confidence level of 95%. The sample frame consisted of a list of ESOL endorsed teachers from nine elementary schools in the school district selected for the study. The sample was drawn from schools within the school district which have significant population of ELs ranging from 27 to 175 students at various English language proficiency levels. Out of the 14 schools in the school district that receive Title I funds, five of the schools in the study receive Title I funds and four do not. Title I provide financial assistance to local educational agencies for children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards (NCES, 2019b). The selected schools are in different areas of the district, reflect the variety of the demographics and the socioeconomic status of their students. In example, one school is comprised of nearly 50% ELs. Other differences included programs offered such as dual language and foreign language in addition to ESOL.

The sample population represented a purposive, nonrandom sample. The researcher used a non-probability sampling technique when selecting units from the population included in the sample. The type of sampling technique used in this research was purposive sampling. Ritchie, Lewis, and Elam (2003) defined this sampling approach as a strategy where "members of a sample are chosen with a purpose to represent a location or type in relation to the criterion" (p. 77). This type of sampling applies expert knowledge of the population to select a sample that can be logically assumed to be representative of the population (Lavrakas, 2008). The main goal of purposive sampling is to focus on characteristics of interest of a population, which best enabled the researcher

to answer the research questions. For this study the following characteristics of teachers were of interest: they are ESOL endorsed in the state of Florida, they currently teach in an elementary school in Florida, they teach in a general education classroom, and they work in the same school district.

Procedures

The following procedures were implemented to initiate and complete this study. The researcher sought approval of the proposal from the Kansas State University Dissertation Committee. An application for approval to conduct the research was submitted to the Kansas State University Institutional Review Board (IRB). Approval to conduct research was sought from the school district's Instructional Support Services Department. The school board approved research to be conducted at nine schools. Letters requesting permission to conduct research at the nine selected school sites were sent to school principals (Appendix A). Research was initiated when the IRB from Kansas State University and the school district granted permission for the researcher to embark upon it.

The researcher identified potential subjects (ESOL endorsed elementary teachers) via school staff lists from the nine schools selected for the study: The researcher verified which teachers at each school had an ESOL endorsement via documentation provided by the school district office. Potential subjects were identified from the list of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers in the selected schools. ESOL endorsed teachers in the selected elementary schools were invited to participate in the study.

Potential subjects were given the opportunity to consent to participate the study through an Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C). School district policy does not allow the dissemination of the survey via teachers' work email. Therefore, the researcher delivered a hardcopy of the

Informed Consent Letter to the schools' front office to be placed in the potential subjects' mailboxes. The Informed Consent Letter contained a link and QR code to the online survey. Potential subjects who wished to participate in the study were instructed to go to the link or code to access the survey. The survey requested that subjects accept or decline consent to participate. Subjects who consented to participate and completed the online survey were enrolled in the study. A Debriefing Statement was included at the end of the online survey.

The electronic data were collected via an online survey on the SurveyMonkey website. The electronic survey data are stored in a SurveyMonkey online account. The data are stored in a regional data center or on servers located in the United States. The data will be kept in the online account for seven years after the completion of the study. After seven years, the researcher will delete all data in the online account. The data are only available to the researcher, principal investigator, and online survey provider. The data are protected by online survey provider by being stored in accredited data centers that adhere to security and technical best practices. The online survey provider encrypted data in transit and at rest. The data are protected by researcher by keeping the researchers' login credentials private, using a sufficiently complicated password, storing credentials safely in the researcher's' home office, and choosing an email account that only the researcher can access. Participants were not identified by name, pseudonym or any other identifiers.

Once approval from the Kansas State University Institutional Review Board, the school district chosen for the study, and individual school administrators was granted, the researcher traveled to the school sites selected for the study. Potential participants were invited from nine out of thirty-seven elementary schools in the school district in the state of Florida, United States. The

selected schools have a significant number of ELs enrolled as well as a significant number of ESOL endorsed teachers as indicated in Table 1.

Table 1.
Number of ELs and ESOL endorsed teachers at school sites by September 2019

School	# of ELs enrolled	# of ESOL endorsed teachers
1	54	31
2	53	38
3	55	29
4	45	31
5	37	36
6	55	37
7	76	39
8	110	30
9	175	29

The researcher delivered hardcopies of the Informed Consent Letter (Appendix C) to the selected schools and asked the front desk staff to place it in teachers' school mailboxes. The Informed Consent Letter introduced the researcher, described the research study, and invited teachers to participate in the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B). The Informed Consent Letter included a link indicating where teachers clicked to start and complete the survey. The survey was activated for teachers to gain access online immediately on September 11, 2019. The participants' responses to the survey remained anonymous. The online link remained open for four weeks. The survey window closed after four weeks, and the information was analyzed.

Data Collection

Both quantitative and qualitative data were collected to answer the three research questions about knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy and the relationship (if any) between the two variables. The techniques of data collection that were used for this study included a quantitative instrument in the form of a survey and qualitative procedures

in the form of open-ended questions. The survey contained quantitative items to determine pedagogical knowledge related to instruction for ELs, while qualitative items gave context to the quantitative data and revealed teachers' interpretations of their knowledge and instruction as ESOL endorsed practitioners. Conforming to the mixed methods design, each set of results was analyzed separately, but the two sets of results were merged at the end to interpret in what ways teachers' knowledge and practice converged and/or diverged.

Survey

A survey was used to collect quantitative and qualitative data for the mixed methods research design. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B) was employed to gather data needed to investigate the knowledge and practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy of ESOL endorsed teachers. A survey was selected as the instrument for data collection because it is effective for obtaining information about people since the "information comes directly from the people and is not subject to observational interpretation" (Fink & Kosecoff, 1998, p. 2-3). The survey was a useful quantitative method for getting individuals to answer questions about their personal experiences. Creswell (2009) explained that survey design provides "quantitative or numeric" explanations of trends, attitudes, or opinions of a population by studying a sample of a particular population, which enables the researcher to generalize about that population. The data provided by the survey method present descriptions of attitudes, values, habits, and background characteristics (Fink & Kosecoff, 1998). Janes (2001) explained that survey methods are best at capturing a glimpse of the existing set of circumstances within a group and are most advantageous when getting "reliable answers to the same set of questions by all respondents" (p. 421). Because surveys can be used to ascertain certain information about how people feel, surveys can offer a more collected aspect of the general attitudes that may exist in a particular organization (Girden &

Kabacoff, 2011). The open-ended questions inserted in The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers allowed respondents to provide personal answers. This approach gave participants the freedom to disclose their feelings and experiences, thus revealing qualitative data that provided deeper insight on the topic.

Practical reasons for the selection of a survey for this study were considered. Surveys are an appropriate data collection strategy because they are effective in gathering an abundance of data in a short period from a large sample of the target population (Creswell, 2009). Surveys are cost-effective and can be distributed electronically to many potential respondents while allowing for the speedy turnaround of data collection (Creswell, 2009). Surveys give participants an opportunity to respond while remaining anonymous. Overall, a survey was a suitable tool to collect the most relevant data about ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and practices for teaching ELs needed for this study. The survey included mostly quantitative items while embedding a few open-ended questions to obtain information needed to better understand the topic.

Part I and II of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was derived from Project DELTA Survey of Elementary Teacher Preparation Program Graduates (Project DELTA, 2014). Part III of Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was derived from Project DELTA Observation Protocol. Project DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol were designed by Maria Coady, Candace Harper, and Ester de Jong at the University of Florida, to study ESOL endorsed graduates' preparedness for and efficacy in working with ELs in general education classroom. With permission from the creators of the Project DELTA, the researcher selected Project DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol as the base for the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers because they draw from the same concepts, pedagogy, and attitudes associated with effective teaching of

ELs (Coady, de Jong, & Harper, 2011) found in the theoretical frameworks of this study. In addition, the development of Project DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol was carefully carried out from its inception to its final version. The process of developing the survey began with pre-post questionnaires designed at the University of Florida and administered to assess teacher candidates' ESOL related learning. Project DELTA staff consulted professional standards documents (i.e. Florida's 25 Performance Standards for ESOL Teachers, TESOL/NCATE Standards for ESL Teacher Education Programs, the TESOL P-12 English Language Proficiency Standards, and the CREDE Standards for Effective Pedagogy) which inform the development of the teacher preparation program at University of Florida (Coady et al., 2011). Overall, the body of ESOL content knowledge and teacher competencies that frame the requirements of the Florida ESOL endorsement served as a foundation in developing the DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol. ESOL endorsed teachers in this study have likely been exposed to this content knowledge and standards in their ESOL preparation, thus providing a rationale for utilizing Project DELTA instruments as the foundations for this study's survey.

Project DELTA Survey is considered a valid basis for the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers because it sought the input of respected professionals who are experienced in the field teaching ELs. In order "to increase the content validity of the survey, a pilot version was sent to a group of ten respected teacher education colleagues and classroom teachers with expertise in teaching elementary ELs in both ESOL and general education classrooms (Project DELTA Resources for Teacher, 2014). Dillman and colleagues (2009) recommend that researchers conduct a pilot study with a small sample of the population. Since validity of a survey is based solely on the judgment of the researcher, Walonick (2003) suggests that each question should be scrutinized and modified until the researcher is satisfied that it is an accurate measure of the desired construct,

and that there is adequate coverage of each area to be researched. For Project DELTA Survey, ESOL content experts acted as respondents of the survey and provided feedback related to the clarity of items and length of the survey. Project DELTA staff addressed the recommendation of experts through the review and revision of several drafts to produce the finalized Project DELTA Survey.

Project DELTA Observation Protocol was also used to create the survey for this study. The Observation Protocol was designed to capture the instructional practices of elementary grade level teachers with ELs (Project DELTA Resources for Teachers and Educators, 2014). The development of the instrument entailed an extensive review of the professional literature on effective instructional practices with ELs as well as performance indicators used in other protocols developed for classroom observation research. The protocol was piloted and revised to incorporate teacher practices that emerged during the pilot observations. The final version of the protocol consists of classroom practices in terms of observable performance indicators. The performance indicators under the conceptual category of linguistically and culturally responsive teaching were used as points of reference for the creation of the survey instrument for this study.

Project DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol were chosen as foundations for the design of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers because they address dimensions and indicators that align with the focus of this study: social and cultural; content area teaching; language and literacy development; curriculum and classroom organization; and assessment issues for teaching ELs. For this investigation, the researcher extrapolated specific items from Project DELTA Survey and Observation Protocol to address foundational knowledge and practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy as presented in the theories that frame this study. The items on the Survey for ESOL Endorsed Teachers concentrated on participants' knowledge and practice for

teaching ELs, which differed from Project DELTA inquiry on teachers' effectiveness and preparedness. The researcher asked several teacher colleagues in the field of ESOL to review the survey prior to its dissemination. The constructive feedback about question items and length of the survey were considered and modifications to the survey were made. The teachers involved in reviewing the survey instrument did not participate in the study.

Part I of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers contained a set of eighteen multiple choice, yes/no, and open-ended questions intended to elicit teacher background characteristics. Background variables were considered in the analysis of the study. Teachers' personal characteristics provided unique insights about their profiles as ESOL endorsed elementary teachers and about the relationship of their profiles to their knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Part II of the survey consisted of ten statements of ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. Part II of the survey presented quantitative data via numerical value Likert–type scale for statements related to teachers' knowledge of the social, cultural and linguistic dimensions of teaching ELs. These dimensions were derived from the conceptual domains found in the theoretical framework of the literature review. Data from Part II of the survey were collected and analyzed to investigate ESOL endorsed teachers' self-reported knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs.

Part III of the survey consisted of thirteen statements related to indicators of teacher practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. Each statement in Part III of the survey indicates an instructional practice related to a statement in Part II, which addressed teachers' knowledge. Part III of the survey provided quantitative data via numerical value Likert–

type scale for statements related to teachers' practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. Part III of the survey yielded data about ESOL endorsed teachers' self-reported culturally and linguistically responsive instructional practices for teaching ELs. The data extracted from Parts II and Part III of the survey were used to draw a statistical correlation between ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practice.

Finally, qualitative data were collected from open ended questions on Part IV of the survey. In this section of the survey, participants responded to three open-ended questions about their personal experiences related to their knowledge and practice for teaching ELs. The three questions on the last part of the survey gave participants the opportunity to present additional comments and to be able to share their views. Multifaceted tailored survey procedures suit "the many different survey populations and situations that arise, in an effort to achieve optimal data quality" (Dillman et al., 2009, p. 400). The study's qualitative component offered insight about participants' views, opinions, and experiences related to their knowledge and practice for teaching ELs.

Data Analysis

Quantitative Data Analysis

To conduct appropriate statistical analysis, responses from the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers were analyzed. For every item in each section of the survey, summary statistics were calculated describing response data for the survey respondents. The quantitative analysis was based upon the numerical ratings of items 2-42. Each respondent selected the response that best represented her or him.

Part I of the survey elicited teacher background information through multiple choice, yes/no and open-ended items. The frequency of responses were calculated and reported for the items of information elicited on teacher background. Measures of center were calculated for

background variables in Part I and survey items about teachers' knowledge (Part II items 20-29) and survey items about teachers' practice (Part III items 30-42). Multiple regression analysis was conducted with all teacher background variables and the sum of questions 20-29 and the sum of questions 30-42. These data were used in the analysis of association of teacher background variables and teachers' ratings of their levels of knowledge and practice.

To answer Research Question One, asking about which aspects of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs teachers felt knowledgeable, descriptive statistics showing the mode, the mean, median, and the frequency were computed for responses to individual items in Part II of the survey. To document the extent to which ESOL endorsed teachers reported being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs, survey items 20-29 were analyzed. On this Likert-like scale format ranging from 1 to 4, 1 = Extremely, 2 = Sufficiently, 3 = Somewhat, and 4 = Not at all. "The major advantage of descriptive statistics is that they permit researchers to describe the information in many scores with just a few indices, such as mean and median" (Frankel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012, p.187).

To answer Research Question Two addressing to which extent teachers self-report practice of culturally and linguistically responsive instruction for ELs. Descriptive statistics documented the frequency, mode, median, and mean of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies practiced by participants to teach ELs. Survey items 30-42 were analyzed for Research Question Two. On this Likert-like scale, 1 = Regularly, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Seldom, and 4 = Never.

Research Question Three addressed the relationship between responses representing teachers' ratings of knowledge and ratings of practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers items 20-29 in Part II and items 30-42 in Part III was used for this research question. Survey items 20-29 documented participants'

reported knowledge of key aspects of culturally and responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs. Survey items 30-42 in Part III documented participants' reported practice of effective culturally and responsive strategies for teaching ELs.

First, survey items 20 through 42 were expressed as quantitative scores. Descriptive statistics (frequency, mode, mean, and median) were applied to document teacher knowledge and practice when teaching ELs. Then items 20 and 30, 20 and 31, 21 and 32, 22 and 33, 23 and 34, 24 and 35, 24 and 36, 25 and 37, 26 and 38, 27 and 39, 28 and 40, 28 and 41, 29 and 42 were paired for statistical analysis (Table 24). For this question, correlations were calculated for teachers' ratings of their own levels of knowledge and practice on each of the 22 items. One measure of association, the Pearson *r* correlation was taken for the knowledge and practice response data. Pearson *r* was calculated in order to measure the relationship between participants' reported knowledge and their reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy when teaching ELs. A Pearson *r* test measures "the linear relationship between two variables that have both been measured on at least an interval level" (Steinberg, 2011, p. 432). "When the data for both variables are expressed in term of quantitative scores, the Pearson *r* is the appropriate correlation to use" (Fraenkel, Wallen, & Hyun, 2012, p. 208).

Qualitative Data Analysis

Qualitative data "involves analyzing and synthesizing the information the researcher obtains from various sources" (Fraenkel et al., 2012, p. 431). The researcher gathered the qualitative information provided in Part IV of the survey. This part of the survey asked open ended questions regarding teachers' knowledge, practices, and experiences teaching ELs. The researcher reviewed all data from open ended responses utilizing inductive analysis. Inductive analysis is defined as the chunking data into smaller analytical units of meaning, then clustering similar units

into categories by identifying patterns and themes. This process is based on the researcher's analytical thinking skills (Bhattacharya, 2017) and their ability to review the data carefully and identify key issues, attach codes, and cluster themes into groups. The responses were situated into themed-based categories and analyzed for significance related to the research questions. The qualitative data was incorporated into the research question analysis.

Researcher's Role and Subjectivities

For the quantitative part of the study, participants acted independently of the researcher. However, the design of the survey reflected in some way the interests and values of the researcher. For instance, the researcher, who is bilingual, chose to include in the survey items related to principles and strategies dealing with ELs native language as essential knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers. Furthermore, since quantitative data are interpreted by the researcher; there is a possibility of shaping the statistical data to focus on what the researcher values and wishes to emphasize.

For the qualitative part of the study, the researcher sought to understand the subjective experience of the participants. In this type of methodology, the researcher was intimately involved in the research, and his or her values and objectives affected the study. In qualitative research, it's important for the researcher to describe relevant aspects of self. Acknowledging biases, assumptions, expectations, and experiences to qualify his or her ability to conduct the research (Greenbank, 2003). By doing so, the researcher reveals the lens through which he or she builds an interpretation of the subject.

In this study, the researchers' role was etic - from an outside view. The qualitative data collection occurred via the survey in the form of open-ended questions; therefore, the researcher did not implement any intervention with participants. Nonetheless, it should be noted that the

researcher has worked as an educator in the field of ESOL, bilingual education, and foreign language education for 27 years. The researcher's teaching experience has encompassed whole class and small groups settings at the elementary, high school and university level. For the past fifteen years, the researcher has been employed by the district participating in the study as an elementary ESOL teacher. For nine years, the researchers worked as facilitator for teachers pursuing ESOL endorsement in the selected school district. The researcher also developed ESOL professional development curriculum for facilitating courses for teachers seeking ESOL endorsement in the school district participating in this study. The researcher's ability to critically analyze qualitative data and identify themes was based on her professional experience teaching and interacting with diverse learners, ELs, and teachers of ELs.

During this investigation, the researcher strived to study the data with limited bias or outside influence. The researcher kept a research journal to jot down thoughts and feelings throughout the process. In the examination of data, the researcher recorded inclinations or "gut" reactions and examined them to determine how the researcher's own personal and professional experiences influenced the conclusions made. During the proposal phase of the study, the researcher selected the school sites to conduct the study. At the time, the researcher did not work at any of the school sites chosen for the study. Due to unforeseen circumstances, the researcher began employment as an instructional coach at one of the school sites four weeks prior to conducting the study. A brief professional relationship existed with some of the participants.

Several other means were utilized to minimize bias. The researcher equitably selected the potential subjects using explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria. Another way in which risks were mitigated was by obtaining permissions prior to conducting the research, and prior to beginning employment at the school site, from the IRB and the school district's research review committee.

Participants may have been uncomfortable participating in a study conducted by a researcher who works in the same school or district. To mitigate teachers feeling uncomfortable about reporting about their knowledge and praxis for ELs, the researcher identified herself simply as a "teacher' in the school district and not specifically as an ESOL teacher or instructional coach in the Informed Consent Letter to teachers. This may have reduced participant perception of the researcher as working particularly with ELs or with teachers of ELs.

Bias in the interpretation of qualitative data is always a possibility, yet the researcher made attempts to diminish this issue. In this study, the researcher included open-ended questions in the survey to collect more meaningful data. Through open-ended questions, participants provided additional information that flowed freely. This type of question revealed responses and attitudes toward the topic the researcher had not considered. Consequently, the researcher gained a better understanding of the scope of the topic. Additionally, every response was considered whether it was perceived useful or not. All data was collated throughout the collection process and evaluated equally. This avoided skewing the researcher's interpretations and conclusions. Collected data were entered into SurveyMonkey online program. It was sorted by the researcher into categories that fit the study and analyzed fairly. The researcher asked several colleagues who do not work for the school district to read through the work objectively at different stages of the research to look for signs of bias the researcher may have missed.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of the research design were related to several factors. The study was limited to examining the knowledge and practices of teachers in one school district in Florida, thereby posing limitations related to the sample size and population. Limiting the study to one school district to involve ESOL endorsed teachers at the elementary grade level contributed to a limited

population size. This may have limited its representativeness of the target population. As well, teachers from nine elementary schools out of 37 in the school district participated in this study. Consequently, the research did not include any data from teachers in the 28 other schools. Surveying teachers in nine schools possibly limited the generalizations that can be made of a larger group of teachers. Restrictions from the school district prohibited the researcher from directly sending the survey to potential participants via the school district email system. Solicitation of respondents via Informed Consent Letter may have limited the potential number respondents since it required participants to access the survey online. The timing of the survey coincided with the start of the school year, which could mean teachers were overwhelmed with other tasks, hence it may have deterred them from responding. Last, the researcher recognized participant self-report as a bias limitation. Respondents might not have answered the questions honestly, which could have impacted survey validity results. In addition, they may not have had an accurate understanding of their knowledge and practice. Without an observation of teachers' instructional practice by the researcher, this is impossible to verify.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine what ESOL endorsed elementary teachers know and practice in terms of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach of ELs. This study focused on principles and effective strategies of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. A mixed methods design was used for conducting the research. This approach helped answer the research questions by collecting, analyzing, and integrating quantitative and qualitative data. The mixed methods design was intended to result in obtaining fuller and richer information about the topic. Integration of both quantitative and qualitative data in the analysis provided a better understanding of the research problem.

Quantitative and qualitative responses were gathered via a survey. ESOL endorsed elementary teachers from nine schools within the same school district in Florida were invited to participate in the survey. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was used as the data collection strategy. Participant responses provided relevant data necessary to obtain a measure of the reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy of ESOL endorsed teachers. All quantitative data were collected and analyzed to measure the reported knowledge and reported practice of ESOL endorsed teachers. Qualitative data were aggregated into categories of information and presented to provide the diversity of ideas gathered during data collection.

Chapter 4 - Analysis of Data

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and instructional practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. This study was guided by three research questions. Research Question One investigated to what extent ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Research Question Two investigated to what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Research Question Three investigated the extent to which there is a relationship, if any, between ESOL endorsed teachers' reported knowledge and reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. To answer these three questions, the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B) was administered to ESOL endorsed elementary teachers who participated in the research. Throughout this research, the term ESOL endorsed teachers refers to Florida teachers who earned their ESOL endorsement through the completion of mandated coursework via college courses or professional development classes. Chapter four presents the results of the data analysis obtained to answer the three research questions. It also presents additional information that surfaced through the background information and from the qualitative part of this research. Additional information includes variables identified from background data that show trends as they relate to responses to the questions of interest in Part II and Part III. A summary concludes this chapter.

Data Analysis

Participant Background Characteristics

Background information about the teachers who participated in this research was obtained from Part I, items 2-19 of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B). Of the 300

teachers invited to participate in this survey research, 83 participants responded to the survey for a response rate of 27.66%.

The number of respondents who provided usable data for this survey was 83, and the return rate for these respondents was 100%. Participants answered all items in Part I, II, III, and IV of the survey. The survey was designed on SurveyMonkey to require each question be answered for respondents to be able to continue to the next question.

Participants' Teaching Experience. The teaching experience of participants was measured by the number of teaching of years a participant had completed by October 11, 2019 (Table 2). Eighty-three participants responded to this survey item. Of these, 14 (16.86%) reported 5 years or less of teaching experience, 22 (26.5%) reported between 6 to 10 years, 14 (16.86%) reported 11-15 years, and 33 (39.75%) reported more than 15 years of teaching experience. The teaching experience of the 83 teacher participants ranged from less than 1 year to 41 years.

Table 2**.**
Participants' Teaching Experience by October 2019 (N= 83)

# Years Teaching	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
≤ 5	14	16.9
6-10	22	26.5
11-15	14	16.9
>15	33	39.8

Grade, Subjects, and Number of ELs Taught by Participants. The grade levels taught by participants during the current school year was investigated. All participants in the study taught elementary level and were licensed by the Florida Department of Education to teach elementary education. At the time of the study, 14 (16.87%) participants taught Kindergarten, 12 (14.46%) participants taught first grade, 12 (14.46%) participants taught second grade, 14

(16.87%) participants taught third grade, 16 (19.28%) participants taught fourth grade, and 15 (18.07%) participants taught fifth grade (Table 3).

Table 3.
Grade Taught by Participants During School Year 2019-2020 (N=83)

Grade	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
Kindergarten	14	16.9
First Grade	12	14.5
Second Grade	12	14.5
Third Grade	14	16.9
Fourth Grade	16	19.3
Fifth Grade	15	18.1

The subjects taught by participants during the current school year were researched. Elementary teachers typically teach most or all content areas, except special classes such as music, art, and physical education. Some teachers were departmentalized to provide instruction in both English language arts and social studies, while a partner teacher provides instruction in science and math. Of the 83 respondents in this study, 72 participants indicated they currently taught English language arts/reading, 69 taught math, 61 taught science, 58 taught social studies, 24 taught art, 24 taught music, and 24 participants taught physical education (Table 4).

Table 4.
Subject(s) Taught by Participants (N=83)

Subject	**# of ELs** *f*
English Language Arts/Reading	72
Math	69
Science	61
Social Studies	58
Music	24
Physical Education	24
Art	24

Participants reported the number ELs they taught and to whom they assigned grades in each subject area. Teachers in this study reported the number of ELs they taught in each subject area. The average number of ELs taught in each subject area waa as follows: 5 ELs in English language arts class, 4 ELs in math class, 3 ELs in science class, 4 ELs in social studies class, 1 EL in music, physical education, and art. A total of 339 ELs receive English language arts instruction and grades from the teachers in this study, 267 ELs receive math instruction and grades, 207 receive science instruction and grades, 214 ELs receive social studies instruction and grades, 17 receive music, physical education, and art instruction and grades (Table 5).

Table 5.
Number of ELs Taught Per Subject by Participants (N=83)

Subject	**Average # of ELs** *f*	**# of ELs** *f*
English Language Arts/Reading	5	339
Math	4	267
Science	3	207
Social Studies	4	214
Music	1	17
Physical Education	1	17
Art	1	17

Teacher participants reported whether the ELs in their classroom receive ESOL instructional support services (i.e., pullout/resource teacher) outside of their classroom. Sixty-four (77.11%) participants reported that their ELs do receive ESOL support services, while 19 (22.89%) reported that their ELs do not receive ESOL support services outside of their classroom. Most teachers indicated that their ELs are provided additional instructional support from ESOL specialists outside of their classrooms (Table 6).

Table 6.
ESOL Instructional Support Services for ELs Outside of the Classroom (N=83)

Support	**# of Responses** *f*	**% of Participants**
ESOL Instructional Support Services for ELs	64	77.1
No ESOL Instructional Support for ELs	19	22.9

Participants reported whether they had taught ELs prior to the 2019-2020 school year. Eighty-one (97.59%) of teachers reported they had taught ELs previously, while only 2 (2.41%) reported they had not taught ELs prior to this school year, 44 (53.01%) teachers reported they had taught ELS for 5 years or less, 18 (21.68%) reported they had taught ELs between 6 and 10 years, 19 (22.89%) reported they had taught ELs for over 10 years. Almost every teacher reported having experience teaching ELs in the past. More than half of the teachers taught ELs 5 years or less, the other half of the participants were almost evenly divided in the ranges of 6 to 10 years or more than 10 years of experience teaching ELs (Table 7).

Table 7.
Participants' Prior Experience Teaching ELs (N=83)

# of Years	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
0	2	2.4
1-5	44	53.0
6-10	18	21.7
> 10	19	22.9

Teachers indicated approximately how many ELs they have taught per year. Fifty-one (61.44%) indicated they taught an average of 5 or less ELs per year, 23 (27.71%) indicated they

have taught an average of 6-10 ELs per year, 9 (10.84%) indicated they taught an average of over 10 ELs per year (Table 8).

Table 8.
Number of ELs Taught per Year (N=83)

Average # of ELs	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
<5	51	61.4
6-10	23	27.7
>10	9	10.8

Participants' College Preparation and Path to ESOL Endorsement. The college preparation of participants was investigated. All participants in this study have a bachelor's degree, a requirement of the Florida Department of Education for obtaining educator certification. Teachers reported when they graduated from college; 19 (22.89%) reported they graduated from college in the past 5 years, 19 (22.89%) reported they graduated from college in the 6-10 years ago, 13 (15.66%) reported they graduated from college 11-15 years ago, and 32 (38.55%) reported they graduated from college more than 15 years ago. Almost 40% of teachers in this study graduated college more than 16 years ago, while almost a quarter of them were new graduates who completed college in the past 5 years (Table 9)

Table 9**.**
Participants' College Graduation (N=83)

# of Years Since Graduation	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
<5 years	19	22.9
6-10 years	19	22.9
11-15 years	13	15.7
>15 years	32	38.5

Participants reported information about their degree specialization areas. The undergraduate degree major of participants reflected several specialization areas. Seventy-four (89.25%) participants majored in elementary education, 1 (1.20%) participant majored in math, and 8 (9.63%) participants majored in other areas such as history, psychology, criminal justice, educational leadership, health administration, fine arts, and supervision and management (Table 10).

Table 10
Participants' College Degree Specializations (N=83)

Degree Specialization Area	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
Elementary education	74	89.2
Math	1	1.2
Other Areas	8	9.6

As per the META Consent Decree, all elementary teachers in the state of Florida are required to hold ESOL endorsement certification. Participants in the study completed ESOL endorsement requirements either through college coursework or district professional development classes. Participants indicated their path to ESOL endorsement as follows. Thirty-six (43.37%) participants obtained their ESOL endorsement through college classes. In Florida, ESOL preparation is often embedded in other coursework within teacher preparation programs. Forty-seven (56.63%) participants completed their ESOL endorsement through district professional development. This route requires Florida teachers to take 60 credit hours or 5 professional development classes, which includes Linguistics, Methods, Testing, Curriculum and Materials, and Cross Cultural Communication. More teachers in this study more teachers obtained ESOL

endorsement preparation though professional development than through college coursework (Table 11).

Table 11
Participants' Path to ESOL Endorsement (N=83)

Path to ESOL endorsement	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
College coursework	36	43.4
Professional development	47	56.6

When asked how many ESOL college classes they had taken, 37 (44.58%) particpants reported taking a total of 1 ESOL college class, 13 (15.66%) reported taking 2 ESOL classes in college, 4 (4.82%) reported taking 3 college ESOL courses, 5 (6.03%) reported taking 4 ESOL courses, and 24 (28.92%) reported taking 5 college ESOL courses. Almost half of the participants had taken at least 1 college ESOL class, while almost a third of the teachers had taken 5 college ESOL courses (Table 12).

Table 12.
Participants' ESOL College Coursework (N=83)

# of ESOL classes	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
1	37	44.58
2	13	15.66
3	4	4.82
4	5	6.03
5	24	28.92

The current teaching certificates of participants were investigated. In addition to the required elementary education certificate and ESOL endorsement, 17 (20.48%) teachers hold a certificate in Exceptional Student Education K-12, 32 (38.55%) in Reading Endorsement, and 34

(40.96%) in other areas of educations such as Gifted Education, Spanish K-12, and Educational Leadership. This data demonstrates that many teachers in the study hold certifications in specializations areas besides the required elementary education and ESOL endorsement (Table 13).

Table 13
Participants' Additional Teaching Certifications (N=83)

Teaching Certification Area	**# of Participants** *f*	**% of Participants**
Exceptional Student Education k-12	17	20.5
Reading endorsement	32	38.6
Other (Gifted, Spanish k-12, Educational Leadership)	34	40.9

Participants' Primary Language, Other Languages, and Cross Cultural Experience. The primary or first language of the respondents were investigated All 83 participants responded to this survey item. The primary language of the 83 participants reflected a predominance of English. Data are as follows: English is the primary language of 73 (87.95%) participants, while 10 (12.05%) reported having a first language other than English. In summary, few participants reported having a primary home language other than English; English was the prevalent home language reported by teachers (Table 14).

Table 14
Participants' Primary Language (N=83)

Language	**# of Participants**	**% of Participants**
	f	
English	73	87.9
Other	10	12.1

Participants reported on their proficiency in a language other than English. Eighty-three out of 83 participants answered this question. Fifty-three (63.86%) participants reported they did not know a language other than English. Thirty (36.14%) participants reported they know a language other than English. Of these 30, 25 reported they know Spanish; the other 5 languages reported were French, Hebrew, Hindi, Arabic, and American Sign Language (Table 15). Among the participants who reported they know a language other than English, 15 indicated they know a language other than English proficiently, 9 indicated they know a language other than English at intermediate level, and 6 responded they know a language other than English at beginner level. Less than 20% of participants had proficient knowledge of a language other than English, while 80% had limited to no knowledge of another language.

Table 15
Participants' Knowledge of a Language Other than English (N=30)

Language	**# of Participants**
	f
Spanish	25
French	1
Hebrew	1
Hindi	1
Arabic	1
American Sign Language	1

Participants were asked whether they had lived or had spent time in another country or had extended interactions with people from a different culture or language background. Eighty-three out of 83 respondents answered this item. Thirty-five (42.17%) indicated they had spent a significant amount of time abroad, while 48 (57.83%) indicated they had not. Seventeen (48.57%) had spent 2 years or more in another country. Additionally, 35 (42.17%) participants indicated they had extended interactions with people from other cultures and languages mainly through family relationships or friendships. Conversely, 48 (57.83%) participants indicated they had not experienced extended interactions with people from other cultures or languages (Tables 16 and 17).

Table 16
Participants' Time Spent Abroad (N=83)

Years	**# of Participants**	**% of Participants**
	f	
0 years	48	57.8
< 2 years	18	54.1
≥ 2 years	17	48.6

Table 17
Participants' Interactions with CLD Family and Friends (N=83)

Extended Interaction	**# of Participants**	**% of Participants**
	f	
Yes	35	42.2
No	48	57.8

Summary of Participants' Background Characteristics

A multiple regression was computed to learn more about the relationship between several of the independent (background) variables and the dependent variables (knowledge) and (practice). A least squares multiple regression was used in this research to find out the best predictor of teacher knowledge and teacher practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. From the multiple regression analysis, several teacher background variables had a significant correlation with teacher knowledge. The salient background predictors of teacher knowledge were as follows: years of teaching experience, outside instructional support for ELs, taught ELs in previous years, number of years teaching ELs, number of ELs taught per year, path to ESOL endorsement, and time spent abroad. When these multiple variables were applied to the sum of all the questions (20-29) about knowledge in Part II of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers, the result is a positive correlation between these background variables and teacher knowledge (negative relationship between the predictors and the score). That is, the coefficients on each predicting variable were negative, so as they increased, the score predicted would decrease, indicating an increase in knowledge given the scale 1 = Extremely, 2 = Sufficiently, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = Not at all. This relationship indicates that as the multiple predictors (independent variables) increase, the dependent variable (knowledge) also grows. For example, the greater the number of years teaching experience, the higher the ratings on all the items related to knowledge, and so on for each independent background variable. Table 18 displays this information. The regression had a sum square error (SSE) of 36.48 and a per term error of 3.17, meaning it would predict the sum and be off on average by 3.17. The multiple regression computed with the same independent variables on the sum of the questions about practice in Part III of the survey did not yield statistically significant correlations, as its sum square error (SSE) was 198.08 and its average error was 18.05.

Table 18.
Multiple Regression of Teacher Background Variables and Sum of Knowledge (N=83)

Predictor	**Coefficient**
intercept	31.16
years of teaching experience	- 0.1
outside instructional support for ELs	- 1.58
taught ELs in previous years	- 3.99
number of years teaching ELs	.009
number of ELs taught per year	- .169
path to ESOL endorsement	- 4.24
time spent abroad	- 3.075
	(SSE) = 198.08

Research Questions One

To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

To answer this question, items 20 through 29 of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B) were used. Descriptive statistics, including the frequency (Table 19), the mode, median, and mean (Table 20) were calculated for each item. The frequency information is documented in Likert-like scale (1= Extremely, 2= Sufficiently, 3= Somewhat, 4= Not at all). Statistical information is followed by the qualitative results of the open-ended responses obtained from survey item 43.

Quantitative Data. Survey item 20 investigated teachers' knowledge about using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 11(13.25%) for Extremely, 29 (34.94%) for Sufficiently, 35 (42.17%) for Somewhat, 8 (9.64%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 20, knowledge about using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching, the mode is 3, the

median is 3, the mean is 2.48 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being sufficiently knowledgeable about using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching. The finding that 35 (42.17%) participants reported being Somewhat knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because using ELs' home language develops comprehensible input (Krashen, 1981) and facilitates ELs expressing ideas and demonstrating understanding.

Survey item 21 investigated teachers' knowledge about using ELs' cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 12 (14.46%) for Extremely, 38 (45.78%) for Sufficiently, 32 (38.5%) for Somewhat, 1 (1.2%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 21, knowledge about using ELs' cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 2.27 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported they were Sufficiently knowledgeable about using ELs' cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching. The finding that 38 (45.78%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because it signals a shift from a deficit-based model of language instruction to an asset-based approach with ELs.

Survey item 22 investigated teachers' knowledge about structuring classroom activities, so that ELs interact successfully with English dominant other students. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 20 (24.1%) for Extremely, 49 (59.04%) for Sufficiently, 13 (15.66%) for Somewhat, 1 (1.2%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 22, knowledge about structuring classroom activities so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant other students, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 1.94 (Table 20). Results indicated that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about structuring classroom activities so that ELs can interact successfully with

English dominant other students. The finding that 49 (59.04%) participants reported being sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because its shows teachers understand that cooperative learning activities promote peer interaction, which helps the development of language and the learning of concepts and content for ELs. Culturally responsive pedagogy allows ELs to work with others who share their home language, and they are also intentionally placed in groups with English dominant students at their same academic language proficiency.

Survey item 23 investigated teachers' knowledge about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning tasks. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 19 (22.89%) for Extremely, 49 (54.09%) for Sufficiently, 14 (16.87%) for Somewhat, 1 (1.2%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 23, knowledge selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning tasks, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 1.96 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning tasks. The finding that 49 (59.04%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because effective teachers of ELs understand that they may not automatically connect their previous experience with the lesson currently being taught. Teachers understand that they must build ELs background knowledge on content topics to increase comprehension of the material.

Survey item 24 investigated teachers' knowledge about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 36 (43.37%) for Extremely,

38 (45.78%) for Sufficiently, 8 (9.64%) for Somewhat, 1 (1.2%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 24, organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 1.69 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. The finding that 38 (43.78%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because it shows an understanding that ELs need a supportive learning environment that helps to reduce the affective filter, that is a 'screen' that is influenced by emotional variables and physical states that can impede learning processes (Krashen, 1982). This obstacle that manifests itself during language acquisition could be reduced by an organized classroom where ELs can develop a sense of individual and group ownership of the room, actively engage in their learning, and work cooperatively.

Survey item 25 investigated teachers' knowledge about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 12 (14.46%) for Extremely, 45 (54.22%) for Sufficiently, 24 (28.92%) for Somewhat, 2 (2.41%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 25, knowledge about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 2.19 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas. The finding that 45 (54.22%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because effective teachers understand that ELs best acquire English when language forms are explicitly taught to support their academic language development.

Survey item 26 investigated teachers' knowledge about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 19 (22.89%) for Extremely, 44 (53.01%) for Sufficiently, 19 (22.89 %) for Somewhat, 1 (1.2%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 26, knowledge about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 2.02 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction. The finding that 44 (53.01%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because it shows teachers understand their critical role in supporting ELs' language development. Participants responses demonstrate they understand they must explicitly teach English language vocabulary in the various subjects to help ELs learn and use aspects of language associated with the academic discourse of those subject areas (Wong Fillmore and Snow, 2000).

Survey item 27 investigated teachers' knowledge about addressing the grammatical (e.g., sentence complexity) demands of content area. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 16 (19.28%) for Extremely, 37 (44.58%) for Sufficiently, 26 (31.33%) for Somewhat, 4 (4.82%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 27, knowledge about addressing the grammatical (e.g., sentence complexity) demands of content area, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 2.22 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about addressing the grammatical (e.g., sentence complexity) demands of content area. The finding that 37 (44.58%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because teachers of ELs need to be prepared to identify and teach the English grammar structures found in

content areas that ELs may not be familiar with. This helps "optimize ELs' English language learning and avoid linguistic obstacles to content area learning" (Wong Fillmore & Snow, 2000, p. 7).

Survey item 28 investigated teachers' knowledge about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 20 (24.1%) for Extremely, 48 (57.83%) for Sufficiently, 13 (15.68%) for Somewhat, 2 (2.41%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 28, knowledge about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 1.96 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction. The finding that 48 (57.83%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally significant because modifying the teacher's use of the English language affects ELs' ability to meaningfully and successfully engage with academic content.

Survey item 29 investigated teachers' knowledge about lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of instruction for ELs. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 18 (21.69%) for Extremely, 46 (55.42%) for Sufficiently, 18 (21.68 %) for Somewhat, 1 (1.2%) for Not at all (Table 19). For item 29, knowledge about lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of instruction for ELs, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 2.02 (Table 20). Results indicate that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of instruction for ELs. The finding that 46 (55.42%) participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable of this principle is educationally

significant because teachers know they should modify the language of materials to ensure that ELs have the language resources to demonstrate their content-area knowledge and skills.

Research Question One explored areas of ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge about principles of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. The descriptive statistical analysis of the survey response data on teachers' ratings of knowledge indicated that the majority reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about social, cultural, and linguistic principles of teaching ELs (Table 19). Teachers reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable on all principles of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs presented in the survey, except "using ELs home languages as a resource in teaching". They reported being Somewhat knowledgeable about this concept. More than 43% of teachers reported being most knowledgeable about "organizing their classroom, so that ELs feel include comfortable and ready to learn". More than 24% of teachers highly-rated their knowledge about "modifying my use of English to help ELs understand my instruction" and "structuring classroom activities, so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students". Teachers reported being least knowledgeable about "using ELs home languages as a resource in teaching" with 9.64% reporting they were Not at all knowledgeable. Another low-rated item for knowledge was "addressing the grammatical demands of content area" with almost 5% reporting they were Not at all knowledgeable. In response to Research Question One, participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about all except one of the principles of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Table 19.
Participants' Reported Knowledge of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (N=83)

Item and Survey Question	Extremely (1) *f* (%)	Sufficiently (2) *f* (%)	Somewhat (3) *f* (%)	Not at all (4) *f* (%)
How knowledgeable do you feel about…				
20. using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching?	11 (13.3)	29 (34.9)	35 (42.2)	8 (9.6)
21. using ELs**'** cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching?	12 (14.5)	38 (45.8)	32 (38.6)	1 (1.2)
22. structuring classroom activities so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students?	20 (24.1)	49 (59.0)	13 (15.7)	1 (1.2)
23. selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning tasks?	19 (22.9)	49 (59.0)	14 (16.9)	1 (1.2)
24. organizing my classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn?	36 (43.4)	38 (45.8)	8 (9.6)	1 (1.2)
25. setting language objectives specifically for ELs when you plan instruction in content areas?	12 (14.5)	45 (54.2)	24 (28.9)	2 (2.4)
26. addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when you plan instruction**?**	19 (22.9)	44 (53.0)	19 (22.9)	1 (1.2)
27. addressing the grammatical demands of content areas?	16 (19.3)	37 (44.6)	26 (31.3)	4 (4.8)
28. modifying your use of English to help ELs understand your instruction?	20 (24.1)	48 (57.8)	13 (15.7)	2 (2.4)
29. lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of your instruction for ELs?	18 (21.7)	46 (55.4)	18 (21.7)	1 (1.2)

Table 20.
Mode, Mean, Median, for Participants' Reported Knowledge of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (N=83)

Item and Survey Question	Mode	Mean	Median
How knowledgeable do you feel about…?			
20. using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching?	3	2.48	3
21. using ELs**'** cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching?	2	2.27	2
22. structuring classroom activities so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students?	2	1.94	2
23. selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning tasks?	2	1.96	2
24. organizing my classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn?	2	1.69	2
25. setting language objectives specifically for ELs when you plan instruction in content areas?	2	2.19	2
26. addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when you plan instruction**?**	2	2.02	2
27. addressing the grammatical demands of content area?	2	2.22	2
28. modifying your use of English to help ELs understand your instruction?	2	1.96	2
29. lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of your instruction for ELs?	2	2.02	2

Qualitative Data. Qualitative data were also gathered to answer Research Question One. This information was obtained from responses to the open-ended question item 43 on the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers. This question requested that participants share their thoughts about knowledge for teaching ELs they gained during their ESOL endorsement preparation. Lunenburg and Irby (2008) highlight the importance of using major themes to organize and present results of

qualitative data. The qualitative data here is organized into major themes, which arose from the open-ended responses in the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers.

The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers item 43, Part IV (Appendix B), requested that participants provide comments related to what they learned during ESOL endorsement preparation they considered important for teaching ELs. They provided qualitative data about knowledge they had gained or wish they had gained. Eighty-three participants responded to the open-ended opportunity to share their thoughts. They specifically addressed elements of culturally responsive pedagogy and linguistically responsive pedagogy. The following themes emerged from these open-ended responses: (1) cultural sensitivity, and (2) value for linguistic diversity.

Item 43 revealed information that related to cultural sensitivity, indicating that participants gained knowledge of the cultures represented in their classrooms and ways to translate this knowledge into instructional practice to maximize learning opportunities for ELs. Cultural sensitivity is a key principle of culturally responsive pedagogy as culturally responsive education recognizes, respects, and uses students' identities and backgrounds as meaningful sources (Nieto, 2000) for creating optimal environments. Twelve participants in this study revealed that they had gained cultural awareness through by learning about ELs cultures during their ESOL endorsement preparation. Their responses showed their understanding of the importance of making all cultures feel appreciated in their classrooms. A few teachers reported they gained knowledge about different cultures and the beliefs about education held by other cultures. A couple of respondents expressed learning about allowing ELs to share their backgrounds and using books in the classroom that "reflect diversity in our world." A small number of teachers came away from their ESOL preparation with a desire to have more knowledge on the diversity of their ELs. Moreover, they want to learn more about "their ELs' living conditions to effectively support students coming

from a wide range of countries." Most of these twelve teachers emphasized their desire to know more about specific cultural traditions to "help better connect with parents of ELs." They want more exposure to various cultures to have a greater understanding of cultural differences. As one participant stated, "every EL is different." In summary, the responses to item 43 exhibited that some teachers had gained knowledge and appreciation of the importance of multiculturalism in their classrooms and in their communities. Figure 2 displays this information.

Ten participants reported on their value for linguistic diversity, indicating that they cultivated favorable views of linguistic diversity and respect for students' home languages in their ESOL preparation. Value for linguistic diversity is a fundamental orientation of linguistically responsive pedagogy, wherein teachers believe that linguistic diversity is worthy of supporting, and their actions reflect that belief (Lucas & Villegas, 2013). A few participants in this study stated they "wished to learn another language to help their ELs." They want to learn basic words and phrases in many languages to communicate and interact with ELs. A couple stated it is important to "take a conversational class in another language." They want to help ELs feel safe in the classroom by allowing them to use their native language while learning English. These teachers feel it is important for them to "learn the alphabet in the language of ELs as well as conversational word." In lieu of knowing another language, teachers learned about translation resources to assist their ELs. In general, the data shows that some teachers had gained knowledge of the importance of respecting ELs' native languages and a few desired to be bilingual themselves. This information is detailed in Figure 2.

Theme	Participants	Selected Comments
Cultural sensitivity	12	and students from different backgrounds. The importance of sharing backgrounds The importance of making all cultures feel appreciated. More background knowledge on the diversity to effectively support students coming from a wide range of countries.
Value for linguistic diversity	10	I wish we were taught another language so that we can have that knowledge to help incoming students who speak other language. I leaned that I should allow student to feel safe to use their native language along with learning the English language. I wish I knew more "survival" phrases for classroom use in other languages. I think it is important for teachers to know some conversational words in other languages.

Figure 2. Themes Derived from Survey Item 43: Knowledge Participants Gained During ESOL Endorsement Preparation

Research Question One investigated the extent to which ESOL endorsed elementary teachers reported knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. The quantitative and qualitative data that were gathered and analyzed indicated that more than 44% participants reported being at least Sufficiently knowledgeable about all, except one, of the culturally and linguistically responsive principles for teaching ELs presented in the survey. The qualitative data gathered from the open-ended question also support the teachers' report of being Sufficiently knowledgeable about culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs.

Research Question Two

To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

To answer this question, items 30 through 42 of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers were used. Descriptive statistics, including the frequency (Table 21), the mode, the median, and

the mean (Table 22) were calculated for each item. The frequency information is documented in Likert-like scale (1 = Regularly, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Never). Statistic information is followed by the qualitative results of the open-ended comments obtained from survey item 44.

Quantitative Data. Lucas and Villegas' Survey item 30 investigated teachers using language other than English during instruction. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 42 (50.6%) for Regularly, 21 (25.3%) for Sometimes, 9 (10.84%) for Seldom, 11 (13.25%) for Never (Table 21). For item 30, using language other than English during instruction, the mode is 1, the median is 1 and the mean is 1.87 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly using language other than English during instruction. The finding that 42 (50.60%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy presents a discrepancy with participants' report that the majority did not know a language other than English. Since participants did not indicate the modality through which they use a language other than English during instruction. It is possible that they could utilize translations applications for this purpose. It is noteworthy to disclose that ELs need to process content in their home language first, so they can later participate in the class in English with their teacher and classmates. ELs' understanding and engagement with the content is the desired outcome; processing the content in their home language is a way to facilitate it. Although teachers may not speak another language, it is possible for them to create the conditions for ELs to use their home languages for learning.

Survey item 31 investigated teachers making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 15 (18.07%) for Regularly, 37 (44.58%) for Sometimes, 21 (25.3%) for Seldom, 10 (12.05%) for Never (Table 21). For item 31, making native

language materials available for ELs to use during instruction, the mode is 2, the median is 2, and the mean is 2.31 (Table 21). Results indicate that most participants reported Sometimes making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction. The finding that 37 (44.58%) participants reported Sometimes using this strategy is educationally significant because it shows teachers using a culturally responsive strategy when allowing ELs to use home languages to clarify concepts and topics. Teachers affirm their students' identities when they encourage ELs to learn about the content they teach from resources in their home languages (Yzquierdo, 2017).

Survey item 32 investigated teachers use of materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 56 (67.47%) for Regularly, 23 (27.71%) for Sometimes, 3 (3.61%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 32, use of materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.39 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly using materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. The finding that 56 (67.47%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because it shows that teachers welcome ELs' cultural experiences and use them to help ELs connect to the class and to the lessons.

Survey item 33 investigated teachers practice of linguistic scaffolding needed for ELs at different English proficiency levels to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 51 (61.45%) for Regularly, 29 (34.94%) for Sometimes, 2 (2.41%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 33, providing linguistic scaffolding needed for ELs at different English proficiency levels to participate meaningfully in cooperative

learning structures, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.43 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants Regularly provide linguistic scaffolding needed for ELs at different English proficiency levels to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures. The finding that 51 (61.45%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because ELs benefit by working with different groups when they are provided support. ELs also learn to express themselves with greater confidence when working in small groups with English language role models

Survey item 34 investigated teachers tapping into/links to students' background knowledge or prior experiences. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 55 (66.27%) for Regularly, 24 (28.92%) for Sometimes, 3 (3.61%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 34, tapping into links to students' background knowledge or prior experiences, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.4 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants Regularly tap into links to students' background knowledge or prior experiences. The finding that 55 (66.27%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because it shows teachers recognizing the assets that ELs bring to school. Helping ELs find the connections between their lived experiences and the content is a culturally responsive practice that affirms students' identities.

Survey item 35 investigated teachers pairing or grouping ELs who share a common native language to support their content learning. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 53 (63.86%) for Regularly, 25 (30.12%) for Sometimes, 3 (3.61%) for Seldom, 2 (2.41%) for Never (Table 21). For item 35, pairing or grouping students who share a common native language to support their content learning, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.45 (Table 22). Results indicate that most

participants Regularly pair or group students who share a common native language to support their content learning. The finding that 53 (63.86%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because teachers of ELs can encourage bilingualism by supporting students' use of native languages. Engaging in meaningful academic experiences in one's native language enriches and develops the second language.

Survey item 36 investigated teachers using routines to facilitate comprehension of activities. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 71 (85.54%) for Regularly, 10 (12.05%) for Sometimes, 1 (1.2%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 36, use routines to facilitate comprehension of activities, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.18 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants Regularly use routines to facilitate comprehension of activities. The finding that 71 (85.54%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because ELs may not understand verbal cues, so predictable structures are even more significant to reduce anxiety, foster feelings of safety and comfort, and orient them to classroom expectations. Classroom patterns and predictable structures also aid language development.

Survey item 37 investigated teachers stating language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them visually for ELs. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 58 (69.88%) for Regularly, 18 (21.69%) for Sometimes, 5 (6.02%) for Seldom, 2 (2.41%) for Never (Table 21). For item 37, stating language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them visually for ELs, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.41 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly using language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them

visually for ELs. The finding that 58 (69.88%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because implementing language objectives helps ensure that ELs have equal access to the curriculum even though they may not be fully proficient in the language. The second language acquisition process requires opportunities for ELs to be exposed to, practice with, and then be assessed on their language skills. Language objectives articulate the academic language functions and skills that ELs need to master to fully participate in the lesson and meet the grade-level content standards (Echevarria et al., 2007).

Survey item 38 investigated teachers using effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 60 (72.29%) for Regularly, 20 (24.1%) for Sometimes, 2 (2.41%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 38, use of effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.33 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly using effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse. The finding that 60 (72.29%) participants reported Regularly using of this strategy is educationally significant because ELs need language support in content areas especially with specialized technical vocabulary, common English words may be used in a different specialized way in a content area, and everyday language structures or frameworks for reporting their learning.

Survey item 39 investigated teachers explicitly teaching the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 48 (57.83%) for Regularly, 29 (34.94%) for Sometimes, 5 (6.02 %) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 39,

explicitly teaching the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.51 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly explicitly teaching the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts. The finding that 48 (57.83%) participants reported Regularly practicing this strategy is educationally significant because ELs need to be explicitly taught how language functions in various modes of communication across the curriculum. In addition, ELs opportunities to use the new forms and modes of language to which they are being exposed, to successfully engage with academic content.

Survey item 40 investigated teachers using clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 73 (87.95%) for Regularly, 8 (9.64%) for Sometimes, 1 (1.2%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 40, use clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.16 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly using clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels. The finding that 73 (87.95%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because it shows teachers understand the characteristics of language learners at different proficiency levels and how to best support ELs in their oral language development and content learning. With the sheltered instruction model, it's best practice to design learning that leads ELs to high-order thinking at all levels of language mastery (Echevarria et al., 2007; Goldenberg & Coleman, 2010).

Survey item 41 investigated teachers simplifying or elaborating/paraphrasing the language of content instruction. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 69 (83.13%) for Regularly, 12 (14.46%) for

Sometimes, 1 (1.2%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 41, simplifying or elaborating/paraphrasing the language of content instruction, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.2 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants simplify or elaborate/paraphrase the language of content instruction. The finding that 69 (83.13%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant for supporting ELs access to the curriculum, helping them comprehend both directions and content, and allowing them to demonstrate what they know and can do.

Survey item 42 investigated teachers asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking. Eighty-three out of 83 participants responded. The frequency reported for the 83 respondents was recorded as follows: 61 (73.49%) for Regularly, 19 (22.9%) for Sometimes, 2 (2.4%) for Seldom, 1 (1.2%) for Never (Table 21). For item 42, asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking, the mode is 1, the median is 1, and the mean is 1.31 (Table 22). Results indicate that most participants reported Regularly asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking. The finding that 61 (73.49%) participants reported Regularly using this strategy is educationally significant because it engages ELs in cognitively demanding tasks to demonstrate understanding and use of academic language and content. "Even newcomer ELLs can be challenged using higher-order thinking when responding to different commands or questions, such as, "Show me how to _____." There is no reason why ELs cannot make decisions based on evidence, produce creative work, construct original models, or invent using their imaginations" (Gottlieb, 2013, p. 38).

Table 21.

Participants' Reported Practice of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (N=83)

Item and Survey Statements	Regularly (1) *f* (%)	Sometimes (2) *f* (%)	Seldom (3) *f* (%)	Never (4) *f* (%)
How often do you practice these strategies when teaching ELs?				
30. I use language other than English during instruction.	42 (50.6)	21 (25.3)	9 (10.8)	11 (13.3)
31. I make native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction.	15 (18.1)	37 (44.6)	21 (25.3)	10 (12.1)
32. I use materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences.	56 (67.5)	23 (27.2)	3 (3.6)	1 (1.2)
33. I provide linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures.	51 (61.5)	29 (34.9)	2 (2.4)	1 (1.2)
34. I tap into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences.	55 (66.3)	24 (28.92)	3 (3.6)	1 (1.2)
35. I pair/group students with a common native language to support content learning.	53 (63.9)	25 (30.1)	3 (3.6)	2 (2.4)
36. I use routines to facilitate comprehension of activities?	71 (85.5)	10 (12.1)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)
37. I state language learning objectives verbally or write and display them visually for ELs.	58 (69.9)	18 (21.7)	5 (6.0)	2 (2.4)
38. I use effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse.	60 (72.3)	20 (24.1)	2 (2.4)	1 (1.2)
39. I explicitly teach the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts.	48 (57.8)	29 (34.9)	5 (6.0)	1 (1.2)
40. I use clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels.	73 (88.0)	8 (9.6)	2 (1.2)	1 (1.2)
41. I simplify (vocabulary or sentence structure) or elaborate/paraphrase the language of content instruction.	69 (83.1)	12 (14.5)	1 (1.2)	1 (1.2)
42. I ask ELs linguistically appropriate content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking	61 (73.5)	19 (22.9)	2 (2.4)	1 (1.2)

Table 22.

Mode, Mean, Median for Participants' Reported Practice of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (N=83)

Item and Survey Statements	Mode	Mean	Median
How often do you practice these strategies when teaching ELs?			
30. I use language other than English during instruction.	1	1.87	1
31. I make native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction.	2	2.31	2
32. I use materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences.	1	1.39	1
33. I provide linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures.	1	1.43	1
34. I tap into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences.	1	1.40	1
35. I pair/group students with a common native language to support content learning.	1	1.45	1
36. I use routines to facilitate comprehension of activities,	1	1.18	1
37. I state language learning objectives verbally or write and display them visually for ELs.	1	1.41	1
38. I use effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse.	1	1.33	1
39. I explicitly teach the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts.	1	1.51	1
40. I use clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels.	1	1.16	1
41. I simplify (vocabulary or sentence structure) or elaborate/paraphrase the language of content instruction.	1	1.20	1
42. I ask ELs linguistically appropriate content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking.	1	1.31	1

Research Question Two explored areas of ESOL endorsed teachers' reported use of linguistically and culturally responsive instructional strategies when teaching ELs. The descriptive statistical analysis of the survey response data on teachers' ratings of practice indicated that the majority Regularly practiced social, cultural and linguistic strategies for teaching ELs. Several salient points are illustrated in Table 21. First, most teachers reported Regularly using every strategy, except "making native language materials available to ELs". Second, 9% to 44% of participants reported at least Sometimes using the strategies. Only 1% of participants reported Never using the strategies. Higher percentages of participants reported Never applying strategies related to the use of native language during instruction. On item 30, "using language other than English during instruction", 13.3% of participants indicated Never. Similarly, 12.1% of participants reported Never "making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction". In response to Research Question Two, participants reported Regularly practicing twelve out of thirteen strategies of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy.

Qualitative Data. Qualitative data were also gathered to answer Research Question Two. This information resulted from open-ended item 44 on the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers, which requested that participants provide comments regarding the instructional practices they learned during their ESOL endorsement preparation which have been effective for teaching ELs. Eighty-three participants responded to open-ended question item 44 to share the effective strategies they use for instruction of ELs. Their responses reflected elements of culturally responsive pedagogy as well as linguistically responsive pedagogy. The following themes emerged as a result of these open-ended responses: (1) scaffolding instruction, (2) understanding and applying strategies for second language acquisition.

Information reported on scaffolding instruction indicates that the participants practice a basic set of practices and tools to support ELs' learning. Scaffolding instruction is a key principle of linguistically responsive pedagogy as ELs need particular types of language-related scaffolding that English proficient students may not need. Twenty participants in this study revealed that they practice using extra-linguistic supports such as "realia, visuals, videos, using gestures, manipulatives, modeling, and hands-on activities." These teachers reported practice of supports for oral text such as "translation aids, native language scaffolding, use of cognates, simplifying sentences, redundancy, and repetition in instruction, using clear speech, and explicit instructions." Their responses stated their practice of supports for written text such as "pre-teaching vocabulary, vocabulary maps, graphic organizers, checking background knowledge, providing sentence starters, and allowing extra time for reading and writing assignments." In general, the responses of these twenty teachers presented application of practices and tools that support ELs' learning of content while promoting second language acquisition. This information is displayed in Figure 3.

Twenty-five teacher responses about their practice reflect application of knowledge about the stages of second language acquisition. A few teachers stated "differentiating instruction per ELs English language level", thus allowing students to complete tasks at their level of proficiency. Responses illustrated teachers providing ELs with comprehensible input through scaffolding instruction. A couple of teachers expressed using "cognates and native language support", allowing ELs to apply knowledge from their native language to English. A handful of teachers also build on ELs transfer of native language to second language by reinforcing common "associations of vocabulary between native and second language." A small number of teachers referred to providing opportunities for output through written and oral forms that address "academic" language. In general, the strategies these teachers reported in this question, align with

practices that promote the second language acquisition process as ELs learn the elements of the new language, such as vocabulary, grammatical structures, and writing systems. Figure 3 details this information.

Theme	Participants	Selected Comments
Scaffolding instruction	20	Pre-teach, small group collaborations, Kagan learning environment, sentence starters. Using clear speech, giving extra time, using partners.
Understanding and applying strategies for second language acquisition	25	ELs. I have them share how to say the words with the class in their language. Clear expectations and procedures that lend themselves to easy to follow routines. I modify lessons and activities to meet the need of the student's proficiency. I use different areas of proficiency with the Can Do Descriptors which has helped me to know where they are and what my expectations should be.

Figure 3. Themes Derived from Survey Item 44: Effective Instructional Practices Participants Learned During ESOL Endorsement Preparation

Research Question Two investigated the extent to which ESOL endorsed elementary teachers reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. The quantitative and qualitative data that were gathered and analyzed indicated that more than 50% participants reported Regularly using all, except one of the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies for teaching ELs presented in the survey. The qualitative data gathered from the open-ended question also support the Regularly reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs.

Research Question Three

To what extent is there a relationship between ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

To answer this question, quantitative research was conducted. The quantitative findings

stem from responses to items 20-29 (Part II) and items 30-42 (Part III) of the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers (Appendix B). Survey items 20-29 provided responses related to participants' reported knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs. Responses to survey items 30-42 provided data related to participants' reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs. Survey items 20 and 30, 20 and 31, 21 and 32, 22 and 33, 23 and 34, 24 and 35, 24 and 36, 25 and 37, 26 and 38, 27 and 39, 28 and 40, 28 and 41, 29 and 42 were paired for statistical analysis (Table 24). For each survey item pair, descriptive statistics were applied. Then Pearson *r* correlations were calculated for each pair to measure the extent of the relationship between participants' knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy and their reported practice of the same when teaching ELs. Qualitative data were also compiled. These data were gathered via the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers Part IV, item 45 (Appendix B). A summary concluded the documentation for findings for Research Question Three.

Quantitative Data. Frequency results for participant's' reported knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs are illustrated in Table 19 (1 = Extremely, 2 = Sufficiently, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = Not at all). Frequency results for the reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs are illustrated in Table 21 (1 = Regularly, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Seldom, 4 = Never). Statistical analysis for each pair follows.

Pair 1: Using ELs' Home Language in Teaching. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 20 and 30 addressed the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching (Appendix B). Survey item 20 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about using ELs home language as a resource in teaching. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 20. Of these, 35 (42.2%) reported being

Somewhat knowledgeable, and nearly 35% reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 3 and a mean of 2.48 for survey item 20. These results show that most participants reported being Somewhat knowledgeable about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching. More than a third reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and more than 13% reported being Extremely knowledgeable about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching.

Survey item 30 investigated the frequency of participants who reported using a language other than English during instruction. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 20. Of these, 42 (50.6%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and slightly more than 25% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.87 for survey item 30. These results show that most participants reported Regularly using a language other than English during instruction. Survey results point to a slight discrepancy between the report of being Somewhat knowledgeable about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching and the reported Regularly using a language other than English during instruction (50.6%). Survey item 20 has a mode of 3, while survey item 30 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of a language other than English during instruction is higher than the reported knowledge about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 20 and 30 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching and the reported practice of using language other than English during instruction. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .355. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of + .355 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant

relationship exists between survey item 20 and survey item 30. The result reads as $r = +.355$, n = 83, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 2: Using ELs' Home Language in Teaching. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 20 and 31 addressed the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching (Appendix B). Survey item 20 was also paired with item 31 as both focus on ELs native language as a resource during instruction, with item 31 addressing native language specifically via materials. Survey item 20 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about of using ELs home language as a resource in teaching. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 20. Of these, 35 (42.2%) reported being Somewhat knowledgeable, and nearly 35% reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 3 and a mean of 2.48 for survey item 20. These results show that most participants reported being Somewhat knowledgeable about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching.

Survey item 31 investigated the frequency of participants who reported making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 31. Of these, 37 (44.6%) reported Sometimes using this strategy, and slightly more than 18% reported using it Regularly. Table 22 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 2.31 for survey item 31. These results show that most participants reported Sometimes making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction. Survey item 20 has a mode of 3, while survey item 31 has a mode of 2. Thus, the reported use of native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction is higher than the reported teacher knowledge about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching. Although the modes for items 20 and 31 are different, survey results point to an accord between the report of being Somewhat knowledgeable (42.2%) about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching

and reporting Sometimes (44.6%) making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 20 and 31 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about the use of ELs home language as a resource in teaching and the reported practice of making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .356. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.356 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 20 and survey item 31. The result reads as $r = +.356$, n = 83, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 3: Using Cultural Backgrounds as Resource in Teaching. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 21 and 32 addressed ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching (Appendix B). Survey item 21 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about using ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 21. Of these, reported 38 (45.8%) being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and close to 39% reported being Somewhat knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 2.27 for survey item 21. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about using ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching; still nearly 15% of participants reported being Extremely knowledgeable about using ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching.

Survey item 32 investigated the frequency of participants who reported using materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 32. Of these, reported 56 (67.5%)

Regularly using this strategy, and slightly more than 27% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.39 for survey item 32. These results show that most participants reported Sometimes using materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. Nearly all participants reported to some extent using materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. Results reported indicate a contrast between the report of being Sufficiently knowledgeable about using ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching, and teachers report of Regularly (67.5%) using materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. Survey item 21 has a mode of 2, while survey item 32 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences is higher than the reported knowledge about using ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 21 and 32 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge using ELs cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching. and the reported practice of using materials that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .288. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.288 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 21 and survey item 32. The result reads as $r = +.288$, $n = 83$, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 4: Fostering Successful Interaction with English-dominant Peers. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 22 and 33 addressed ELs successful interaction with English dominant peers (Appendix B). Survey item 22 investigated the frequency of participants

who reported being knowledgeable about structuring their classroom activities, so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 22. Of these, 49 (59%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and slightly more than 24% reported being Extremely knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 1.94 for survey item 22. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about structuring their classroom activities, so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students, with only 1 participant reporting being Not at all knowledgeable about this principle.

Survey item 33 investigated the frequency of participants who reported providing linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 33. Of these, 51 (61.5%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and almost 35% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.43 for survey item 33. These results show that most participants reported Regularly providing linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures. Nearly all participants reported providing linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures. The mode for survey item 22 is 2, whereas the mode for survey item 33 is 1. This indicates that the reported use of providing linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures is higher than their reported knowledge about structuring their classroom activities, so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students. Besides the 59% who reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about this principle, over 24% of participants reported being Extremely knowledgeable about this principle; 61.5% of participants reporting using this strategy Regularly.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 22 and 33 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about structuring their classroom activities, so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students and the reported practice of providing linguistic scaffolding for ELs to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .394. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at α= .05, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.394 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 22 and survey item 33. The result reads as $r = +.394$, n = 83, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 5: Building on ELs' Background Knowledge. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 23 and 34 addressed ELs background knowledge. Survey item 23 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning task. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 23. Of these, 49 (59%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and almost 23% reported being Extremely knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 1.96 for survey item 23. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning task. Nearly all participants reported being Somewhat to Extremely knowledgeable about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning task; while only one participant reported being Not at all knowledgeable.

Survey item 34 investigated the frequency of participants who reported tapping into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83

participants responded to survey item 34. Of these, 55 (66.3%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and almost 29% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.4 for survey item 34. These results show that most participants reported Regularly tapping into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences. Nearly all participants reported tapping into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences to some extent. Survey item 23 has a mode of 2, whereas survey item 34 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported practice of tapping into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences is higher than the reported knowledge about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning task. Except for one participant, the rest reported being at least Somewhat knowledgeable about this principle, with most participants reporting being Sufficiently knowledgeable and Regularly using this strategy.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 23 and 34 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning task and the reported practice of tapping into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .472. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.472 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 23 and survey item 34. The result reads as $r = +.472$, $n = 83$, $p < .05$. Pair 5, which addressed ELs' background knowledge, resulted in the second strongest correlation of the data set. The correlation indicates there is a moderate relationship between teachers' reported knowledge about selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning task and the reported practice of tapping into links to ELs' background knowledge or prior experiences.

Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 6: Making ELs' Comfortable to Facilitate Learning. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 24 and 35 addressed making ELs comfortable to facilitate learning (Appendix B). Survey item 24 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 24. Of these, 38 (45.8%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and more than 43% reported being Extremely knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 1.69 for survey item 24. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. Only one participant reported being Not at all knowledgeable about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn.

Survey item 35 investigated the frequency of participants who reported pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 34. Of these, 53 (63.9%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and slightly more than 30% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.45 for survey item 35. These results show that most participants reported Regularly pairing or grouping students with a common native language to support content learning. All but two participants reported to some extent pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support their content learning. Survey item 24 has a mode of 2, while survey item 35 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support their content learning is higher than participants' reported knowledge about organizing

the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. Ninety-three percent reported using the strategy at least Sometimes.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 24 and 35 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn and the reported practice of pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .193. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.193 does not meet or exceed the critical *r* of .217, there is not enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 24 and survey item 35. The result reads as $r = +.193$, n = 83, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 7: Making ELs Comfortable to Facilitate Learning. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 24 and 36 addressed making ELs comfortable to facilitate learning (Appendix B). Survey item 24 was also paired with item 36 as they both attend to making ELs feels comfortable to learn, with item 36 addressing routines, so ELs comprehend activities and are ready to learn. Survey item 24 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about organizing the classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 24. Of these, 38 (45.8%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 1.69 for survey item 24. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn.

Survey item 36 investigated the frequency of participants who reported using routines with ELs to facilitate their comprehension of activities. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 36. Of these, 71 (85.5%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and

slightly more than almost 12% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.18 for survey item 36. These results show that most participants reported Regularly using this strategy. Almost 99% of participants reported to some extent using routines with ELs to facilitate their comprehension of activities. Survey item 24 has a mode of 2, while survey item 36 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of routines with ELs to facilitate their comprehension of activities is higher than participants' reported knowledge about organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn. The majority of participants reported being Sufficiently to Extremely knowledgeable about this principle, with almost 86% reporting Regularly using the strategy.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 24 and 36 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn and the reported practice of using routines with ELs to facilitate their comprehension of activities. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .341. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.341 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 24 and survey item 36. The result reads as $r = +.341$, $n = 83$, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 8: Addressing Language Objectives. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 25 and 37 addressed language objectives for ELs (Appendix B). Survey item 25 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about setting language objective specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 25. Of these, 45 (54.2%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and nearly 28% reported being Somewhat knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a

mode of 2 and a mean of 2.19 for survey item 25. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas. Almost 15% of participants reported being Extremely knowledgeable about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas.

Survey item 37 investigated the frequency of participants who reported stating language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them visually for ELs. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 37. Of these, 58 (69.9%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and almost 22% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.41 for survey item 37. These results show that most participants reported Regularly stating language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them visually for ELs. Only two participants reported Never using this strategy for teaching ELs. Survey item 25 has a mode of 2, while survey item 37 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of stating language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them visually for ELs is higher than participants' reported knowledge about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 25 and 37 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about setting language objectives specifically for ELs when planning instruction in content areas and the reported practice of stating language learning objectives verbally or writing and displaying them visually for ELs. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .372. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at α= .05, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.372 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey

item 25 and survey item 37. The result reads as $r = +.372$, n = 83, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 9: Teaching Content Area Vocabulary. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 26 and 38 addressed content area vocabulary for ELs (Appendix B). Survey item 26 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction for ELs. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 26. Of these, 44 (53%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, while 19 (22.89%) equally reported being Extremely or Somewhat knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 2.02 for survey item 26. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction for ELs. All except one participant reported having knowledge about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction for ELs.

Survey item 38 investigated the frequency of participants who reported using effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 38. Of these, 60 (72.3%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and more than 24% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.33 for survey item 38. These results show that most participants reported Regularly using effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse. Survey item 26 has a mode of 2, while survey item 38 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse is higher than participants' reported knowledge

about addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction for ELs.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 26 and 38 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when planning instruction for ELs and the reported practice of using effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .504. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at α= .05, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.504 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 26 and survey item 38. The result reads as $r = +.504$, n = 83, $p < .05$. Pair 9, which addressed content area vocabulary for ELs, resulted in the strongest correlation of the data set. The correlation indicates there is a moderate relationship between teachers reported knowledge about addressing the vocabulary demands of content areas when planning instruction for ELs and their reported practice of using effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 10: Addressing Content Area Grammar. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 27 and 39 addressed content area grammar for ELs (Appendix B). Survey item 27 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about addressing the grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 27. Of these, 37 (44.6%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and slightly more than 31% reported being Somewhat knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 2.22 for survey item 27. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about addressing the addressing the

grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs. Only four participants reported being Not at all knowledgeable about addressing the grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs.

Survey item 39 investigated the frequency of participants who reported explicitly teaching ELs the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 39. Of these, 48 (57.8%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and nearly 35% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.51 for survey item 39. These results show that most participants reported Regularly explicitly teaching ELs the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts. Survey item 27 has a mode of 2, while survey item 39 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported practice of explicitly teaching ELs the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts is higher than participants' reported knowledge about addressing the grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 27 and 39 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about addressing the grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs and the reported practice of explicitly teaching ELs the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .446. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.446 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 27 and survey item 39. The result reads as $r = +.446$, $n = 83$, $p < .05$. Pair 10, which dealt with addressing content area grammar for ELs, resulted in the third strongest correlation of the data set. The correlation indicates there is a moderate relationship between teachers reported knowledge about

addressing the grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs and the reported practice of explicitly teaching ELs the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 11: Modifying Teacher Speech. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 28 and 40 addressed modifying teacher speech for ELs (Appendix B). Survey item 28 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 28. Of these, 48 (57.8%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and slightly more than 24% reported being Extremely knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 1.96 for survey item 28. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction. Results indicate that only two participants reported being Not at All knowledgeable about this principle.

Survey item 40 investigated the frequency of participants who reported using clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 40. Of these, 73 (88%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and nearly 10% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.16 for survey item 40. These results show that most participants reported Regularly use clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels. All except one participant reported using clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels at least Seldom. Survey item 28 has a mode of 2, while survey item 40 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported use of clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels is higher than participants reported about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 28 and 40 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction and the reported practice of using clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .340. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at α= .05, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.340 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 28 and survey item 40. The result reads as r = +.340, n = 83, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 12: Modifying Teacher Speech. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 28 and 41 addressed modifying teacher speech for ELs (Appendix B). Survey item 28 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 28. Of these, 48 (57.8%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 1.96 for survey item 28. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction.

Survey item 41 investigated the frequency of participants who reported simplifying, elaborating or paraphrasing the language of content instruction when teaching ELs. Table 21 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 41. Of these, 69 (83.1%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and nearly 15% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.2 for survey item 41. These results show that most participants reported Regularly simplifying, elaborating or paraphrasing the language of content instruction when teaching ELs. Except two participants, all others reported simplifying, elaborating or paraphrasing

the language of content instruction when teaching ELs at least Sometimes. Survey item 28 has a mode of 2, while survey item 41 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported practice of simplifying, elaborating or paraphrasing the language of content instruction when teaching ELs is higher than participants' reported knowledge about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 28 and 41 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about modifying their use of English to help ELs understand instruction. and the reported practice of simplifying, elaborating or paraphrasing the language of content instruction when teaching ELs. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .324. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.324 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 28 and survey item 41. The result reads as $r = +.324$, $n = 83$, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Pair 13: Lowering the Language Difficulty of Instruction. The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers survey items 29 and 42 addressed lowering the language difficulty of instruction for ELs (Appendix B). Survey item 29 investigated the frequency of participants who reported being knowledgeable about lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of instruction for ELs. Table 19 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 29. Of these, 46 (55.4%) reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and slightly more than 21% equally reported being Extremely or Somewhat knowledgeable. Table 20 displays a mode of 2 and a mean of 2.02 for survey item 29. These results show that most participants reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable about lowering the language difficulty of instruction for ELs. Apart

from one participant, all others reported being at least Somewhat knowledgeable about lowering the language difficulty of instruction for ELs.

Survey item 42 investigated the frequency of participants who reported asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking. Table 22 illustrates that 83 out of 83 participants responded to survey item 42. Of these, 61 (73.5%) reported Regularly using this strategy, and nearly 23% reported using it Sometimes. Table 22 displays a mode of 1 and a mean of 1.31 for survey item 42. These results show that most participants reported Regularly ask ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking. Almost 99% of participants reported asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking. Survey item 29 has a mode of 2, while survey item 42 has a mode of 1. This indicates that the reported practice of asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking is higher than participants' reported knowledge about lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of instruction for ELs.

A Pearson *r* correlation was calculated for survey item 29 and 42 to determine the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of instruction for ELs and the reported practice of asking ELs linguistically appropriate, content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking. The Pearson correlation for these two items is .221. The sample size for this study is 83. For a correlation at $\alpha = .05$, the critical *r* is .217. Given that the calculated *r* of +.221 exceeds the critical *r* of .217, there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between survey item 29 and survey item 42. The result reads as $r = +.221$, $n = 83$, $p < .05$. Table 24 displays this information.

Table 23.
Description of Survey items in the Pearson r Correlation

20	Use ELs for language as resource	30	Use language another than English during instructions
20	Use ELs for language as resource	31	Make language materials available
21	Use ELs culture background as resource	32	Use materials to reflect culture
22	Structure activities for ELs to interact with English- dominant peers	33	Provide linguistic scaffolding
23	Select activities to build ELs background knowledge	34	Link to ELs back acknowledge
24	Organize classroom for ELs to learn	35	Group ELs with common language peers
24	Organize classroom for ELs to learn	36	Use routines to help comprehension
25	Set language objective when planning	37	State language learning objective
26	Address vocabulary demand of content	38	Use strategic to teach vocabulary
27	Address grammar demand of content	39	Explicitly teach grammar
28	Modify use of English	40	Use clear speech for proficiency level
28	Modify use of English	41	Simplify the language of content
29	Lower language difficulty	42	Ask linguistic appropriate questions

Table 24.
Pearson r Correlation: Knowledge and Practice of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy (N=83)

Pair	Item	Item	Average Difference	Correlation *r* $r \geq .217, \alpha = .05$
1	20	30	0.6145	0.355
2	20	31	0.1687	0.356
3	21	32	0.8795	0.288
4	22	33	0.506	0.394
5	23	34	0.5663	0.472
6	24	35	0.241	0.193
7	24	36	0.506	0.341
8	25	37	0.783	0.372
9	26	38	0.6988	0.504
10	27	39	0.7108	0.446
11	28	40	0.8072	0.34
12	28	41	0.759	0.324
13	29	42	0.7108	0.221

Research Question Three investigated the extent of a relationship between ESOL endorsed teachers' reported knowledge and reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Results of quantitative data indicates there is enough evidence to conclude that a statistically significant relationship exists between reported knowledge of principles and reported practice of strategies of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Table 24 displays the Pearson *r* correlation for paired items addressing reported knowledge from Part II of the survey and reported practice from Part III of the survey. Correlation analysis resulted in a

correlation coefficient greater than the critical $r = .217$ for all pairs, except one, thereby providing evidence of a relationship between the pairs. The strongest correlations were found in pair 9 (items 26 and 38) content area vocabulary, pair 5 (items 23 and 34) ELs' background knowledge, and pair 10 (items 27 and 39) addressing content area grammar. Pair 6 (items 24 and 35) making ELs comfortable to facilitate learning was the only pair in the data set that did not result in a correlation; thus, no relationship was found between participants' reported knowledge about organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn and their reported practice of pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning.

Research Question Three addressed the extent to which there is a relationship between ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Principles of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy were paired with instructional strategies for statistical analysis. In response to Research Question Three, the quantitative results indicate that a relationship does exist between participants' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs.

Qualitative Data. Frequency Qualitative data were also gathered to provide insight into teachers' experiences teaching ELs. This information resulted from open-ended item 45 on the Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers, which requested that participants share any information regarding their experiences teaching ELs that may be relevant to this study. Eighty-three participants responded to open-ended question item 45 to share their experiences teaching ELs. Their responses reflected elements of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. The

following themes emerged as the result of these open-ended responses: (1) access to learning and (2) hope for ELs' academic success.

Eighteen teacher responses revealed they provide ELs with access to learning in school. One way of providing ELs access to education is by valuing and promoting use of their native language. One teacher shared that her EL "spoke no English and understood little when he started the school year. I believe that he had a strong background in his native language that helped him make the giant gains he did last year." Another teacher stated that "pairing those with a common language is very effective." A few respondents agreed that "every class should have at least one other same language speaker" to work with ELs. An educator described how s/he provided an EL with access to learning by practicing "with him 30 minutes before school every day" and using the student's native language as s/he "worked hard finding him any material he needed. He read bilingual books and used a dictionary to help him understand meaning of words." These comments illustrated of teachers' use of ELs native language to provide access to learning.

Tapping into their funds of knowledge is another means for teachers of ELs to give students access to learning. Students' funds of knowledge encompass the knowledge, skills and experiences they possess from their family life, culture and community and utilize as they navigate their lives (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & Gonzalez, 2001). The skills ELs bring forth from their family affect their learning. Several recognized the importance taking the student's background into account to help them to learn. One teacher even felt that the learning is mutual; "ELs learn from the teacher, and the teacher learn from ELs." An important part of ELs lives is their family, and a few teachers acknowledged that "making connections with ELs' families" was essential for teaching them. They understand that the family's support is needed to bring forth their students' success. Not only did teachers express awareness about the obvious cultural pieces of ELs lives such as "celebration of

culture and traditions", but also about their skills to navigate life. ELs experiences make them unique and often build skills that affect their mindset in positive ways. One teachers noted: "Last year I taught a student recently relocated from the mountains of Guatemala. He had an amazing mindset towards being successful and drastically improved." Anecdotes about ELs' resilience was shared by a few teachers. Recognizing ELs funds of knowledge "inspired teachers" to continue providing ELs' access to learning.

When teachers have high expectations for their ELs, they provide them equitable access to education. Many described ELs as "very bright", "usually learn very quickly", "eager to learn and succeed." These comments illustrate positive notions of teachers' academic expectations of their ELs. Some responses reinforced the idea that "ELs are capable learners." Several respondents recognized that "ELs make academic growth" and many excel. Teacher support and student accountability were mentioned as reasons for ELs successful academic performance. A few teachers attributed ELs achievement on tests and other academic measures to a combination of "teacher instructional support and instilling ELs responsibility" for their learning. Teacher practice was touted as an essential component of ELs learning the English language by a handful of respondents. One participant affirmed "if teachers use the strategies to teach ESOL students, the they will overcome their fear and acquire the language as they go." Consistent teacher application of strategies for supporting ELs was highlighted by several teachers, specifically scaffolding instruction according to their level of proficiency, to build knowledge and second language learning. Although patience is required to teach ELs, several participants in this study held high expectations for ELs and provided them access to learning.

Ten participant responses about their experiences teaching ELs indicated they "care about ELs as individuals" and have hope for their future. The importance of knowing their ELs and

building relationships with them was highlighted by a couple of teachers. Building relationships was considered as important as teaching the academics by a few teachers. Establishing a personal connection with their ELs allowed teachers to encourage them through the process of learning the language and content at the same time. Though teaching ELs can be challenging, one teacher commented that "there needs to be an element of authentic passion for working with these students. Otherwise "the students know this, and that's why they don't show improvement." Teaching with passion that and hope for their academic success send a powerful message of encouragement for ELs to achieve. This information is displayed in Figure 4.

Theme	**Participants**	**Selected Comments**
Access to learning	18	ELs have to be supported where they are in whatever stage to build knowledge, confidence, and welcome and support their language acquisitions during their learning daily and consistently. I believe that our ELs need to feel included and given support and scaffolding, but they should never be excluded. My EL students have usually performed very well given supports needed and holding them accountable to their best dependent upon their ability. I feel that it is important for all teachers to know how to teach students who are learning English as a second language. Teachers need to find developmentally appropriate tasks, as well as language appropriate tasks. I've seen great success in language acquisition when ELs are taught using ESOL and reading best practices!
Hope for ELs' academic success	20	I feel that they can comprehend and achieve at levels higher than what some believe they can. I have had wonderful ELs in my classrooms every year since I started teaching in public schools. Most of these students are eager to learn and succeed. I think the growth of watching ESOL students is amazing. Most ELs make significant academic growth every year.

Figure 4. Themes Derived from Survey Item 45: Participants' Experiences Teaching ELs

The qualitative data results of survey item 45 indicate that participants provide ELs access to learning via actions that align with culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Teachers' answers to this question reveal they offer ELs access to learning through their high expectations. Teachers also have hope that ELs will achieve academic success. These consistent messages from the teacher that students will succeed are based upon the teacher's genuine respect for students and the belief in student capabilities. This is a practice that exemplifies culturally responsive teaching. Teachers' positive perspective on students' funds of knowledge, their families, and their native language shows both culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. To answer to Research Question Three, a relationship between knowledge and practice is supported by the qualitative data.

Summary

Chapter four presented the result of the data analysis obtained from the three research questions. The description of research participants was followed by the results for Research Question One, which investigated the extent to which elementary ESOL endorsed teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Subsequently, the results for Research Question Two were reported. This question addressed the extent of elementary ESOL endorsed teachers reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Next, the results for Research Question Three were reported. This research question investigated the relationship between participants' reported knowledge about principles of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy and their reported practice of culturally and responsive strategies to teach ELs. Chapter five discusses the finding of this study.

Chapter 5 - Findings, Discussion, and Implications

The purpose of this study was to investigate ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' knowledge and instructional practices of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. The problem studied was whether ESOL endorsed teachers are knowledgeable about and enact instructional practices to engage in culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to meet the language, literacy, and content learning needs of ELs. Research Question One investigated the extent to which ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Research Question Two investigated the extent to which ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs. Research Question Three investigated the extent to which there is a relationship between ESOL endorsed teachers' reported knowledge and reported practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs.

Chapter one introduced the problem and its descriptive factors. Chapter two rendered a review of the literature. Chapter three described the methodology issued for this study. Chapter four presented analysis of the data. Chapter five consists of an introduction, a summary of the study, a discussion of the findings, implications for practice, recommendations for additional research, and conclusions. The purpose of chapter five is to elaborate on the findings of the EL/ESOL related issues studied to promote further understanding, and to make recommendations to expand research related to ELs. The aim is that the information in this study will positively impact the preparation of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers and their practice to effectively teach ELs.

Summary of the Study

This section commences with a summary of the purpose and design of this research.

Findings related to ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge are presented next. A discussion of findings is presented in relation to effective culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Finally, implications for the preparation of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers, for the practice of teachers of ELs, and for school and district administrators are considered and discussed.

The study investigated areas connected to the field of teaching and learning for ELs. It sought to investigate participants' knowledge of principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, practice of culturally and linguistically responsive instructional strategies for ELs, and the relationship between teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Quantitative and qualitative research was conducted to achieve the objectives of this study.

The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers was designed to obtain quantitative and qualitative data for this study. On Part I, the 83 participants were asked to provide responses to questions about their background. On Part II and III, the participants were asked to provide responses on a Likert-like scale to best represent their knowledge and practices of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching for ELs. On Part IV, the open-ended questions, asked participants to provide responses that elaborated on the knowledge gained from ESOL endorsement preparation, instructional practices they find effective with ELs, and thoughts on their experience teaching ELs. These open-ended questions were asked to obtain further insight regarding their thoughts about their knowledge, practices and experiences as teachers of ELs. Participants reported on the open-ended questions to illustrate their thoughts and experiences. This study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

2. To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?
3. To what extent is there a relationship between ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

Findings and Discussion

Research Question One

To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report being knowledgeable of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

Descriptive statistics were calculated on items 20-29 from the Survey of ESOL endorsed teachers. Additionally, qualitative information was gathered from open-ended question comments in survey item 43. The findings resulting from Research Question One indicate that teachers who participated in this study reported they were Sufficiently knowledgeable on all principles of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs presented in the survey, except one, using ELs home languages as a resource in teaching. This is evident by a mode of 2 for all except one of the principles investigated (1 = Extremely, 2 = Sufficiently, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = Not at all). The researcher noted that although most teachers reported they were Sufficiently knowledgeable, a significant percentage reported they were Somewhat knowledgeable on some items. Approximately a third or more of participants reported they were Somewhat knowledgeable on the following items: using ELs' cultural background as a resource for teaching (38.55%), addressing the grammatical demands of content area (31.33%), and setting language objectives for ELs when planning instruction in content areas (28.92%). The item on which teachers reported being least knowledgeable about was using ELs home languages as a resource in teaching. Most rated

themselves Somewhat knowledgeable about this concept, yet more teachers reported they were Not at all knowledgeable about this principle than on any other question. The focus of this part of the discussion is on the items that are overtly strong areas of knowledge for the teachers in the study. The discussion also shed light on items that discreetly reveal principles of knowledge for teaching ELs which remain weak, even for ESOL endorsed teachers.

Most teachers rated themselves as sufficiently knowledgeable (45.78%) about organizing their classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn, and an almost equal number rated themselves as Extremely knowledgeable (43.37%). Providing a welcoming classroom environment where there are structures such as predictable routines, procedures and expectations meets the needs of all students, including ELs. de Jong, Harper, and Coady (2013) noted that research about elementary teachers suggests that some practices, such as strategies used to create a welcoming environment for ELs may be easier for teachers to implement than others. These strategies seem to be more easily assimilated into teachers' general instructional routines. Nonetheless, they are key for supporting the linguistic, and academic growth of ELs. The findings in this study support the literature that suggests teachers find it easier to make ELs feel comfortable, included, and ready to learn because it is part of their repertoire for creating a classroom environment they already implement for all learners.

Another survey item on which most teachers reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, and on which over 24% reported being Extremely knowledgeable, was structuring classroom activities, so ELs can interact successfully with English dominant students. The environment is an essential motivation for language development (De Temple & Snow, 2003); the setting provides a means from which all students, especially ELs, learn to speak the language and to experience language structures. Knowledge of how to structure classroom activities for ELs to interact with

English dominant peers can provide them with opportunities to practice speaking English. One area where interaction is crucial is seeking clarification of message content (Barr, Eslami, and Joshi, 2012). This hold true for ELs since they are less proficient in English. Thus, it is the teacher's responsibility to adequately plan and scaffold ELs' interactions with English dominant students (Coleman & Goldenberg, 2009). The findings indicate that teachers in this study feel that they know how to provide cooperative learning structures for ELs to successfully interact with English dominant classmates. Cooperative learning is yet another commonly known principle for all teachers since it is foundational for all learners.

The researcher noted three survey items of interest on which most teachers reported being Sufficiently knowledgeable, yet a deeper look disclosed that a significant number of teachers, reported they were only Somewhat knowledgeable. Many teachers reported they were not at least Sufficiently knowledgeable about using ELs' cultural background as a resource for teaching, addressing the grammatical demands of content area, and setting language objectives for ELs when planning instruction in content areas. This data is of concern, since the population in this study consists of teachers who have undergone an ESOL endorsement preparation and typically teach ELs every year.

Nearly 40% of teachers reported being only Somewhat knowledgeable about using ELs' cultural background as a resource for teaching. The notion of culturally responsive teaching is grounded on the idea that culture is vital to student learning (Ladson-Billings, 1994). Moreover, there is evidence that cultural practices shape thinking processes, that in turn serve as tools for learning (Hollins, 1996). Teachers help students see everyday experience in more complex ways when students are invited to relate their home and community activities to learning topics (Dalton, 1998). Some effective strategies identified from the research include linking new vocabulary with

background knowledge through brainstorming and describing what students already know about the topic (August et al., 2005; Carlisle, 2007). The findings in this study suggest that teachers may be addressing ELs culture in surface ways and do not fully comprehend how cultural dimensions of learning are salient aspects that will impact students' language and conceptual development (de Jong and Harper, 2005).

Almost a third of teachers (31.33%) reported they were only Somewhat knowledgeable about addressing the grammatical demands of content area when teaching ELs; moreover, nearly 5% reported they were Not at all knowledgeable. The professional standards established by the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL, 2006) require that teachers be able to integrate language and content instruction. This entails having expertise in their content area, and also a solid understanding of how language functions in content learning, which demands knowledge of linguistics. Wong-Fillmore and Snow (2000) emphasize the importance of being able to identify and teach ELs high-priority language structures found in specific content area. The findings indicate that many teachers in this study do not have a good enough understanding of addressing English language structures. The English dominant teachers in this study (87.9%%) may benefit from more preparation about English grammar and how the English language works to facilitate ELs' learning.

Setting language objectives for ELs when planning instruction in content areas was the third item on which many teachers reported they were only Somewhat knowledgeable. When planning instruction for ELs, teachers must review academic tasks to determine the purposes for which ELs are expected to use language (e.g., paraphrase, to defend, summarize, define, critique). Teachers must plan for and explicitly teach the language objectives ELs will need to carry out the learning tasks (Lucas et al., 2008). A study conducted by Huang, Berg, Romero, and Walker (2016)

found that teachers typically do not see students' language development as their responsibility. However, a professional development project positively impacted their view of language as content specific and their teaching of language features and skills at the discourse level and within the disciplinary context in which they are being used.

Findings in this study seem to suggest that teachers do not pay enough attention to the integration of language in their content instruction to increase ELs language development. The low ratings in this item may indicate that the teachers in this study are not well informed about setting language objectives to support ELs' second language acquisition and to attain the desired articulation of content knowledge.

The lowest rated item, using ELs home language as a resource for teaching, received higher responses in the Not at all knowledgeable option than the rest of the survey items. Eight teachers (9.64%) reported they were Not at all knowledgeable about this principle; the majority reported they were only Somewhat knowledgeable (42.17%). This concept is intrinsically connected to ELs' acquisition of the second language with the home language being an EL's most valuable resource. There is undeniable evidence about the personal, cognitive, linguistic, and educational value in using the linguistic resources that ELs bring to school. Research suggests that knowing something in one language allows one to transfer this knowledge to another language or easily learn it in another language (Moats, 1999; August, Carlo, Dressler, & Snow, 2005; Goldenberg, 2008). In example, children who are learning to read in a second language are able to transfer many skills and knowledge from their first language to facilitate their acquisition of reading skills in the second language (August & Shanahan, 2006; Riches & Genesee, 2006). The findings in this study seem to point to teachers' weakness in knowledge regarding how to utilize ELs' most valuable

resource, their native language, for ELs to make conceptual and linguistic connections as they acquire English.

The qualitative data reported reflected participants' ideas that focused on cultural sensitivity and value for linguistic diversity, principles at the core of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Teachers in the study discussed their favorable perspectives about students maintaining their native language, valuing the idea of knowing more than one language, and even expressing their own desire to learn a second language. Although these comments reflect a belief that other languages are worthy of cultivating, the teachers in the study have not developed linguistic sensitivity, that is, they do not know enough about how to address ELs struggle with linguistic resources in academic settings (Commins & Miramontes, 2006; de Oliveira and Athanases, 2007; Huang & Laskowski, 2014; Sleeter, 2008). Furthermore, language diversity is not just a variety of native languages. Among ELs, language diversity is manifested as variations of their English proficiency levels by content and grade level. For teachers to differentiate instruction for ELs, it is imperative that they begin to recognize different proficiency levels and plan for them. Similarly, although teachers generally expressed respect for ELs' cultures, many of them do not know how to use cultural background as a resource for teaching. These findings shed light on the need to emphasize the development of teachers' concrete application of the culturally and linguistically responsive approach to teaching ELs.

Research Question Two

To what extent do ESOL endorsed elementary teachers report practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

The Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers items 30 through 42 and the open-ended item 44 were used to answer this question. Descriptive statistics were applied to document the frequency

of culturally and linguistically responsive strategies practiced by participants. The findings resulting from Research Question Two indicated that most participants (50% to 88%) reported Regularly practicing all strategies, except one, making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction (item 31). The three strategies that had the highest ratings were: using clear speech as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels (87.95%), using routines to facilitate comprehension of activities (85.54%), and simplifying or elaborating/paraphrasing the language of content instruction (83.13%). Strategies in which participants rated themselves lower were: explicitly teaching the grammar/discourse features needed to talk to write about concepts, providing linguistic scaffolding for ELs at different levels of proficiency to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures, and using language other than English during instruction. Although participants mostly reported Regularly practicing all these strategies, many teachers reported they practice these strategies Sometimes or Seldom. Thus, this indicates that overall, teachers practice these strategies less frequently. The lowest rated strategy was making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction. Only 15 (18.1%) indicated using this strategy Regularly. The researcher focuses the next part of the discussion on the salient data that exposes areas of practice which ESOL endorsed teachers may need to enhance.

The researcher noted teachers reported high frequency of practice on most strategies. They reported Regularly practicing strategies that align with principles of knowledge about which they reported they were Sufficiently knowledgeable. This data may suggest that the teachers in this study may have a disposition to serve ELs to the best of their ability, although they may not be experts on all principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching. It may exhibit a willingness to apply these principles in practice as best they can, due to the necessity of having to serve ELs every year. After all, in the state of Florida, ESOL endorsed elementary teachers are

considered the ELs' primary ESOL teachers, and as such, they are responsible for their learning. Notwithstanding their positive disposition, it would be beneficial for teachers of ELs to strengthen their practice of the culturally and linguistically responsive strategies on which they reported less extensively.

Among the strategies that stood out as less frequently practiced, a significant number of teachers (34.94%) reported they only Sometimes explicitly teach the grammar and discourse features needed to talk and write, while 6.02% reported they Seldom practice this strategy. Nonetheless, research recommends that teachers need to give explicit attention to linguistic form and function, arguing that ELs need to focus on the formal elements of English to become proficient (Schleppegrell, 2004; Swain, 1995). Exposure to and communicative interaction in English are not sufficient for proficiency in the second language to occur. Academic language tends to be more technical and abstract than communicative language. Furthermore, current content area standards specify skill-based language proficiency, but do not specify the specific language students need to effectively demonstrate mastery of content area skills. Thus, it is imperative that content area teachers, although not experts on language, learn to identify which specific language ELs need to use to show that they meet the standard and explicitly teach the special features of the language of their subject matter to their ELs (Lucas et al., 2008). Undoubtedly, "content is not separate from the language through which it is presented" (Schleppegrell & Achugar, 2003, p. 21). Yet as supported by the findings in this study, the language demands of academic tasks that are needed for understanding and constructing are rarely made explicit in teaching ELs (Bratkovich, 2019).

Approximately 35% of participants reported they Sometimes provide linguistic scaffolding for ELs at different levels of proficiency to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning

structures. Swain (1995) points to the idea that language learning requires opportunities to talk and interact with proficient peers. ELs can benefit from these opportunities, if their teachers know about how language works in content, and they support ELs' linguistic engagement in classroom activities (Schleppegrell & O'Hallaron, 2011). Teachers can provide temporary scaffolds tailored to ELs' linguistic needs such as supports through and explicit instruction to aid with comprehension vocabulary (Adamson et al., 2013; Shanahan & Shea, 2012); clear directions (Brancard & Quinnwilliams, 2012); comprehensible input (Choi & Morrison, 2014); and extra-linguistic communication (Deaton et al., 2014; Estapa et al., 2016). While many studies have focused on scaffolding approaches for ELs, a study performed by Gonzalez (2016) found that teacher candidates needed to improve their ability in planning language instruction according to ELs' linguistic levels for instructional differentiation. This study similarly found that ESOL endorsed teachers need to improve their practice using linguistic scaffolding to support ELs' ability to participate in cooperative learning activities according to ELs' language proficiency.

Finally, participants in the study rated themselves the lowest in the practice of strategies involving a language other than English during instruction. A quarter of the teachers practice it Sometimes, while 10.84% Seldom practice using a language other than English to support ELs' learning. Similarly, most participants reported they Sometimes make native language materials available for ELs to use, while a quarter of them Seldom practice this strategy, and more than 12% Never do. The use of ELs' home languages as a linguistic support was reported in several studies, wherein teachers used vocabulary in both English and Spanish (Johnson et al., 2016); fostered the discussion of concepts and vocabulary in students' native languages (Adamson et al., 2013); and translated a science text to scaffold ELs' understanding and participation (Burstein et al., 2014). Using a language other than English during instruction does not necessarily involve teachers being

proficient in another language. As evidenced in the studies mentioned, teachers use creative ways to afford ELs the opportunity to learn by leaning on their native language assets. The findings in this study support the need to enhance ESOL endorsed teachers' practice with using their ELs' native language during instruction as well as availing ELs native language materials to support learning of content and language.

The qualitative data reported for item 44 exhibited the variety of participants' strategies used for teaching ELs. Most focused on basic strategies for scaffolding instruction and for support of second language acquisition. Some participants discussed using strategies that provide content and language support, while others shared more basic strategies such as Total Physical Response (TPR) and using pictures. There was little mention of instructional practices for teaching ELs that involved current classroom demands such as participation in student-centered tasks or talk and interaction with peers. Most of the scaffolds were applicable to teacher-led lessons, and less to student-led activities, which are more current. While, the qualitative research aligns with the findings that most teachers Regularly practice strategies that address linguistically and responsive pedagogy, it also illustrates that teachers could sharpen pedagogical tools further and gain currency in their practices to improve ELs' access to content and language.

Research Question Three

To what extent is there a relationship between ESOL endorsed elementary teachers' reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy to teach ELs?

The findings resulting from Research Question Three indicate that a relationship exists between participants' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Table 19 displays that participants reported a Sufficient level of knowledge of culturally and

linguistically responsive pedagogy. Table 20 displays each of the survey items regarding principles of linguistically and culturally responsive teaching for ELs had a mode of 2, except using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching (item 20). It also displays a mean range of 1.69 to 2.27 for teacher knowledge, except item 20 which had a mean of 2.48. Table 21 displays that participants reported they Regularly practice culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Table 22 displays each survey item regarding practice of linguistically and culturally responsive teaching for ELs had a mode of 1, except making native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction (item 31). It also displays a mean range of 1.16 to 1.87 for teacher practice, except item 31 which had a mean of 2.31.

Findings for Research Question Three revealed that the Pearson *r* correlation applied to each of the culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy pairs documented enough evidence to conclude that for each pair a relationship exists between participants' knowledge and their practice of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching ELs, except one pair. Pair 6 revealed there was not enough evidence to conclude a relationship between teachers' knowledge of organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn and their practice of pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning. As stated earlier, organizing the classroom to make students, including ELs, feel comfortable is part of every teachers' broad set of knowledge and skills. Teachers rated themselves Sufficiently knowledgeable about this principle. On the other hand, most reported that they were Somewhat knowledgeable, that is, they did not know enough about using students home language for instruction. Additionally, they rated themselves the lowest on the practice of strategies involving a language other than English during instruction. Pairing ELs with a common native language for learning falls in the realm of practices using ELs' native language, an area on which teachers self-reported weakly.

Interacting with common native language peers allows ELs to engage in purposeful activities in which they have opportunities to interact. ELs should have "substantial and equitable opportunities to participate" in meaningful activities (Walqui, 2006, p.114). Verplaeste & Migliacci (2008) advise teachers to increase the number of activities in which students work together and allow ELLs to use their native languages for problem solving with students who speak the same language. Using ELs' home languages enables rather than impedes their learning and engagement (2012). In fact, there is consensus in the field that the use of native language can support ELs in understanding content (August, Artzi, Kuchle, & Halloran, 2015; Echevarria et al., 2012). The findings in this study support the need to strengthen this area of practice for ESOL endorsed teachers of ELs.

The alignment between all other pairs of principles of knowledge and instructional strategies was a noteworthy result. As previously noted, participants in the study are ESOL endorsed teachers in the state of Florida who have received preparation for teaching ELs either through college coursework or 5 professional development classes. The majority (39.8%) have more than 15 years of teaching experience, 98% of them have taught ELs in the past. More than half of participants have experience teaching ELs for 1 to 5 years, while nearly 45% have taught ELs for over 6 years. All participants teach in a school district that serves nearly 3,000 ELs. In the elementary schools selected for this study, there are a total of 660 ELs enrolled for the current school year; thus, the teachers in the study have ample opportunities to work with ELs. Overall, teachers reported they know Sufficiently about principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, and the Regularly practice this pedagogy with ELs.

The qualitative data extracted from item 45 illustrated that the teachers in the study had positive experiences teaching ELs. They expressed admiration for ELs' success in school and for

their determination to acquire the English language while simultaneously learning content in the different subject areas. This fostered their willingness to provide ELs with their knowledge and strategies to the best of their abilities to reach academic growth. The participants see themselves as teachers of ELs who have a responsibility for teaching them well. This qualitative portion of the study supported the quantitative data, which brought to light that a moderate association exists between knowledge of principles and instructional practice of culturally linguistically responsive pedagogy. The combined findings illustrate that the teachers in this study implement what they learned in their ESOL preparation in terms of theory and their application of it to help ELs achieve language acquisition and academic success.

Implications

Implications for ESOL Endorsement Teacher Preparation

Findings of this study have several implications for both university and professional development programs that prepare general education teachers for ESOL endorsement. Throughout this paper, the researcher avoided the term mainstream to refer to general education teacher and classrooms because the reality is that ELs are the mainstream. This magnitude of ELs' presence in today's schools is such that it is paramount that everyone in the field of education realize the need to be prepared to teach this population of students. For ESOL endorsement preparation programs, this study offered several insights that can improve ESOL preparation for teachers. Based upon the findings of this study regarding knowledge and practices culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for teaching ELs, the following refinements to teacher preparation programs are recommended:

1. Provide teachers with direct experience in learning a language other than English. For example, exposing them to the second language acquisition process can create personal

experience with fundamental principles of SLA and may foster empathy towards ELs. This recommendation is consistent with previous research (Turgut Dost, 2016) which reported prospective teachers became aware of the linguistic, cognitive, and emotional hard work encountered while learning a new language during language tasks.

2. Infuse the elements of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy into all the coursework and model these strategies to foster growth of the practice. Teachers not only need to be taught how to work with ELs, they need to be shown.
3. Enhance teachers' linguistic awareness through language-focused learning opportunities. Knowledge of linguistics is paramount for teachers of ELs, so they may develop facets of language (i.e., grammar) within content areas for ELs. The literature suggests that content area teachers of ELs need language-related knowledge and skills (Achugar, Schleppegrell, & Oteíza, 2007; Aguirre-Muñoz, Park, Amabisca, & Boscardin, 2008; Fillmore & Snow, 2002; Schleppegrell, Achugar, Oteíza, 2004; Turkan & Buzick, 2014).
4. Provide teachers ways to practice adapting instruction to effectively integrate students' native languages in classroom instruction. Research conducted by Bellas (2015) points out that although teachers are receptive to native language use in social settings, they need professional development to enhance the intentional practice of connecting students' home languages to the acquisition of the second language. Native language support is useful even in English-only instruction when used strategically for activating prior knowledge and providing ELs with comprehensible information (Richards-Tutor, Aceves, & Reese, 2016).
5. Provide teachers with opportunities to increase their cultural competence through interactions with community members from diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. These experiences may help teachers to identify and include ELs' funds of knowledge. Gay

noted, “when academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and frames of reference of students, they are more personally meaningful, have higher interest appeal, and are learned more easily and thoroughly. As a result, the academic achievement of ethnically diverse students will improve when they are taught through their own cultural and experiential filters” (2002, p. 106).

Implications for ESOL Endorsed Teachers’ Practice

Based upon the findings of this study regarding effective instructional practices for teaching ELs, the following enhancements are recommended for ESOL endorsed teachers’ practice:

1. Understand and communicate the language demands embedded in academic text and learning tasks. This is a necessary skill to scaffold instruction adequately for ELs. Teachers must examine lessons or units and anticipate the extent of explicit instruction ELs will need in how to carry out those learning activities (Lucas et. al., 2008).
1. Explicitly instruct ELs on the use of linguistic features for the expression of content knowledge. In her study, Bratkovich (2019) noted that although students used the English language to explain, provide reasons, describe, interpret and argue academics; the teaching attended to a particular subset of the English language specific to the discipline of the subject area (e.g., mathematics or science).
2. Differentiate instruction targeting ELs’ linguistic needs in the context of specific content areas recognizing variations of their language proficiency (i.e. starting, emerging, developing, expanding, bridging).
3. Incorporate students’ home languages into instructional practice, avail ELs materials in their native language, and set up grouping configurations for ELs with common language

peers for content area learning. Research has shown that, rather than treating each language as a separate system, teachers of ELs should consider a student's entire linguistic repertoire as a system (García & Li, 2014). Doing so acknowledges that ELs draw upon all their native language and English linguistic skills in the process of developing proficiency in the second language. Validation ELs' linguistic resources (Gort & Sembianti, 2015; Palmer, Mateus, Martínez, & Henderson, 2014) communicates to them that bilingualism is valuable.

4. Support students' language and thinking through explicit instruction targeting specific language objectives. Although, it can be challenging for teachers to teach both language and content in a lesson (Lyster, 2007), ELs benefit because they have a plan from the onset of the lesson, so they can focus on what is important and take an active part in the learning process.
5. Locate and integrate ELs' funds of knowledge in instruction. Culturally linguistically responsive pedagogy goes beyond "good teaching" and affirmative attitudes towards diversity (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Nieto, 2013; Sleeter & Grant, 2011). Teachers can activate ELs' background knowledge by choosing texts and topics that are interesting and relevant to students, and making connections between the lesson and students' lives. Creating contexts to which ELs relate also promotes their engagement in the language and content learning.

Implications for School and District Administrators

Considering the findings of this study, the following are recommendations for school and district administrators:

1. Include a section on teacher-observation rubrics that requires teachers to explicitly demonstrate how they are meeting the language and learning needs of ELs in their classrooms. This information can in turn be used to support professional development aligned with teacher needs.
2. Closely examine district professional development for ESOL endorsement to determine if it is sufficiently aligned with the most current research regarding what teachers ought to know to meet the linguistic, academic, and cultural needs of ELs.
3. Foster collaboration between ESOL specialists, foreign language teachers, and general education teachers within organized professional learning activities geared towards the improved education for ELs.

Limitations of the Study

This research data in this study resulted in significant findings; however, it is not without limitations.

1. Sample Size: The research was limited by the number of school sites which participants were invited. Only nine out of a total of 37 possible school sites participated in the research. This limited the population sample and consequently the number of respondents. Only 83 out of the desired 90 minimum participants responded to the survey.
2. Population: The characteristics of the population sample of the study could be viewed as a limitation of the study. The many differences in the participants' background profiles (e.g., years of experience, number of ESOL endorsement classes taken, when they graduated

college) are all possible areas of limitation since the study did not differentiate between these participant characteristics.

3. Data Collection Process: Several limitations are linked to the data collection process. The researcher was limited to reaching potential participants via delivery of a hard copy of the letter of consent to the school sites' front desks, which likely affected the number of responses. In fact, the researcher could not be certain how many potential respondents received the invitation to participate in the study. Another limitation under this category involved the length of the survey. The extensive number of background questions likely deterred participants from providing richer and more complete qualitative responses at the end of the survey. Yet another limitation was participants' self-report. Dishonesty in responses is a potential issue. Moreover, without an actual observation of teachers' instruction by the researcher, there is no possibility of verifying whether self-reported practices took place. Another concern is the uncertainty that respondents may or may not have an accurate understanding of their knowledge and practice when self-reporting.
4. Timing of the Study: The data was collected at the beginning of the school year, thus posing a limitation. This start of a new school year is not best suitable for teachers because they are busy with many tasks involved in commencing the new academic year. This likely limited both the number of responses as well as the time and effort respondents dedicated to answering to the survey.

This study was not without limitations, and thus points to directions for further research.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following are recommendations for further research stemming from the results of this study:

1. Research individual variables of teacher background and ESOL endorsed teacher knowledge to uncover specific relationships and to better understand the knowledge needs of teachers with different profiles.
2. Research individual variables of teacher background to find out if they have a correlation on any subset of the practice questions.
3. Conduct instructional observations to verify ESOL endorsed teachers' enactment of culturally and linguistically responsive practices as it relates to their reported knowledge and practice.
4. Research the impact of ESOL endorsement preparation on knowledge and practice to study teacher effective practices for teaching ELs.
5. Investigate ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy in the context of factors such as school culture and EL student community.
6. Examine the effect of ESOL endorsed teachers' culturally and linguistically responsive knowledge and practice on ELs' academic growth.

Conclusions

This study, grounded in previous research, investigated ESOL endorsed elementary teachers reported knowledge and practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. Guided by three research questions, the study uncovered several findings. In response to Research Question One, participants self-reported they were Sufficiently knowledgeable about most foundational principles of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching for ELs, except using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching. In response to Research Question Two, ESOL endorsed teachers self-reported they Regularly practice most of the culturally and linguistically

responsive strategies for teaching ELs, except making native language materials available during instruction. In response to Research Question Three, participants self-reported responses revealed a positive relationship between their knowledge and their practice of culturally responsive pedagogy for ELs. The only pair that did not exhibit a relationship was teachers' knowledge about organizing the classroom, so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn and teachers pairing or grouping ELs with a common native language to support content learning. The qualitative data reported in this study expounds teachers' knowledge gained during their ESOL endorsement preparation, the instructional practices they consider effective for teaching ELs, and their experiences as teachers of ELs. Regarding knowledge gained during ESOL endorsement preparation, teachers indicated they held positive views of ELs, their families, and their cultures. Their responses illustrated cultural sensitivity and value for linguistic diversity. In terms of their practice, teachers in this study reported examples of scaffolding instruction for ELs and application of strategies for second language acquisition, albeit not the most current in terms of linguistically responsive pedagogy. Finally, their experiences as teachers of ELs reflected they provide ELs access to learning and have hope for their academic success.

Based upon the findings of this study, and in alignment with the literature regarding culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, the implications highlight specific recommendations for ESOL endorsement preparation programs, for the instructional practice of ESOL endorsed elementary teachers, and for district and school administrators. Recommendations for further research were derived from the findings of this study, its limitations, and the theoretical and empirical literature discussed in chapter two. The recommendations emphasized further research of ESOL endorsed teachers' background variables in relation to principles of knowledge of culturally and linguistically responsive teaching, background variables in relation to subset of

practice strategies, observations of ESOL endorsed teachers' enactment of culturally and linguistically responsive practices as it relates to reported knowledge, the impact of ESOL endorsement on the development of teachers' knowledge and skills, and the impact of teachers knowledge and practice on ELs' performance.

Findings of this study aligned with and expanded upon previous findings regarding culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy in the literature. This is a complex theoretical concept, which is difficult to capture in teachers' self-report of knowledge and practice. Although, the results of this study expose ESOL endorsed teachers' self-reported strengths as well as weaknesses of knowledge and practice, the researcher considers the general trend to be very encouraging. The findings provide evidence indicating that the ESOL endorsed elementary teachers in this study feel they possess Sufficient knowledge of principles to Regularly enact strategies aligned to culturally and linguistically responsive teaching. Although research suggests that many teacher preparation programs still do not provide teachers with enough information and techniques for teaching culturally and linguistically diverse students (Hutchinson, 2013), the teachers in this study feel they are prepared to teach ELs in ways that facilitate their acquisition of language and content. This study is one of the few that has specifically targeted highly trained teachers who have undergone extensive professional development or undergraduate preparation to obtain a mandated ESOL endorsement; thus, contributing greater insights into the knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers. Through the empirical evidence presented, the study elucidates the complexities involved in knowing about and practicing culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy for ELs. It also highlights the importance of addressing specific areas of knowledge in ESOL preparation programs and of strengthening teacher practice of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy. It is the hope of the researcher that the findings of this study

will contribute to the field of culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy and second language acquisition in advancement of the effective education of ELs that incorporates value of their cultural and linguistic assets.

References

In Achugar, M., Schleppegrell, M. J., & Oteíza, T. (2007). Engaging teachers in language analysis: A functional linguistics approach to reflective literacy. *English Teaching Practice and Critique 6*(2), 8-24.

Adamson, K., Santau, A., & Lee, O. (2013). The impact of professional development on elementary teachers' strategies for teaching science with diverse student groups in urban elementary schools. *Journal of Science Teacher Education*, *24*(3), 553–571.

Aguirre-Muñoz, Z, Park, J.-E., Amabisca., & Boscardin, C. (2008). Developing teacher capacity for serving ELLs' writing instructional needs: A case for systemic functional linguistics. *Bilingual Research Journal, 31,* 295-322.

Athanases, S. Z. and de Oliveira, L. C. (2011). "Toward program-wide coherence in preparing teachers to teach and advocate for English language learners.". In T, Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 195–215). New York, NY: Routledge.

Athanases, S. Z., Wahleitthner, J. M., & Bennett, L. H. (2013). Learning about English learners' content understandings through teacher inquiry: Focus on writing. *The New Educator*, *9*(4), 304-327.

August, D., Artzi, L., Kuchle, L., & Halloran, C. (2015). *Quality of English language proficiency assessments: Evaluation of state and local implementation of Title III assessment and accountability systems*. Washington D. C.: American Institutes for Research, U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from ncela.ed.gov/files/15_2037_QELPA_ELSWD_Summary_final_dla_5-15-15_508.pdf

August, D., Carlo, M., Dressler, C., & Snow, C. (2005). The critical role of vocabulary development for English language learners. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice, 20*, 50-57. Retrieved from 10.1111/j.1540-5826.2005.00120.x

August, D., & Shanahan, T. (Eds.). (2006). *Developing literacy in second language learners. Report of the national literacy panel on language-minority children and youth*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bhattacharya, K. (2017). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide*, London: Routledge.

Baecher, L. (2012). Feedback from the field: What novice preK–12 ESL teachers want to tell TESOL teacher educators. *TESOL Quarterly*, *46*(3), 578–588.

Baecher, L., Farnsworth, T., & Ediger, A. (2014). The challenges of planning language objectives in content-based ESL instruction. *Language Teaching Research*, *18*(1), 118-136. https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168813505381

Baecher, L. Schieble, M., Rosalia, C., & Rorimer, S. (2013). Blogging for academic purpose with English language learners: An online fieldwork initiative. *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education, 13*(1), 1-21.

Bahamonde, C. and Friend, M. (1999). Teaching English language learners: A proposal for effective service delivery through collaboration and co-teaching. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 10: 1–24.

Ballantyne, K.G., Sanderman, A.R., Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Retrieved from at https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED521360.pdf

Public education in Florida (2013). Retrieved from https://ballotpedia.org/Public_education_in_Florida#:~:targetText=In%202013%20Florida%20had%202%2C692%2C162,national%20average%20of%201%3A16

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. In J. A, Banks & C. A. M, Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 3-24). New York: Macmillan.

Banks, J. A. (2000). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Banks, C. M., & Banks, J. A. (2007). *Multicultural education: Issues and perspectives*. New York: Wiley.

Barr, S., Eslami, Z., & Joshi, R. M. (2012). Core strategies to support English language learners. *The Educational Forum, 76*, 105-117. 10.1080/00131725.2011.628196

Bellas, T. J. (2015). *Culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy: Case studies of rural elementary teachers.* Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/de3b/9f94bad0964746f38ffee5e6aecc6f3b0eeb.pdf

Brancard, R., & Quinnwilliams, J. (2012). Learning labs: Collaborations for transformative teacher earning. *TESOL Journal, 3*(3), 320-349. Retrieved from10.1002/tesj.22

Bratkovich, M. O. (2019). *Content area teaching in linguistically diverse classrooms*. Theses, Dissertations and Culminating Projects Retrieved from https://digitalcommons.montclair.edu/etd/294

Brooks, K., & Adams, S. R. (2015). Developing agency for advocacy: Collaborative inquiry-focused school-change projects as transformative learning for practicing teachers. *New Educator*, *11*(4), 292–308

Bryman, A. (2006). Integrating quantitative and qualitative research: How is it done? *Qualitative Research, 6*(1), 97-113.

Burstein, J., Shore, J., Sabatini, J., Moulder, B., Lentini, J., Biggers, K., & Holztman, S. (2014). From teacher professional development to the classroom: How NLP technology can enhance teachers' linguistic awareness to support curriculum development for English language learners. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *51*(1), 119–144.

Buxton, C. A., Kayumova, S., & Allexsaht-Snider, M. (2013). Teacher, researcher, and accountability discourses: Creating space for democratic science teaching practices in middle schools. *Democracy & Education, 21*(2), 1–10.

Castañeda v. Pickard, 648 F.2d 989 (5th Cir. 1981).

Carlisle, J. F. (2007). Fostering morphological processing, vocabulary development, and reading comprehension. In R. K, Wagner, A. E, Muse, & K. R, Tannenbaum (Eds.). *Vocabulary acquisition: Implications for reading comprehension* (pp. 78-103). NY: Guilford Press.

Choi, D. S., & Morrison, P. (2014). Learning to get it right: Understanding change processes in professional development for teachers of English learners. *Professional Development in Education*, *40*(3), 416–435.

Chval, K. B., Pinnow, R. J., & Thomas, A. (2015). Learning how to focus on language while teaching mathematics to English language learners: A case study of Courtney. *Mathematics Education Research Journal*, *27*(1), 103–127.

Coady, M. R., de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2011). Preservice to practice: Mainstream teacher beliefs of preparation and efficacy with English language learners in the state of Florida. *Bilingual Research Journal 34*(2).

Coady, M. R., Harper, C. A., & de Jong, E. J. (2016). Aiming for equity: Preparing mainstream teachers for inclusion or inclusive classrooms? *TESOL Quarterly*, *50*(2), 340–368.

Cochran-Smith, M., Davis, D., & Fries, K. (2004). Multicultural teacher education: Research, practice, and policy. In J. A, Banks & C. M, Banks (Eds.). *Handbook of research on multicultural education* (2nd ed., pp. 931–975). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Zeichner, K. (Eds.) (2005). *Studying Teacher Education: The Report of the AERA Panel on Research and Teacher Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Coleman, R., & Goldenberg, C. (2009). *What does research say about effective practices for English learners: Introduction and Part 1—Oral language proficiency*. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 11–16.

Commins, N. L., & Miramontes, O. B. (2006). Addressing linguistic diversity from the outset. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *57*, 240–246.

Correll, P. K. (2016). *Teachers' preparation to teach English language learners (ELLs): An investigation of perceptions, preparation, and current practices*. Theses and Dissertations. University of Kentucky. Retrieved from https://uknowledge.uky.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1021&context=edc_etds

Cranton, P. (1996). *Professional development as transformative learning: New perspectives for teachers of adults*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research designs: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2007). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cummins, J. (1979). Cognitive/academic language proficiency, linguistic interdependence, the optimum age question and some other matters. *Working Papers on Bilingualism,19*, 121-129.

Cummins, J. (1981) *Bilingualism and minority language children.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2008). BICS and CALP: Empirical and theoretical status of the distinction. In B, Street & N. H, Hornberger (Eds.). *Encyclopedia of language and education: Vol. 2. Literacy* (2nd ed., pp. 71-83). New York: Springer.

Dalton, S. (1998). *Pedagogy matters: standards for effective teaching practice*. UC Berkeley: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence. Retrieved from https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6d75h0fz

Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing What matters most: Investing in quality teaching.* NY: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful Teacher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L., Furger, R., Shields, P. & Sutcher, L. (2015). *Addressing California's emerging teacher shortage: An analysis of sources and solutions.* Policy Brief. Palo Alto: Learning Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://learningpolicyinstitute.org/wpcontent/uploads/2016/01/LPI-4pp Brief_AddressingShortages.pdf

Da Silva Iddings, A. C., & Rose, B. (2012). Developing pedagogical practices for English-language learners: A design-based approach. *Pedagogies: An International Journal, 7*, 32-51. 10.1080/1554480X.2012.630510.

De Araujo, Z., Smith, E., & Sakow, M. (2016). Reflecting on the dialogue regarding the mathematics education of English learners. *Journal of Urban Mathematics Education, 9.*

Deaton, C. M., Deaton, B., & Koballa, T. (2014). Teachers' awareness of their diverse classrooms: The nature of elementary teachers' reflections on their science teaching practice. *Action in Teacher Education, 36*(3), 211–233.

de Jong, E. J. (2008). Contextualizing policy appropriation: Teachers' perspectives, local responses, and English only ballot initiatives. *Urban Review, 40*(4), 350-370.

de Jong, E. J. (2011). *Foundations of multilingualism in education: From principles to practice*. Philadelphia, PA: Caslon Publishing,

de Jong, E. (2014) Preparing mainstream teachers for multilingual classrooms. *Association of Mexican American Educators Journal, 7*(2), 40–49.

de Jong, E. J., Coady, M. R., & Harper, C.A. (2010). *Project DELTA: Preliminary findings from Florida.* Office of English Language Acquisition (OELA). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education.

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.

de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2008). ESL is good teaching "plus": Preparing standard curriculum teachers for all learners. In M. E, Brisk (Ed.). *Language, culture, and community in teacher education* (pp.127–148). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2011). Accommodating diversity: Pre-service teachers' views on effective practices for English language learners. In T, Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms. A resource for teacher educators*. New York: Routledge.

de Jong, E.J., Harper, C.A., & Coady, M. (2013). Enhanced knowledge and skills for elementary mainstream teachers of English language learners. *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 89-97.

de Jong, E.J., Naranjo, C., Li, S., & Ouzia, A. (2018). Beyond compliance: ESL faculty's perspectives on preparing general education faculty for ESL infusion, *The Educational Forum*, *82*(2), 174-190.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other People's Children: Cultural Conflict in the Classroom*. New York: New Press.

Denzen, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

de Oliveira, L. C., & Athanases, S. Z. (2007). Graduates' reports of advocating for English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 58*, 202–215.

De Temple, J. M., & Snow, C. E. (2003). Learning words from books. In A, van Kleeck, S. A, Stahl, & E. B, Bauer (Eds.). *On Reading Books to Children: Parents and Teachers* (pp.16–36). Center for Improvement of Early Reading Achievement, CIERA. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Diego, D. J. (2013). Teacher preparation, professional development, and long-term English learners. *International Journal of Education, 5*(4), 1-18.

Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2009*). Internet, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method* (3rd ed.). Hoboken, NJ, US: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Doherty, R. W., R. Hilberg, S., Pinal., A., & Tharp. R. G. (2003). Five standards and student achievement. *NABE Journal of Research and Practice 1*(1), 1-24.

Durgunoğlu, A. Y., & Hughes, T. (2010). How prepared are the US preservice teachers to teach English language learners? *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 22*(1), 32-41.

Dutro, S. & Kinsella, K. (2010). English language development: Issues and implementation at grades six through twelve. In California Department of Education (Ed.). *Improving education for English learners: Research-based approaches* (pp. 151 207). Sacramento: California Department of Education.

Echevarria, J., & Graves, A. (2010). *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English learners with diverse abilities* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. J. (2007). *Making content comprehensible for English learners: The SIOP model* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2012). *Making content comprehensible for English learners* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Education Commission of the States (2014a). *What ELL training, if any, is required of general classroom teachers?* Retrieved from http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbquestNB2?rep=ELL1415

Education Commission of the States (2014b). *How is an "English language learner" defined in state policy?* Retrieved from http://ecs.force.com/mbdata/mbquestNB2?rep=ELL1402

Ellis, R. (2005). Principles of instructed language learning. *System, 3*3(2), 209-224.

Enright, K. A. (2011). Language and literacy for a new mainstream. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(1), 80-118.

Entz, S. (2006). *Why pedagogy matters: The importance of teaching in a standards-based environment.* Urbana, Illinois: The Forum on Public Policy.

Estapa, A., Pinnow, R. J., & Chval, K. B. (2016). Video as a professional development tool to support novice teachers as they learn to teach English language learners. *The New Educator, 12*(1), 85–104.

Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015, PL PL. 114-195. Retrieved from https://www.congress.gov/bill/114th-congress/sen ate-bill/1177/text

Faulkner-Bond, M., Waring, S., Forte, E., Crenshaw, R. L., Tindle, K., & Belknap, B. (2012). *Language instruction educational programs (LIEPs): A review of the foundational literature.* Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education; Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development; Policy and Program Studies Service.

Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001). From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *Teachers College Record, 103*, 1013–1055.

Fitts, S., & Gross, L. A. (2012). Teacher candidates learning from English learners. Constructing concepts of language and culture in Tuesday's tutors after-school program. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 39*(4), 75-95.

Fink, A. & Kosecoff, J. (1985). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide*. London, UK, Sage Publications.

Fitzgerald, J., & Graves, M. F. (2004). *Scaffolding reading experiences for English-language learners*. Norwood, MA: Christoper-Gordon.

Florida Department of Education (1990). *Florida consent decree*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7582/urlt/Consent-Decree.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2003). *Stipulation modifying consent decree.* Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7582/urlt/0064484-stipulation.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2010). *Florida teacher standards for ESOL endorsement*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7750/urlt/0081098-approvedteacherstandards.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2011). *Technical assistance for teacher preparation: Meeting the needs of English language learners (ELL) in Florida*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7502/urlt/0071749-mnellf.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2014). *2013-2014 English language learners (ELLs) database and program handbook.* Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7750/urlt/0081068-1314-ell databaseprogramhandbook.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2018). *Florida standards assessments: English language arts and mathematics*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/5668/urlt/80PacketFSA18.pdf

Florida Department of Education (2019). *Specialization requirements for certification in English for speakers of other languages (grades K-12)-Academic class*. Retrieved from http://www.fldoe.org/teaching/certification/administrative-rules/6a-4-0245.stml

Florida Department of State (2018). *Florida administrative code & Florida administrative register*. Retrieved from https://flrules.org/gateway/ruleNo.asp?id=6A-1.0503

Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.

García, O., & Li, W. (2014). *Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education*. New York, NY: Palgrave McMillan.

Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Gay, G. (2002). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53,* 106–16.

Gay, G. (2010). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York: Teachers College.

Gay, L., Mills, G. & Airasian, P. (2009). *Educational research: competencies for analysis and application* (9th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Gibbons, P. (2002). *Scaffolding language, scaffolding learning: Teaching second language learners in the mainstream classroom*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Girden, E. R., & Kabacoff, R. I. (2011). *Evaluating Research Articles. From start to finish* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goldenberg, C. (2008). Teaching English language learners: what the research does - and does not — say. *American Educator*. Retrieved from http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/summer2008/goldenberg.pdf

Goldenberg, C. & Coleman, R. (2010). *Promoting academic achievement among English learners: A guide to the research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Gonzalez, M. M. (2016). Preparing teacher candidates for the instruction of English language learners. *Networks: An Online Journal for Teacher Research, 18*(2). Retrieved from https://dx.doi.org/10.4148/2470-6353.1005

Gonzalez, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C. (2005). *Funds of knowledge: theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbau.

Gonzalez, R. J., Pagan, M., Wendell, L., & Love, C. (2011). *Supporting ELL/culturally and linguistically diverse students for academic achievement.* NY: International Center for Leadership in Education.

Gort, M. & Sembiante, S. F. (2015). Navigating hybridized language learning spaces through translanguaging pedagogy: Dual language preschool teachers' languaging practices in support of emergent bilingual children's performance of academic discourse. *International Multilingual Research Journal, 9*(1), 7–25.

Gottlieb, M. (2013). *Essential Actions: A handbook for implementing WIDA's framework for English language development standards*. Madison: Board of Regents of the U of Wisconsin System.

Greenbank, P. (2003). The role of values in educational research: the case for reflexivity. *British Education Research Journal, 29*, 791-801.

Greene, J. C. (2007). *Mixed methods in social inquiry*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Green, J. D., Gonzalez, E. M., López-Velásquez, A. M., & Howard, E. R. (2013). Hands-on professional development: Middle school teachers' experiences with a curriculum intervention research project. *Middle School Journal*, *45*(2), 27–32.

Guler, N. (2018). *Optimizing elementary education for English language learners*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Hamann, E., & Reeves, J. (2013). Interrupting the professional schism that allows less successful educational practices with ELLs to persist. *Theory into Practice*, *52*(2), 81–88.

Harper, C. A, & de Jong, E. J. (2009). English language teacher expertise: the elephant in the room, *Language and Education, 23*(2), 137-151.

Harper, C. A., de Jong, E. J., & Platt, E. J. (2008). Marginalizing English as a second language teacher expertise: The exclusionary consequences of No Child Left Behind. *Language Policy, 7*, 267–284.

Herrera, S. G. (2010). *Biography-driven culturally response teaching*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Herrera, S. (2016). *Biography-driven culturally responsive teaching* (2nd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hilberg, R., Doherty, W. R., Epaloose, G., & Tharp, R. G. (2004). The standards performance continuum: A performance-based measure of the standards for effective pedagogy. In H. C, Waxman, R. G, Tharp, & R, Hilberg (Eds.). *Observational research in U.S. classrooms: New approaches for understanding cultural and linguistic diversity* (pp. 48–72). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Hildenbrand, S. M., & Schultz, S. M. (2015). Implementing service learning in pre-service teacher coursework. *Journal of Experiential Education, 38*(3), 262-279.

Hollie, S. (2012). Culturally and linguistically responsive teaching and learning: Classroom practices for student success. Huntington Beach, CA: Shell Education.

Hollins, E. R. (1996). *Culture in school learning: Revealing the deep meaning.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Huang, J. & Laskowski, T. (2014). Development of linguistic sensitivity of ESL teacher candidates for linguistically responsive instruction. *The International Journal of Literacies, 20(2), 29-50.*

Hutchinson, M. (2013). Bridging the gap: Preservice teachers and their knowledge of working with English language learners. *TESOL, 4*(1), 25-54.

Irvine, J. J. (1990). *Black students and school failure*. New York: Greenwood.

Irvine, J. (2001). The critical elements of culturally responsive pedagogy: A synthesis of research in culturally responsive teaching. In J. J, Irvine & B. J, Armento (Eds.). *Culturally responsive teaching: Lesson planning for elementary and middle grades* (pp. 2–17). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Janes, J. (2001). *Survey research design*. Library Hi Tech - LIBR HI TECH. 19. 419-421. 10.1108/EUM0000000006543

Jensen, E. (2000). *Brain-based learning*. San Diego: Brain Store Incorporated.

Jick, T. D. (1979) Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 24*, 602-611. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.2307/2392366

Jimenez-Silva, M. & Olson, K. (2012). A community of practice in teacher education: Insights and perceptions. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education 24*(3), 335-348.

Johnson, R. B., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Turner, L. A. (2007). Toward a definition of mixed methods research. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research, 1*(2), 112-133.

Johnson, C. C., Bolshakova, V. L. J., & Waldron, T. (2016). When good intentions and reality meet: Large-scale reform of science teaching in urban schools with predominantly Latino ELL students. *Urban Education*, *51*(5), 476–513.

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

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/1163320

Ladson-Billings, G. (2000). Fighting for our lives preparing teachers to teach African American students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 51*(3), 206- 214.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2001). *Crossing over to Canaan: The journey of new teachers in diverse classrooms*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children (*2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Lavrakas, P. J. (2008). *Encyclopedia of survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lee, O., Deaktor, R., Enders, C., & Lambert, J. (2008). Impact of a multiyear professional development intervention on science achievement of culturally and linguistically diverse elementary students. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 45*(6), 726-747.

Lee, O., & Maerten-Rivera, J. (2012). Systemic functional linguistics with English language learners: Results of a multiyear professional development intervention across multiple grades. *Teachers College Record*, *114*(8), 1–42.

Lau, et al. v. Nichols, et al. Volume 414, 563 (1974).

LeVine, R. A. (2002). Contexts and culture in psychological research. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development, 96,* 101-106.

Lucas, T. (Ed.). (2011). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms. A resource for teacher educators*. New York: Routledge.

Lucas, T., & Grinberg, J. (2008). Responding to the linguistic reality of mainstream classrooms: preparing all teachers to teach English language learners. In M, Cochran-Smith, S, Feiman-Nemser and D. J, McIntyre (Eds.). *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed., pp. 606- 636). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lucas, T., Strom, K., Bratkovich, M & Wnuk, J. (2018). Inservice preparation for mainstream teachers of English language learners: A review of the empirical literature, *The Educational Forum*, *82*(2), 156-173.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A. M. (2011). A framework for preparing linguistically responsive teachers. In T, Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 55–72). New York, NY: Routledge.

Lucas, T., & Villegas, A.M. (2013). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers: Laying the foundation in preservice teacher education, *Theory into Practice, 52*(2), 98-109.

Lucas, T., Villegas, A. M. and Freedson-Gonzalez, M. (2008). Linguistically responsive teacher education: Preparing classroom teachers to teach English language learners. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59,* 361–373.

Lunenburg, F. C., & Irby, B. J. (2008). *Writing a successful thesis or dissertation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Lyster, R. (2007). *Learning and teaching languages through content: A counterbalanced approach.* Amsterdam, the Netherlands: John Benjamins.

MacDonald, V. (2004). *The status of English language learners in Florida: Trends and prospects*. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Research Unit (EPRU).

Mann, P. S. (1995). *Introductory Statistics* (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Markos, A. M. (2012). Mandated to learn, guided to reflect: Pre-service teachers' evolving understanding of English language learners. *Issues in Teacher Education, 21*(1), 39–57.

McCorkel, J. & Myers, K. (2003). What difference does difference make? Position and privilege in the field. *Qualitative Sociology, 26*(2) 199-231.

McFarland, J., Hussar, B., Zhang, J., Wang, X., Wang, K., Hein, S., Diliberti, M., Forrest Cataldi, E., Bullock Mann, F., & Barmer, A. (2019). *The condition of education 2019*. Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2019144.

McInerney, D. M. & Van Etten, S. (2003). *Research on sociocultural influences on motivation and learning, Vol. 3. Focus on teacher education.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

McIntyre, E., Kyle, D., Chen, C., Muñoz, M., & Beldon, S. (2010). Teacher learning and ELL reading achievement in sheltered instruction classrooms: Linking professional development to student development, *Literacy Research and Instruction, 49*(4), 334-351. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/3587433

Medina, A.L., Hathaway, J. I., & Pilonieta, P. (2015). How preservice teachers' study abroad experiences lead to changes in their perceptions of English language learners. *Frontiers: The Interdisciplinary Journal Study Abroad, 25,* 73-91. Retrieved from http://frontiersjoyrnal.org/past-volumes/vol-xxv/

Merton, R. K. (1987). Three fragments from a sociologist's notebooks: Establishing the phenomenon, specified ignorance, and strategic research materials. *Annual Review of Sociology, 13*, 1-28.

Metzler, J., & Woessmann, L. (2012). The impact of teacher subject knowledge on student achievement: Evidence from within-teacher within-student variation. *Journal of Development Economics, 99*(2), 486-496.

Migration Policy Institute (2017). *ELL Information Center*. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/programs/ell-information-center

Milner, H. R. (2006). Preservice teachers' learning about cultural and racial diversity: Implications for urban education. *Urban Education, 41*(4), 343-375.

Milner, H. R. (2010). *Start Where You Are, but don't Stay There*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press.

Moats, L. C. (1999). *Teaching reading is rocket science: What expert teachers of reading should know and be able to do.* Washington, D. C.: American Federation of Teachers.

Moll, L. C., Amanti, C., Neff, D., & Gonzalez, N. (1992). Funds of knowledge for teaching: A qualitative approach to developing strategic connections between homes and classrooms. *Theory into Practice, 31*, 132-141.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2015). *English as a new language.* Retrieved from https://www.nbpts.org/wp-content/uploads/ECYA-ENL.pdf

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (2016). *What teachers should know and be able to do*. Retrieved from http://accomplishedteacher.org/wp-comtent/uploads/2016/12/NBPTS-What-Teachers-Should-Know-And-Be-Able-to-Do-.pdf.

National Center for Education Statistic (NCES) (2017a). *The nation's report card: Reading 2017 grades 4 & 8.* Washington, D. C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/reading_2017/nation/achievement?grade=4Academic Performance

National Center for Education Statistic (NCES) (2017b). *The nation's report card: Mathematics 2017 grades 4 & 8.* Washington, D. C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/math_2017/nation/achievement?grade=4

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2017c), *National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 and 2017 math assessments*. Washington, D. C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from NAEP Data Explorer https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/ndecore/xplore/nde.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2017d), *National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 2009 and 2017 reading assessments*. Washington, D. C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from NAEP Data Explorer https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/ndecore/xplore/nde.

National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2019a). *The condition of education 2019, English language learners in public schools*. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2006/2006071.pdf

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2019b). *Study of the Title I, Part A Grant Program Mathematical Formulas* (NCES 2019-016). Washington, D. C.: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2019/titlei/summary.asp

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (NCELA) (2011). *The growing number of English learner student*s. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu/files/uploads/9/growing_EL_0910.pdf

National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition (2017). *Profiles of English learners (ELs).* Washington, D. C.: Office of English Language Acquisition, U. S. Department of Education. Retrieved from https://ncela.ed.gov/files/fast_facts/Profiles_of_ELs_4.12.18_MM_Final_Edit.pdf

National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) (2012). *Standard for preparation of teachers of secondary English language arts 7-12*. Retrieved from http://www.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Groups/CEE/NCATE/NCTE%20RevisedStandards%204%2010%2012.pdf

National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE) (2017). *Principles in practice imprint*. Retrieved from https://secure.ncte.org/library/NCTEFiles/Resources/Books/Sample/02947SampleChapter.pdf

Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.

Nieto, S. (2001). We speak in many tongues. In C, Diaz (Ed.). *Multicultural education for the 21st century* (pp. 152–170). New York, NY: Longman.

Nieto, S. (2002). *Language, culture, and teaching: Critical perspectives for a new century*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Nieto, S. (2013). *Finding joy in teaching students of diverse backgrounds: Culturally responsive and socially just practices in U.S. classrooms*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann Publishers.

Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Harlow, England: Pearson Education Limited.

O'Hara, S., Pritchard, R., Huang, C., & Pella, S. (2013). The teaching using technology studio: Innovative professional development to meet the needs of English learners. *TESOL Journal, 4(*2), 274–294.

Palmer, D., Martínez, R., Garcia-Mateus, S., & Henderson, K. (2014). Reframing the debate on language separation: Toward a vision for translanguaging pedagogies in the dual language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal, 98.*

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Peercy, M. M., Martin-Beltrán, M., Silverman, R. D., & Nunn, S. J. (2015). "Can I ask a question?" ESOL and mainstream teachers engaging in distributed and distributive learning to support English language learners' text comprehension. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 42*(4), 33–58.

Peregoy, S. F., Boyle, O., & Cadiero-Kaplan, K. (2008). *Reading, writing and learning in ESL: A resource book for teaching K-12 English learners*. Boston: Pearson.

Platt, E. (2007). *The inclusion of limited English-proficient students in Florida's K-12 content classrooms*. Florida State College of Education White Papers. Retrieved from http://www.coe.fsu.edu/whitepapers/inclusion.htm

Polat, N. (2010). A comparative analysis of pre-and in-service teacher beliefs about readiness and self-competency: Revisiting teacher education for ELLs. *System, 38,* 228-244.

Project DELTA. (2014). *Resources for teachers and teacher educators*. Retrieved from http://education.ufl.edu/project-delta/resources-for-teachers-and-teacher-educators/

Pu, C. (2012). Narrative inquiry: preservice teachers' understanding of teaching English learners. *AILACTE Journal, 9*(1), 1-18. Retrieved from http:''ailacte.org/AILACTE_Journal

Public education in Florida. (2013). Retrieved from https://ballotpedia.org/Public_education_in_Florida#:~:targetText=In%202013%20Florida%20had%202%2C692%2C162,national%20average%20of%201%3A16.

Reeves, J. (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-language learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99*(3), 131–42.

Richards-Tutor, C., Aceves, T., & Reese, L. (2016). *Evidence-based practices for English Learners.* University of Florida, Collaboration for Effective Educator, Development, Accountability, and Reform Center. Retrieved from http://ceedar.education.ufl.edu/tools/innovation-configurations/

Riches, C., & Genesee, F. Literacy: Crosslinguistic and crossmodal issues. (2006). In F, Genesee, K, Lindholm-Leary, W, Saunders, & D, Christian (Eds.). *Educating English language learners: A synthesis of empirical findings* (pp. 64-108). NY: Cambridg University Press.

Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., & Elam, G. (2003). Designing and selecting samples. In J, Ritchie & J, Lewis (Eds.). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 77–108). London: Sage.

Ruiz Soto, A. G., Hooker, S., & Batalova, J. (2015). States and districts with the highest number and share of English language learners. Brief No. 5. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/states-and-districts-highest-number-andshare-english-language-learners

Rodriguez, D., Manner, J., & Darcy, S. (2010). Evolution of teacher perceptions regarding effective instruction for English language learners. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *9*(2), 130–144.

Rubinfeld, D. L. (2011). *Reference manual on scientific evidence* (3rd. ed.). Washington, D. C.: The National Academy Press. Retrieved from https://www.fjc.gov/sites/default/files/2015/SciMan3D01.pdf

Rumbaed, R. G., Massey, D. S., & Bean, F. D. (2006). Linguistic life expectancies: Immigrant language retention in southern California. *Population and Development Review 32*(3), 447-460.

Russell, F. A. (2014). Collaborative literacy work in a high school: Enhancing teacher capacity for English learner instruction in the mainstream. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, *18*(11), 1189–1207.

Russell, F. A. (2015). Learning to teach English learners: Instructional coaching and developing novice high school teacher capacity. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, *42*(1), 27–47.

Samson, J., & Collins, B. (2012). *Preparing all teachers to meet the needs of English language learners: Applying research to policy and practice for teacher effectiveness*. Washington, D. C.: Center for American Progress.

Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling*: *A functional linguistics perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum Associates.

Schleppegrell, M., & Achugar, M. (2003). Learning language and learning history: A functional linguistics approach. *TESOL Journal, 12*(2), 21-27.

Schleppegrell, M., Achugar, M., & Oteíza, T. (2004). The grammar of history: Enhancing content-based instruction through a functional focus on language. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*(1), 67-93.

Schleppegrell, M., & O'Hallaron, C. (2011). Teaching academic language in L2 secondary settings. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*. *31*. 10.1017/S0267190511000067

Settlage, J., Gort, M., & Ceglie, R. J. (2014). Mediated language immersion and teacher ideologies: Investigating trauma pedagogy with a "physics in Spanish" course activity. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 41*(3), 47-66.

Shanahan, T.B., & Shea, L.M. (2012). Incorporating English language teaching through science for K-2 teachers. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 23*(4), 407-428.

Short, D. (1991). *Integrating language and content instruction: Strategies and techniques.* Washington, D. C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Siegel, M. A. (2014). Developing preservice teachers' expertise in equitable assessment for English learners. *Journal of Science Teacher Education, 25*(3). 289-308.

Siwatu, K. O., Chesnut, S. R., Alejandro, A. Y., & Young, H. A. (2016). Examining preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy doubts. *The Teacher Educator, 51*(4), 277-296.

Siwatu, K. O. (2007). Preservice teachers' culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy and outcome expectancy beliefs. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 23*(7), 1086– 1101.

Siwatu, K. O. (2011). Preservice teachers culturally responsive teaching self-efficacy forming experiences: A mixed methods study. *The Journal of Educational Research, 104,* 360–369.

Sleeter, C. (2008). An invitation to support diverse students through teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 59*(3), 212-219.

Sleeter, C E., & Grant, C. A. (2011). *Making choices for multicultural education: Five approaches to race, class and gender* (6th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley.

Snow, C. E., & Uccelli, P. (2009). The challenge of academic language. In D. R., Olson, & N, Torrance (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Literacy* (pp. 112-133). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sousa, D. A. (2001). *How the brain learns* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Corwin Press.

Spada, N., & Lightbrown, P. (2008). Form-focused instruction: Isolated or integrated? *TESOL Quarterly, 42*, 181-207.

Steinberg, W. J. (2011). *Statistics Alive!* (2nd ed.). Washington, D. C.: Sage.

Sugarman, J. (2018). *A matter of design: English learner program models in K-12 education*. Washington, D. C.: Migration Policy Institute.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G, Cook & B, Seidlehofer (Eds.). *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in honour of H. G. Widdowson* (pp. 125-144). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Taie, S., & Goldring, R. (2017). *Characteristics of public elementary and secondary school principals in the United States: Results from the 2015–16 National Teacher and Principal Survey First Look Repor*t. (NCES 2017-070). Washington, D. C.: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Tellez, K., & Waxman, H. C. (2006). *Preparing quality educators for English language learners: Policies and practices.* New York, NY: Routledge.

TESOL. (2006). *Pre-K-12 English language proficiency standards framework*. Retrieved from https://www.tesol.org/docs/books/bk_prek12elpstandards_framework_318.pdf?sf vrsn=2

Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL). (2010). *TESOL/ NCATE standards for the recognition of initial TESOL programs in P–12 ESL teacher education*. Alexandria, VA. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/s_tesol/seccss.asp?CID=219&DID=1689

Tharp, R. G. (1997). *From at-risk to excellence: Research, theory, and principles for practice,* Research Report 1. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence.

Tharp, R. G. (1999). *Proofs and evidence: Effectiveness of the five standards for effective pedagogy*. Technical Report No. 2. Santa Cruz, CA: Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence.

Tharp, R. G. (2007). A Perspective on unifying culture and psychology: Some philosophical and scientific issues. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *27*(2); *28*(1), 213-233.

Tharp, R. G., & Dalton, S. S. (2007). Orthodoxy, cultural compatibility, and universals in education. *Comparative Education, 43*(1), 53-70.

Tharp, R. G., Estrada, P., Dalton, S. S., and Yamauchi, L. (2000). *Teaching transformed: Achieving excellence, fairness, inclusion, and harmony.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press. Retrieved from https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9c40/6ae1f75a9383e90e10504e5e3bfab7d3afc2.pdf

Turgut Dost, G. (2016). Preparing linguistically responsive teachers through experiential foreign language tasks: A phenomenological study. *Cogent Education, 3*(1). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10/1080/2331186X.2016.1169614

Turkan, S., & Buzick, H. M. (2014). Complexities and issues to consider in the evaluation of content teachers of English language learners. *Urban Education,* 1-28. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/100.1177/0042085914543111

U. S. Department of Education (2017). *Consolidated state performance reports SY 2016-2017*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/admins/lead/account/consolidated/index.html

U. S. Department of Education (2018a). *Academic performance and outcomes for English learners*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/el-outcomes/index.html

U. S. Department of Education (2018b). *Our nation's English learners*. Retrieved from https://www2.ed.gov/datastory/el-characteristics/index.html#mapnotes

Valdés, G., Bunch, G. C., Snow, C. E., & Lee, C. (2005). Enhancing the development of students' language(s). In L, Darling-Hammond, J, Bransford, P, LePage, K, Hammerness & H, Duffy (Eds.), *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do* (pp. 126-168). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Verplaetse, L. S. (2000). How content teachers allocate turns to limited English proficient students. *Journal of Education, 182*(3), 19-35.

Verplaetse, L. S., & Migliacci, N. (2008). Inclusive pedagogy: An introduction. In L. S, Verplaetse & N, Migliacci (Eds.). *Inclusive pedagogy for English language learners: A handbook of research-informed practices* (pp. 3-13). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Villegas, A. M. and Lucas, T. (2002a). *Educating culturally responsive teachers: A coherent approach*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2002b). Preparing culturally responsive teachers: Rethinking the curriculum. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53,* 20–32.

Villegas, A. M., & Lucas, T. (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational Leadership, 64*, 28-33. Retrieved from http://eric.ed.gov

Villegas, A. M. and Lucas, T. (2011). Preparing classroom teachers for teaching English language learners: The policy context. In T, Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp. 35–52). New York, NY: Routledge.

Villegas, A. M., Saiz de LaMora, K., Martin, D., & Mills, T. (2018). Preparing future mainstream teachers to teach English language learners: A review of the empirical literature. *The Educational Forum, 82*(2), 138–155.

Vogt, M., & Echevarria, J. (2007). *99 ideas and activities for teaching English learners with the SIOP model*. Boston, MA: Pearson Allyn & Bacon.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The instrumental method in psychology. In J. V, Wertsch (Ed.), *The concept of activity in Soviet psychology* (pp. 134–144). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.

Walonick, D. (2003). *Survival Statistics*. Minneapolis. MN: Statpac.

Walqui, A. (2006). Scaffolding instruction for English language learners: A conceptual framework. *The International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 9*(2), 159–180.

Walqui, A. (2011). The growth of teacher expertise for teaching English language learners: A socio-culturally based professional development model. In T, Lucas (Ed.). *Teacher preparation for linguistically diverse classrooms: A resource for teacher educators* (pp.160–177). New York, NY: Routledge.

Washburn, G. N. (2008). Alone, confused, and frustrated: developing empathy and strategies for working with English language learners. *The Clearing House: A Journal of Educational Strategies, Issues and Ideas, 81*, 247–250.

Wilson-Patton, M. E. (2000). *A legal Study of the Florida ESOL consent decree: From initiation through fifth year implementation.* Tallahassee: Florida State University.

Wong-Fillmore, L. & Snow, C. (2000). *What teachers need to know about language*. Washington D. C.: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Wong-Fillmore, L. & Snow, C. (2005). What teachers need to know about language. In C. T, Adger, C. E, Snow, & D, Christian (Eds.). *In what teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7–54). Washington, D. C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Wood, D., Bruner, J. S., & Ross, G. (1976). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines, 17*(2), 89-100.

Youngs, C. S., & Youngs, G. A., Jr. (2001). Predictors of mainstream teachers' attitudes toward ESL students. *TESOL Quarterly, 35*, 97-120.

Yzquierdo, M. L. (2017). *Pathways to greatness for ELL newcomers: A comprehensive guide for schools and teachers*. San Antonio, TX: Seidlitz Education/Canter Press.

Zhang, S., & Stephens, V. (2013). Learning to teach English-language learners in mainstreamed secondary classrooms. *Teacher Education and Practice, 26*(1), 99-116.

Appendix A - Letters Soliciting Participation and Approval

Kansas State University
Graduate School
113-119 Eisenhower Hall
1013 Mid Campus Drive
Manhattan, KS 66506

July 2019
_____County Public Schools
Florida
Dear Mr./Mrs./ Dr. (name of school principal)

My name is Silvina Aznar Mojica. I am a teacher in _____County Public Schools. I am also a doctoral student in the College of Education at Kansas State University. I am conducting survey study in the field of English as a Second Language ESOL. Upon requesting and receiving permission from _____ County Public Schools Instructional Support Services Department to conduct this research, I am inviting teachers from several elementary schools to participate in it. I am requesting your permission to invite the teachers at your school to participate in the survey. I ask that you kindly allow me to deliver a hardcopy of the Informed Consent Letter to teachers at your school. The Informed Consent Letter serves as the invitation and contains a link to the survey.

The purpose of the study is to examine knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers. The goal of the research is to gain an understanding of the knowledge teachers obtain from ESOL endorsement preparation and its relationship to the instructional practices that teachers implement to support the academic achievement of English language learners. Participation in the study is voluntary. There are no anticipated financial or professional risks involved with participation. Results may be published in aggregate form. No participant will be individually identified because the survey is anonymous.

To respond to this request, or should you have any questions in regards to this study, you may contact me, Silvina Aznar-Mojica at mojica@ksu.edu. My faculty advisor, Dr. Socorro Herrera, may be contacted by email at sococo@ksu.edu. All research conducted at Kansas State University is under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions and concerns about your rights may be directed to Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, Kansas State University, 203 Fairchild Hall 1601 Vattier St., Manhattan KS, 66502, 785 532-3224.

I look forward to the participation of _____ County Public School teachers in this study.

Sincerely,
Silvina Aznar-Mojica

Teacher, _____County Public Schools
Doctoral Candidate, Kansas State University

April 29, 2018
mcoady@coe.ufl.edu

Dear Dr. Coady,

I am a doctoral student from Kansas State University writing my dissertation tentatively titled *ESOL Endorsed Elementary Mainstream Teachers' Knowledge and Practice of Effective, Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy for English Language Learners* under the direction of my dissertation committee chaired by Dr. Socorro Herrera.

I would like your permission to reproduce to use Project DELTA survey instrument in my research study. I would like to use and print the survey under the following conditions:

- I will use this survey only for my research study and will not sell or use it with any compensated or curriculum development activities.
- I will include the copyright on all copies of the instrument.
- I will send my research study and one copy of reports, articles, and the like that make use of these survey data promptly to your attention.

If these are acceptable terms and conditions, please indicate so by signing one copy of this letter and returning it to me through either postal mail or email.

Postal Address: Silvina Aznar-Mojica
1526 Equinox Circle
Sanford, FL 32771
Email: mojica@ksu.edu

Sincerely,
Silvina Aznar-Mojica
Doctoral Candidate

5/15/18

Signature

Expected Date of Completion: 11/15/2018

On May 3, 2018, at 8:35 AM, De Jong,Ester Johanna <edejong@coe.ufl.edu> wrote:

Dear Silvina,

Thank you for your inquiry. I'm delighted to see you plan on using our instrument and I look forward to reading your study. Permission granted under the conditions outlined in your letter.

Best

Ester de Jong, EdD

Professor & Director School of Teaching and Learning

University of Florida

2423 Norman Hall

Gainesville,FL 32611

352-273-4227

FAX: 352-392-9193

edejong@coe.ufl.edu

<image001.png>

Center for Excellence in Elementary Teacher Education (Project ADePT)

http://education.ufl.edu/elementary-teacher-preparation/

Past President (2018-2019) <image002.png>

TESOL International Association

1925 Ballenger Avenue, Suite 550

Alexandria, VA 22314-6820 USA

www.tesol.org

edejong@tesol.org

Dear Ms. Aznar-Mojica,

August 28, 2019
Ms. Silvina Aznar-Mojica
1526 Equinox Circle
Sanford, FL 32771

Dear Ms. Aznar-Mojica,

I am in receipt of the proposal and supplemental information that you submitted for permission to conduct research in the _____ County Public Schools. You are granted permission to conduct the study described herein, *English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsed Elementary Teachers' Knowledge and Practice of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy for English Learners*, with the following parameters:

1. The principal of each school listed below has the final authority to allow you to conduct research on his/her campus. Your first order of business is to contact the principal and ask permission to provide the ESOL teachers on his/her campus with a copy of the Informed Consent letter and survey link. If the principal declines, please contact me prior to adding schools.

2. Please refrain from using _____ email to contact study participants.

3. Conduct all study related questioning outside of contracted time for both you and the participants.

4. Please send a copy of your results to Ms. Minnie Cardona, Director of ESOL and World Languages.

Respectfully,

Anna-Marie Cote, Ed.D. Deputy Superintendent, Instructional Excellence and Equity

August 28, 2019

cc. Dr. Marian Cummings, Executive Director, Elementary Schools Dr. Robin Dehlinger, Executive Director, Elementary Schools Ms. Minnie Cardona, Director, ESOL, World Languages and Student Access

Appendix B - Survey of ESOL Endorsed Teachers

SURVEY OF ESOL ENDORSED TEACHERS

The purpose of this study is to examine knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers. Participation in this study is voluntary. There are no anticipated financial or professional risks involved with participating. Results may be published in aggregate form. No participant will be individually identified because the survey is anonymous Should you have any questions in regards to this study, you may contact me, Silvina Aznar-Mojica at mojica@ksu.edu. My faculty advisor, Dr. Socorro Herrera, may be contacted by email at sococo@ksu.edu. All research conducted at Kansas State University is under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions and concerns about your rights may be directed to Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, Kansas State University, 203 Fairchild Hall 1601 Vattier St., Manhattan KS, 66502, 785 532-3224.

1. I give my consent to participate in this study. Yes ____ No ____

Part I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2. How long have you been teaching? (# of years): _____

3. What grade level(s) are you currently teaching? K 1 2 3 4 5

4. For each subject that you *currently* teach, please indicate how many English learners (ELs) you currently teach and assign grades to:

English Language Arts ____ Math ____ Science ____ Social Studies ____

Music ____ Physical Education ____ Art ____

5. Do these ELs receive ESOL instructional support services (i.e., pullout/resource teacher) outside your classes? Yes ____ No ____

6. Have you taught ELs in the past (*prior to this school year*)? Yes ____ No ____

7. If yes, when did you teach them? Indicate year(s). _____

8. How many ELs have you taught on average per year? _____

9. When did you graduate from college? Year_____

10. What was/were your specialization(s)? _____

11. Where did you complete the ESOL endorsement requirements?

College _____ District Professional Development _____

12. If in college, how many ESOL classes did you take? _____

13. Indicate your current teaching certificates/endorsements. Check all that apply.

Elementary Education _____ ESOL _____

Exceptional Student Education _____ Reading _____ Other (please specify) _____

14. Is English your first language? Yes ____ No ____

15. Do you know any language(s) other than English? Yes ____ No ____

16. If yes, which language(s) you know _____

17. Indicate the proficiency level (beginner, intermediate, advanced) for each additional language you know.

Additional Language(s)	Beginner	Intermediate	Advanced

18. Have you lived/spent time in another country or had extended interactions with people from a different culture/language background? Yes ____ No ____

19. If yes, indicate where, for how long, and under what circumstances**:**

Country	Length of time	Circumstances

Part II. SOCIAL, CULTURAL, AND LINGUISTIC DIMENSIONS OF TEACHING ELs

Please rate each of the statements below in response to the question:

How knowledgeable do you feel about the following aspects of teaching ELs?

	(1) Extremely	(2) Sufficiently	(3) Somewhat	(4) Not at all
20. Using ELs' home languages as a resource in teaching.	1	2	3	4
21. Using ELs**'** cultural backgrounds as a resource in teaching.	1	2	3	4
22. Structuring classroom activities so that ELs can interact successfully with English dominant other students.	1	2	3	4
23. Selecting activities to build on background knowledge for ELs before reading, writing, or learning tasks.	1	2	3	4
24. Organizing my classroom so that ELs feel comfortable and ready to learn.	1	2	3	4
25. Setting language objectives specifically for ELs when I plan instruction in content areas.	1	2	3	4
26. Addressing the vocabulary demands of a specific content area when I plan instruction**.**	1	2	3	4
27. Addressing the grammatical (e.g., sentence complexity) demands of content area.	1	2	3	4
28. Modifying my use of English to help ELs understand my instruction.	1	2	3	4
29. Lowering the language difficulty (but not the cognitive demand) of my instruction for ELs.	1	2	3	4

Part III. EFFECTIVE STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING ELs

Please rate each of the statements below in response to the question

How often do you practice these strategies when teaching your ELs?

	(1) Regularly	(2) Sometimes	(3) Seldom	(4) Never
30. I use language other than English during instruction (e.g., cognates, translation and definition of vocabulary, development of math concepts or oral language and literacy).	1	2	3	4
31. I make native language materials available for ELs to use during instruction.	1	2	3	4
32. I use materials (e.g., books, pictures, videos) that reflect different ethnicities, racial groups, or students' home lives or experiences.	1	2	3	4
33. I provide linguistic scaffolding needed for ELs at different English proficiency levels to participate meaningfully in cooperative learning structures.	1	2	3	4
34. I tap into/link to students' background knowledge or prior experiences (e.g., by inviting ELs to share experiences and encouraging all students to value and learn from diverse experiences).	1	2	3	4
35. I pair or group students who share a common native language to support their content learning.	1	2	3	4
36. I use routines to facilitate comprehension of activities.	1	2	3	4
37. I state language learning objectives verbally or write and display them visually for ELs (e.g., on the board, chart paper).	1	2	3	4
38. I use effective strategies to teach vocabulary to ELs (e.g., pre-teaching, using different modalities, referring to native language) in the context of meaningful text and oral discourse.	1	2	3	4
39. I explicitly teach the grammar and/or discourse features needed to talk or write about concepts.	1	2	3	4
40. I use clear speech (e.g., reduced rate, clear enunciation, repetition, or paraphrase) as appropriate for ELs' age and English proficiency levels.	1	2	3	4
41. I simplify (vocabulary or sentence structure) or elaborate/ paraphrase the language of content instruction (e.g., math word problems).	1	2	3	4
42. I ask ELs questions linguistically appropriate (according to their English proficiency levels), content-related questions that encourage higher order thinking.	1	2	3	4

Part IV. PERSONAL EXPERIENCES

43. What knowledge did you gain or wish you had gained during your ESOL endorsement preparation that you consider important for teaching ELs?
44. What instructional practices learned during your ESOL endorsement preparation have you used effectively for teaching ELs?
45. Please share any information regarding your experiences teaching ELs that you feel may be relevant to this study.

Thank you for your participation in this study! Your participation is greatly appreciated.

DEFRIEFING STATEMENT

Purpose of the Study:

The researcher previously informed you that the purpose of the study was to examine knowledge and practices of ESOL endorsed teachers. The goal of the research is to gain an understanding of the knowledge teachers obtained from ESOL endorsement preparation and its relationship to the instructional practices that teachers implement to support the academic achievement of English language learners.

Confidentiality:

No participant will be individually identified because the survey is anonymous. Researcher will ensure that all data collected in this study are kept confidential and accessed only by the principal investigator.
Please do not disclose research procedures and/or hypotheses to anyone who might participate in this study in the future as this could affect the results of the study.

Final Report:

If you would like to receive a copy of the final report of this study (or a summary of the findings) when it is completed, please feel free to contact the researcher *Silvina Aznar-Mojica at mojica@ksu.edu*

Useful Contact Information:

If you have any questions or concerns regarding this study, its purpose or procedures, or if you have a research-related problem, please feel free to contact the researcher, *Silvina Aznar-Mojica at mojica@ksu.edu.*

If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research subject, you may contact *Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, Kansas State University, 203 Fairchild Hall 1601 Vattier St., Manhattan KS, 66502, 785 532-3224.*

Appendix C - Informed Consent Letter

Kansas State University
Graduate School
113-119 Eisenhower Hall
1013 Mid Campus Drive
Manhattan, KS 66506

September, 2019

_____ County Public Schools Teachers
Florida

Dear ESOL endorsed teacher from _____ Public Schools,

You are invited to participate in research designed to gather information about ESOL endorsed teachers. Your insight is important to learning about ESOL endorsed teachers' knowledge and instructional practices used in the classroom for English learners. As an ESOL endorsed teacher in _____ County Public Schools, you have been especially selected to take this survey. Your input will be anonymous. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer.
This survey is expected to take 10-15 minutes.

Your participation in this study is entirely voluntary. You may select to participate or not without any repercussion. There are no anticipated financial or professional risks involved with completing this survey. The results of this survey may be published in aggregate form. No participant will be individually identified.

Should you have any questions in regards to this study, you may contact me, Silvina Aznar-Mojica at mojica@ksu.edu. My faculty advisor, Dr. Socorro Herrera, may be contacted by email at sococo@ksu.edu. All research conducted at Kansas State University is under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions and concerns about your rights may be directed to Rick Scheidt, Chair, Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, Kansas State University, 203 Fairchild Hall 1601 Vattier St., Manhattan KS, 66502, 785 532-3224.

(LINK to Survey goes here)
By clicking this link, you are giving your informed consent.

Thank you for your participation in this survey.

Sincerely,

Silvina Aznar-Mojica
Teacher, _____ County Public Schools
Doctoral Candidate

Appendix D - Kansas State University IRB Approval

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY | University Research Compliance Office

TO: Socorro Herrera
Curriculum and Instruction
221 Bluemont Hall

Proposal Number: 9839

FROM: Rick Scheidt, Chair
Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects

DATE: 8/20/2019

RE: Proposal Entitled, "English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsed Elementary Teachers' Knowledge and Practice of Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Pedagogy for English Learners."

The Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects / Institutional Review Board (IRB) for Kansas State University has reviewed the proposal identified above and has determined that it is EXEMPT from further IRB review. This exemption applies only to the proposal - as written – and currently on file with the IRB. Any change potentially affecting human subjects must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation and may disqualify the proposal from exemption.

Based upon information provided to the IRB, this activity is exempt under the criteria set forth in the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects, **45 CFR §46.101, paragraph b, category: 2, subsection: ii.**

Certain research is exempt from the requirements of HHS/OHRP regulations. A determination that research is exempt does not imply that investigators have no ethical responsibilities to subjects in such research; it means only that the regulatory requirements related to IRB review, informed consent, and assurance of compliance do not apply to the research.

Any unanticipated problems involving risk to subjects or to others must be reported immediately to the Chair of the Committee on Research Involving Human Subjects, the University Research Compliance Office, and if the subjects are KSU students, to the Director of the Student Health Center.

203 Fairchild Hall, Lower Mezzanine, 1601 Vattier St., Manhattan, KS 66506-1103 | 785-532-3224 | fax: 785-532-3278
comply@k-state.edu | k-state.edu/comply