# Educating English Learners in Non-Gateway Districts: Teachers' Perspectives, Practices, and Professional Preparation

by

Lori A. Randall

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Curriculum and Instruction)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2013

Date of final oral examination: 07/08/13

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Margaret R. Hawkins, Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Stacey J. Lee, Professor, Educational Policy Studies
Catherine F. Compton-Lilly, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Mariana Pacheco, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Melissa L. Braaten, Assistant Professor, Curriculum and Instruction

Sowohl diese Arbeit als auch meine Lebensaufgabe ist an Sr. Susan Kongs, Fr. Margot Wiebe, und mein Bruder Loran gewidmet. «Danke Schön» genügt nicht, meine Dankbarkeit für Eure Betreuung, Euer Glauben an meine Fähigkeit, und Eure Liebe auszudrücken. Ich hoffe nur, dass ich Euch durch meine Bemühungen, anderen ihren eigenen Träumen zu verwirklichen, richtig ehren kann.

I would like to express my deepest thanks to the teachers and teacher educators who kindly agreed to participate in this study. I am particularly grateful to the eight wonderful and dedicated teachers whom I had the pleasure of meeting throughout the course of this study. Thank you for sharing your time, your stories, and your thoughtful insights.

I would also like to thank the members and officers of the UW-Madison Working Class Student Union (WCSU). You made sure that I always had a metaphorical place to call home here at "this fine place so far from home." I cannot thank you enough for your support. Keep up the great work, guys!

Additionally I would like to thank my advisor, Maggie Hawkins, and all of the faculty members with whom I have worked. You have done an amazing job of helping me understand what it means to be both a scholar and an advocate for social justice in school and society. Academia is a bit of a strange new world for me, and I'm quite sure I'd never have figured out how to navigate it without your guidance! Above all, you have – more than any other educators or mentors in my life – helped me discern my true calling. The gift of discernment is priceless, and I will always be grateful to you for it.

Endlich danke ich Dir, Rob. Obwohl Alles uns leider schief gegangen ist, danke ich Dir noch, dass Du mich diesen langen Jahren geliebt und unterstützt hast. Diese Erfahrung hätte ich sicher nie überlebt, ohne sowohl Deine Liebe und Großmut als auch die Freundschaft und Liebe Deiner Familie. Ich liebe Dich immer noch und hoffe, dass wir einander auf die Ewigkeit als Freunde Wilkommen heißen!

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# Chapter 1

## Introduction

Although English remains the exclusive language of instruction in most K-12 schools in the U.S., the number of students who regard English as a second – or third or fourth – language has increased significantly over the last decade (NCELA, 2008) and is expected to continue rising over the next twenty-five years (Villegas & Lucas, 2002). Indeed, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education estimates that, by the year 2025, 40% of all students in grades K-12 will be English Learners (ELs) (AACTE, 2002, as cited in Lucas & Grinberg, 2008). The growing number of ELs has been accompanied by a demographic shift, with the result that ELs are no longer solely concentrated in urban areas that have traditionally served as gateways for immigrant families. Rather, rural, semirural, and suburban areas, especially in the Midwest and Southeast, are rapidly becoming home to increasing numbers of immigrant and bilingual families (Capps et al, 2005; Levinson et al, 2007). Thus, it is clear that all U.S. teachers – not just those who plan to work in traditional gateway areas – must be prepared to meet the unique needs of students who conduct their academic careers exclusively in a language that is not their home language.

Indeed, preservice preparation that specifically addresses the needs of linguistically diverse students may be even more vital for teachers who will serve in non-gateway areas than for teachers who will serve in traditional gateway areas. While 63% of mainstream classroom teachers in traditional urban gateway areas are likely to attend professional development sessions designed to help them work more effectively with ELs, only 25% of their counterparts in non-gateway areas are likely to participate in such professional development opportunities (Cosentino de Cohen et al, 2005). These statistics highlight the need to ensure that all teachers enter the

profession prepared to work confidently and successfully with ELs. Yet there is evidence to suggest that the average American teacher does not receive preservice preparation focused on the needs of ELs.

Wong Fillmore and Snow's 2002 report "What Teachers Need to Know about Language" indicates that teacher preparation programs typically do not require, or even offer, the types of courses that would help teachers develop the set of beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions generally regarded as necessary for working successfully with ELs. Indeed, numerous studies (e.g., Ballantyne, et al, 2008; Gándara, et al, 2005; Lucas & Grinberg, 2008; Reeves, 2004, 2006; Verplaetse, 1998) conducted both before and after the publication of "What Teachers Need to Know" indicate that teachers themselves often feel unprepared to work effectively with students who are learning English as a second language. Even the graduates of those teacher-preparation programs that stand out from the rest for their excellence in preparing teachers to meet the demands of changing classroom demographics report very low levels of confidence in their ability to work successfully with ELs (Darling-Hammond, 2006).

In an effort to ensure that more teachers are prepared to work confidently and successfully with ELs, five states (Arizona, California, Florida, New York, and Pennsylvania) have recently mandated that all preservice teacher-preparation programs must include coursework that specifically prepares candidates to work with ELs. In certain cases, new teachers are required to possess dual certification in ESL (English as a Second Language) and the core certification area of their choice, such as elementary education, or, at the secondary level, English, mathematics, science, or social studies (NCELA, 2008). Schools of education outside of these five states have likewise begun to include ESL-specific coursework in their

preservice teacher preparation programs or to offer dual certification in ESL and the core certification area of the teacher's choice (NCELA, 2008).

As an increasing number of programs restructure their curricula to include ESL-specific preparation, it is important to ensure that new and existing programs truly meet the professional development needs of ESL teachers. It is particularly important to ensure that programs designed for secondary-level ESL teachers are effective in meeting the needs of these teachers and their students. As Reeves (2006) and Olson and Land (2007) note, few researchers have investigated the professional-development needs of secondary-level teachers who work with ELs. This lack of attention to the specific needs of secondary-level teachers may not seem to be a grave omission from the literature, as the existing literature on effective vs. ineffective approaches to teacher education as well as the existing literature on the beliefs, skills, knowledge and dispositions deemed necessary to work successfully with ELs is generally considered to be relevant for teachers enrolled in both elementary- and secondary-level preparation programs. Nevertheless, teachers preparing to work or currently working at the secondary level are likely to experience their ESL preparation programs and their work with ELs in substantially different ways than teachers who are preparing to work or are currently working at the elementary level.

Elementary school teachers, with the exception of art, music, foreign language, physical education, and other special-subjects teachers, typically work with no more than thirty students per year, see their students for several hours of each day, enjoy a holistic picture of each student's progress across subject areas, and generally have opportunities to connect on a meaningful level with students' families. Teachers at the secondary level have a markedly different experience. These teachers can work with nearly 200 students per day; generally see their students for no more than fifty minutes per day; often do not know what other courses any

given student is taking; and often find that their opportunities to develop sustained, meaningful relationships with students and their families are severely restricted. Under such circumstances, teachers may be daunted by attempts to cultivate a meaningful understanding of each student's cultural and linguistic background and learning needs. Indeed, in their 2000 report "Overlooked and Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools," Ruiz-de-Velasco and Fix note that one of the challenges of

> teaching LEP [Limited English Proficient] / immigrant students derives from the ways in which secondary schools are organized. The division of secondary schools into departments along the lines of universities, the isolation of language development teachers, and the division of the day into 50-minute periods militate against the kind of individualized instruction students with special learning needs may require (Ruiz-de-Velasco and Fix, 2000, p. vii).

The above-described circumstances, which differentiate the work of elementary-level ESL teachers from the work of secondary-level teachers in dramatic ways, may require differentiation between the ways in which secondary-level and elementary-level ESL teachers are prepared for professional practice. The current study will offer insight into the kinds of programmatic differentiation that may be necessary by investigating the following issues: 1) the nature of the work performed by ESL teachers at the secondary level; 2) the extent to which ESL teachers and ESL teacher educators agree when defining the beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions that are necessary in performing this work successfully; and 3) the elements of teachers' preparation programs that teachers identify as having been most (or least) effective in helping them develop the beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions upon which they rely in working with adolescent English learners.

It is important to note that a teacher's preparation program is only one of many elements that influence her beliefs, skills, knowledge, dispositions, and classroom practice. School culture, community culture, and teachers' own life experiences, for example, also play

significant roles in shaping both a teacher's practice and the knowledge, skills, dispositions and beliefs upon which she draws as a professional. The focus of this study on one particular element is not meant to diminish the importance of or to ignore the role played by the others. Rather, the role played by teacher preparation programs in shaping teachers' work was singled out for discussion because of the timeliness of the topic. As noted above, an increasing number of teacher preparation programs are beginning to add or have already added mandatory coursework or certification requirements pertinent to teaching ELs. Thus, it seems appropriate to focus research attention on the intersections among teachers' preparation programs, their work with ELs, and the knowledge, skills, dispositions, and beliefs that lie at the heart of that work.

Before investigating these intersections, it is helpful to review the literature that informs our understanding of what it means to work effectively with ELs at the secondary level. Thus, the following chapter will be dedicated to a review of the existing literature on second language acquisition and ESL pedagogy in the American K-12 school context. To the extent possible, this literature will focus on the unique needs of adolescent and young adult language learners; however, as a substantial portion of scholarship in this area comes from research conducted with child learners, some of the literature reviewed will necessarily be drawn from this context.

# Chapter 2

## Literature Review

### THEORIES OF SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION (SLA)

In its early days, the field of SLA was dominated by linguists and psychologists from the western world. True to the expectations of their respective disciplines, these scholars focused their research and theory-building activities on the learner and on those internal processes and knowledge that are assumed to be at work when learners acquire a second or subsequent language(s). Thus, for many years, SLA literature left little room for a discussion of the social or cultural aspects of language acquisition and use. Indeed, the early SLA literature generally failed to discuss language use at all, regarding use as a phenomenon separate from acquisition and not, therefore, legitimately within the domain of language acquisition studies. Scholarship that investigated questions regarding the intersection of language use and language acquisition or questions regarding the social and cultural aspects of language acquisition was given little attention within the field, when its existence was acknowledged at all.

Between 1996 and 1998, two events called attention to the oft-voiced, but little heeded, complaint that the field of SLA lacked respect for research not only on the sociocultural aspects of language acquisition but also on the intersection of language acquisition and use. The first of these events was a keynote address given by James Lantolf at the 1995 annual meeting of the British Association of Applied Linguistics in Southampton, UK. This address, published in December of 1996 under the title "SLA Theory Building: 'Letting all the Flowers Bloom!,'" charged SLA scholars with an elitist preference not only for cognitive theories of language acquisition but also for positivistic research methods that mimic research in the hard sciences. Lantolf recommended that the field of SLA open itself up to a higher level of respect for and

attention to sociocultural theories of language acquisition as well as constructivist research methods that more closely resemble research in the social sciences and humanities.

The following year, Alan Firth and Johannes Wagner published an article entitled "On Discourse, Communication, and (Some) Fundamental Concepts in SLA Research" in the autumn edition of the *Modern Language Journal*. This article echoes Lantolf's concerns and calls for "a reconceptualization of SLA as a more theoretically and methodologically balanced enterprise that endeavours to attend to, explicate, and explore, in more equal measures and, where possible, in integrated ways, both the *social* and *cognitive* dimensions of S/FL use and acquisition." (Firth & Wagner, 1997, p. 286, emphasis in the original). The publication of this article sparked a sometimes rather heated debate about the nature of SLA and of language itself that raged across the pages of the *Modern Language Journal* well into 1998.

In the wake of these events, the field of SLA has become increasingly more amenable to scholarship that explores sociocultural theories of language acquisition as well as theories that explore the intersection between language acquisition and language use. Thus, the field currently houses a host of theories that can be broadly divided into two strands. The first is the strand of cognitive theories, while the second is the strand of sociocultural theories. Each strand will be briefly described below.

## COGNITIVE THEORIES OF SLA

Theories of SLA in this strand are rooted in the work of linguist Noam Chomsky. Formulated and refined over the span of nearly fifty years, Chomsky's work (1957, 1965, 1981, 1995, 2002) introduces the concepts of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD), Universal Grammar (UG), and Transformational-Generative Grammar (TG). While these concepts are

intended to explain the process of first- or native-language acquisition, they have been applied liberally to the study of second language acquisition, as well.

The concept of the Language Acquisition Device, or LAD, refers to a structure or set of structures in the brain that are believed to be dedicated solely to the purpose of language acquisition. The LAD functions simultaneously as a warehouse and a processing device. In its capacity as a warehouse, it stores two relatively small sets of language-use rules, known as Universal Grammar, or UG, and Transformational-Generative Grammar, or TG. Universal Grammar contains all possible rules governing the deep structure of language, while Transformational-Generative Grammar contains all possible rules governing the transformations that can be made to deep structures, in order to create the multitude of unique utterances produced by proficient speakers of any given language.

According to Chomsky, the task of a language learner is to sort through the rules of UG and TG, determining which ones apply to the language used in his or her environment and which ones don't. This is precisely what the LAD does in its capacity as a processing device. That is, the LAD retrieves various rules of UG and TG from storage, compares the structural characteristics of those rules to the structural characteristics of the language used in the learner's environment, and, as applicable, either returns the rules to storage or keeps them out for further use. Over time, the learner's brain builds up an active system of language-use rules, known as a mental grammar, upon which the learner can rely in comprehending and producing language. The mental grammar contains only those rules of TG and UG determined by the LAD to be applicable in the learner's linguistic environment. Once the mental grammar contains a complete set of rules, the learner is considered to have reached his or her goal of language acquisition. Indeed, the phrase "target language," often used by language educators as a reference to that

language which a learner is in the process of acquiring, implies that the language-acquisition process has a fixed, measurable end point.

While the concepts of the LAD, UG, and TG have been criticized widely by many scholars working within both the cognitive and the sociocultural strands of SLA, these concepts have nevertheless remained popular in informing the work of language teachers and language teacher educators. Stephen Krashen's Monitor Model (1978), for example, is based largely upon Chomsky's work and continues to play a central role in language teacher preparation programs (Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Lightbown & Spada, 1999). This model contains five separate, but interrelated, hypotheses, as delineated below:

1) acquisition is distinct from, and more effective than, learning. While acquisition occurs naturally and subconsciously as a result of the work of the LAD, learning occurs only as a result of conscious attention and practice on the part of the learner.
2) conscious learning of language-use rules does play a role, although it is of secondary importance to acquisition. That is, consciously learned language-use rules serve as a monitor that edits the learner's acquired speech for correctness. Lightbown and Spada believe that Krashen's first two hypotheses hold the following implications for language teachers

> only acquired language is readily available for natural, fluent communication, [and] … learning cannot turn into acquisition. [Furthermore], since knowing the rules only helps the speaker supplement what has been acquired, the focus of language teaching should be on creating conditions for 'acquisition' rather than 'learning' (Lightbown & Spada, 1999, p. 38).

3) the language acquisition process happens in predictable, sequential stages. The natural order of acquisition functions independently of the order in which grammatical features are presented in the classroom.

4) in order for acquisition to occur, the language input to which learners are exposed must be comprehensible, yet push learners to the next stage of the acquisition process. This aspect of Krashen's work is generally expressed with the formula *i +1,* meaning that input (*i)* that is one step (*+1)* beyond the learner's current level of proficiency can be acquired.
5) in order for acquisition to occur, the learner's "affective filter" must be lowered. The "affective filter" refers to a learner's emotional state and the probability that this state will facilitate language acquisition. When learners are bored, tense, unmotivated, or otherwise distracted or distressed, language input will not be able to permeate the LAD, and acquisition will not occur.

An additional concept from the cognitive strand of SLA that figures prominently in language-teacher preparation programs is that of interlanguage (Selinker, 1972, 1992). The concept of interlanguage is clearly linked to Chomsky's theory of language acquisition. Recall that, in this view, learners use language input in the environment to discover rules about the structure of the target language. Such a view implies that newcomers to a language know nothing about its structure, while proficient speakers know all or nearly all that there is to know about its structure. Interlanguage lies in between these end points of the language acquisition process. Each learner's interlanguage contains a functional set of rules governing use of the target language, but that set of rules isn't complete yet, or contains some inaccuracies, or is unduly influenced by the rules of the learner's L1. In relying on this inaccurate or incomplete set of rules, learners often produce language forms that seem incorrect to a more proficient speaker. Such incorrect forms may give language teachers insight into the learner's current location along

the continuum of acquisition stages, as described above in point three of Krashen's monitor model.

A handful of scholars working within the cognitive strand of SLA (e.g. Klein & Perdue, 1992; Long, 1996; Swain & Lapkin, 1995) have acknowledged that opportunities for social interaction are as important to the successful language acquisition process as exposure to comprehensible input. Only through interacting with others in the target language are learners able to produce output, receive feedback on that output, and accordingly adjust their understanding of the ways in which the target language should function. While these scholars may be seen by some as straddling the divide between the cognitive strand and the sociocultural strand in SLA, they remain largely rooted in cognitive approaches to language acquisition.

The various cognitive approaches to language acquisition are built upon the assumption that language is a static body of rules or knowledge that can be known in its entirety and will be understood and used in the same way by all proficient hearers / speakers under all circumstances. Moreover, this understanding of language and the language-acquisition process assumes that learners are deficient communicators until they have discovered, constructed, and demonstrated the ability to utilize a complete, correct mental grammar of the target language. Indeed, this view of the language learner as a deficient communicator is identified by Firth and Wagner as one of the most problematic aspects of "traditional" (cognitive) approaches to SLA:

> We claim that, for the most part, [the concepts of nonnative speaker (NNS), learner, and interlanguage] are applied and understood in an oversimplified manner, leading, among other things, to an analytic mindset that elevates an idealized 'native' speaker above a stereotypicalized 'nonnative,' while viewing the latter as a defective communicator, limited by an underdeveloped communicative competence (p. 285).

Similar concerns have been raised repeatedly in the SLA literature by scholars (see, e.g., González, Moll & Amanti, 2005; Hawkins, 2005; Toohey, 2000; Villegas & Lucas, 2007) who

object not only to the political and social implications of juxtaposing the "expert" native speaker against the "deficient" nonnative speaker but also to the implications for teaching and learning derived from such views. Namely, these views cast learners in both a deficient and a passive role, assuming that they must wait patiently for a complete set of language-use rules to become fixed in their minds before they can use the language for a full range of diverse and creative purposes. Such an understanding implies that meaningful social and intellectual engagement for ELs must be delayed until they have reached an idealized state of "full" proficiency in English. Well intentioned teachers influenced by such views are, thus, likely to delay the introduction of rigorous content instruction until such time as ELs can demonstrate a native-like command of the language. In doing so, they deprive students of valuable opportunities not only to access the mainstream curriculum that is readily available to their native-speaker peers but also to accelerate their development of those academic language skills necessary for success in school.

## SOCIOCULTURAL THEORIES OF SLA

Theories of SLA in this strand are predominantly rooted in the work of social psychologist Lev Vygotsky. Vygotsky's work with children in the 1920s and 1930s illuminated the social and cultural nature of knowledge, teaching, and learning. Two key Vygotskian concepts are as follows: 1) the zone of proximal development, which represents the gap between those tasks that a child can complete unaided and those tasks that he or she can complete with the guidance of an adult or a more capable peer, and 2) inter- and intrapersonal transfer, which describe the processes through which the external, public events of any given social interaction are transformed inside a participant's mind into an internal, personal understanding not only of the meaning of the interaction but also of the skills and knowledge necessary to participate in similar subsequent interactions.

In the 1960s and 1970s, as Vygotsky's work became increasingly available outside the Soviet Union, a host of Western scholars began applying Vygotsky's ideas about the sociocultural nature of learning to their own efforts at understanding not only the processes of teaching and learning but also the very nature of knowledge itself. The work of two scholars within the sociocultural tradition are particularly important to the study of second language acquisition. These are Lave and Wenger's 1991 concept of legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice and Gee's 1996 concept of Discourses.

Lave and Wenger posit that learners become proficient at new tasks – including the use of language - not through didactic instruction but through a form of apprenticeship that begins with legitimate peripheral participation and moves towards full participation in the community of practitioners who perform the task in question. Unlike the cognitive approaches to language acquisition outlined briefly above, Lave and Wenger's approach to learning asks not "what kinds of cognitive processes and conceptual structures are involved, [but] … what kinds of social engagements provide the proper context for learning to take place" (Hanks, 1991, p. 14).

In their exploration of five modern-day western and non-western systems of apprenticeship, both formal and informal, the authors discovered that learning is most effective when learners, or newcomers to a community of practice, have full access to the activity(ies) of that community and are permitted to participate in authentic, if incomplete, ways. In such an environment, '[t]here are strong goals for learning because learners, as peripheral participants, can develop a view of what the whole enterprise is about, and what there is to be learned" (Lave & Wenger 1991, p. 93). Moreover, the authors point out that an extended period of apprenticeship, or peripheral participation, allows learners to make sense of the activity and to adopt it as their own.

While Lave and Wenger's concept of apprenticeship into and eventual full membership in a community of practice is useful in shaping our understanding of the learning process, Jim Gee's concept of Discourses is useful in identifying the community of practice into which ELs in the American K-12 school setting must be apprenticed. Gee's work focuses on the Discourses that students must master if they are to do well in K-12 school settings. He defines Discourses as "ways of being 'people like us.' They are 'ways of being in the world;' they are 'forms of life;' they are socially situated identities…[outside of which] language makes no sense" (p. 3). In this view, language is not an independent phenomenon, but an integral part of the "ways of behaving, interacting, valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing, that are accepted as instantiations of particular identities (or 'types of people') by specific groups" (p. 3).

Learners come to function effectively within the parameters of various school-based Discourses through legitimate peripheral participation that eventually moves learners not just towards full participation but towards modification of the applicable Discourse(s). Such modifications express the user's unique mastery of and relationship to each Discourse. Gee (1996) notes that "good teachers" structure the learning environment in ways that not only apprentice students into the authentic use of various Discourses but also explicitly teach students how to recognize and reflect upon the relationships between and among various Discourses.

This aspect of a language teacher's work may be one of the most important. That is, students must be able to recognize differences among Discourses and to reflect upon the socioeconomic and political implications of participation in various Discourses, if they are to apprentice successfully into desired Discourses. "Desired Discourses," in the secondary-school setting, include those Discourses – such as the Discourse of science or the Discourse of history - that must be mastered in order for students to do well in academic classes, but may also include

Discourses used by the media, by politicians, or for social purposes. Indeed, students' ability to apprentice successfully into a social Discourse that establishes them as legitimate members of the school community may be as vital to their academic success as their ability to apprentice successfully into each respective academic Discourse used at the secondary level. Numerous scholars have pointed to the existence of strong links between student achievement and students' sense that they are legitimate members of the school community (see, e.g., Hawkins, 2005, 2010; Lee, 2001, 2005; and Toohey, 2000).

Furthermore, in recognizing and reflecting upon the power differentials that exist between and among various Discourses, students will be better able to understand structures of oppression and inequality in their schools, their communities, and beyond. Such an understanding can play a key role in both encouraging and enabling students to work for changes in those structural relationships that serve to oppress members of certain Discourse communities while privileging members of certain other Discourse communities.

This view of the language-acquisition process is clearly built upon the assumption that language is a dynamic pool of resources upon which users draw to make sense of, interact with, and even change their world. Due to the dynamic nature of language use and the participatory nature of language acquisition, learners are not perceived to be deficient users of an ill-formed and incomplete set of language-use rules. Rather, they are regarded as newcomers to a community who are in the process of determining how language can best be used to meet their varying needs. This view casts learners in an active and capable role, assuming that language must be used to be learned.

Such an understanding implies that ELs should be given opportunities for meaningful social and intellectual engagement in the L2 from the earliest stages of language acquisition.

According to this framework, teachers who introduce conceptually rigorous, yet linguistically accessible, academic content instruction before learners appear to have the language skills needed to engage with such content do not confuse or overwhelm students. Rather, assuming that appropriate scaffolding is in place, they offer students valuable opportunities not only to apprentice into and access the mainstream curriculum that is readily available to their native-speaker peers but also to accelerate the process of acquiring those linguistic conventions that they must command in order to do well in high school and beyond.

## CONFLICTING OR COMPLEMENTARY STRANDS?

Although Firth and Wagner's 1997 article called for a balance between the cognitive strand and the sociocultural strand of research and theory in SLA, the two strands are often seen as being in competition. From an ideological standpoint, it is not difficult to understand why they are so regarded. As described above, scholars working in each strand operate not only from a different set of beliefs about the language-acquisition process but also from a different set of beliefs about the nature of language itself. Yet from a pedagogical perspective, it is easier to see how the two strands complement one another. Gee's work on Discourses reminds us, as noted above, that good teachers must help students not only learn how to use the Discourses that will allow them to succeed in school but also how to transform various Discourses and the relationships of power that they represent. In order to do this, teachers and students must be able to "break down material into its analytic 'bits' and juxtapose diverse Discourses and their practices to each other" (Gee, 1996, p. 178).

A sociocultural framework of language, its acquisition, and its use is valuable in helping students and teachers perform the latter half of this task. To begin with, "a sociocultural approach offers a possibility of equal access and participation for all students in schools,"

(Hawkins, 2010, p. 106). Equal access and participation are clearly prerequisites to students' involvement in the tasks of both appropriating and transforming desired Discourses. Additionally, such a framework exposes the relationships among language, dispositions, beliefs, attitudes and the host of other elements that comprise membership in a Discourse community. In recognizing the intricate relationships between language and other characteristics that distinguish members from non-members of desired Discourses, students will find it easier to appropriate their selected – or required - Discourses. A focus solely on isolated structures of language would offer far less concrete guidance to students who wish to appropriate and transform desired Discourses for their own use.

Furthermore, an understanding of sociocultural approaches to learning simplifies the task of the teacher who wishes to help students acquire desired Discourses. Language teachers who work within a sociocultural framework need not attempt to anticipate every detail of students' future language-use needs, striving to provide direct instruction that will help them cope with each of those forms and functions. Rather, teachers can orchestrate classroom experiences that allow students to experiment over time with the authentic use of language in various contexts, thereby apprenticing them into the desired Discourses.

On the other hand, a cognitive framework of language, its acquisition, and its use is beneficial in helping students and teachers perform the former half of the above-described task of Discourse analysis and juxtaposition. Such a framework calls attention to the structural components of language upon which users rely in constructing appropriate Discourses. An understanding of such components simplifies the task not only of the student who is trying to understand why sentences must be patterned in certain ways but also of the teacher who must answer his or her questions. Additionally, an understanding of the cognitive framework of

language acquisition can be useful in providing guidance to the teacher who is trying to determine whether, when, and what kind of direct instruction in certain grammatical features or lexical items may be beneficial.

In light of the implications for teaching and learning posed by each strand respectively, Firth and Wagner were wise in calling for a balance between sociocultural and cognitive approaches to SLA. The need for this type of balanced approach in preparing teachers to work with ELs has been reiterated frequently in the literature. Wong Fillmore and Snow (2002), for example, propose a comprehensive list of knowledge about language that teachers must possess, if they are to be effective communicators, educators, evaluators, educated human beings, and agents of socialization in their classrooms. This list seamlessly combines elements of linguistic knowledge that are considered important from a cognitive perspective on SLA with elements of linguistic knowledge that are considered important from a sociocultural perspective on SLA. Namely, Wong Fillmore and Snow identify the following elements of language as vital in informing teachers' work not just with ELs, but with all students:

- the structure of language in general with an emphasis on the specific structures of Standard American English and an introduction to comparative linguistic analysis
- the role of both L1 (native language) and L2 (second or additional language) in literacy development and the acquisition of academic registers
- the role of language in classroom instruction
- the history of the English language
- the role of language in culture and identity-formation
- the history of language policy, as it pertains to schooling, and the history of the use of multiple languages or dialects in education

- the phenomena of language contact, shift, isolation, and loss
- the processes of first and second language acquisition, especially in school settings
- approaches to combining language instruction with subject-matter instruction in the students' L2
- register- and subject-specific features of the language used in the oral and written texts of school, as compared to the register- and topic-specific features of English, as it is used in oral and written texts outside of school (Wong Fillmore and Snow, 2002, pp. 32–34).

Teacher educators Courtney Cazden (2001), Mary Schleppegrell (2004), and Ester de Jong and Candace Harper (2004, 2005) affirm the value of the final item on Wong Fillmore and Snow's list by asserting that teachers must have a deep understanding of the linguistic conventions of academic texts, both spoken and written, in order to make these conventions explicit and accessible to students who enter school unfamiliar with general academic and subject-specific Discourses. Likewise, in a 2003 book chapter, Dutro and Moran advise teachers to pay explicit attention to the general functions of language, such as describing; comparing; ordering; etc, within the context of specific content, so that students' "academic language is developed from the beginning stages of second-language learning, [enabling] students to participate in content instruction and support[ing] the acquisition of academic-language proficiency" (Dutro & Moran, 2003, p. 236).

Téllez and Waxman (2006) underscore the importance of ensuring that teachers who work with ELs possess a strong foundation in the types of cognitively-oriented linguistic knowledge that is necessary to carry out the socioculturally-oriented task of helping students understand and appropriate for their own purposes the forms and functions of school-based Discourses. In describing the challenges of preparing teachers to work effectively with ELs, they

note that, among a variety of other challenges, the language-skills piece of working with ELs has often been overlooked or taken for granted. They observe that "[t]eacher educators have not provided a strong enough focus on language instruction while state legislators and policymakers have generally failed to require the specialized knowledge needed for quality ELD (English Language Development) teaching" (Téllez & Waxman, 2006, p. 12). Harper, de Jong, and Platt (2008) and Lucas and Grinberg (2008) likewise note that policymakers and teacher educators too often ignore the fact that teachers need specialized linguistic knowledge in order to work effectively with ELs, thereby ignoring ELs' full range of academic needs as well as marginalizing both ELs and the teachers who serve them. It is, then, crucial to remember that educators who wish to work effectively with ELs must draw on elements of both the sociocultural approach to SLA and the cognitive approach.

In addition to the literature pertinent to each strand in the field of SLA, as described briefly above, there exists a body of literature to guide teachers and administrators in the creation of language support program models for ELs in the American K-12 school context. We turn our attention next to this body of literature.

## LITERATURE ON LANGUAGE-SUPPORT PROGRAM MODELS

A variety of models exists to assist educators in designing programs that provide effective language support services to ELs. While there is some disagreement regarding the precise names and definitions of each model, most educators can agree on the following list and their subsequent definitions:

- transitional / early exit bilingual education (TBE)
- developmental / late exit bilingual education (DBE)
- dual-immersion / two-way immersion bilingual education

- ESL pullout
- ESL push-in
- English Language Development (ELD) period
- sheltered instruction (SI) / Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE)
- ESL resource
- newcomer programs

While any of these program models could theoretically be implemented at any grade level, only the following models are commonly found at the secondary level:

- ESL pullout
- ESL resource period
- ELD period
- SI/SDAIE
- ESL push-in
- newcomer programs

Each of the models commonly used at the secondary level will be described briefly below, along with its advantages and disadvantages for learners in various contexts.

**ESL PULLOUT**

Pullout support, as its name implies, removes students from the regular classroom setting to provide supplemental language support or development. At the secondary level, this type of support can take many forms. For example, newcomer ELs who lack access to a specially designed newcomer program may attend pullout sessions routinely, typically during the time when they are scheduled to attend language-intensive classes like English or social studies. During their pullout sessions, these students may work on assignments or activities relevant to

the classes that they would normally attend during that period, or they may work on unrelated grammar and vocabulary development assignments and activities. Meanwhile, ELs with higher levels of proficiency may attend pullout sessions only when they need testing accommodations or help with class work. ESL pullout is the most common type of language support offered to ELs across all grade levels, in spite of the fact that it is the least effective model of support (Thomas & Collier, 1997). It is additionally the most expensive model to implement (Chambers & Parrish, 1992; Crawford, 1997), in that it requires expenditures for space and staffing that would not be necessary, if students remained in content-area classes with their peers and content-certified teachers for the entire day.

**ESL RESOURCE PERIOD**

A variant of pullout support found at the secondary level is the ESL resource period. This is a study hall period set aside for ELs and supervised by an ESL teacher or tutor. Genesee (1999) notes that this form of support, which provides very little beyond time and space for homework completion, is intended to be one component of an "articulated and flexible program that provides English language learners access to all content subjects," (p. 6) not a stand-alone model of support.

**ELD PERIOD**

Adolescent ELs, whose school day is already divided into distinct periods for distinct purposes, often enroll in one or more ELD courses. Instruction in such courses is offered by an ESL-certified teacher, who may choose either a language-as-content approach or a language-through-content approach. The former approach draws upon cognitive theories of SLA, in that it regards language as a static body of knowledge. Thus, the English language can function as an

object of study in and of itself. As a result, instruction in a language-as-content ELD classroom is built around the sequential acquisition of grammatical structures and lexical items.

The sequence of acquisition is often chosen to correspond with the presumed natural order of acquisition, as discussed by scholars in the cognitive strand of SLA (see, e.g. Clahsen, et al, 1983; Dulay & Burt, 1974; Dulay, Burt, & Krashen, 1982; Pienemann, 1998). The sequence may also reflect teachers' or the textbook publishers' assumptions about those grammatical structures or lexical items that are most salient to students' school or social lives. Once these structures and items have been mastered with a reasonable degree of proficiency, students and teachers move on to study less salient lexical items and grammatical structures that are presumed to be situated higher up the hierarchy of natural acquisition stages. This type of instruction would likely look familiar to any reader who has studied a foreign language at the American secondary or post-secondary level, since it has historically been the predominant model of foreign language instruction. This approach reinforces the notion that ELs must wait to engage in meaningful social or intellectual activities in the L2 until they can demonstrate an idealized conception of "full" proficiency in English.

Alternatively, ELD teachers may choose a language-through-content approach to instruction. This approach, sometimes referred to as content-based instruction (CBI), aligns more closely with sociocultural theories of SLA in that it regards language as a tool for exploring knowledge or interacting with the world. It furthermore regards language use in authentic, meaningful situations as a vital component of language acquisition. Stryker and Leaver explain that CBI

> …can be at once a philosophical orientation, a methodological system, a syllabus design for a single course, or a framework for an entire program of instruction. CBI implies the total integration of language learning and content learning. It represents a significant departure from traditional foreign language teaching methods in that language

> proficiency is achieved by shifting the focus of instruction from the learning of language *per se* to the learning of language through the study of subject matter.
>
> We see a CBI curriculum as one that 1) is based on a subject-matter core, 2) uses authentic language and texts, and 3) is appropriate to the needs of specific groups of students. All three characteristics are essential for success (1997, p. 5).

Thus, an ELD classroom that utilizes a CBI approach builds language instruction around the study of academic content, rather than the study of language itself. In such a classroom, students are given opportunities to perform meaningful intellectual tasks in the L2, even if they cannot yet demonstrate an idealized notion of full proficiency in the L2. This type of instruction resembles sheltered instruction, as described below.

**SI/SDAIE**

It is important to note that SI/SDAIE can function both as a program model and as an instructional approach to be used in any classroom where students' L2 serves as the medium of instruction. In sheltered instructional settings or SDAIE classrooms, the focus of instruction is not on language, but on age-appropriate academic content presented in ways that make it accessible to students with limited proficiency in English. Although language is not the primary object of study, students' language-acquisition needs are not ignored. SI instructors think carefully about the language demands of their instruction and design each lesson to include clearly articulated language-learning goals along with the scaffolding that must be provided to help students achieve those goals.

Perhaps the most well known approach to SI is Echevarria, Vogt, and Short's *SIOP* model (2000/2008). This model provides teachers with a detailed planning guide designed to ensure that lessons accomplish the following:

1) include clearly articulated content- and language-learning goals,
2) make content accessible to students with varying levels of proficiency in English, and

3) provide opportunities for students to engage in meaningful ways with the content and the language through which it is expressed.

The *SIOP* model likewise provides a comprehensive observation protocol for school administrators to use in observing and evaluating the work of teachers in SI classrooms.

While SI/SDAIE may seem identical to CBI, Diaz-Rico and Weed (2006) and Echevarria, Vogt, and Short (2008) note a subtle, yet important, difference. CBI classes are taught by ESL-certified teachers who build language-development lessons around texts and other materials used in the core content areas of math, science, social studies, and English. Teachers may or may not be certified in any of these subjects; thus, it is not guaranteed that teachers in CBI classrooms understand the conventions of any given academic discipline well enough to apprentice learners appropriately and effectively into its Discourse.

SI or SDAIE classes, on the other hand, are taught by content-certified teachers who build language support and instruction into the study of the standard curriculum for their respective subjects. Since these teachers bring with them a thorough understanding of the subject matter they teach, they are in a better position than ESL teachers in a CBI classroom to effectively and appropriately apprentice learners into the Discourses of their respective subjects. This subtle distinction between CBI and SI highlights the problematic nature of teacher preparation programs, licensing regulations, and hiring practices that cast teachers as experts of either language or content, but not both. A more effective approach would ensure that all teachers are properly prepared and qualified to serve as experts of both language and content.

**ESL PUSH-IN**

Successful ESL Push-in support relies on collaboration between content-certified teachers and ESL-certified teachers. With adequate time and support for co-planning, this can be

an effective model. As co-teachers in the mainstream content-area classroom, the content-certified teacher and the ESL-certified teacher can pool their respective areas of expertise to ensure that all students' language- and content-learning needs are met. However, this model may require more time for collaboration between teachers than most schools are able or willing to provide. Lucas (1997) calls attention to this problem when she shares the observation of a teacher at the International High School at LaGuardia Community College, which today belongs to the successful network of alternative high schools for recent non-English-speaking immigrants known as the Internationals Network for Public Schools:

> We have a common philosophy of education, of teaching and learning here. … The key ingredient is time for conversation among faculty. It takes place over time and helps teachers develop a philosophy of learning. Here, we have time for that. … We build in time to have professional conversations with faculty. Other schools could do what we do if they would build in this time. (C. Glassman, personal communication, October 28, 1994, cited in Lucas, 1997, p. 35).

Moreover, time alone may not be the only obstacle to the creation of a language-support program that relies on quality co-teaching between an ESL-certified teacher and content-certified teachers. Walqui (2000) and Ruiz de Velasco and Fix (2000) note that the traditional departmentalization of secondary schools, especially at the high school level, creates little incentive for content-area teachers to take responsibility for the education of ELs until they have exited their specialized ESL coursework. The authors further note that the time and effort needed to reach across departmental lines and create collaborative relationships that acknowledge the shared responsibility of content-certified and ESL-certified teachers in educating ELs are unlikely to be expended in the absence of structural changes that incentivize such expenditures.

**NEWCOMER PROGRAMS**

Newcomer programs are the only model on this list designed specifically for use with adolescent ELs at the secondary level. The purpose of such programs is to acclimate older immigrant students as quickly as possible to the conventions of schooling in the US, to the fundamentals of the English language, and to academic content that they may not have studied in their home countries. Newcomer programs often include a literacy development component for those students who did not learn to read in their native languages or whose native languages do not have a written form. Such programs also occasionally offer content instruction in students' native languages or otherwise work towards the maintenance and development of students' native languages. Nevertheless, the primary goal of such programs is to help students acquire and learn to cope with the large amount of social, linguistic, and academic knowledge they must possess if they are to successfully complete high school in the limited amount of time available to them.

Those programs that serve under-schooled adolescents often choose a CBI or SI approach to language instruction so that they may effectively meet students' language- and content-learning needs, while those that serve adolescents who have enjoyed a consistent schooling experience may choose a "traditional" approach to language instruction, in which the sequential acquisition of grammatical features and salient lexical items takes center stage (Mace-Matluck, et al, 1998; Short & Boyson, 2004). Students typically enroll in newcomer programs for one to three semesters, although a handful of institutions (e.g. the Internationals Network for Public Schools in New York and California, Liberty High School Academy for Newcomers in New York, and the International Newcomer Academy in Fort Worth, TX) do offer a four-year program, upon completion of which students receive a standard high-school diploma. While the

vast majority of newcomer programs are located in urban areas that have traditionally served as immigration gateways, 17% of such programs were located in suburban areas and 7% were located in rural districts as of the 1999-2000 school year (Short & Boyson, 2004).

## WHICH MODEL IS MOST EFFECTIVE?

Bérubé (2000) reminds us that

> ... there are many kinds of structured language support models that are appropriate for LEP [Limited English Proficient] students. The ability of a district to provide some of these programs depends on the availability of native-language-speaking personnel, the availability of instructional materials in students' native language for regular content classrooms, and the student composition of the district's second language classrooms. The keys to an effective and appropriate program choice include careful consideration of the LEP child's needs, research into the personnel or material resources available, full understanding of possible program configurations, and adherence to equity issues demanded under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and related federal and state legislation. State and local requirements are also necessary for all students to achieve predetermined academic standards … LEP student achievement of such standards will be predicated in part on the institutional approach selected. (pp 41-42).

In spite of the clear difficulties involved in issuing blanket statements about the "best" model of language-support services for ELs, it is generally agreed that learners of all ages and proficiency levels benefit most from those programs that not only combine language and content instruction but also promote additive bilingualism (see, e.g., Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Crandall, 1987; Crawford, 1999; Cummins, 1981a, 1981b, 2000; Echevarria & Graves, 2007; Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2000; Short, 1991a, 1991b; TESOL Standards, 2006; WIDA Standards, 2012).

The concept of combined language and content instruction was described above in the discussions on CBI and SI. Recall that SI can function both as a program model for ELs and as an instructional approach to be used in any classroom where students' L2 serves as the medium of instruction. Such an approach offers clear advantages to ELs who arrive in the United States as adolescents. Namely, this approach allows students to engage simultaneously in mastering English, the culture and expectations of American schooling, and the academic content

knowledge required of high-school graduates in their respective states. Even those adolescent ELs who are not newcomers can benefit from combined language and content instruction that helps them recognize the ways in which content-specific "knowledge is construed in language … [and] information [is condensed] through lexical choices and clause structures that are different from the way language is typically used in ordinary contexts of everyday interaction" (Schleppegrell, 2004, p. 4).

The concept of additive bilingualism is, perhaps, best understood in contrast to its opposite: subtractive bilingualism. While subtractive bilingualism encourages the development of a learner's second language at the expense of further development in his or her first language, additive bilingualism encourages the simultaneous development of both languages. Note that the concepts of additive and subtractive bilingualism are not limited to those learners acquiring their second of only two languages; they apply equally to multilingual learners acquiring any additional language(s). The work of numerous scholars (see, e.g. Cummins, 1981a, 1981b; Reese, et al., 2000; Royer & Carlo, 1991; Saville-Troike, 1984; Thomas & Collier, 1997) indicates that those ELs who have meaningful opportunities to develop their L1 oracy and literacy skills achieve far greater levels of academic success throughout their K-12 careers than those ELs who do not receive such opportunities. In other words, successful ELs are those whose schooling experience encourages additive bilingualism.

It is important to note that the majority of studies which reveal connections between additive bilingualism and academic success have been conducted with students enrolled at the elementary level or with students enrolled at the secondary level who participated in a bilingual education program in the early grades, but received no L1 support at the secondary level. Nevertheless, there is evidence to suggest that sustained, meaningful L1 support continues to

play a crucial role in fostering academic success for students enrolled at the secondary or even post-secondary level (see, e.g. Auerbach, 1993; García, 2013; Lucas, et al 1990; and Valdés, 1998, 2001).

Angela Valenzuela offers particularly compelling support for the idea that additive bilingualism is beneficial to students at the secondary level. In her ethnographic study of Mexican-American students in an urban secondary school in the American southwest, she delineates the dangers of a phenomenon known as "subtractive schooling" (Valenzuela, 1997; 1999), which leaves students "progressively vulnerable to academic failure" (Valenzuela, 1999, p. 3). The term "subtractive schooling" is used to define a school environment in which curricular choices, school structures, and relationships between and among students and teachers encourage the subtraction not just of students' native languages but also of their native cultures, sense of identity, and ethnic or national pride, thereby depriving them of the kinds of social, cultural, and linguistic resources needed to achieve academic success. Valenzuela notes that "rather than building on students' cultural and linguistic knowledge and heritage to create biculturally and bilingually competent youth, schools subtract these identifications from them to their social and academic detriment" (p. 25, 1999).

Sleeter (1999) regards subtractive schooling as a form of control which ensures that youth from culturally "inferior" communities remain in their proper place: at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder, where they lack the power or resources to enact positive political, social, or economic change. Valenzuela concurs, noting that the persistence of subtractive schooling in the site of her study could be largely attributed to the prevalence of "a comfortable, if not callous, fixation on the status quo" (1999, p. 257) among teachers and administrators.

García (2009) likewise views subtractive bilingualism as a means of maintaining a status quo that privileges monolingual speakers of a certain variety of English. She asserts that school environments which promote subtractive bilingualism are motivated by a Foucauldian desire to "'regulate' the ways in which language is used, and [to] establish language hierarchies in which some languages, or some ways of using language, are more valued than others" (García, 2009, p. 141). She contends that American society values monolingualism over bilingualism and that schools, therefore, are structured to suppress bi- or multilingual practices. Under such circumstances, multilingual or multidialectal students are denied the opportunity to engage in the natural act of "translanguaging," or "accessing different linguistic features of various modes of what are described as autonomous languages, in order to maximize communicative potential" (García, 2009, p. 140). The result of such linguistic control is much the same as that which Valenzuela discovered; namely, students are hindered not only in their attempts to create positive and competent identities as learners but also to access the full range of linguistic, intellectual, cultural, and social resources that should be available to them in successfully navigating both their schooling experience and their post-graduation dreams.

## WHICH MODELS FULFILL THESE CRITERIA?

None of the models commonly found at the secondary level is specifically designed to promote additive bilingualism, although most of them could, theoretically, incorporate the use of students' native languages in ways that promote its continued use and development. However, Bérubé (2000) reminds us that it is impractical to implement "bona fide bilingual education programs … in rural schools … with low-incidence LEP student enrollments" (p. 45). Additionally, the challenge of locating qualified bilingual teachers for less commonly encountered languages poses problems for many districts, both small and large. Thus, the

majority of districts that serve ELs at the secondary level are unlikely to possesses the resources needed to implement their language-support programs in ways that promote additive bilingualism.

Combined language and content instruction may be easier to implement, as all of the models commonly used at the secondary level, with the exception of the ESL resource period, can be built around this instructional approach. However, there is no guarantee that the sheltered content approach is used consistently across schools. Even within those schools that claim to combine language and content instruction, there is great variability in defining and implementing this type of instruction. Indeed, Echevarria, Vogt, and Short note that they were motivated to develop their *SIOP* model because

> "sheltering techniques are used increasingly in schools across the United States, particularly as teachers prepare students to meet high academic standards. However, in the past the use of these techniques had been inconsistent from class to class, discipline to discipline, school to school, and district to district. … [SIOP] mitigates this variability and provides guidance as to what constitutes the best practices for SI, grounded in more than two decades of classroom-based research, the experiences of competent teachers, and findings from the professional literature" (Echevarria, Vogt, & Short, 2008, p. 5).

Thus, it is problematic to assume that all programs claiming to offer combined language and content instruction actually do so in an effective or successful manner.

**INTRODUCTION TO THE PRESENT STUDY**

The preceding literature review highlights the relative scarcity of scholarship that exists to guide the decisions either of teachers working with ELs at the secondary level or of the teacher educators who prepare them for that work. In light of the factors described in Chapter One – a growing population of ELs, demographic shifts that have increased ELs' enrollment in those schools that have not traditionally served bilingual students, and an increase in the number of teacher preparation programs offering ESL-specific coursework or certification options - it is

crucial to build up our knowledge base of what it means to work effectively with adolescent ELs, particularly in areas that have not traditionally served as immigration gateways. The current study contributes to this knowledge base by collecting insights from practicing secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway areas about their daily work and the effectiveness of their preparation programs in having prepared them for it. The following three questions served as guides in the collection of these insights:

1) According to secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts, what does it mean to work successfully with ELs, and what skills, knowledge, and dispositions do teachers feel that they need in order to realize their beliefs about successful work with ELs?
2) According to secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts, what were the strengths and weaknesses of their ESL-preparation programs in helping them develop not only their beliefs about what it means to work successfully with ELs but also the skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed in order to realize those beliefs?
3) How do the curriculum and pedagogy of teachers' preparation programs as well as the goals, beliefs, and priorities of teacher educators at those institutions align with the stated beliefs, needs, and experiences of secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts?

# Chapter Three

# Methods

## METHODOLOGY

This study, as indicated in Chapters One and Two, sheds light on the intersections between secondary-level ESL teachers' preparation programs, their work with ELs, and their ongoing professional development needs by interviewing not only teachers but also teacher educators from those institutions of higher education at which teachers were prepared. Additionally, this study draws upon data collected during observations of the work of participating ESL teachers. The study was designed as a collective case study. Stake (1995) identifies the case-study approach as an ideal methodology for evaluating educational programs. Kenny and Grotelueschen (1980) have likewise commented on the fit between case-study methodology and the task of program evaluation by noting that a case study allows for the development of "a better understanding of the dynamics of a program. When it is important to be responsive, to convey a holistic and dynamically rich account of an educational program, case study is a tailormade approach" (Kenny and Grotelueschen, 1980, as cited in Merriam, 1998, p 39). While the current study is certainly not a formal program evaluation linked to funding or policy consequences for any particular ESL preparation program, it does pose an evaluative question about the effectiveness of participating teachers' preparation programs in having readied them for their work with ELs. It likewise requires a rich and holistic account of each teacher's experiences, so that relationships between teachers' work and their preparation programs can be recognized and described. This requirement is best satisfied with a case-study approach.

It should be noted that focused concentration on a single case – one teacher and the ESL preparation program from which he or she graduated – could also provide a depth of insight into the unique challenges faced by teachers who work with ELs at the secondary level and the teacher educators who prepare them for that work. Indeed, it could be argued that the richness of detail that characterizes a case study will be lacking in a study that explores multiple cases. Yet there is a compelling reason to focus on several cases, rather than a single case, in this study. Stake (1995) reminds us that "…the first criterion [of selecting a case or cases] should be to maximize what we can learn" (Stake, 1995, p. 4). A focus on multiple cases instead of a single case maximizes what we can learn from this study by revealing a greater number of issues for consideration.

The rich descriptive capacity of a case-study approach offers an additional advantage. While one purpose of the study is to gain a deeper understanding of the ways in which ESL teacher preparation programs can – and do – help secondary-level teachers develop those beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions upon which they rely when working with ELs, it is recognized that the data collected will point neither to a single set of best classroom practices for teachers who work with ELs nor to a single best way of preparing teachers to work with ELs. Rather, teachers' individuality and the unique ways in which their learning and teaching have been and are influenced by political, social, economic, or other factors will point to a variety of issues that must be thoughtfully considered when designing, implementing, or revising ESL-teacher preparation programs. This complex intertwining of a teacher's beliefs and experiences with the unique context in which he or she learns and works is best captured and explored through a research methodology that allows for detailed description of the phenomenon under investigation. Yin (1994) and Merriam (1998) have noted the particular suitability of a case-

study approach when the researcher wishes to acknowledge the inseparability of a phenomenon from its context. Indeed, Merriam (1998) notes that "[c]ase study has in fact been differentiated from other research designs by what Cronbach (1975) calls 'interpretation in context' (p. 123)" (p. 29).

**PARTICIPANT SELECTION**

Eight teachers were selected to participate in this study. Teachers were chosen from districts in a Midwestern state that have not traditionally served as immigration gateways. As noted in Chapter One, teachers in these rural, semirural, and suburban areas are less likely than their counterparts in urban gateway areas to have access to ESL-specific professional development opportunities, teaching materials, or support networks of colleagues, mentors, or supervisors who are experienced in working with ELs. It is precisely because of their potentially limited access to professional development opportunities, teaching materials, and support networks that teachers in non-gateway districts were chosen to participate in this study. Teachers working under such circumstances may identify a greater range of practical challenges in working successfully with ELs than their counterparts in more resource-rich gateway schools. Such a vibrant and complex picture of the needs and learning experiences of teachers who work with ELs at the secondary level will be beneficial to teacher educators as they strive to create maximally effective preservice ESL-preparation programs. Additionally, the majority of the literature on working effectively with ELs at any grade level has focused on the needs of teachers and students in gateway areas; thus, the present study addresses a gap in the literature.

The state in which data was collected proved to be ideal, as changes in the number and geographic distribution of ELs throughout the state have closely mirrored national trends (NCELA, 2008; Levinson et al, 2007; Capps et al, 2005; State Department of Public Instruction,

2009). Thus, the needs and learning experiences of teachers who work in non-gateway schools in this state are likely to be similar to the needs and learning experiences of teachers working in non-gateway schools in other states. While it is recognized that teachers' needs and learning experiences will vary – sometimes drastically – from setting to setting and from individual to individual, it is hoped that the data collected in this study will provide a helpful starting point for teacher educators who are interested in learning more not only about the ways in which teacher preparation programs already meet teachers' needs in working with ELs but also about the ways in which programs can be enhanced to provide even more comprehensive preparation in working with ELs.

State law requires that districts with "ten LEP students speaking the same non-English language at grades K-3, 20 students at grades 4-8, or 20 students at grades 9-12 …design a program and prepare a formal plan of services …for meeting the needs of these students" (State Statute 115.95/PL 13). Census data from the state Department of Public Instruction (DPI) was used to determine whether ELs were enrolled in sufficient numbers at the secondary level in any given non-gateway district to warrant the provision of language support services. Only those districts that had reached threshold enrollment between, but not before, 2000 and 2010 were selected for participation. District choices were further narrowed to those whose online faculty directories indicated that a full-time ESL teacher was employed at the secondary level.

In order to ensure demographic and geographic diversity, the state was divided into eight regions reflecting my perceptions, as developed over fifteen years of living and working in four distinct regions of the state, of the geographic, economic, cultural, and linguistic diversity represented throughout the state. At least one district in all but two of the regions consented to participate. Two of the districts, representing three participating teachers, are located in distinctly

rural communities with populations of less than 4,000 each. Three are located in semi-rural communities with populations that range between 5,000 and 8,000. It should be noted, however, that two of these communities are within an easy commuting distance of the state capital, whose population is approximately 250,000 and whose cultural and economic patterns may exert some influence on both of these communities. The remaining districts are located in small towns with populations between 12,000 and 16,000. Although eight teachers participated, a total of only seven districts is represented, as two participating teachers work in the same district.

While it is recognized that ESL-certified teachers are not the only teachers who work with and strive to provide effective instruction for ELs, participation in this study was limited to those teachers who hold ESL certification. This criterion ensured that participants had all received a roughly equal amount of ESL-specific preparation.

Four teacher educators were likewise selected to participate in this study. These participants were chosen based on their affiliation with those institutions of higher education at which teacher participants had completed their respective ESL preparation programs. During teachers' interviews, each teacher was asked to identify the institution at which she had completed her ESL preparation. Once this information had been obtained, teacher educators at each applicable institution were invited to participate in an interview for this study. Several teachers attended the same preparing institutions; additionally, teacher educators from one of the institutions attended by a participating teacher declined the invitation to participate. Thus, only four institutions of higher education are officially represented in this study through an interview with a teacher educator who works there.

## DATA COLLECTION

Data collection consisted of the following: one or more visits to the website of each participating district and school, one interview with each participating teacher, one observation of each teacher's work with ELs, one or more visits to the website of each institution of higher education at which participating teachers received their ESL preparation, and one interview with each participating teacher educator. Visits to the website of each participating district and school provided not just valuable information about the availability of language support services for ELs at the secondary level but also an overview of each district's and school's values, mission, curricula, and climate.

The teacher interview protocol (see Appendix A) was designed to elicit each teacher's beliefs about what it means to work successfully with ELs; her understanding of the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to realize those beliefs; and her assessment of the role that her preparation program played in shaping the development of those beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions. I conducted a total of eight teacher interviews between 27 September, 2011 and 24 May, 2012. All interviews were conducted face-to-face at a time and place of each teacher's choosing. Teachers invariably chose to be interviewed in their classrooms before school, after school, or during a planning period. Each interview lasted between one hour and ninety minutes. In order to facilitate the data-analysis process, interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

In order to gain additional insight into the relationships between teachers' beliefs, as revealed in their interviews; their classroom practice; and their preservice professional development experiences, I scheduled one classroom observation with each participating teacher. Note that, although I observed each participating teacher's work on only one day, my

observations encompassed more than one class period, provided that the teacher in question spent more than one period of each day working with ELs. Observations were scheduled at each teacher's convenience between 4 October, 2011 and 16 May, 2012. In order to protect students' privacy, recordings were not made, although I took detailed field notes by hand or on a laptop computer, as school policy permitted (a handful of schools did not allow the use of laptops that had been brought in from outside.) While I was unable to schedule a formal observation of one teacher's work with ELs, her interview was interrupted several times by ELs arriving in her room to ask for assistance with homework. As this particular teacher spends the majority of her time with ELs in a resource setting, the one-on-one interactions that I observed on the day of our interview were likely representative of her daily work with ELs.

During her interview, each participating teacher had been asked to identify the institution(s) at which she had completed her ESL preparation. Once this information was available to me, I visited the website of each institution of higher education at which a participating teacher had prepared. Visits to the website of each institution provided valuable information about the curriculum of the institution's ESL teacher preparation program(s), the licensing options available for prospective or practicing ESL teachers, and the contact information of faculty members who oversee or work within each program. Furthermore, these visits provided insight into the history, values, mission, and overall student body of each ESL preparation program.

Once I had obtained contact information for each program attended by a participating teacher, I arranged interviews with a teacher educator from each institution. Only four institutions of higher education are represented in the data collected from teacher educators, as many of the participating teachers had attended the same preparing institutions. A fifth

institution is not officially represented in this study with interview data, as I was unable to obtain permission to interview an educator at this institution. Nevertheless, limited information about the ESL preparation program at this institution was available to me via the institution's website and my interview with the participating teacher who graduated from this program.

The teacher educator interview protocol (see Appendix B) was designed to elicit each educator's beliefs about what it means to work successfully with ELs; his or her understanding of the skills, knowledge, and dispositions necessary to realize those beliefs; and his or her assessment of effective strategies that teacher preparation programs can use in shaping the development of those beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions. I conducted a total of four teacher educator interviews between 28 March, 2012 and 15 May, 2012. All interviews were conducted at a time and place of each educator's choosing. Three interviews were conducted face-to-face, while one was conducted via Skype, due to the distance between my home and the institution at which this educator works. Most teacher educators chose to be interviewed in their offices, although one chose to meet in a coffee shop, instead. Each interview lasted between forty and ninety minutes. In order to facilitate the data-analysis process, interviews were audio recorded and transcribed.

These interviews provided insight into teacher educators' institutional and personal positions on the following issues: what it means to work successfully with ELs; what skills, knowledge, and dispositions teachers must possess in order to realize that belief about working successfully with ELs; and what instructional approaches schools of education should ideally use to help teacher candidates develop the identified beliefs, skills, knowledge, and dispositions.

## DATA ANALYSIS

In order to ensure that the interconnectedness of context and phenomenon is central to this study, the data was analyzed using the grounded theory approach formulated by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and recast in a stronger constructivist light by Charmaz (2005). This data-analysis method requires that the researcher interpret data as it is collected, formulating theories about its meaning and refining the data-collection process based on the theories so formulated. This constant comparison of the fit between data collection and data analysis facilitates the construction of a theory

> …that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents. That is, it is discovered, developed, and provisionally verified through systematic data collection and analysis of data pertaining to that phenomenon. Therefore, data collection, analysis, and theory stand in reciprocal relationship with each other. One does not begin with a theory, then prove it. Rather, one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 23).

Thus, the grounded-theory approach to data analysis helped to ensure that the data analysis was driven by the data itself, rather than by preconceived expectations of the practices in which teachers who work with ELs or the educators who prepared them should engage. I began the process of analyzing data on the drive home from my first teacher interview, at which time I began mentally trying to sort interview data into meaningful themes. Two themes stood out in my mind, interfering with my ability to remember or notice anything else the teacher had said. These two themes were as follows: 1) the teacher had begun her career as an ESL teacher in a very unusual way, and 2) the teacher spent only three periods of each day in a classroom with adolescent ELs. Of those three periods, none could really be described as instructional time, since two of the three periods were resource periods and the third was a science class during

which she provided push-in support for a newcomer. Her duties in providing push-in support more closely resembled those of a classroom aide or tutor than those of a teacher.

Upon transcribing the interview data and conducting multiple readings of the resultant transcript, I began to notice themes other than those two that had taken up such a prominent position in my thoughts on the drive home. The data collected in this first interview signaled that I should be attentive to the presence (or absence) of the following themes in subsequent interviews:

1) teacher was chosen to work with ELs because her experience or initial teacher preparation was in a foreign language or languages
2) teacher feels that positive beliefs/attitudes about diversity, students' abilities, and/or students' right to be in school are vital to a teacher's ability to work effectively with ELs
3) teacher feels that good relationships with students and their families are vital to a teacher's ability to work effectively with ELs
4) teacher feels that the ability to differentiate language, instruction, and assessment are vital to a teacher's ability to work effectively with ELs
5) teacher feels that an understanding of the SLA process, as described by the cognitive strand of research in SLA, is vital to a teacher's ability to work effectively with ELs
6) teacher feels that the ability to understand/use students' L1 and a good sense of when to use the L1 vs. the L2 are vital to a teacher's ability to work effectively with ELs
7) teacher feels that the ability to sympathize with students/understand their circumstances is vital to a teacher's ability to work effectively with ELs

8) teacher identifies a climate of racism, in which diversity is feared and ELs are viewed as deficient, as one of the biggest challenges faced by ELs in her school
9) teacher identifies the lack of post-graduation options and a concomitantly low motivation to do well in school as one of the biggest challenges faced by ELs in her school
10) teacher identifies the home/school culture divide as one of the biggest challenges faced by ELs in her school
11) teacher identifies a need for the entire school community to take "ownership" of the education of ELs

While I specifically sought evidence of these themes in subsequent teacher interviews, I also made note of new themes as they arose during each interview, as I was reflecting upon the interview during the (sometimes quite long) drive home, as I was transcribing the interview, or as I was (re)reading interview transcripts. After having completed the final teacher interview, I created one table for each teacher educator, upon which was listed all of the themes that had emerged across all eight interviews. When evidence for a theme existed in the pertinent teacher's data, I placed an "x" in the column beside that theme, along with any notes that seemed relevant. Ultimately, I created a single table containing the names of all teachers and a list of those themes expressed by four or more teachers (see Appendix C).

Once I had identified common themes across teachers' data, I combed through transcripts of teacher educators' data to discover possible linkages between teacher educators' data and the abundance of common themes apparent in teachers' data. This proved to be rather difficult, as my initial impressions of teacher educators' interviews indicated that teacher educators' data was largely particularized, ungeneralizable, and unrelated to teachers' data. Indeed, the only

common theme that seemed to exist across teacher educators' data was the fact that each teacher educator spoke about and seemed to tailor his or her interview responses to particular issues related to local school policy or practice. Commonalities began to emerge only after I had, with the assistance of my advisor, narrowed my focus on teachers' themes to four that seemed most salient and most clearly related to teachers' experiences with their preparation programs.

The grounded-theory approach to data analysis proved to be a particularly appropriate, though challenging, choice for this study. The challenge of using this approach can be attributed to two factors. First, I embarked upon the research with several biases generated by my own experiences as a language learner and teacher; my previous studies in applied linguistics; and my experiences as an undergraduate who, through a combination of dreadful advising and extremely limited funds, was unable to achieve my goal of obtaining certification as a secondary-level German teacher. These biases included the following: an assumption that ESL teachers lack a thorough understanding of the sounds and structures of English; an assumption that a thorough understanding of the sounds and structures of English is the most important factor in determining an ESL teacher's success in working with adolescent and young adult ELs; and a fundamental distrust of traditional teacher preparation programs. Because of these biases, it was extremely difficult for me to look at the data in ways that allowed relevant themes to emerge, if those themes happened to contradict my own expectations and beliefs.

Second, my background in modern languages and applied linguistics led me to expect that research, to paraphrase Strauss and Corbin, starts with a theory and then proves or disproves it. As described briefly above, I initially regarded data analysis as a process of seeking evidence. On the one hand, I sought evidence that would prove the existence of shared themes across teachers' data, rather than allowing myself the flexibility to discover themes as they emerged

naturally. On the other hand, and more problematically, I sought evidence that would prove a point about definitive cause-and-effect relationships between teachers' preparation programs and teachers' work. While I recognized that a teacher's work is affected by relationships, contexts, and experiences both inside and outside of her preparation program, I nevertheless expected – indeed, hoped - to find one or more definitive causal relationships between elements of teachers' preparation programs and elements of their work with ELs. Thus, my instinct was to ignore any data that seemed incapable of providing evidence of direct causative links between teachers' preparation programs and teachers' work. However, the more persistently I attempted to ignore themes that seemed irrelevant to my research goals, the more persistently they emerged. For example, one of the most salient themes that emerged from the data was the fact, as noted above, that no participating teacher spent more than two hours of each day in a whole-class instructional setting with ELs. This situation caused a good deal of difficulty.

To begin with, the fact that participating teachers had limited access to ELs, while important, seemed to have more to do with the decisions of district- or building-level administrators than with teachers' experiences in their preparation programs. It was difficult for me to see how this theme could possibly be relevant to an investigation of the effectiveness of ESL teachers' preparation programs in having readied them for their work. Additionally, the limited amount of time that teachers spent with ELs in an instructional setting seemed to render the initial research questions largely meaningless. Recall that the initial research questions were as follows:

1) According to secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts, what does it mean to work successfully with ELs, and what skills; knowledge; and dispositions do

teachers feel that they need in order to realize their beliefs about successful work with ELs?

2) According to secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts, what were the strengths and weaknesses of their ESL-preparation programs in helping them develop not only their beliefs about what it means to work successfully with ELs but also the skills, knowledge, and dispositions needed to realize those beliefs?
3) How do the curriculum and pedagogy of teachers' preparation programs as well as the goals, beliefs, and priorities of teacher educators at those institutions align with the stated beliefs, needs, and experiences of secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts?

Participating teachers were initially confused by those interview prompts designed to elicit their thoughts on both the first and second research questions. That is, they were unsure whose work with ELs should serve as the foundation for their responses: their actual daily work with ELs; their work with ELs in an ideal world; or the work of their mainstream classroom colleagues with ELs. When asked to base their responses upon a combination of their own work and the work of their colleagues in mainstream classrooms, teachers identified a set of skills, knowledge, dispositions and beliefs that was, for the most part, consistent with that set identified both in the literature and by participating teacher educators.

Yet it was difficult to gauge whether teachers' responses reflected their genuine convictions or a mere recollection of the big ideas addressed in their teacher preparation programs. Even more difficult to gauge was the extent to which participating teachers actually relied in their daily work on those skills, knowledge, dispositions, and beliefs they had identified. Most of the participating teachers spent too little instructional time with ELs for an observation

of their work to shed light on those skills, knowledge, dispositions, and beliefs that actually lay at the heart of their teaching. Moreover, in identifying the elements necessary for success in working with adolescent ELs, almost all participating teachers told stories or gave examples which clearly indicated that they were thinking of shortcomings they wished their colleagues in mainstream classrooms would address rather than strengths or weaknesses of their actual work with ELs. Finally, two participating teachers openly acknowledged that the skills, knowledge, dispositions, and beliefs they had identified for the purposes of our interview had very little to do with their daily work. Shirley[1], for example, remarked that the only skills she really needed in her work were good organizational and time management skills, noting with a discernible degree of bitterness that "I don't understand why they're paying me to do this, when they could have just an aide do this" (Shirley, interview, 24 May, 2012). Diane perhaps summed up the situation best when she reported feeling "like I've got the skills [to teach ELs effectively]; I just never get to deploy them" (Diane, interview, 27 September, 2011).

Thus, it appeared that one of the most salient themes that had emerged from the data threatened to derail my study or, at the very least, to send it in a radically different direction. Yet with the guidance of my advisor and a good deal of reflection on the methods course I had taken, I began to realize that it was not the data, but my understanding of the nature and purpose of research, that threatened to derail my study. I eventually became comfortable with the idea that I did not need to provide evidence or proof of definitive links between teachers' preparation programs and their work; rather I could allow the data to reveal common themes which offer insight into the questions and problems that confront secondary-level ESL teachers in non-gateway districts and the educators who prepare them for their work. In shifting my perspective on the concept of research itself, I began to recognize that those themes which I had hoped to

[1] With the exception of the researcher's name, all names of people and places in this study are pseudonyms.

dismiss as irrelevant did, indeed, offer important insight into the role that teachers' preparation programs can, do, and could play in shaping teachers' skills, knowledge, dispositions, beliefs, and daily work.

Chapters Four and Five will describe the four themes that persistently emerged from participating teachers' data, the two themes that persistently emerged from participating teacher educators' data, the intersections among themes, and the insights that these intersections hold for teacher educators who wish to increase the effectiveness of preparation programs in readying teachers for their work with ELs. Before exploring these themes, we turn our attention to the study participants and the contexts of their work.

## PARTICIPANTS

### ESL TEACHERS

#### *Diane Acker, Randolph District*

Diane Acker works as both the secondary-level ESL teacher and the ESL/Bilingual Program Coordinator for the Randolph School District. Randolph, which lies in the southeastern portion of the state approximately thirty miles east of the state capital, has a population of 5,454, according to the most recent U.S. Census data. The local economy is sustained primarily by agricultural production and manufacturing jobs, although the state capital likely shapes the town's economic landscape to some degree. Agricultural production has drawn small numbers of migrant and non-migrant immigrant workers to the Randolph area for a number of years; however, ELs did not begin enrolling in substantial numbers in the Randolph schools until the 1999-2000 school year. According to data from the state Department of Public Instruction (DPI), ELs comprised 2.1%, or approximately eleven, of the 516 students enrolled at Randolph High School during the 2011-2012 school year, when this study was conducted.

Due to the small number of ELs enrolled at the secondary level in the Randolph District, the state DPI, in order to protect the privacy of individual students, does not release disaggregated data for ELs regarding drop-out rates, absenteeism, or test scores. Thus, it is difficult to compare the achievement of ELs at Randolph High School as measured by these standard metrics with the achievement of non-ELs. Diane believed that 100% of Randolph's ELs graduate, but added that many of them are unable to attend college because their immigration status prevents them from applying for student loans. She concluded that school was not necessarily a welcoming place for ELs in Randolph, as Latino culture "is invisible here, even though Latinos are about 99% of our ELL population" (Diane, interview 27 September, 2011).

Diane is the only ESL teacher at the secondary level and does not receive the support of tutors, paraprofessionals, aides, or classroom volunteers. She does receive secretarial support in completing her duties as district-level coordinator of the ESL/Bilingual Program. These duties consist primarily of completing administrative tasks pertinent to the district's ACCESS[2] testing requirements and the maintenance of funding for the district's K-3 early-exit Spanish/English bilingual program. During the semester in which this study was conducted, she spent no instructional time with adolescent ELs, although she did supervise two ESL resource periods as well as provide push-in support for one period of each day. ELs at Randolph Middle School and Randolph High School did not receive language support services outside of Diane's resource periods, unless they happened to be enrolled, along with a newcomer to the district, in the science course in which Diane provided push-in support.

---

[2] ACCESS = Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners. The ACCESS is a standardized exam administered to all ELs in this and many other states annually not only to gauge students' progress in developing academic English proficiency but also to match them with appropriate language-support services.

While Diane is ostensibly responsible for having chosen this model of support, her programmatic choices, as will be described in a subsequent chapter, have been largely constrained by the preferences of school board members. She is not responsible for creating ELs' course schedules at either the middle school or the high school, although the counselors responsible for this task do occasionally seek her input in selecting appropriate courses for ELs.

When ELs began arriving in the district twelve years ago, Diane was recruited as a part-time language tutor by a school-board member who suspected that she would be comfortable working with persons from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, since she herself is multilingual. As an undergraduate, Diane studied classical literature and languages with an emphasis on Latin. Additionally, she learned Russian through a combination of study at the Defense Language Institute and a military career spent primarily in Russia. She did not study education as an undergraduate and had no plans to teach. Upon retiring from their military careers, she and her husband settled in Randolph to be near family. Her husband began a second career as a teacher at Randolph High School, and she began a second career as a homemaker and mother. Since she was an avid volunteer at her children's schools, she was already a familiar face in Randolph Elementary School and Randolph Middle School when she began tutoring newly arrived ELs.

As an increasing number of ELs enrolled in the Randolph District, Diane's tutoring load grew to be unmanageable, and she requested that the school board reconsider its ESL service model. Thus, Diane suddenly found herself promoted from her position as a part-time language tutor to her current position as a full-time teacher and district-level ESL/bilingual program coordinator. Hired on an emergency license, she enrolled in a teacher preparation program at

nearby Glacier State University and currently holds permanent licenses in K-12 ESL, Russian, and Latin.

While Diane's schedule varies somewhat from semester to semester or year to year, depending upon the number and ages of ELs enrolled in the district, her day generally looks much like the one described here. She starts the day with a half-hour administrative period in her classroom at the high school. She works on a variety of tasks during this period, such as meeting with parents, many of whom are on their way home from 3rd-shift work in nearby manufacturing plants; consulting with colleagues who have academic or disciplinary concerns about ELs in their classes; providing language tutoring or job search assistance to adult members of ELs' families; and advising students about post-graduation options or assisting them in completing scholarship and college admissions applications. Although her schedule shows that she officially arrives in her classroom at 7:15 am, she frequently arranges to meet earlier with parents, students, or colleagues, since her time during this period is limited and the demands upon it are typically great.

At 7:45, she crosses the parking lot to the middle school, where she spends the first period of the school day completing administrative tasks or meeting with middle-school colleagues, students, or parents. With the start of the 2nd period at both the high school and the middle school, she returns to her room in the high school for three full periods. One of these periods provides additional opportunities for her to complete administrative tasks or to consult with colleagues, although it frequently turns into a one-on-one tutoring or test-administration session for ELs who require extra time or assistance in completing homework assignments or exams. The remaining two periods are scheduled as ESL resource periods.

After completing her three-hour block at the high school, Diane travels to the elementary school for one period. She typically spends this period providing push-in support to 4th grade students who have recently exited the Spanish/English bilingual program, but require some additional support in their English-medium classes. There is only one bilingual teacher at the elementary school and no ESL teacher; thus Diane helps out as she can at the elementary school. This assistance includes the provision of guidance or in-class support, as needed, to the monolingual teachers working in the "English" half of the K-3 bilingual program. Diane's commitment at the elementary school is followed by a period of push-in support for a newcomer enrolled in a 7th-grade science class. She ends her day at the high school, where she is once again available for one-on-one tutoring, meetings, or testing accommodations.

***Donna Umscheid, Eldon Middle School***

Donna Umscheid, who taught two sheltered content courses for ELs at Eldon Middle School during the semester in which this study was conducted, is one of two participating teachers from the Eldon District. Eldon is a community of 3,425 in the northwestern portion of the state, approximately seventy miles from the border with the neighboring state to the west. The community's proximity to the state line is significant.

Gemini City, a large urban area located in the neighboring state near the border, has served as a popular resettlement site for Somali refugees since the early 1990s. Students in Gemini City must pass a state-mandated exit exam in order to graduate from high school, whereas students in Eldon are not required to fulfill such a requirement. According to Linda Becket, the ESL teacher at Eldon High School as well as the ESL Program Coordinator for the Eldon District, Somali-speaking students who settle in Gemini City late in adolescence are generally able to complete their high-school coursework, but often find it difficult to pass the

state-mandated exit exam. Thus, when word began to spread among the Somali community in Gemini City that students in the neighboring state to the east could graduate from high school without passing an exit exam, resettlement across the state line became an attractive option for families with older children. In some cases, young adults between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one moved alone or with friends to Eldon, drawn by the promise not only of a high-school diploma but also of work at the "Meat Mart," as locals call the Pinedrive Beef Processing and Packing Plant. Since the Meat Mart runs three shifts, two of which operate outside of school hours, it is possible – although not ideal – for many students to combine the pursuit of a high-school diploma with full-time work.

According to current census data, nearly 5%, or approximately sixteen, of the 329 students enrolled at Eldon Middle School are ELs. As is the case at Randolph High School, the number of ELs enrolled at Eldon Middle School is so small that the state DPI does not release disaggregated data for this group of students regarding drop-out rates, absenteeism, or test scores. Thus, it is difficult to compare the achievement of ELs at Eldon Middle School as measured by these standard metrics with the achievement of non-ELs.

While there is, thus, no state-issued data available to provide a picture of ELs' experiences at Eldon Middle School, there is evidence from Donna to suggest that these experiences may be less than ideal. Donna worried that ELs found it difficult to keep up in their mainstream classes, as there were no language-support services available to them once they had completed the sheltered courses she offered, and she felt that her colleagues generally lacked either the time or the knowledge to modify instruction in appropriate ways for ELs. Furthermore, she worried that the ELs at Eldon Middle School, most of whom are Muslim, found

it difficult to fit in at school and in the community, where "everything is so Christian-oriented" (Donna, Interview, 29 September, 2011).

Although Donna is the only ESL teacher at the middle school, she does receive the support of a monolingual English-speaking aide, Leslie, for one or two hours of each day. She also frequently receives the support of tutors participating in a special volunteer program for senior citizens and of practicum students enrolled in the teacher preparation program at a state university approximately forty miles from Eldon. During the semester in which I visited her class, she additionally received the support of a Somali/English bilingual interpreter, Joe. While Joe was hired to accompany a newcomer to her classes and interpret as necessary, he frequently provided tutoring or small-group instruction for the other students enrolled in Donna's sheltered courses, while Donna worked one-on-one with the newcomer to develop basic literacy skills.

This model of language support was designed by Donna's colleague at Eldon High School, Linda Becket, who also serves as the district's ESL Program Coordinator. However, Donna consults each semester with her principal; elementary-school and middle-school colleagues, including counselors; and Linda to decide which of the four core secondary-level academic subjects should be offered as sheltered courses to which ELs in the upcoming semester. This decision is based upon teacher recommendations, students' grades, and students' most recent scores on the ACCESS exam.

Donna was hired on an emergency ESL license midway through the 2007-2008 school year to work with newcomer Somali-speaking students at Eldon High School. Prior to that, she had worked for three years as a substitute in the nearby town of Leroy, where she and her husband live. At the time of her hire, she was certified to teach grades 1-8 with an endorsement

to teach German in grades 6-8. She completed this portion of her teacher preparation at Lake State University and started her teaching career as a German teacher in the town of Lake.

In fulfillment of the requirements of her emergency ESL license, she enrolled in an online ESL teacher preparation program offered through Andrews University, a private institution whose physical campus is located in Gemini City. Ironically, by the time she had completed her coursework in this program and applied for her permanent ESL license, the majority of those ELs with whom she had been hired to work had exited the ESL program and the number of new immigrants had tapered off, resulting in a decrease in the number of ESL classes offered and Donna's reassignment to a non-ESL position.

Although she currently spends most of her time teaching 6th-grade science and language arts classes to non-ELs, she maintains some contact with the ELs at Eldon Middle School during the first and second periods of each day, when she teaches a sheltered language arts class and sheltered math class, respectively. Additionally, she sets aside time at the beginning of each semester to compile a packet of information for each mainstream classroom teacher who will work with an EL in the upcoming semester. This packet contains the ACCESS score report of each student in question as well as a list of tips for making language and content more accessible to ELs. She is likewise available throughout the school year for consultation with colleagues who have questions or concerns about working effectively with ELs, although she notes that few of her colleagues take advantage of her expertise.

### *Linda Becket, Eldon High School*

Linda Becket, who teaches sheltered content courses at Eldon High School, is the second participating teacher from the Eldon District. According to current census data, nearly 9%, or approximately thirty-four, of the 383 students enrolled at Eldon High School are ELs. As was

the case with Randolph High School and Eldon Middle School, the small EL population at Eldon High School prohibits the DPI from releasing disaggregated data that could be used to gauge ELs' achievement relative to their non-EL peers. However, the publicly available school report card for the 2011-2012 school year indicates that of all the subgroups of students enrolled at Eldon High School, black students are least likely to be "on-track" and "ready" for post-secondary education. Given the demographics of the Eldon community, virtually all black students are Somali immigrant students, rather than native-born African Americans. Thus, it seems that the majority of ELs at Eldon High School are not achieving on par with their non-EL peers. Linda had little to say about disparities in achievement between ELs and non-ELs, although she did note that fitting in was a tremendous challenge for all ELs, both Somali and Latino, indicating that

> …in our community, we have the Somalis that kind of stick to themselves, you have the Hispanics that kind of stick to themselves, and then you have the Caucasians, and there's not a lot of connection. … And, you know, the communities try to make steps [in unifying the three isolated communities], but you know, really, until that happens, and there's an appreciation, I don't know how much more it can improve (Linda, Interview, 10 November, 2011).

Linda serves as both the ESL teacher at Eldon High School and the district's ESL Program Coordinator. She is the only ESL teacher at the secondary level and does not receive the support of tutors, paraprofessionals, aides, or classroom volunteers. She does receive secretarial support in completing her duties as district-level coordinator of the ESL Program. These duties consist not only of collaborating with high-school counselors to create course schedules for ELs but also of completing administrative tasks pertinent to the district's ACCESS testing requirements and to the maintenance of funding for ESL programming.

During the semester in which this study was conducted, Linda enjoyed two hours of sheltered instructional time with ELs in addition to one ESL resource period. ELs who enroll in

her sheltered social studies and sheltered English courses also enroll in sheltered math and science courses. These courses are taught by content-certified teachers who have not received preparation as ESL teachers, but who do occasionally consult with Linda in ensuring that instruction in their courses is accessible and appropriate. Linda bears sole responsibility for having created the language support program at Eldon High School and for making changes to it each semester, as student demographics demand.

Linda began her tenure in the Eldon District in 1996 as an 8th-grade language arts and social studies teacher who held licenses in K-8 general education and K-8 ESL education. When the district experienced a slight increase in the number of newcomer ELs, she volunteered to teach a section of sheltered middle-school social studies. As the number of newcomer ELs began rising,

> the high school principal and the elementary principal, they're like, 'hey, that's not fair. … Why does the middle school get ESL?' And they're like, 'hm. Well, Linda, how would you like to go K-12 ESL? In the morning?' In the morning K-12 ESL –
>
> Lori: and then in the afternoon 8th grade social studies?
>
> Linda: Exactly! Exactly. That's exactly what the proposal was (Linda, Interview, 10 November, 2011).

Thus armed with K-8 certification and experience, but no administrative experience or qualifications, no secondary-level content-area or ESL certification, and limited time, Linda was faced with the task, which she described as "daunting," not just of designing a program to serve the needs of an ever increasing population of newcomer ELs but also of teaching most of the courses offered within that program from Kindergarten through 12th grade. While juggling her teaching duties and her new administrative duties, she also returned to her undergraduate alma mater, Cliff State University, for 9-12 ESL certification.

As the number of ELs continued to rise, the Eldon district hired additional teachers, including Donna Umscheid, to help with instruction. When the number of newcomers declined again, Linda maintained both her role as district-level administrator and her duties teaching sheltered secondary-level English and social studies. Her duties as district-level ESL coordinator leave her with little time to teach: three of her eight daily periods during the 2011-2012 school year were reserved for the completion of administrative tasks, as described above. The remaining five periods were divided between an ESL resource period, a sheltered social studies course, a sheltered English course, and two planning periods. The resource period was open to any EL who wanted time and assistance in completing homework assignments, while the sheltered content area classes offered both by Linda and her non-ESL-certified colleagues in science and math were reserved for those ELs who had received a score lower than four on the most recent ACCESS exam.

### *Ashley Roosevelt, Waubunsee High School*

Ashley is the only ESL teacher at Waubunsee High School. Waubunsee, which lies in the east-central portion of the state, has a population of 16,000 according to the most current U.S. Census data. The local economy is sustained primarily by manufacturing jobs. ELs, the majority of whom are native speakers of Spanish, began enrolling in small numbers in this district approximately fifteen years ago. According to current DPI census data, ELs comprised 4.3%, or approximately forty-four, of the 1,013 students enrolled at Waubunsee High School in the 2011-2012 school year. No data is available to indicate how ELs fare academically or socially in comparison to their non-EL peers, although Ashley did note that colleagues in mainstream classrooms were sometimes reluctant to modify instruction, assignments, and

assessments in appropriate ways for language learners, which may indicate that ELs struggle unnecessarily with at least some of their coursework at Waubunsee High School.

Although Ashley is the only ESL teacher at Waubunsee High School, she does receive the support of two part-time Spanish/English bilingual ESL tutors during the ESL resource periods that she supervises in a typical school year. However, during the semester in which I conducted her interview and visited her class, she did not supervise any ESL resource periods. Indeed, Ashley was quite limited, during the fall 2011 semester, in her ability to work with ELs, as she spent five periods of each day teaching mainstream biology courses. Her remaining two periods consisted of a planning period and a sheltered English course for ELs who were considered to have an intermediate level of proficiency in English. The curriculum for this course, which combined elements of the mainstream 9th-grade English curriculum with elements of the mainstream 11th-grade English curriculum, had been designed by the district's ESL/Bilingual Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the head of Waubunsee High School's English Department, several years before Ashley was hired. Ashley continued to use the curriculum that she had inherited, although she had made minor changes to it during her three years of employment with the district.

The ESL/Bilingual Program Coordinator, in conjunction with the principal of each school in the district, bears responsibility for having designed and continuing to make needed changes to the language support program(s) available to ELs in all grade levels. The Coordinator also makes course placement decisions for ELs and assigns them to language support programs, based on their most recent ACCESS scores. Ashley noted that, while the proficiency levels of those students enrolled in her sheltered English course during the fall 2011 semester all ostensibly fell within the intermediate range, their ACCESS scores varied widely, with a low of

two to a high of four. She confided that this variation in proficiency levels made it difficult for her to differentiate instruction effectively.

ELs at Waubunsee High School were able to enroll in one or more resource periods during the fall 2011 semester. These resource periods, supervised by an ESL tutor, were the only type of support available to ELs in that particular semester, outside of Ashley's sheltered English course. Ashley's schedule in previous years had given her the opportunity to spend more time with ELs, in the form of ELD courses, sheltered English courses, resource periods, and push-in support provided in students' core content-area classes.

At the time of our interview, Ashley was starting her third year as the ESL teacher at Waubunsee High School. She was the least experienced of the teachers participating in this study, having completed her BA in biology as well as teacher certification in biology and ESL at Glacier State University in May of 2009. She also completed the coursework necessary to apply for certification as a Spanish teacher, but did not apply for the Spanish teaching license. Although she was initially more enthusiastic about teaching biology than ESL, she applied shortly after graduation for the ESL position at Waubunsee High School because of Waubunsee's proximity to her home town. She reported being pleased with her choice to teach ESL, rather than biology, and seemed somewhat frustrated by the fact that she spent so much time teaching mainstream biology during the semester in which I interviewed her.

### *Amanda Penfield, St. George District*

Amanda is the only ESL teacher at the secondary level in the St. George District and does not receive the support of tutors, paraprofessionals, aides, or classroom volunteers. St. George, which lies in the west-central portion of the state, has a population of 12,000, according to the most recent U.S. Census data. The local economy is sustained primarily by manufacturing jobs,

although there are some opportunities for agricultural work in the area, as well. According to current DPI census data, ELs comprised 1.4%, or approximately fourteen, of the 1,020 students enrolled at St. George High School in the 2011-2012 school year. As is the case with most participating schools, the number of ELs enrolled at St. George High School is so low that the DPI does not release disaggregated data for this group. Thus, it is difficult to compare the achievement of ELs at St. George High School to the achievement of non-ELs. However, Amanda, like Ashley and Donna, noted that ELs may struggle in their mainstream classrooms, as many of her colleagues lack the time, knowledge, or willingness to modify instruction, assignments, or assessment for ELs.

While Amanda does not officially serve as a district-level coordinator for ESL services, she estimates that she spends approximately 10% of her time on parent outreach work and administrative tasks related to ACCESS testing. She receives secretarial support in completing her duties pertinent to the ACCESS exam and parent outreach. The remaining 90% of her time was divided during the fall 2011 semester between two planning periods, two periods of sheltered English that she co-taught with an English-certified colleague at St. George Middle School, and a three-hour block at St. George High School comprised of a period of ELD for newcomers sandwiched between two ESL resource periods. Note that one of these ESL resource periods also served as a study hall for non-ELs. While Amanda ostensibly received two planning periods each day, in reality she spent much of this time not in planning instruction, but in performing the above-mentioned administrative and outreach tasks or in consulting with content-certified teachers in grades K-12 about their work with ELs in the mainstream classroom. Her consultation work even occasionally extends to the local K-5 parochial school, which pools its

resources with those of the public school district in administering the annual ACCESS exam to the small number of ELs enrolled there.

Amanda did not indicate who had been responsible for designing her schedule or choosing the types of support she would offer to ELs. However, she seemed to have a substantial amount of control over her schedule. While the sheltered English courses that she co-taught with a colleague at St. George Middle School were a new part of her schedule in the fall 2011 semester, the ELD and resource periods had been a familiar part of her schedule since she had begun working for the district six years earlier.

Of the many unusual pathways in which participating teachers entered the field of ESL, Amanda's is one of the most peculiar. She received her initial certification in special education from Lake State University in 2001 and worked for four years as a special education teacher at a middle school in a town near the city of Lake. At the end of her four-year tenure at this school, she

> wanted to move back [to St. George to be near family]. And I was just gonna move; I didn't have a job; I was just gonna cross my fingers, and, um, I was looking for apartments with my Mom, and she said, 'Oh look, the door is open'– to the admin building. So I walked in; I said, 'Hey do you have any special ed jobs open?' And they said, 'no.' And I was like, 'Oh, OK, well I'll watch…' you know, and I was walking away and they said, 'But do you speak Spanish?' [laughter] And I said, 'Yes.' And they said, 'Well we have *this* job you can apply for; the deadline is Friday.' So I applied right away; I quickly got all my stuff in, and I applied for the job and I, um, had the interview, and got the job, obviously, um, without the license (Amanda, interview, 3 November, 2011).

She began her new position with the St. George District in the fall of 2005 and enrolled in the ESL certification program at her alma mater of Lake State University in the spring of 2006. At the time of her hire, the majority of ELs in the St. George District were native speakers of Spanish; hence, the district's interest in her Spanish-language abilities. However, during the

2011-2012 school year, when this study was conducted, she worked primarily with newcomer ELs from Albania.

***Kara Rohr, Decameron District***

Kara is the Spanish and ESL teacher at Decameron High School and Middle School. She is the only ESL teacher at the secondary level and does not enjoy the support of a paraprofessional, tutor, aide, or volunteers. Decameron, located in the north central sector of the state, is a rural village of just 2,316 residents whose sizeable meat-packing industry has attracted migrant and non-migrant immigrant and non-immigrant workers for a number of years. According to current DPI census data, ELs comprised an astonishing 20.8%, or approximately seventy, of the 337 students enrolled at Decameron High School and Middle School in the 2011-2012 school year. All of the ELs in the Decameron District are native speakers of Spanish. Indeed, Kara noted that all but two ELs had immigrated from the same region of northern Mexico.

Since ELs are enrolled in substantial numbers in Decameron High School and Middle School, and the data from both schools is reported together in its annual report card, Decameron is the only participating district for which consistent, detailed information comparing ELs' achievement to non-ELs' achievement exists. Regrettably, the data reveals substantial disparities between the achievement of ELs and the achievement of non-ELs. ELs at Decameron High School, for example, have a dropout rate twice as high as the dropout rate for any other group. Additionally, the achievement gap in reading scores between $10^{th}$-grade ELs and $10^{th}$-grade non-ELs increased between the 2010-2011 school year and the 2011-2012 school year. Finally, standardized test scores of reading and mathematics are broken down statewide into four possible categories of achievement: advanced, proficient, basic, and minimal performance. ELs

at Decameron Junior High and High School never place in the "advanced" category, while the percentage of ELs in the "minimal performance" category is consistently twice as high as the percentage of non-ELs in the same category.

Given the large number of ELs from the same language background enrolled at Decameron High School, it is, perhaps, not surprising that this school, alone of all the sites I visited, offers a Spanish for Native Speakers course. Kara both advocated for the creation of and teaches this course. ELs at Decameron High School also have the opportunity to enroll in an ESL resource period supervised by Kara. The resource model was chosen by the district-level ESL/Bilingual Program Coordinator.

During the 2011-2012 school year, Kara spent the majority of her day (five periods) teaching beginning and intermediate Spanish for nonnative speakers. Her remaining four periods were divided between two planning periods, an ESL resource period, and the Spanish for Native Speakers course. In past years, she has had the opportunity to co-teach a sheltered version of the mainstream English course that students take concurrently with her Spanish for Native Speakers course, but her schedule did not allow her to collaborate in teaching this course during the 2011-2012 school year. While this course had been offered only for the past three years, Kara had been in the district for six years at the time of our interview. She received her initial license in Spanish and ESL from River State University and was working at the time of our interview on an online MA in Foreign Language pedagogy offered by a private out-of-state college.

### *Fanny Davidson, Alta Vista High School*

Fanny Davidson, who is the only ESL teacher at Alta Vista High School, enjoys the support of a Spanish/English bilingual paraprofessional, Martín, who works three afternoons per week. The town of Alta Vista, much like Randolph, lies reasonably near the state capital and

may, thus, be somewhat influenced by social and cultural trends there. Nevertheless, this town of 7,997 exudes its own distinct flavor as a growing town sustained primarily by dairy production but also to some extent by manufacturing. According to current DPI census data, ELs comprised 6%, or approximately thirty-six, of the 596 students enrolled at Alta Vista High School in the 2011-2012 school year. In spite of the small number of ELs enrolled at Alta Vista High School, the school's annual report card does indicate that ELs have the highest dropout rate of any subgroup of students at Alta Vista High School. This is, perhaps, not surprising, as Fanny noted that many of the ELs with whom she works lack the documentation necessary to attend college and see, therefore, little point in completing high school. Additionally, the school climate, which Fanny depicted as being characterized by cliquish student behavior that tends to segregate ELs from non-ELs, may contribute to ELs' lack of interest in completing high school.

Alta Vista High School relied on a resource model, which had been selected by Fanny's predecessor. At the time of her interview, Fanny hoped that she would be able to implement a new approach to working with ELs in the 2012-2013 school year. That is, she had proposed – but not yet received permission to implement – a sheltered English class that would not only make the standard 9$^{th}$ grade English curriculum more accessible to ELs but also enable Fanny to utilize her experience as a teacher of English literature and composition in Brazil. At the time of our interview, however, Fanny's opportunities to work with ELs were limited to four ESL resource periods per day. The remaining four periods of her day were reserved for administrative work. She completed a variety of tasks during these periods, which included the following: providing one-on-one tutoring for newcomers; providing a testing space for ELs who required additional time or L1 assistance in completing tests; translating documents for colleagues or the district office; serving as an interpreter for visiting parents; mediating disputes

between ELs and non-ELs, ELs and school faculty or staff, or ELs and law enforcement officers; conducting outreach with Spanish-speaking parents in the district; scheduling administration of and administering the annual ACCESS exam; and completing and submitting reports necessary to maintain state and federal funding for ESL services.

Fanny, who is fluent in Portuguese, Spanish, and English, came to the United States to work on an MA in ESL/bilingual education at Glacier State University, intending to return home to Brazil upon completion of her degree. However, "during the first week of classes, I met my husband – an American - and changed my plans" (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012). She continues to work part-time on her MA and is simultaneously pursuing K-12 ESL/bilingual teacher certification, since the certification that she earned in Brazil is not valid in the United States. She was hired by the Alta Vista district as the elementary-level ESL teacher in the fall of 2009, but transferred to the high school when the ESL teacher position became available there in the fall of 2010. She preferred work with older students, as her initial certification in Brazil qualified her to teach English, Portuguese, and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) at the secondary level. She explained that her EFL certification qualified her to teach beginning-level English language courses, whereas her English certification qualified her to teach advanced-level composition and literature courses.

### *Shirley Weiss, Westmoreland High School*

Shirley is the only ESL teacher at Westmoreland High School and does not enjoy the support of a paraprofessional, tutor, aide, or volunteers. The semi-rural community of Westmoreland, located in the east-central portion of the state, is home to a population of 7,763 residents and a substantial food-processing industry. This industry has drawn primarily Spanish-speaking immigrant workers to the area for a number of years. According to current DPI census

data, there are approximately twenty eight ELs at Westmoreland High School, which represents 5.5% of the student body of 512. In spite of the small numbers of ELs enrolled at Westmoreland High School, the school's annual report card does provide limited data about these students' achievement, relative to that of their non-EL peers. Namely, ELs at Westmoreland High School are, as a group, less "on-track" and "ready" for postsecondary education than their non-EL peers or any other subgroup of students in the school, such as students with disabilities, or students from low-income homes. Additionally, ELs at Westmoreland High School have the highest rate of any subgroup - an astonishing 20.7% - of chronic absenteeism. It is, perhaps, not surprising that ELs in this school have such a high rate of chronic absenteeism, as Shirley noted that "fitting in" with the school community was a tremendous problem for her students.

For the most part, Westmoreland High School uses an ESL resource model of support. Shirley did not indicate who had selected this particular type of support, but it seemed that she had a good deal of control over her schedule and the selection of language-support program models. She commented during her interview that she had been charged with the task of creating a model of language support services, but did not indicate whether or not she had been guided in this endeavor by the district's ESL Program Coordinator.

Shirley began her tenure at Westmoreland High School as a German teacher, whose former students still occasionally drop by her classroom to say hello to "Frau." During the 2004-2005 school year, she became aware of the fact that her school offered very few services to its small, but slowly growing, number of ELs. Thus, she volunteered to work with newcomers during her planning periods. Eventually, the district asked her to create an ESL program at the high school and to serve as its sole teacher. Hired on an emergency ESL license, she enrolled in the ESL preparation program at Lake State University, where she was able to link her initial

certification in K-12 German to her new license in K-12 ESL. Although she does not hold Spanish/English bilingual teacher certification, she is quite comfortable in Spanish, which she learned primarily from her co-workers at a cheese factory where she worked for several years while earning money for college.

As noted above, Shirley works with ELs primarily during resource periods. Her schedule for the 2011-2012 school year began at approximately 7:00 am each day, when she came in to work for fifty minutes before the start of the first hour. She explained that she used this as her planning period, since the two planning periods built into her schedule generally turned into one-on-one tutoring sessions for newcomers, homework help for more proficient students, or test administration sessions for ELs who required additional time or accommodations in completing exams. In addition to these two planning periods, her schedule for the 2011-2012 school year consisted of a study hall for non-ELs, during which she typically provided tutoring for a newcomer EL; three resource periods; and one sheltered English course for students who had attained an intermediate level of proficiency in English. Two of the resource periods that she offered had initially been scheduled as periods of push-in support, during which she accompanied newcomer ELs to a mainstream science class and a mainstream English class. As will be detailed in a subsequent chapter, she abandoned her efforts to provide push-in support after it became clear that she was not a respected member of the classroom community and that her presence served to stigmatize those students whom she hoped to help. Thus, she replaced these two periods in her schedule with two additional resource periods. Those newcomers whom she had sought to accompany to their mainstream science and English classes instead sought permission to leave these classes and obtain assistance in Shirley's room, as needed.

## ESL TEACHER EDUCATORS

### *Marshall Miller, Lake State University*

Lake State University is situated on a medium-sized campus in the city of Lake, which has a population of approximately 66,000. When the surrounding metropolitan area is included in this count, the population increases to approximately 160,000. The University is a significant employer in the area, as are manufacturing, aviation technology, and tourism.

It could be said that Lake State University is the state's "professional school," as business, education, and nursing are its three most prominent and consistently well-enrolled programs. Nonetheless, Lake State does offer a full range of undergraduate and some graduate majors and minors commonly found in schools that emphasize the liberal arts. The University had a total student enrollment of 12,232 undergraduates and 1,229 graduates as of the fall 2011 semester. Teacher candidates at Lake State can seek ESL certification at the undergraduate and graduate levels as well as an MA in ESL education.

Marshall Miller, Professor of Curriculum and Instruction, has taught courses in the ESL teacher preparation program since its inception, which coincided with his arrival in 1997. His post-secondary educational pursuits initially took him into the field of political science, which explains, he believes, why he is so passionate about helping teachers understand the political aspects of their work with ELs. As a result of having spent several years teaching EFL in a variety of countries, he developed an interest in language pedagogy and language teacher education. This interest led him back into school for a PhD in Education, which he completed in 1997.

### *Bernadette Sester, Andrews University*

Andrews University is a small private college located in the heart of Gemini City, an urban area with a population of over 3,000,000. A student quoted on the University's website describes the campus as "like a little oasis. It has a very small-town feel when you're on campus, but step off-campus [sic] and you get the big city experience, too" (Andrews University website, 7 May, 2012). While just 1,866 undergraduates attend classes in this "little oasis," the University has a total enrollment of 5,000 students, many of whom are pursuing graduate or professional degrees through Andrews University's online programs. The School of Education alone offers ten online programs and an additional four programs that combine online learning with on-campus learning. These programs lead to undergraduate- or graduate-level ESL certification or to an MA in ESL education. Andrews University's undergraduate ESL certification program is the oldest one in the state.

Bernadette Sester, Professor of ESL and bilingual teacher education, oversees the various undergraduate and graduate ESL preparation programs as well as teaches courses in the preparation programs. She notes that she has been involved in the field of ESL since the age of five, when she arrived in the U.S. with no knowledge of English and was placed in a Kindergarten classroom with a teacher "who paid absolutely no attention to me. … That teacher wasn't much help, but, you know, she didn't have a clue about what to do – so now I've spent the rest of my life helping people like her!" (Bernadette, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

As an undergraduate, Bernadette studied German and Spanish and became certified to teach both languages. After several years as a high-school language teacher, she returned to school for a PhD in Second Languages and Cultures. As a graduate student, she enjoyed her work as a teacher educator in her institution's K-12 foreign language teacher certification

program; thus she chose to remain in the field of teacher education upon completion of her PhD in 1996.

### *Angela Jackson, Glacier State University*

Glacier State University is unique in that its student population of 12,034 almost equals the permanent population of the town of Glacier, in which it is located. The economy in this town of approximately 14,500 is sustained largely by the University, but also by retail, agricultural production in the surrounding countryside, and a small degree of tourism connected with the nearby state park.

Glacier is noted among the state's university system for its affordability and accessibility, particularly to non-traditional students. The university's College of Education offers undergraduate- and graduate-level ESL certification as well as an MSE in ESL education.

Angela Jackson, Assistant Professor of Curriculum and Instruction and coordinator of the Bilingual Education Program, has worked at Glacier State University since the fall of 2010. Before launching her career as a teacher educator, she worked for several years as a Spanish and ESL teacher in K-12 urban schools. She began her undergraduate education as a Latin American studies major, but was persuaded in her junior year to consider teaching and eventually earned certification in both K-12 Spanish and ESL. She completed her PhD in Education in 2009.

### *Mia Park, River State University*

Intersected by a river, the campus of River State University is one of the prettiest – and smallest – of the campuses in the state university system. The local economy is sustained largely by the University, although health care and tourism are also major factors. The city of River, with its population of nearly 66,000, is the last major city reached by tourists traveling from the south or west to one of several state or national forests and parks in the area.

The ESL certification program at River State is housed only partially in the College of Education. This interdisciplinary program meets the needs of candidates preparing to teach EFL abroad as well as ESL in the American K-12 school setting. Candidates may pursue undergraduate- or graduate-level K-12 ESL certification, undergraduate TEFL certification for work in international contexts, or an ME in Professional Development with an emphasis on TESOL.

Mia Park, Assistant Professor of Education, began her career as an EFL teacher in a high school in Korea. She came to the United States to pursue a PhD in Applied Linguistics/TESOL, but changed her plans and began to study Education when she realized that a PhD in Education would be more amenable than a Ph.D. in Applied Linguistics to her research interests. After having completed the PhD in 2009, she accepted her current position at River State University, where she teaches courses in the ESL certification program offered through the College of Education, coordinates the ME/TESOL program, and works with an interdisciplinary committee to oversee the administration of the undergraduate ESL/TEFL certification program.

**LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY**

Before exploring the data provided by those teachers and teacher educators introduced above, we turn briefly to an examination of the limitations of the study. One of the primary limitations of this study lies in my own inexperience as a researcher. In retrospect, I realize that my inexperience as a researcher manifests itself in three ways. First, I chose not to observe four teaching situations that may have provided valuable insight into teachers' work. Namely, I did not observe the following instances of teachers' work during the semester in which I conducted their interviews: Diane's period of push-in support with a newcomer enrolled in a science course at Randolph Middle School; Amanda's two periods of co-teaching with non-newcomer ELs

enrolled in mainstream English courses at St. George Middle School; and Kara's Spanish for Native Speakers Course at Decameron High School. I chose not to observe Diane's and Amanda's work in these contexts because my interests lay primarily with teachers' work at the upper secondary level. However, in reflecting upon the data collected, I realize that an observation of these three teaching contexts could have provided me with valuable insight into the role that teachers' preparation programs had played in shaping their abilities to work confidently and competently across a variety of language-support program models. Meanwhile, I chose not to observe Kara's Spanish for Native Speakers Course because I speak and understand very little Spanish. Yet, I realize now that I could have drawn upon my own experience as a language teacher (both German and ESL) in observing beyond the language barrier to obtain a picture not only of Kara's practice as a language teacher but also, perhaps, of the beliefs about language pedagogy upon which that practice is built.

Additionally, due to scheduling and communication difficulties, I was unable to conduct a formal observation of Shirley's work with ELs. However, our interview was interrupted several times by students requesting homework help. As Shirley spent the majority of her time during the spring 2012 semester working with ELs in a resource setting, it is likely that the interactions I observed informally during the course of our interview are typical of her daily interactions with students. As an inexperienced researcher, I was content to work with this data when I repeatedly encountered difficulty in scheduling a formal observation with Shirley during the fall 2012 semester. A more experienced researcher might have acted more aggressively than I did in arranging a formal observation.

The second way in which my lack of experience limited this study lies in my failure to distinguish between those times when I should have stuck to the interview protocol and those

times when I should have asked unplanned questions to explore issues raised by participants. Indeed, as I transcribed interviews, I frequently found myself regretting the fact that I had not taken up a teacher or teacher educator's comments by asking additional questions. Regrettably, I find that the first five to six interviews that I conducted were constrained by my obsession with adhering strictly to the interview protocol, while the remaining interviews became such expansive conversations that they almost lost sight of the interview protocol. In analyzing the data, I realized that teachers and teacher educators could, most likely, often have given me more information on a certain emergent theme than I possessed, if I had only conducted the interview with more confidence and competence.

Finally, my lack of experience as a researcher resulted in a conviction, as described above, that I was expected to collect data for the purpose of proving the existence of definitive cause and effect relationships between teachers' preparation programs and teachers' work. Influenced by this positivistic conception of research, I found it difficult to truly hear what participants said, unless their words conformed to my narrow expectations of the kind of language that provided "evidence" or "proof" of causative relationships.

One final limitation of the study lies in an element of the design that is simultaneously a strength and a weakness. That is, in focusing specifically on the experiences and work of teachers in non-gateway districts, I may, as described above, have gathered a more detailed picture of the challenges that confront ESL teachers at the secondary level than would have been provided by teachers in traditional gateway areas, who are likely to be situated within stronger and more reliable networks of collegial support. Indeed, each participating teacher was isolated in her school as the lone ESL expert, although teachers enjoyed varying degrees of support from ESL-certified colleagues at the elementary level or from district-level specialists. Thus,

teachers' relative lack of support in their schools may have provided a richer picture of the varied aspects of secondary-level ESL teachers' work as well as the various challenges that they face.

Yet this focus on teachers in non-gateway areas leaves a host of questions unanswered about the similarities – and differences – that distinguish the work of teachers in gateway areas from the work of teachers in non-gateway areas. Chief among these is the question of whether or not teachers in traditional gateway districts enjoy more opportunities than their counterparts in non-gateway districts, as represented by the participating teachers in this study, to work in meaningful ways with ELs. If they do, can this disparity in the amount and quality of instruction that teachers are able to offer be attributed to differences in teachers' professional development experiences or to differences in school structures, school culture, and district-level decision-making processes? If they do not, can this similarity in the amount and quality of instruction that teachers are able to offer be attributed to similarities in teachers' professional development experiences or to similarities in school structures, school culture, and district-level decision-making processes? An opportunity to compare the experiences and work of teachers in traditional gateway areas in the same state with the experiences and work of teachers participating in the present study would provide fascinating and valuable insight into the complex interrelationships between secondary-level ESL teachers' preparation programs, their work with adolescent ELs, and students' experiences of success and satisfaction with school.

# Chapter Four

## The Challenges of Teachers' Work

Four themes began to emerge consistently across the data collected from the eight participating teachers who were introduced in the preceding chapter. These four themes, each of which will be discussed in detail below, are as follows: 1) program models substantially constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs in each participating teacher's school; 2) ESL teachers' qualifications and knowledge of core secondary-level content played a role in precluding not only the establishment of more effective ESL program models but also the implementation of more effective instructional approaches; 3) instructional approaches constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs; and 4) teachers were uncertain whether and how they should incorporate the use of students' native languages into classroom instruction.

### ESL PROGRAM MODELS

By far the most widely implemented program model observed at participating sites was the ESL Resource model. With the exception of Ashley, all participating teachers supervised at least one ESL Resource period each day. Donna ostensibly supervised no resource periods, as her two daily ESL periods were intended to serve as sheltered content classes. Nevertheless, in an attempt to meet the unique language-learning needs of a newcomer who had arrived at Eldon Middle School at the start of the 2011-2012 school year, Donna divided the students in each of her classes into small groups who worked at different paces on different projects with different amounts and types of adult supervision. Thus, Donna's sheltered language arts and sheltered math classes resembled ESL Resource Periods much more strongly than they resembled sheltered versions of their respective mainstream content-area courses.

Resource periods looked much the same no matter where I went. An excerpt from the field notes that I took during my seventh classroom observation indicates that:

> This is a little bit creepy – all of the resource periods I've seen are more or less interchangeable. Everybody's working on the same kind of math problems, the same kind of fill-in-the-blank science worksheets, the same kind of five-paragraph essay. It just seems odd, and it certainly seems uninspiring. I haven't seen anyone working on a homework assignment (outside of the math problems, I suppose) that requires any sort of critical thinking skills or creativity or originality. It's a little depressing (Field notes, 16 May, 2012).

Resource periods seemed to differ from a typical high-school study hall for non-ELs in only one substantial way. Namely, languages other than English were occasionally heard as students socialized with one another or the teacher, assisted one another with their assignments, or sought help from the teacher. There were also a number of subtle differences that distinguished the ubiquitous ESL Resource period from the typical study hall period.

One of these differences lay in the fact that the resource period "monitor," unlike her typical counterpart in a mainstream study hall, was a certified teacher, rather than an aide or paraprofessional. Another lay in the scope of duties performed by the teacher. While each participating teacher did, indeed, spend her time in this period helping students with assignments representing a variety of academic subjects, most of them also used this time to provide guidance counseling, tips on part-time employment, and general motherly advice. Diane, for example, discussed both scholarship applications and quinceanera plans with one of the young women enrolled in her 3$^{rd}$-hour resource period, while Amanda helped one of the young women in her 8$^{th}$-hour resource period line up a babysitting job. On the day of my observation, Kara spent a substantial portion of her resource period offering guidance counseling to one of the three students enrolled.

Sergio checked in with Kara at the beginning of the resource period and immediately disappeared to chat with the representative of a nearby technical college who was visiting Decameron High School that afternoon. Once he had gone, Kara told me that Sergio wanted to become an architect, but could not afford to attend college full time and hoped to find a program at the nearby technical college that would allow him to continue living and working part time in Decameron while he earned the credentials necessary to work in the construction or architectural design industry. While Kara did not indicate whether or not Sergio was eligible for federal financial aid, she did note that approximately one quarter of the ELs in the Decameron district lack the documentation necessary to qualify for financial assistance. Thus, college was an unrealistic goal for nearly twenty of the ELs enrolled in Decameron Junior High and High School during the 2011-2012 school year.

When Sergio returned from his visit with the tech-school representative, he placed a packet of slick admissions materials and a fat course catalog on the table between us and asked whether we thought he should enroll in the construction-site management program or the drafting program. He seemed completely unfazed by the prospect of discussing his post-graduation plans with me, a complete stranger. Indeed, he seemed eager to collect as much input from as many sources as possible. Kara helped him compare costs, course requirements, scheduling constraints, and the projected salaries of jobs that would be available to him as a result of having completed each program. As he asked questions and voiced concerns, Kara addressed those issues that she could, making a written list of those that she could not. At the end of the resource period, she told Sergio that he must insist on being given an appointment with Ms. Larson, the school guidance counselor, so that he could ask her about all of the questions and concerns on the list that Kara had made while they had talked. She handed him

this list and instructed him to let her know if he had trouble scheduling an appointment with Ms. Larson. After students had left the room, she confided in me that ELs at Decameron High School often had trouble obtaining the services they needed from the school's certified guidance counselors.

One final way in which the ESL resource periods that I observed differed from typical study hall periods for non-ELs lay in the sense of community evident in each classroom. While study hall periods generally evince little sense of camaraderie or solidarity, each of the ESL resource periods that I observed felt like a caring and trusting community characterized by respect for and pride in students' multilingualism and multiculturalism. Each resource period I observed offered a welcoming environment in which students felt comfortable using their native languages instead of or in addition to English and expressing their native cultures instead of or in addition to the mainstream American culture in which they were immersed throughout the remainder of the day. Students in Fanny's eighth-hour resource period at Alta Visa High School, for example, began each day with a five- to ten-minute language lesson.

Although this portion of the resource period had grown out of students' informal conversations at the beginning of the first semester of the 2011-2012 school year, it had become an institutionalized part of Fanny's class by the end of the second semester of that year. During this time students, with Fanny's encouragement and occasional input, taught each other non-English expressions or words relevant to events they had experienced throughout the course of the day. As one of the students was celebrating his 18th birthday on the day of my observation, the seven-minute language lesson focused on birthday greetings in various languages as well as birthday customs from students' home countries.

At St. George High School, Amanda's newcomer students frequently took opportunities throughout the course of both their tutorial periods and their ELD class to teach each other about their respective native languages and cultures. Amanda was pleased to note during our interview that "my lone Spanish-speaking EL is bound and determined to learn Albanian" (Amanda, Interview, 3 November, 2011). One of the Albanian speakers in her ELD course must likewise have been bound and determined to learn Spanish, as I heard him attempt once or twice during the class period that I observed to converse in Spanish with his Spanish/English bilingual classmate.

Participating teachers recognized that opportunities to socialize with colinguals or sympathetic English-speaking interlocutors were valuable to students. Amanda explained, for example, that "that's always a challenge, to not make [the ESL Tutorial period] a …hang-out-and-chat. Although there's some community building that's important as well, so I try to balance that" (Amanda, Interview, 3 November, 2011). Linda, meanwhile, noted that ELs who were not enrolled in her resource period frequently came to her room during her resource or administrative periods "for the comfort factor" (Linda, Interview, 10 November, 2011). While most students at Eldon High School sought permission to leave their mainstream classrooms, taking class assignments or exams to complete in Linda's room, it was not, apparently, uncommon for students to simply leave in the middle of a mainstream classroom where they felt uncomfortable, seeking refuge in Linda's room, instead. Diane, Fanny, and Shirley likewise recognized that their respective classrooms represented a space in which students could "be who they are" (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012) to a much greater extent than was possible in their mainstream classes.

Thus, while the ESL Resource periods at each site clearly served a valuable purpose in providing a safe emotional and social space for ELs, their academic value was questionable. Teachers themselves were discernibly frustrated by the ways in which the ESL resource model constrained their opportunities to teach ELs in meaningful and coherent ways. Amanda noted that she tried to structure her two ESL Tutorials in ways that helped students preview, practice, and review vocabulary items and grammatical structures relevant to specific aspects of their homework, but that she was unable to do this very often, as she generally did not know in advance what topics students were working on in their classes or what homework assignments they would bring with them to the tutorials. Additionally, the fact that non-ELs attended her eighth-hour tutorial indicated that school administrators and the general student body regarded this course as a study hall, not as a period dedicated to specialized language instruction.

Fanny, meanwhile, confided that she had hoped to structure her eighth-hour resource period as a writing class, since academic writing was a weak point for each of the nine students enrolled in it. Yet her attempts to establish writing instruction or activities as a regular element of this resource period had been consistently resisted by students, who pointed out that her course was not graded, while the mainstream academic classes for which they needed to complete homework were. In other words, students were, understandably, more worried about getting good grades in their mainstream academic classes than they were about using their study hall period to work on ungraded writing assignments.

Fanny respected her students' objections to structured writing lessons and activities, realizing that completed homework assignments held more immediate, practical value for a "typical teenager" (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012) than activities designed to improve a skill upon which students drew very little in completing the majority of those assignments. Students'

inability to perceive the long-term benefits of ungraded writing instruction and practice could perhaps be attributed not just to the behavior and attitudes of a "typical teenager" but also to the fact that many of the students in the Alta Vista district lacked, due to their immigration status, access to the financial aid programs that would have made college a realistic option for them. Fanny observed that students in this situation regarded high school as more of a chore than an intellectual challenge. Thus, while Fanny did plan structured writing activities for "down" days in her eighth-hour resource period and encouraged students to journal or engage in other writing activities as time permitted, students' individual homework assignments inevitably took precedence over writing instruction and practice. Fanny was clearly frustrated by the fact that she had no "window to work with [students], because even when I want to say, you know, let's do a writing activity today, … I can't, because they have homework to get done" (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

Shirley and Diane both expressed a good deal of frustration over the fact that their work with ELs lacked a concrete curriculum. Shirley felt that her district was to blame for the lack of a meaningful ESL curriculum at Westmoreland High School, noting that the allocation of time, funds, and teacher incentives consistently relegated the needs of ELs and their teachers to the bottom of the district's list of priorities. She remarked that, "They wouldn't approve extra summer hours for me to work on curriculum development for ESL classes, but they gave everyone time to come in and work on the school website. I mean, come on – the website?!" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

Unlike Shirley, Diane did not draw explicit connections between the district's priorities and the curricular shortcomings of the ESL program model available to students at Randolph High School. Nevertheless, she spoke at great length about the difficulties she had encountered

in convincing school board members that a six-month period of language support services was insufficient. When Diane began her work with the district, she was expected to provide one-on-one or small group tutoring with newcomer ELs for six months, after which students were placed in mainstream classes and no longer had access to language-support services of any kind.

Diane reported that she spent nearly one year trying to convince school board members that students were not ready to lose all language support because they had reached a reasonable level of comfort conversing in English. After having heard her speak numerous times at school board meetings about Jim Cummins' concepts of BICS, CALP, and the number of years presumably needed to acquire each, the school board reluctantly gave Diane permission to set aside one or two hours of her largely administrative day to provide language-support services for those adolescent ELs who were already able to function reasonably well in social settings and to cope with the language demands of daily classroom routines. In describing her difficulties with the school board, she seemed to suggest that the establishment of an ESL resource model, which placed demands on no one's time or resources but her own, may have been the path of least resistance, rather than the preferred course of action.

Participating teachers were not pleased with the fact that ESL resource periods consumed so much of the time available to them in their work with ELs. Their displeasure is not difficult to understand. Recall that the literature on effective language support program models for ELs, as reviewed in Chapter Two, regards ESL resource periods as one component in a comprehensive model of support, not a stand-alone model. Yet with few exceptions, the resource period was the only model of support available to ELs in participating teachers' schools.

The primary difficulty in relying solely on ESL resource periods as a model of support is that such periods function as homework help sessions, not instructional periods. Thus, it is

difficult, if not impossible, for teachers to create an environment characterized by either of those attributes of an effective language support program identified in Chapter Two. Namely, the unique structure and purpose of the ESL resource period effectively preclude the implementation either of combined language and content instruction or of practices that promote additive bilingualism. Nevertheless, all seven of the participating teachers who presided over resource periods made at least some effort to combine language and content instruction, typically in the form of one-on-one instruction that helped students learn to use strategies relevant to the type of text - such as a science textbook or a persuasive essay - that they must read or write for their respective homework assignments. Additionally, all but one teacher made some effort either to use students' native languages for purposes of socialization or academic assistance in the resource period or to encourage L1 use among students.

Thus, it seems that teachers realized not only that the ESL resource model was ineffective but also why it was ineffective. That is, teachers seemed to be aware of the fact that the ineffectiveness of the ESL resource model lay in its limited opportunities to engage in combined language and content instruction and to encourage translanguaging practices. Even so, participating teachers seemed resigned to work within the constraints of this ineffective model, perhaps because they lacked the authority or skills to implement or advocate for change in their respective schools; perhaps because they lacked knowledge of or skills to work within more effective models.

In light of the fact that ELs in the majority of participating sites were unable to access effective language-support programs, it is not surprising that they, as described in Chapter Three, consistently performed more poorly on traditional measures of academic success than their native-English-speaking peers. Nor is it surprising that they felt alienated from the overall

school culture. The support programs available to them, while administered by compassionate teachers who clearly cared about and enjoyed working with ELs, did little to help students achieve academic success or to identify as respected and capable members of a community of learners. Indeed, in segregating ELs for special help in special resource periods, the resource model, no matter how well intentioned its creation may have been, may have actually contributed to students' inability to identify positively with the larger school community. Under such circumstances of isolation, ELs in these or any schools are denied access to those relationships and identities recognized in the literature as key to student success.

While ESL resource periods constituted the majority of participating teachers' work with ELs, other language-support program models were represented in the study. That is, Ashley, Linda, and Shirley each had at least one opportunity to teach a sheltered content-area course, while Amanda had an opportunity to teach an ELD course, and Kara had an opportunity to offer native-language instruction in the form of a Spanish for Native Speakers course that complemented the English-medium literature and composition course required of all students at Decameron High School. Each of these exceptions to the ubiquitous resource period will be discussed in subsequent sections.

## ESL TEACHERS' QUALIFICATIONS AND KNOWLEDGE OF SECONDARY-LEVEL CONTENT

Although participating teachers may have recognized that the program models within which they worked lacked curricular cohesion and academic challenge, they also realized that their own qualifications and knowledge of core secondary-level content limited their ability to work within a more robust program model. Recall that, of the eight participating teachers, only one – Ashley - held dual certification in ESL and a core secondary-level subject. Ironically, she

was assigned not to a sheltered version of the science courses that she was qualified to teach, but to a sheltered English class. Ashley admitted that she was not entirely comfortable with this teaching assignment, commenting that the curricular focus on literature, rather than language skills

> was kind of new, because in ELL we don't, in college, in ELL classes it's not really focused on themes and plot development and character development. So that was new to me and I had to, um, well, I married an English teacher, so that helped! But [I didn't marry him] for that reason! And I've been working a lot with the English teachers here more and more because I'm trying to become more of an expert (Ashley, Interview, 17 October, 2011).

Kara likewise lacked confidence in her ability to carry out a part of her duties as the ESL teacher at Decameron High School. Of the two periods that she spent with ELs each day, one was an ESL Resource Period and the other was a Spanish for Native Speakers course. Bilingual students at Decameron High School – all of whom are native speakers of Spanish – enroll during a single semester in both the ESL English class and the Spanish for Native Speakers class, so that literacy skills practiced in one class can be reinforced and further developed in the other. Students receive credit for graduation from the English Department for their participation in the ESL English class and elective credit for their participation in the Spanish for Native Speakers class.

While Kara had been largely responsible for the implementation of this course, she admitted that she was not entirely comfortable teaching it. She pointed out that

> "I don't know how to teach English. I do have them do writing, and then I don't know how to grade it, or what to tell them to fix. … I try to get them good at spelling; I try to get them reading a lot; I try to get them to recognize formal and informal speech; um, and you know, with the writing I don't know what I'm doing. If I could have had a third minor in English!" (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012).

Kara's concerns about her lack of qualifications were exacerbated in the 2011-2012 school year by the fact that she was unable to co-teach or even engage in collaborative lesson

planning with the English teacher who instructs the complementary section of ESL English. In previous years, Kara and her colleague in the English Department had been able to plan their courses together, and Kara has even had the opportunity to co-teach the ESL English course, so that both courses truly complemented one another and the two teachers could work together to discuss assignments, assessments, learning goals, and teaching strategies. During the year in which this study was conducted, however, there was no room in Kara's schedule for such a high level of collaboration with her colleague in the English Department. Kara was thus left with little guidance beyond previous years' lesson plans in deciding how to teach writing, reading, and literary analysis skills, about which she knows little.

Participating teachers' lack of knowledge about core secondary-level academic subjects was evident within the context of their ESL Resource Periods, as well. During these periods, students inevitably request help with their math homework, which is problematic for most of the participating teachers. Diane and Shirley jokingly referred to themselves as self-taught "math experts," because each of them had, in an effort to increase their competence in helping students complete math homework, spent a good deal of time trying to learn more about the concepts and processes emphasized in their respective schools' math curricula. Shirley commented dryly, "I feel like I'm becoming a math teacher" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

Amanda, Diane, Kara, and Fanny all worried about their abilities to provide students with adequate support in completing homework assignments for math classes more advanced than pre-Algebra. Amanda stressed that she was not certified to teach math and didn't know how to help, while Diane and Kara both admitted to sending students who needed help with advanced math homework in search of a math teacher whose planning period coincided with their resource periods. Both women noted that ELs would typically not take the initiative to ask for help with

math homework from a math teacher and felt that their duties as ESL teachers included helping students develop a level of confidence in recognizing and advocating for their own learning needs. Meanwhile, Fanny referred math homework questions from her students to Martín, the paraprofessional who helped in her eighth-hour ESL Resource Period three afternoons per week. It is not clear what Martín's qualifications were as a math teacher or tutor, but Fanny assured me that "he's great with the math and science stuff; I leave that up to him" (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

Donna and Linda were the only two teachers who seemed comfortable providing both language and content instruction. Indeed, Donna was the only participating teacher whose preparation and certification areas actually qualified her to teach the middle-school sheltered ESL language arts and math classes assigned to her. Linda, as a 1-8 certified teacher, was likewise familiar with subject matter in all four core content areas, but was not qualified to teach any of them beyond the lower secondary level. She confided during her interview that her lack of certification to teach at the upper secondary level really didn't matter, as she geared much of her instruction to a fourth-grade level. Her decision to "water down" instruction to a fourth-grade level seemed to be consistent with the intentions of the district, which had intentionally hired elementary-certified teachers for work with high school students. Donna explained that

> What they were looking for was an elementary person actually to work with high school kids. They wanted an elementary person because elementary persons, uhm, you know how elementary people think differently than a high school person. A content-area person is content, content, content, where elementary can teach everything (Donna, Interview, 29 September, 2011).

Given participating teachers' lack of familiarity with secondary-level content, it is not surprising that they were unable to justify the creation and implementation of a sheltered content model of language support. It is also not surprising that those who already worked within such a

model were unable to approach language instruction in ways that combine knowledge of content with knowledge of the discourse-level structures and cultural conventions necessary to engage effectively with that content.

Teachers' lack of familiarity with core secondary-level content goes quite some way in explaining students' lack of success in school. Recall that, from a sociocultural perspective, school-based learning is a process of being apprenticed into appropriate school-based Discourses. Teachers who are unfamiliar with the Discourses in which students need or want to participate can do little to apprentice them into those Discourses effectively. Although teachers did not specifically refer to the concept of apprenticing students into appropriate Discourses, they clearly recognized that their lack of content knowledge stood in the way of effective instruction and went to great lengths (i.e. teaching themselves about the math curriculum, working with content-certified teachers to learn more about the subjects they were assigned to teach) to fill in the gaps in their knowledge.

Even so, these teachers' classrooms more closely approximated content-based language instruction (CBI) than true sheltered instruction (SI). Recall from Chapter Two that CBI classes are taught by ESL-certified teachers who build language-development lessons around texts and other materials used in the core content areas of math, science, social studies, and English. CBI teachers are not necessarily certified to teach the content areas around which they build their lessons, and may not, therefore, understand the conventions of any given academic discipline well enough to apprentice learners appropriately and effectively into its Discourse. With the exception of Donna, who was certified as both a 1-8 teacher and an ESL teacher, this was clearly the case in the present study.

SI or SDAIE classes, on the other hand, are taught by content-certified teachers who build language support and instruction into the study of the standard curriculum for their respective subjects. Since these teachers bring with them a thorough understanding of the subject matter they teach, they are in a better position than ESL teachers in a CBI classroom to effectively and appropriately apprentice learners into the Discourses of their respective subjects. As noted above, Donna was the only one of the eight participating teachers who was properly prepared and certified to teach both ESL and the subjects that she had been assigned to teach in her sheltered courses. Yet even she was unable to provide the type of instruction that could have apprenticed students effectively and appropriately into the Discourses of either middle school English or middle school math, as she spent the majority of her time in each day's sheltered content classes working on basic literacy skills with a newcomer. While the CBI approach prevalent in some participating teachers' classes is certainly more effective than the ESL resource period available to most of the students in participating schools, it is considered to be less effective in promoting academic success than true sheltered instruction.

**INSTRUCTIONAL APPROACHES**

When the work of a language teacher is evaluated using criteria drawn from the cognitive framework of SLA described in Chapter Two, seven of the eight participating teachers meet the criteria of excellent language teachers. Six of the teachers held foreign-language certification, and four of them had worked or continued to work as foreign language teachers. Amanda, Shirley, and Fanny each observed that one of her strengths in working with ELs lay in her love of languages and language teaching. This was evident in the skill that each of them exhibited when scaffolding content or communication to ensure that it was accessible, when explaining grammatical features of English in ways that made sense to students, and when teaching students

how to use reading, writing, and vocabulary acquisition strategies that draw upon knowledge of both the native and the target language. My observation of teachers' one-on-one work with individual students and, in rare cases, with the entire class, revealed that these attributes of a good language teacher were shared by most participating teachers. Additionally, participating teachers exhibited a good deal of knowledge about both the structure and phonology of English and, in some cases, of the student's native language.

In spite of their obvious skill as language teachers, those participating teachers whose schedules allowed them the opportunity to combine language instruction with academic content instruction had a good deal of difficulty doing so. Linda's sheltered English class, for example, was dominated by a lesson on English morphology. The night before, students had been assigned to read the first segment of a short fable borrowed from Chamot and O'Malley's (1994) *CALLA Handbook.* As they read, students were to highlight all of the words they could find that contained prefixes, suffixes, or both. During class, Linda walked students through the fable line by line, calling on volunteers to identify the words in each line that they had highlighted and discussing how the affixes connected to each word changed the meaning of that word. Her students remained remarkably engaged with and participated enthusiastically in this activity for its entire duration. My field notes observe that

> from a linguistic perspective and a strategies-instruction perspective, this is a really good exercise. Students are getting lots of good practice identifying various morphological features of the English language and seem to understand how they can use those features as a strategy for dealing with unfamiliar vocabulary (field notes, 25 April, 2012, Eldon High School.)

This emphasis on morpheme- or word-level language was likewise a central focus of Linda's 2nd-hour sheltered social studies class. The day's lesson was essentially a review of the vocabulary needed to work on students' upcoming projects, in which they would record a two-

minute newscast reporting on the details of a selected event or series of events that happened during WWII. The lesson also introduced students to the technology that they must use in recording these newscasts. That is, Linda's eleven students, working in three small groups, were required to use an iPad to scan OCR codes printed on 8.5 x 11 sheets of paper scattered throughout various parts of the room. When scanned, each code revealed a picture of a person, object, or event relevant to WWII. Students must use the "record" function of the iPad – the same function that they would use in recording their newscasts – to capture the revealed photo and take it back to their group mates. Group members must then work together to match each picture with the appropriate vocabulary word on a worksheet that had been distributed at the beginning of class. After students had identified each vocabulary item and shared their responses with the large group, the class engaged in a lively Q and A and discussion session with Linda regarding those vocabulary items, concepts, and events that were unfamiliar.

In many ways, Linda's classes appeared to be models of successful sheltered instruction: students were highly engaged with accessible content; students were able to participate using the target language; students learned both content and the language necessary to interact with that content. Yet the language goals of both classes were limited to morpheme-, word- or sentence-level learning goals. These are clearly admirable goals in a traditional foreign language classroom, where instruction focuses on the acquisition of structural and lexical knowledge of the target language. Yet in an ideal sheltered content setting, the goal of instruction should be to help students develop academic content knowledge as well as the discourse-level language knowledge and skills that enable them to engage authentically and extensively with that content. Vocabulary acquisition and an understanding of morphology are certainly important steps in the process of learning to use language in authentic academic ways, but they are not sufficient.

Subsequent lessons in Linda's classes may have taken students beyond morpheme-, word-, and sentence-level understandings of the language of literature and the language of social studies, but on this particular day, it was clear that Linda's instruction was not designed to help students acquire the larger discourse-level features of academic language.

The inability to implement authentic discourse-level language instruction was identified by Kara as one of her chief weaknesses in working effectively with the ELs at Decameron High School. Her Spanish for Native Speakers course, as described above, was designed to help students develop good academic literacy skills in their native language. Kara had lobbied for the creation of this course when she realized that

> … they [the guidance counselors] would just assign the native speakers to any old Spanish class that fit their schedule.
>
> Lori: Like Spanish I?
>
> Kara: [laughs] Yeah, yeah! And so I've gotten most of that taken care of. And it was really awful because the other kids felt intimidated, and the native speakers were bored and naughty (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012).

While Kara was understandably proud of her accomplishment in having advocated for and successfully implemented this much needed course, she felt that the course did not fully meet students' language-learning needs. As noted above, Kara was uncomfortable in her role as a teacher of reading, writing, and literature, having received no preparation to teach in these areas. Furthermore, while she was an active participant in cultural events sponsored by the Latino community in Decameron and had made an effort to educate herself about the region of northern Mexico from which all but two of her students' families had immigrated, she admitted that she lacked the cultural knowledge necessary to "act like a teacher in Mexico" (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012).

Thus, it is unlikely that she is familiar with or able to familiarize her students with the types of literacy or literary discourses used in Mexican high schools. Moreover, she is not entirely comfortable with her own level of proficiency in Spanish and tends, therefore, to focus on the grammatical and orthographic elements of language that she can teach with confidence. In addressing this issue, she commented

> …if I'm going to teach native speakers, I need to be better at Spanish than those students, which I'm not, really. I am in some areas, and they're better than me in other areas so that, you know, every year I need to convince them that they should trust me as a Spanish teacher, because, you know, I do know how to spell, and I do know grammar, and they don't (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012).

While Kara's course is clearly beneficial in promoting students' general literacy skills, it is unlikely, given Kara's own lack of confidence in her Spanish-language skills and her inability to "act like a teacher in Mexico," that students in this course have access to truly authentic Spanish-language literacy or literary Discourses, as those Discourses are used either in students' shared country of origin or in language and literature departments in U.S. post-secondary institutions. Likewise, as discussed in the previous section, Kara is unable to apprentice students into authentic English-language literacy and literary Discourses, as she was not prepared to work as an English teacher. Thus, students may learn valuable strategies for coping with general literacy tasks and may enhance their knowledge of standard Spanish grammatical and orthographic conventions in Kara's class, but it is unlikely that they are fully apprenticed into established secondary-level school-based Discourses of literacy and literature.

In this section, as in the previous section, we are reminded that teachers were unable to apprentice students effectively and appropriately into school-based Discourses. In the previous section, it was clear that teachers' lack of content knowledge prevented them from creating authentic classroom Discourses that enable students to adopt and adapt such Discourses for their

own use. In this section, it is clear that teachers' instructional approaches further limited students' access to authentic school-based Discourses by focusing on discrete elements of language, rather than overarching Discourse features. What remains unclear is the extent to which teachers' lack of content knowledge and teachers' inability to focus instruction on Discourse-level language are related.

It is possible that teachers' choice of instructional approaches was constrained entirely by their limited knowledge of core secondary-level content. Without such knowledge, it is indeed difficult to create learning environments that enable students to apprentice gradually into an authentic Discourse of literature or history or science or math. Teachers who lack academic content knowledge, but possess knowledge of language as content are likely to create lessons that focus on discrete elements of language, rather than Discourse-level features of language, as it is used within a specific academic discipline.

Yet it also possible that teachers' choice of instructional approaches was constrained entirely or in part by the beliefs about language acquisition and pedagogy as well as the teaching methods to which they were exposed in their preparation programs. A preparation program built solely upon the cognitive strand of research in SLA, as described in Chapter Two, would encourage teachers to regard language as an object that can be disconnected from its contexts of use and studied as a series of discrete grammatical rules or lexical items, with the end goal of study being the acquisition of a complete, or native-like set of grammatical rules and lexical items that can then (and only then) be used in exploring academic content. Such a view would simultaneously encourage the implementation of instruction that focuses on discrete language forms while discouraging the implementation of instruction that invites students to use their L2

skills, no matter how limited, to participate, no matter how peripherally, in authentic Discourses of literature, composition, mathematics, history, etc.

Meanwhile, a preparation program built upon the sociocultural strand of research in SLA, as described in Chapter Two, would encourage teachers to regard language as a pool of meaning-making and –expressing resources that is intimately connected to contexts of use. Given the inextricable connections between language and context, language must be studied in context, with the end goal of study being the ability to participate fully in authentic Discourses of various school-based communities. Such a view would encourage the implementation of instruction that enables students to develop their L2 skills while moving through the stages of apprenticeship from legitimate peripheral participation to full participation in the Discourses of secondary-level literature, composition, mathematics, history, etc.

As will be discussed in the following chapter, the data suggests that each of the eight participating teachers attended a preparation program built upon the beliefs and assumptions embedded within the cognitive strand of SLA. Nevertheless, it is difficult to know whether teachers' inability to implement more effective pedagogical approaches was most strongly influenced by their lack of content-area knowledge, by the philosophical orientations of their preparation programs, by a combination of both factors, or by other factors that did not become apparent throughout the course of this study. Regardless of the reasons that lie behind teachers' inability to implement pedagogical approaches that focus on Discourse-level language instruction, rather than isolated features of language, the fact remains that they were unable to do so. Thus, students in participating sites were consistently denied access to and opportunities to engage with authentic school-based Discourses.

## TEACHERS' IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIVE LANGUAGE SUPPORT

Participating teachers' understandings of whether and how to incorporate students' native languages into classroom instruction can be loosely divided into the following four categories:

1) Students' L1 knowledge serves as a vehicle for learning content or managing the learning task
2) Students' L1 knowledge is a vital part not only of students' identities but also of their intellectual development
3) Teacher's use of L1 serves as a vehicle for classroom management
4) Students' L1s function as an obstacle to L2 acquisition.

### STUDENTS' L1 KNOWLEDGE AND CONTENT

The majority of participating teachers clearly viewed students' L1 knowledge as a valuable vehicle for learning content. As noted above, Fanny encouraged the use of multiple languages in her classroom with the result that students enrolled in her resource period frequently used a shared L1 to help clarify homework concepts for one another. Spanish-speaking students likewise used their native language on occasion to request help from Fanny or Martín. During the period that I observed, Fanny spent much of her time helping Teresa, an 11$^{th}$-grader, brainstorm ideas and outline a draft for an essay she was required to write in her English class. Her work with this student demonstrated Fanny's skill not just in recognizing when L1 clarification would be desirable to facilitate comprehension or communication but also in helping students develop and apply effective writing strategies that draw upon their knowledge of both the native and the target language.

Shirley and Diane were likewise adept at conversing bilingually with students, effortlessly weaving together Spanish and English, as the context and student's perceived level

of comprehension seemed to merit. A typical exchange between Diane and the students enrolled in her resource periods looked like this:

> Student [pointing to his textbook]: Señora, what's this word?
> Diane: Pahoehoe.
> Student: Qué?
> Diane: It's a type of lava. Pa- [gestures that student should repeat]
> Student: Pa
> Diane: hoe – ee
> Student [laughing]: hoe – ee
> Diane: hoe – ee
> Student: hoe – ee.
> Diane: Pahoehoe.
> Student: Pahoehoe.
> Diane: Right.
>
> The conversation is moving into Spanish, so I'm not 100% certain what's going on. Diane and student both point to pieces of the text as they talk. OK – Diane is reading from the text now, so I can follow along again. She's showing the student how he can use a variety of text clues to guess the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary. She also models for him what's going through her head when she reads a science text: what questions she asks herself; how she summarizes the concepts; how she uses text layout to provide clues about meaning. They're speaking bilingually, so I'm not understanding the entire conversation, but it's pretty obvious that Diane has good, solid advice about reading strategies; that she is making her point clearly; and that she enjoys a comfortable and respectful relationship with this particular student, as she seems to with all of her students (Field notes, 4 October, 2011).

While Amanda was unable to rely on knowledge of the L1 spoken by the majority of students enrolled in her ESL class during the fall 2011 semester, she clearly valued the use of students' native languages as a vehicle for understanding content. Students' work with new vocabulary, much of which adorned the walls of her room in the form of cleverly illustrated posters, always paired the new English word with an L1 equivalent. In light of the fact that her students did not share a common L1, vocabulary posters, class-generated word lists, and even individual vocabulary journals were a multilingual effort, containing entries in Albanian, English, and Spanish. Amanda spoke at some length about the benefits of multilingual vocabulary instruction, noting, among other issues, that such an approach to vocabulary

instruction often served to expand students' vocabulary in their native languages as well as in English. Thus, while students' L1 served primarily as a vehicle for content acquisition in Amanda's classroom, it seems that Amanda, much like Fanny and Kara, recognized the value of additive bilingualism.

## STUDENTS' L1, IDENTITY, AND INTELLECTUAL DEVELOPMENT

Although Kara did not explicitly use the term "additive bilingualism," she clearly recognized the value of this perspective on bilingualism. Her respect for the concept of additive bilingualism may have stemmed from the research project that she had just completed as part of the requirements of an online Master's in Foreign Language Teaching program in which she was enrolled. In her research, she had investigated the literacy development of her own Spanish/English bilingual students and had concluded that those students who had received early literacy instruction in Spanish before leaving Mexico felt more confident in their literacy skills and performed better on standardized tests of L2 reading and writing than their peers who had not received early literacy instruction in their native language. Moreover, those students who had continued to develop their L1 literacy skills through at-home reading in the native language outperformed all other study participants, both in terms of their confidence and their scores on standardized tests. For this reason, Kara is strongly committed to providing the ELs at Decameron High School with as many opportunities to read and write in Spanish as possible.

Fanny also described a system of beliefs about bilingualism consistent with the concept of additive bilingualism. Her comments, perhaps inspired by her own experience as a multilingual immigrant, focused on the importance of one's native language in establishing a positive identity and sense of belonging. It is worth quoting at length from her interview:

> It's just, uh, I think they feel more comfortable [in my classroom, where they can speak Spanish], because they can be who they are. Because I get a feeling that out there, you

> know, after the, beyond that door, they get targeted or they get certain - and that people just look at them as the, you know problems. But I say you guys are wonderful; you guys are bilingual, and that's amazing. So, yeah, and we are a bilingual classroom in here; let's use the different languages and cultures we have; you know, I embrace that, you know I wanna encourage them to, and for their parents, too. I mean, when parents know that I'm here, they call me, they feel comfortable coming to school and participating in our school (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

Shirley was likewise aware of the positive effects of additive bilingualism on students' sense of identity and belonging. She values her ability to converse with Spanish-speaking parents and students in their native language and relies upon this ability in socializing with parents or students, in clarifying academic content or procedural details, or in describing student progress or school policies to parents. Although she freely and frequently uses the L1 of her Spanish-speaking students, she did not comment directly on her beliefs about the use of students' L1 in the classroom. Nevertheless, her comments about the overall school and district climate revealed strong disapproval of an environment that encourages subtractive, rather than additive, bilingualism.

She spoke at great length about the challenges faced by ELs in trying to "fit in with the white kids," (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012), noting that they wouldn't use their native languages or, in the case of a young Muslim woman, wear traditional dress for fear that other students would make fun of them or that teachers would not like them. Above all, she reported that ELs at Westmoreland High School had never fully recovered from the emotional blow of having been told by a district administrator that they were not allowed to use their native languages for any purposes at school. Shirley explained that she and the other ESL teachers in the district had protested this mandate vehemently, with the result that it was quickly withdrawn. Nevertheless, she realized that, for students, "the damage had been done" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

While participating teachers did not all express such a high level of regard for the concept of additive bilingualism, they did, for the most part, hold positive attitudes about the use of students' native languages and find ways to encourage the use of those languages in the classroom. Nevertheless, three participating teachers expressed somewhat negative attitudes about the use of students' native languages or incorporated the use of those languages into classroom instruction in negative ways.

**STUDENTS' L1 AND CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT**

Of all of the participating teachers, Ashley seemed to be the least sure of what she believed about the role that students' L1 should play in instruction. During her interview, she spoke about encouraging her colleagues in mainstream classrooms to allow ELs with very low levels of proficiency to conduct research or write papers in Spanish. She even volunteers to grade students' L1 work and is occasionally called upon to provide this service. She seemed pleased with colleagues who chose this accommodation for ELs, noting that it was a good way not only to keep students from falling behind in content knowledge but also to make them feel comfortable in school. Nevertheless, she also respected the concerns of colleagues who "sometimes feel that the students are, shouldn't, they shouldn't be getting accommodations or so much help because of their [the teachers'] work ethic. They feel like we're enabling them [the students]" (Ashley, Interview, 17 October, 2011). When colleagues voiced concerns such as these, Ashley chose not to educate them about the benefits of bilingualism or the importance of providing scaffolding; rather, she "make[s] sure that they [the teachers] understand that we are required to offer these supports" (Ashley, Interview 17 October, 2011).

Her ambivalent stance on the use of students' L1 manifested itself in her own classroom, where I observed her using students' L1 primarily for the purpose of directing students'

behavior. When students were off-task, for example, she used Spanish to call their attention back to their work. When students pled with her in Spanish not to enforce school policy by writing them detention slips for tardiness, she countered their pleas in Spanish. Yet when the same students used Spanish to ask clarifying questions in class or to exchange small talk with her at the end of class, she responded in English. Her single attempt to draw on students' L1 knowledge as an instructional tool was met with confusion and was quickly abandoned. That is, when students were unable to recall the name of one of the characters (Sixto) in Pam Muñoz Ryan's *Esperanza Rising,* Ashley prompted their memory by saying,

> Ashley: Remember? It's like a number? *Seis?* [long pause, during which students are silent and seem to be confused] *Seis*….six? Remember?
>
> Two female students, more or less in unison: Oh, Sixto!
>
> Ashley: Right!
>
> (Field notes, 1 November, 2011).

Admittedly, her use of Spanish in this instance was marginal and may or may not be typical of the ways in which she generally uses students' L1 in the classroom. Nevertheless, this example represents the only occasion during my visit on which students' L1 was used for a purpose that could be classified as instructional.

My interview notes observe that Ashley was visibly nervous discussing the use of students' L1 in general as well as her colleagues' specific feelings about the use of students' L1 in the classroom. Meanwhile, the field notes that I took during my observation note that she seemed "overwhelmed by her duties in this particular course and probably needs a little time and guidance to figure out how on earth she's supposed to incorporate language goals, content goals, bilingualism, and classroom management into one tiny little class period each day" (field notes, 1 November, 2011). Thus, Ashley's choices governing the use of students' L1 in the classroom

seemed to result from her relative lack of experience and general discomfort in having been assigned to a course that was, by her own admission, difficult for her to teach. Likewise, her reluctance to take a strong public stance either in favor of or in opposition to the use of students' L1 in the classroom likely stems from her relative lack of both teaching experience and school status. On the other hand, Linda's choices governing the use of students' L1 in the classroom seem to be the result of clearly defined beliefs about the language acquisition process.

**STUDENTS' L1 AND L2 ACQUISITION**

Of all the teachers I observed, Linda was the only one who displayed an ENGLISH ONLY sign on the wall of her classroom. Indeed, when asked what resources she wished were available to her in working more effectively with ELs, she jokingly replied "a bigger English Only sign. One with blinking lights around it." (Linda, Interview, 10 November, 2011). Linda acknowledged that she wasn't actually opposed to the idea of students using their native languages; rather, she wanted to ensure that they had sufficient time to practice their English.

> I don't care if you want to use Somali – when you're in the hallway: speak Somali! When you're at lunch: speak Somali! But when you're in here: speak English! Practice! It's forty-five minutes. All I'm asking for is FORTY-FIVE minutes, that you practice. Is that too much? (Linda, Interview, 10 November, 2011).

Although Linda relaxed her English Only policy during her resource period, the sign remained on the wall and students enrolled in this period rarely used a shared native language, as they had in all other resource periods I had observed. Ironically, the English Only sign did little to prevent a group of young women in Linda's second-hour sheltered social studies class from using their native language to clarify content. Instead of trying to use English to clear up their confusion, these three young women simply whispered very quietly in Somali, casting nervous glances occasionally towards the front of the room, where Linda worked with another group. Once they had clarified their confusion, they consulted in English with their remaining group

member, a young Korean/English bilingual woman, who confirmed that her understanding of the content was the same as theirs.

Donna, who had worked closely with Linda at Eldon High School during the peak immigration years of 2007-2009, echoed Linda's concerns that a reliance on students' L1 might interfere with their ability or willingness to practice English. In describing the supports available to Filsan, a newcomer who had arrived at the beginning of the 2011-2012 school year, Donna explained that Joe, a Somali/English interpreter, would accompany Filsan to each of her classes for a time, so that he could provide simultaneous translation. Donna was responsible for determining when to end Joe's services and was clearly uncomfortable with this responsibility. She worried about taking away the support too soon; yet at the same time, she was afraid that Filsan would start to use Joe as a "crutch," if he accompanied her for too long. Thus, while Donna indicated in her interview that she was generally supportive of bilingual education and regretted that it was impossible to provide such a model in a small district that hosted immigrant communities from multiple language backgrounds, it seemed that she, like Linda, worried about students' use of their native languages interfering with their opportunity and motivation to learn English.

In this section, we have seen that the majority of participating teachers held positive beliefs about the use of students' L1 in the classroom, and that many even found positive ways to incorporate students' native languages into their resource periods or classroom instruction. Indeed, three participating teachers (Kara, Fanny, and Shirley) expressed views that revealed a strong preference for school environments in which additive bilingualism is promoted, while two others (Amanda and Diane) were clearly aware of the value of using students' native languages as a resource for both language and content learning. These teachers' attitudes about and

approaches to the use of students' native languages are consistent with those of Valenzuela (1997, 1999) and García (2009), who have argued that a student's success in school is contingent upon his or her ability to access the full range not just of linguistic resources but also of cultural and social resources at his or her disposal.

According to this view, multilingual students are denied access to a substantial portion of the resources they possess when schools "subtract" students' native languages, cultures, and identities through the imposition of monolingual, monocultural curricular choices and school policies. On the other hand, when school policies and curricular choices encourage translanguaging and the expression of multicultural identities, students enjoy unrestricted access to the full range of resources available to them in navigating the worlds of school, home, work, and society.

Most participating teachers made a valiant effort to encourage translanguaging practices in their classrooms, thereby increasing ELs' access to the full range of linguistic resources they bring with them to school. Regrettably, these teachers' positive attitudes about and efforts to encourage translanguaging seem to have had very little effect on ELs' school achievement or sense of belonging. It is possible that teachers' efforts to promote additive bilingualism in their classrooms were simply insignificant in the face of a larger school climate that overwhelmingly favored monolingualism. While I was unable to spend enough time at each participating site to verify that school climates favored monolingualism, teachers' comments consistently revealed a sense of frustration at the lack of respect or even tolerance for linguistic and cultural diversity prevalent in their schools. Moreover, a visit to the website of each school confirms that linguistic and cultural diversity do not feature prominently in the structure, curriculum, lunch

menu options, extracurricular activities, or other everyday practices of any of the eight participating schools.

Even those three teachers who did not exhibit strong support for additive bilingualism realized that their respective school climates were not receptive to linguistic and cultural diversity. In Ashley's case, the lack of positive school-wide conceptions about cultural and linguistic diversity may have contributed at least in part to her ambivalent beliefs about the value of using students' L1 in the classroom. Given her relative lack of teaching experience and her status among colleagues as a relative newcomer, she may have simply been reluctant to challenge the prevailing preference for monolingualism with clearly articulated beliefs about the benefits of additive bilingualism or classroom practices that encourage translanguaging. Linda's and Donna's beliefs about the use of students' native languages, on the other hand, seemed to be rooted firmly in an understanding of language acquisition and pedagogy informed by scholarship drawn from the cognitive strand of SLA.

Recall that, from this perspective, language is a fixed object whose rules must be fully mastered before learners can use language to engage in meaningful and authentic ways with academic content. Furthermore, language is acquired through a subconscious process of absorbing and analyzing language input in one's environment. Additionally, the learner's native language is regarded as an entity that can – and does - interfere with L2 acquisition. Thus, effective language pedagogy consists of ensuring that students have adequate access to L2 input, reduced opportunities for L1 interference, and carefully controlled opportunities for L2 interaction that focus students' attention on pertinent language forms or lexical items. Given these understandings about the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy, it is only natural that teachers would exhibit a "time-on-task" attitude about native vs. second

language-use in the classroom, worrying, as did Donna and Linda, that students might use the L1 as a "crutch" for too long, or that they would have insufficient time to practice English, if they used the L1 during class time.

## CONCLUSION

The four themes explored in this chapter plainly illustrate that ESL services at each participating site lacked those two characteristics of effective language-support program models outlined in the literature review. That is, ESL programs in participating sites were characterized neither by effective and academically challenging language and content instruction nor by a climate that promotes additive bilingualism. Participating teachers, as detailed above, were clearly unable to provide the former characteristic of effective instruction for ELs. As regards the latter characteristic, the majority of teachers made seemingly sincere efforts to promote additive bilingualism within the confines of their own classrooms. Nevertheless, these efforts seem to have had little effect on students' academic performance or sense of belonging outside of the ESL classroom. Namely, ELs in each participating school, as described in Chapter Three, consistently fare worse, as a group, than their non-EL peers on a variety of traditional measures of school success, such as graduation rates, reading and mathematics achievement scores, and readiness for post-secondary education. Additionally, teachers' depictions of ELs as isolated from the larger school community, likewise described in Chapter Three, suggest that ELs are not able to establish positive identities as learners. Such outcomes indicate that school practices in all eight participating sites did, indeed, deny ELs access not only to those school-based Discourses that students must adopt if they are to succeed in school but also to the full range of linguistic, social, and cultural resources upon which students must be allowed to draw in navigating school and society.

ESL teachers certainly cannot bear sole responsibility for improving ELs' schooling experience and academic achievement. If this were the case, participating teachers' efforts to encourage translanguaging practices in an environment that respects and promotes linguistic diversity would surely have resulted in a perceptible increase in student achievement, student satisfaction, or both. Nevertheless, ESL teachers can contribute substantially to ELs' academic success and overall satisfaction with school. To do so, teachers must be able to fulfill two key roles in their schools, neither of which participating teachers seem to have been equipped by their preparation programs to undertake successfully. These roles are detailed below.

1) the role of language expert *and* content expert, and

2) the role of advocate

**ESL TEACHERS AS LANGUAGE AND CONTENT EXPERTS**

As has been repeatedly demonstrated, participating teachers were not equipped to fulfill this role. Only Donna was properly prepared and certified to teach both ESL and middle school science and English. However, it is difficult to gauge the extent to which her expertise in both language and content informed her instruction, as her sheltered content courses during the semester of my observation were, in order to accommodate the unique needs of an underschooled newcomer, structured more like resource periods than sheltered content courses. Linda likewise possessed 1-8 certification and was, therefore, qualified to teach each of the core content areas of math, science, social studies, and English through the eighth grade. However, her expertise in these areas was not sufficient to inform her work as a social studies or English teacher at the upper secondary level. She compensated for this lack of knowledge by simply gearing her instruction to a fourth-grade level, which, in her opinion, accurately reflected the abilities of her students, most of whom had not attended school as young children.

Teacher preparation programs could clearly take a stand in remedying teachers' inability to act as content experts. In requiring that secondary-level ESL teachers hold or be eligible to hold certification in a core secondary-level content area, preparation programs would ensure that ESL teachers enter the profession with the skills and knowledge needed to apprentice ELs effectively and appropriately into the Discourse of their respective subject areas. To be sure, this practice will not prevent schools from assigning ESL teachers to courses that they are not qualified to teach, as was Ashley's experience at Waubunsee High School. Nevertheless, preparation programs can set an important precedent by requiring that secondary-level ESL teachers hold credentials as experts of both language and content. The result of such a requirement would be twofold. First, the number of qualified content and language teachers would increase, thereby making it easier for schools to hire qualified teachers and assign them to appropriate courses. Second, and perhaps more important, schools of education would send a strong message to teachers and administrators about the importance of studying language in context, rather than attempting to isolate language as a distinct subject whose study is to be overseen by a language expert. Armed with such an understanding of the nature of language acquisition, use, and pedagogy, school administrators may think more carefully about the qualifications of teachers assigned to work with ELs in sheltered content courses.

**ESL TEACHERS AS ADVOCATES**

Diane's attempts to advocate for a more effective language-support program model were described above; other teachers' attempts to do the same will be detailed in the following chapter. For the purposes of the present discussion, it is sufficient to note that teachers' efforts to advocate for effective programming met with varying levels of success, which seemed to be determined more by chance or by personal qualities of the teacher than by her possession of

effective advocacy skills and knowledge. As we have seen in Diane's case, her relationship with the school board members worked as a more effective advocacy tool than any skills or knowledge that she brought with her from her preparation program.

The difficulties that teachers encountered in advocating successfully for the implementation of effective program models may have been caused at least in part by their lack of theoretical understandings and proper nomenclature. Only two participating teachers seemed to be familiar with the terminology used to describe various models of language support. Participating teacher educators, meanwhile, were presumably familiar with such terminology, but refrained, by and large, from using it during their interviews. While all four participating teacher educators did express a preference for bilingual education, they did not discuss the characteristics of effective bilingual program models. Indeed, neither participating teachers nor participating teacher educators explicitly referred to concepts such as combined language and content instruction, subtractive bilingualism, additive bilingualism, or translanguaging.

Moreover, participating teachers' beliefs about the benefits of additive bilingualism seemed, by and large, to be shaped more by personal experiences as language learners or cultural outsiders than by theoretical knowledge. Amanda and Kara are the only participating teachers who explicitly indicated that their beliefs about the benefits of additive bilingualism were grounded in theory. In Kara's case, this theoretical knowledge was derived not only from her own research project on students' bilingual literacy practices but also from the literature review that she conducted prior to embarking upon her study. Jim Cummins' concept of common underlying proficiency[3] featured prominently both in Kara's literature review and in Amanda's

[3] The concept of Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) is a component of Cummins' linguistic interdependence hypothesis, which posits that multilinguals draw upon the same pool of linguistic knowledge whether they are using the L1 or the L5. In other words, linguistic skills or knowledge such as the ability to read or to understand that a single utterance may express a range of meanings transfer directly

stated beliefs about the benefits of additive bilingualism. Meanwhile, Shirley, Fanny, and Diane seemed to understand that it is problematic – or perhaps even unethical – to deny students access to their L1 resources, but were unable to articulate exactly why this practice is problematic or even unethical. All three women had experienced life as a linguistic or cultural outsider and seemed to draw upon the emotional distress that had characterized these experiences, rather than knowledge of the literature, in justifying their support for additive bilingualism.

Given teachers' apparent lack of familiarity not only with the theoretical underpinnings of concepts such as translanguaging or additive bilingualism but also with the practical daily workings of various language-support program models, it is not surprising that participating teachers were unable to act as successful advocates for effective language-support programming. Without an understanding of the structure and details of various language-support program models, it is difficult to argue convincingly for the relative strengths and weaknesses of one program over another, let alone to propose an acceptable program implementation plan. It is likewise difficult to argue convincingly for the implementation of school-wide practices that promote additive bilingualism, when one can argue only from the strength of one's personal experiences or opinions. An understanding of the concepts of additive bilingualism, subtractive bilingualism, and translanguaging would likely have gone far in helping practicing teachers explain to skeptical monolingual colleagues why it is important to encourage multilingualism at school.

---

from the language in which they were learned to all subsequent languages that a learner may acquire. This process of transfer facilitates the learner's ability to perform linguistic tasks across multiple unfamiliar languages. Language skills or knowledge are typically acquired with most confidence in a learner's first or native language and transferred to all subsequent languages learned. It is, thus, logical to assume that the development of students' native languages will facilitate the development of their second (or subsequent) languages. See Cummins 1981a, 1981b, and 2000 for more information.

It seems, then, that participating teachers' preparation programs may have sent teachers into the field inadequately prepared to fulfill their roles not only as language and content experts but also as advocates. The discussion in the following chapter will shed light on the ways in which teachers' preparation programs may have limited teachers' opportunities to develop those skills and knowledge that would have allowed them to take up these two important roles with a greater degree of success and confidence.

# Chapter Five

## The Professional Preparation of ESL Teachers

As described in the previous chapter, four themes emerged consistently from the observations and interviews conducted with participating teachers. These themes are as follows: 1) program models substantially constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs in each participating teacher's school; 2) ESL teachers' qualifications and knowledge of core secondary-level content played a role in precluding not only the establishment of more effective ESL program models but also the implementation of more effective instructional approaches; 3) instructional approaches constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs; and 4) teachers were uncertain whether and how they should incorporate the use of students' native languages into classroom instruction.

These themes consistently intersect with two program characteristics shared by all four participating teacher preparation programs. The two program characteristics are as follows: 1) The structure of each teacher preparation program allows teacher candidates to graduate with a limited knowledge of core secondary-level content; and 2) The philosophy or structure of each teacher preparation program reflects underlying assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will teach. Both of these characteristics will be explored further below, followed by a discussion of the ways in which these two characteristics of teachers' preparation programs intersect with the four themes detailed in the previous chapter.

### THE STRUCTURE OF TEACHER PREPARATION PROGRAMS

A visit to the website of each institution represented in this study reveals that no institution requires candidates for ESL certification to hold, pursue, or be eligible for certification in a core secondary-level content area. Andrews University and Lake State

University both offer ESL certification as an initial license that need not be linked to any other teaching license. Teachers who hold this type of ESL license can be regarded as experts on the content of the English language itself – its phonology, syntax, morphology, semantics, pragmatics, and possibly history – but do not need to possess enough expertise in any core content area to understand or effectively teach students to understand and use the discourse-level language features of that discipline. This emphasis on language as a subject that can be studied apart from its contexts of use aligns neatly with a traditional cognitive perspective of SLA, but does little to acknowledge the important understandings brought to the field by the sociocultural perspective.

In failing to require that ESL teacher candidates hold or be eligible to hold certification in a core secondary-level content area, both of these programs send many teachers into the field prepared only to work in ESL pull-out, push-in, or resource models. Even push-in or resource models may present difficulties for ESL teachers at the secondary level who lack content-area certification. Recall, for example, that over half of participating teachers expressed doubts about their ability to assist students effectively with math assignments during their resource periods.

River State University and Glacier State University as well as Linda's alma mater of Cliff State University, which is not officially represented in this study, require that teacher candidates link their ESL certification to an initial license. However, teacher candidates enrolled in programs at these institutions are allowed to link their ESL credentials to an initial license in special education or in non-core content areas, such as art, music, or a foreign language. Indeed, the combination of a foreign language license and an ESL license is common among participating teachers, half of whom hold such credentials. Teachers who choose to link their ESL licenses to a foreign language license are in much the same situation as those who choose to

pursue an initial license in ESL; namely, they possess expertise in the sounds and structures of the relevant languages, but not of the ways in which those languages are used in any given academic field.

As noted above, the practice of offering a stand-alone ESL license or an ESL license that can be linked to foreign language certification reinforces the idea that language can be studied as an academic subject in and of itself, isolated from its contexts of use. ESL preparation programs that promote such licensing practices would seem to be built upon understandings of the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy drawn from the cognitive strand of SLA scholarship. Thus, the certification practices of participating teachers' preparation programs suggest that all eight participating teachers attended preparation programs informed largely or exclusively by a cognitive understanding of the language acquisition process.

If this is indeed the case, it is not surprising that teachers, as described in Chapter Four, were unfamiliar with concepts embraced by the sociocultural framework of language acquisition, such as additive bilingualism, translanguaging, and the idea of apprenticing students through language use into desired or necessary Discourses. Teachers who were not introduced in their preparation programs to sociocultural theories about the nature of language and its acquisition and use, are unlikely to have learned about such concepts from other sources. Thus, they were likely to have entered the field – and are likely to remain in the field – without the knowledge necessary to implement or advocate successfully for implementation of relevant and effective language-support programs and school language-use policies which flow from an understanding of language as a meaning-making tool that is honed through use, of learning as apprenticeship that is achieved through participation, and of the native language as a resource, rather than a roadblock.

Teacher educator Bernadette Sester describes an additional problem inherent in allowing ESL teachers to graduate with a solid understanding of language as content, but limited or no understanding of core secondary-level content. Specifically, ESL teachers who lack certification in a core secondary-level content area must work closely and continuously with their content-certified colleagues, in order to create a meaningful curriculum for ELs:

> …they [ESL teachers] need to be smart, because they have to teach in complement to any academic area, whether it's high-school physics or physical education in the elementary school. They often have to gear their lessons towards meeting that mainstream curriculum, so the ESL teacher does not have a separate curriculum without consulting with the mainstream. They have to be consulting all the time with the mainstream and working towards mainstream content standards through their language instruction – in conjunction with the mainstream teachers, obviously, not by themselves (Bernadette, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

Bernadette's comments point not just to one of the challenges faced by ESL teachers who lack content-area certification but also to an underlying assumption about the teaching contexts in which graduates of Andrews University's ESL preparation program will work. That is, Bernadette's comments reveal an assumption that ESL-certified teachers will have abundant opportunities to collaborate with content-certified teachers in their schools. Andrews University is not alone in making assumptions about the contexts in which its graduates will work. The following section will explore those assumptions expressed by teacher educators or inherent within the structure of each participating institution of higher education.

## UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS ABOUT CONTEXTS

Of the four participating institutions of higher education, Lake State University seems to have been most strongly influenced in building its program around assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will work. Indeed, Shirley reported that

> A lot of the people in the program already had established programs that they were going to or coming from, so a person in my situation, you know, where I had to start the actual

> program and organize it at the high-school level; it obviously wasn't going to meet my needs in that aspect. I don't really count that as a strike against the program; it's just, they can't really differentiate for us that way (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

Teacher educator Marshall Miller acknowledged that the program caters to the professional development needs of teachers working in a specific program. He explained that the coordinator of ESL/Bilingual Programs in the Wembley District, which lies approximately fifty miles north of the town of Lake, approached him and his colleague fifteen years ago with a request to offer relevant professional development for teachers working in the district's newly implemented and rapidly growing K-8 dual-immersion Spanish/English bilingual program.

The coordinator had initially taken her request to teacher educators at the state university located in Wembley, but had been rebuffed, as the teacher educators at Wembley State University didn't "believe in bilingual education" (Marshall, Interview, 28 March, 2012). Thus, Marshall and his colleague at Lake State University had obliged, creating a program to meet the professional development needs of currently practicing teachers working on an emergency license in this particular district's K-8 Spanish/English dual-immersion bilingual program. Marshall noted that

> Since 1997 we have probably licensed at least ten teachers per year from [Wembley]. … We've been fortunate that we've had this connection with [Wembley] that's been real strong for about the last fifteen years now. I mean, it's a little bit of a distance for them; that's one of the reasons why we developed our weekend alternative program, for them (Marshall, Interview, 28 March, 2012).

The ESL preparation program at Glacier State University was likewise designed with the needs of a very specific group in mind. Angela Jackson explained that faculty at Glacier State had applied for a federal grant approximately ten years earlier, when the number of ELs in local districts had begun to rise. This grant money had been used to design and implement an ESL preparation program for practicing teachers whose classrooms were undergoing demographic

shifts. A quick scan of student census data from the state Department of Public Instruction reveals that most of the schools within a fifty-mile radius of Glacier State University whose EL enrollment has increased over the past ten years have realized the largest growth of ELs at the elementary and lower secondary levels. Thus, it is not unreasonable to assume that Glacier State designed its program with the needs of K-8 teachers in mind. My interview with Angela Jackson confirmed that the program, whether or not it was initially designed to focus on the needs of elementary-level teachers, currently does so.

Angela described an activity she likes to use with teacher candidates, in which she combines the detailed case-studies found in Guadalupe Valdés' *Learning and Not Learning English* (2001) with the teaching methods found in *Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning* by Pauline Gibbons (2002): "And so my goal is to do this: let's talk all about Miguel, everything he faced and why he faced it, and all these messages …. put this Critical Race Theory lens on it, and then talk about what would Gibbons have us do in the classroom that he's in" (Angela, Interview, 10 May, 2012).

While this is no doubt an engaging and useful exercise for all ESL teacher candidates, one of the texts upon which it draws was written for an audience of K-8 teachers and teacher educators. This certainly does not preclude the possibility that Angela and her students discuss ways in which Gibbons' pedagogical suggestions can be adapted for use in grades nine through twelve; nevertheless, the use of a text designed for K-8 teachers sends a subtle message that this program, much like the program at Lake State, is not necessarily designed to meet the needs of teachers who will work with ELs in grades 9-12. Moreover, Angela stated that she sees no difference between the professional development needs of ESL teachers who work at the secondary level and ESL teachers who work at the elementary level, as the goal for both types of

teachers is the same: "…to get their students involved in something that's real, that has a real purpose, and to incorporate this critical lens, critical inquiry in their classes" (Angela, Interview, 10 May, 2012).

Angela had not yet joined the faculty when Diane and Ashley attended the program at Glacier State University; thus her perspective on the goals of professional development for ESL teachers clearly played no role in influencing either teacher's professional growth. Angela speculated that her preference for critical inquiry had not played a vital role in the ESL preparation program before her arrival. As she saw no difference between the professional development needs of elementary-level and secondary-level ESL teachers, she did not indicate whether or not her colleagues currently express or had in the past expressed a preference for meeting the needs of elementary-level teachers. Thus, it is unclear whether or not the program at Glacier State University focused on the needs of elementary-level teachers before Angela's arrival to the extent that it currently does. Evidence from both Diane and Ashley, as detailed below, suggests that it did.

The preparation program at Andrews University reflects two assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will teach. One of these assumptions, as described above, envisions an environment in which ESL teachers and content-certified teachers enjoy close and consistent co-teaching or co-planning opportunities. The second envisions an environment in which ESL teachers work primarily with recently arrived immigrant ELs in newcomer programs, while content-certified teachers work with ELs who are not newcomers. Bernadette acknowledged that "…a lot of our graduates go on to work in the newcomer centers here in Gemini City" (Bernadette, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

Meanwhile, the bulk of her comments about preparing teachers to work with ELs focused on the difficulties that she and her colleagues encounter in trying to help preservice candidates for content-area certification develop quality language goals and opportunities for student interaction. As our Skype connection had at times been less than ideal, I did not realize until I was transcribing our conversation that her comments had referred to general – not ESL-specific – teacher preparation. Thus, I did not have an opportunity to ask about the details of her work with ESL certification candidates. However, Donna Umscheid, in describing her experience as a student in the methods course for ESL teacher candidates at Andrews University, suggests that ESL teacher preparation in this program may be designed to help candidates teach discrete language forms linked to relevant academic content, but not the discourse-level language features needed to engage more fully with that content.

Donna explains that she was asked to create and implement a series of lessons much like those used in a content-based foreign language classroom. Namely, she was given feedback on how well she modeled the use of a certain language feature in the context of a relevant academic topic, guided students through various opportunities to practice using that feature, and provided an opportunity for less structured or unstructured practice of the new feature within the context of the selected academic topic. Instruction and practice in using this approach to language teaching would be quite valuable for ESL teachers preparing to work in newcomer centers, where students and teachers are concerned with "first-order language acquisition tasks, [such as].. basic oral English language skills, … the Roman alphabet or specific sounds associated with its letters in English, … [and] reading comprehension and writing skills [for] underschooled immigrant students." (Ruiz-de-Velasco and Fix, 2000, p. 56).

However, this approach to language instruction was less relevant for Donna, who worked in a sheltered content setting. She noted that the lesson planning process advocated by teacher educators at Andrews University had been beneficial in helping her think about details of the language used in her lessons, but that she rarely used the lesson-planning tools they had taught her or created the kinds of lessons they endorsed. Furthermore, she noted that her practicum teaching for her methods class had not always been terribly successful, as she and her students knew each other quite well, and she had never used that style of teaching before, "so my students were going 'huh?'" (Donna, Interview, 29 September, 2011).

The assumption that graduates must be skilled at teaching language as content, rather than language through content, likewise seems to lie at the heart of the ESL teacher preparation program at River State University. Theirs is an interdisciplinary program that serves the needs not only of candidates preparing to teach ESL in the American K-12 context but also of candidates preparing to teach EFL to child, adolescent, or adult learners in international contexts. It is, perhaps, because graduates will work in such diverse settings that the program focuses on the one constant factor sure to be found across all settings. Namely, teachers in any ESL or EFL setting must understand the sounds and structures of the English language. Mia explained that

> …from my view, the courses [that ESL teacher candidates take] are really problematic and really focused on theoretical linguistics. So they take phonetics, you know, all these linguistics courses, but not really that many foundational courses, for example, language and race and language and indigenous knowledge. … So a lot of broader issues are not touched, and it really gives the wrong message, I think (Mia, Interview, 15 May, 2012).

Mia additionally indicated that the program at River State does not place a great deal of emphasis on discussing and evaluating the various ESL program models typically found in U.S. schools, noting that teacher candidates do not have opportunities "to examine really critically the assumptions made about ESL students and programs" (Mia, Interview, 15 May, 2012).

## INTERSECTIONS

While it is not possible to draw definitive causative connections between teachers' preparation programs and their work in the classroom, it is nonetheless instructive to explore intersections between the themes that emerged from participating teachers' data and the program characteristics that emerged from participating teacher educators' data. In exploring these intersections, valuable insight can be gained into the role that teachers' preparation programs may have played in shaping their daily work with ELs. The final section of this chapter will investigate those intersections.

**PROGRAM CHARACTERISTIC ONE - The structure of each teacher preparation program allows teacher candidates to graduate with a limited knowledge of core secondary-level content**

**intersects with**

**THEME TWO: ESL teachers' qualifications and knowledge of core secondary-level content played a role in precluding not only the establishment of more effective program models but also the implementation of more effective instructional approaches**

This characteristic of teachers' preparation programs sheds light on the reasons why teachers were unable to apprentice students successfully into the Discourses of core secondary-level academic subjects. Nevertheless, it is problematic to suggest that preparation programs can remedy this situation by requiring that all ESL teacher candidates who wish to work at the secondary level hold or are eligible to obtain certification in a core secondary-level content area. Recall that Ashley was assigned to teach a sheltered section not of biology, which she was certified to teach, but of English, which she was not certified to teach. Thus, preparation programs may be able to implement policies which ensure that ESL teacher candidates are qualified experts in both language and content, yet it is the responsibility of local districts and

schools to ensure that teachers are assigned to teach only those courses for which they are certified.

Nonetheless, preparation programs can lead the way to accomplishment of this goal by requiring that ESL teacher candidates who wish to work at the secondary level already hold, are pursuing, or are eligible to obtain certification in a core secondary-level content area. Such a requirement may, indeed, be the first line of defense in combating the phenomenon that Ruiz-de-Velasco and Fix (2000) describe as the "departmentalization" of secondary schools, which creates few incentives for non-ESL teachers to "assume responsibility for LEP students' outcomes … [and] effectively bar[s] language and content teachers from collaborating to improve immigrant student outcomes" (p 4). In requiring that ESL teachers hold certification in a core secondary-level content area, teacher preparation programs may be able to break down the barriers of "departmentalization" by blurring the lines between teachers' departmental affiliations and loyalties.

**PROGRAM CHARACTERISTIC ONE - The structure of each teacher preparation program allows teacher candidates to graduate with a limited knowledge of core secondary-level content**

**intersects with**

**THEME THREE: instructional approaches constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs**

Data provided by both Ashley and Kara illustrates some of the ways in which teachers' ability to offer quality instruction is constrained by their lack of content-area certification. Both women recognized that they lacked the knowledge and skills needed to teach composition and literary analysis, which comprised the bulk of the mainstream English curriculum upon which their sheltered English and Spanish for Native Speakers courses, respectively, were modeled. Ashley compensated for her lack of knowledge and qualifications by seeking advice from

English-certified colleagues, including her husband, while Kara compensated for her lack of knowledge and qualifications by focusing instruction on those discrete features of language with which she was comfortable, such as grammar and orthography. Linda, whose initial license qualifies her to teach all core content areas, but only through the eighth grade, likewise seemed more comfortable structuring the language-learning component of her high-school social studies and English classes around word- and sentence-level features than around discourse-level features.

**PROGRAM CHARACTERISTIC TWO – The philosophy and structure of each teacher preparation program reflects underlying assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will teach**

**intersects with**

**THEME ONE: Program models substantially constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs**

All eight teachers were constrained in some way by the program models within which they worked. Even Donna and Linda, whose schools offered the seemingly ideal model of sheltered content instruction, struggled to some degree with the constraints of their program models. Donna, for example, was expected to meet the needs not only of a newcomer but also of several students with much higher levels of proficiency within the structure of a single sheltered content classroom. Linda, meanwhile, was expected to oversee sheltered math and science classes whose teachers did not possess ESL certification and who were not always proactive in collaborating with Linda to ensure that their courses met both the language-learning needs and the content-learning needs of the ELs at Eldon High School. Fanny, whose daily schedule consisted solely of administrative and resource periods, perhaps best described the situation of all other participating teachers when she commented that her biggest challenge in working with ELs lay in her school's "lack of programming" (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

While it may seem as if the constraints imposed by program models have little relationship to teachers' experiences in their professional development programs, the data suggests that each teacher's knowledge of language-support program models and ability to advocate successfully for the implementation of effective models may have been limited by the underlying assumptions of the preparation program she attended. That is, each preparation program exhibited a preference, based on educators' assumptions about the teaching contexts in which graduates would work, for one specific type of language-support program model. In focusing on the needs, prior knowledge, and interests of candidates who already work or will work in the preferred program model, educators may deny teacher candidates access to information about the structure, advantages, and disadvantages of other language-support program models.

At Andrews University, for example, assumptions about teachers' work in newcomer programs could mean that candidates are introduced only to the details of pull-out programs that focus on language-as-content instruction. Donna's experience with her methods class, described above, suggests that this may, indeed, be the case. Meanwhile, Lake State University, with its clear connections to the K-8 dual-immersion Spanish/English bilingual program in the Wembley District, may not introduce candidates to pull-out, push-in, or sheltered content models. At River State University, a desire to meet the needs of teachers in both international and domestic EFL/ESL teaching contexts may preclude a discussion or evaluation of any program models. This may also have been the case at Linda's alma mater of Cliff State University, which likewise offers an interdisciplinary ESL program that serves the needs of both international and domestic EFL/ESL teacher candidates.

Regardless of the reasons why such discussions did not happen at Cliff State University, Linda indicates quite clearly that they did not. In describing the history of the ESL program at Eldon High School, Linda noted that she had been charged with the task of creating a program, largely because she had been the only ESL-certified teacher in the district when the need for a coherent program of language-support services had arisen. She further noted that she had been given carte blanche, but no guidance, in creating the new program. She observed with a good deal of frustration that her ESL teacher preparation program had not even touched on the subject of program design:

> I had the methods; I understood how to teach [ELs], but I had no clue how to start a program. You know, do you do pull out, do you do mainstream? There was nothing [about that in my preparation program] (Linda, Interview, 10 November, 2011).

Thus, Linda had been unsure of an effective way to meet the needs of students who entered the country as adolescents and had a limited amount of time not only to develop proficiency in English but also to learn the academic content required for successful completion of high school. Eventually, she had located a well-established ESL program that enjoyed a reputation of success in working with adolescent ELs. Traveling over 260 miles each time she visited this program, she had spent a semester meeting teachers, students, and administrators; observing their work; learning about their curriculum; and discussing the advantages and disadvantages of a sheltered-content approach to instruction with ELs. By the following year, Linda had established an ESL program at Eldon High School that offered sheltered language instruction in each of the following subjects: math, science, social studies, English, physical education, and computer skills.

Two other teachers indicated that their programs, like Linda's program at Cliff State, simply did not discuss or evaluate the various types of language support programs found in the

American K-12 public school setting. Shirley stated that "I had to make up the structure of my day, and I didn't know what to do with it. Should students stay in their classrooms and I go to them? Should they leave their classrooms and come to me? What was this going to look like?" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012). She felt that her preparation program had left her ill-prepared to make such decisions.

Ashley, meanwhile, was so unfamiliar with the different program models used in K-12 school settings that she didn't know what to expect when she began working as an ESL teacher. She reported having worried that she might not like the ESL position at Waubunsee High School for which she was hired shortly after graduation, because "I didn't fully understand what my job would look like" (Ashley, Interview 17 October, 2011). As part of her preservice preparation, she had performed a portion of her student teaching in a secondary-level pull-out ESL classroom and understood fairly well what was expected of teachers and students in such a setting. However, she was shocked to discover how much ESL programs "vary … from school to school" and noted that "it took me a while to really get it straight in my head what I'm doing here; what my role is" (Ashley, Interview 17 October, 2011).

Furthermore, Ashley's approach to providing push-in support, which consists of attending ELs' classes, taking notes, and checking students' comprehension during a resource period later in the day or on the following day, suggests that Glacier State University spends little time helping ESL teacher candidates develop good strategies for working effectively within a push-in model at the secondary level. Diane, also a Glacier State graduate, had ambivalent feelings about the value of the push-in support she provided. During the fall 2011 semester, she accompanied a newcomer seventh-grader at Randolph Middle School to his science course and translated classroom talk or clarified content in his L1 (Spanish) to the extent necessary. She

also made an effort to circulate the room, answering questions from and providing one-on-one assistance to other students, so that no stigma would be attached to the newcomer EL for receiving special assistance. Thus, while she felt that her presence was largely beneficial to all students in the classroom, she expressed doubt regarding the effectiveness of this particular model of language support and questioned whether she really understood how to provide meaningful push-in support.

According to Shirley, a failure to provide guidance in offering push-in support was also a shortcoming of the program at Lake State. Shirley began the spring 2012 semester by providing push-in support for ELs enrolled in science and English classes at Westmoreland High School. However, her efforts were so unsuccessful that she eventually abandoned the idea of providing push-in support and, instead, established two additional resource periods that coincided with the science and English classes in which she had attempted to provide push-in services. The ELs enrolled in these courses understood that they could seek permission to leave their mainstream classes and work on the day's assignment in Shirley's classroom with her assistance, if necessary. Shirley instituted this arrangement primarily because she felt like a peripheral and largely disrespected member of the classroom community whose presence merely stigmatized the ELs. She regretted that she had been unable to establish a more effective model of push-in support, noting that she had hoped to work with each mainstream classroom teacher to establish a meaningful co-teaching relationship, but lacked a good understanding of what such a relationship should look like, as her preparation program simply had not covered "the practical stuff, like there were no co-teaching models" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

While a number of reasons could be offered to explain why teachers' preparation programs failed to discuss program models or to introduce candidates to effective ways of

teaching within various models, it is possible that such discussions were excluded from the curriculum because of teacher educators' assumptions about the contexts in which graduates would work. Teacher educators at Lake State, for example, presumably see little need to help candidates explore push-in models in the form of co-teaching arrangements, if the majority of its graduates are assumed to work alone in a self-contained K-8 bilingual classroom where language and content are explored simultaneously.

Teacher educators' assumptions about the contexts in which the graduates of their programs will work may also mean that preparation programs spend little or no time preparing candidates to act as confident advocates for the implementation of new program models. This omission seems to have affected the work of Diane, Kara, Shirley, and Donna, and would likely have affected Linda's work, as well, had her district not placed such complete faith in her abilities to build a language-support program from the ground up, and had she not proactively identified other programs to visit.

As described previously, Diane struggled greatly to convince the school board that ELs continue to require language support services long after they have achieved enough fluency in English to survive in social settings. In advocating for the provision of long-term support for the district's ELs, she admitted that her personal connections to several school board members had probably been a more effective bargaining tool than any skills or knowledge she had gained in her preparation program. However, she did acknowledge that one aspect of her preparation program had been tremendously beneficial to her in advocating for the provision of long-term language-support services. That is, during her final semester in the teacher preparation program at Glacier State University, she had been required to conduct a piece of action research. She acknowledged that she had relied heavily upon her newly acquired research skills in discovering

and presenting the literature that would ultimately convince the school board to allow her to continue providing language support services to ELs who had been in the district longer than six months. Thus, while her preparation program may not have explicitly prepared her to advocate for the implementation of appropriate language-support services, it did play a role in helping her obtain needed services for her students.

Kara also seems to have been unprepared to act as an advocate for appropriate student services. While she was successful in lobbying for the creation of a Spanish for Native Speakers class that allows ELs at Decameron High School to continue developing academic literacy skills in their L1, the reasons she gave for proposing such a course were based less on an understanding of the benefits of program models that encourage additive bilingualism than on a need to solve two immediate problems.

First, as described earlier, Decameron High School guidance counselors had been in the habit of assigning native Spanish-speaking students to "any old Spanish class that fit their schedule," (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012), even if that course happened to be Spanish I for nonnative speakers. As can be imagined, this situation created an unhealthy classroom environment for native Spanish speakers, native English speakers, and Kara alike. Thus, Kara was desperate to ensure that the ELs at Decameron High School could be reassigned to a more appropriate course. Second, Kara noted that many ELs were falling behind with reading assignments in their mainstream English classrooms. Thus, the Spanish for Native Speakers course also served as a way to ensure that students are "getting the literature. Maybe they can't keep up with the reading in that class, but they can in mine" (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012).

During our interview, Kara indicated that she has a good deal of respect for program models that facilitate the development of additive bilingualism. Yet she admitted that this

appreciation was awakened by a research project that she had recently completed as part of the requirements for an online MA in Foreign Language Teaching program in which she was enrolled. Thus, an understanding of effective program models had presumably not influenced her decision three years earlier to propose a Spanish for Native Speakers course. Her success in advocating for the creation of this course could, perhaps, be attributed more to chance than to a reliance upon the skills and knowledge to which she had been exposed in her initial preparation program.

Shirley and Donna likewise seemed to lack the skills and knowledge needed to advocate successfully for the provision of program models more effective than those currently in place in their respective districts. Shirley felt strongly that push-in support in the form of co-teaching between the ESL teacher and the content-area teacher would be an effective way to serve the ELs at Westmoreland High School, yet she lacked, as described above, models for effective co-teaching upon which to draw in designing such a program. It seems that she may also have lacked the skills necessary to advocate for the creation of co-teaching opportunities, as she had tried several times - without success - to garner more time for co-planning and -teaching. Visibly frustrated, she concluded that "…co-teaching is a pipedream, if you [administration] don't give us time to actually do it" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

In Donna's case, a preparation program that had helped her develop advocacy skills and knowledge of different program models may have helped her create a more appropriate learning environment for all of the ELs enrolled in her sheltered language arts and math classes in the fall of 2011. Given the apparent programmatic preference of her alma mater, Andrews University, newcomer programs or pull-out models may have been the only models with which she was familiar. Indeed, observation revealed that she worked well with her newcomer student, whose

needs were probably met adequately by the time that she spent working one-on-one with Donna to master a basic understanding of language as content. Yet this arrangement, which prevented Donna from working with the remaining students in her classes on combined language and content lessons, was clearly less adequate in meeting these students' needs. Had Donna been better prepared to evaluate the effectiveness of various program models for various learners and to advocate for the provision of appropriate services, she may have been able to justify the creation of a separate instructional setting for her newcomer student, thereby increasing the amount of time that she was able to spend with all of her students.

**PROGRAM CHARACTERISTIC TWO – The philosophy and structure of each teacher preparation program reflects underlying assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will teach**

**intersects with**

**THEME THREE: Instructional approaches constrained the quality and quantity of support available to ELs**

Assumptions made by teacher educators about the contexts in which teachers will work may likewise have affected teachers' ability to implement effective instructional approaches. Namely, such assumptions may have restricted teacher candidates' access to valuable information about instructional approaches used in various teaching contexts. Lake State University, for example, with its clear preference for bilingual education at the K-8 level, may leave teacher candidates wondering how to teach effectively when use of the students' L1 is not a possibility, or when working at the upper secondary level.

Teachers' lack of experience in applying what they learned in their preparation programs to their work at the secondary level may likewise be a problem for graduates of Glacier State University's program. Meanwhile, the preference for newcomer programs exhibited by the ESL preparation program at Andrews University may leave teacher candidates wondering how to

teach effectively in settings that approach language instruction from a language-through-content perspective, rather than a language-as-content perspective. Finally, the apparent failure to discuss program models at River State University may leave graduates unaware of the existence of a distinction between program models that focus on language-as-content instruction and program models that focus on language-through-content instruction.

Those who struggled most to implement effective instructional approaches were Linda and Ashley, who both had opportunities to combine language and content instruction, but were unable to do so in meaningful ways. Linda's difficulties in combining language and content instruction in meaningful ways could, perhaps, be attributed to her preparation as an elementary teacher who simply lacked an understanding of the discourse-level structures that characterize the language of literary studies and the language of social studies at the upper secondary level. It is also possible that she intentionally avoided discourse-level instruction, as she admitted that she geared most of her teaching to a 4$^{th}$-grade level. Yet there is also the possibility that her preparation program did not offer adequate preparation in teaching language through content effectively. Recall that her program at Cliff State University is designed to meet the professional development needs not only of candidates preparing to teach ESL in the American K-12 context but also of candidates preparing to teach EFL in various international contexts. While a language-as-content approach to ESL instruction is common in both international and domestic contexts, the language-through-content approach, when used at all, is more common in domestic settings. For this reason, it is quite possible that a program designed for both international and domestic teaching contexts focused on the lowest common denominator: language-as-content instruction.

Meanwhile, Ashley's difficulties in combining language and content instruction in meaningful ways can most likely be attributed to the fact that she was working outside her area of certification. However, her difficulties may have been exacerbated by the fact that she attended a preparation program that seems to have been designed primarily to meet the professional development needs of teachers working at the elementary level. She noted that much of her coursework seemed to focus on teaching language to younger learners, for whom the development of literacy skills in the L1, the L2, or both can constitute content in and of itself. She had difficulty envisioning how those approaches could be applied to the teaching of both language and content to older learners, noting that "I wasn't really prepared for other issues, besides just how to teach them language" (Ashley, Interview, 17 October, 2012).

Fanny encountered similar difficulties relating certain aspects of her preparation program at Glacier State to her needs as a secondary-level teacher. She noted that

> I took a reading class, and we focused a lot on the elementary level. … I know people become literate when they're in Kindergarten or first grade, but I wish they could target more to the secondary level. … [And in] the assessment class I'm taking this semester, they focus a lot on the elementary and maybe I'd like to see more at the secondary level, because it is different, you know, being an ELL teacher at the elementary level or the high school, because kids here see way more content and different subjects, and different teachers (Fanny, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

While Fanny tried to find ways of adapting what she had learned about both assessment and literacy to the needs of older students, she felt that she was generally unsuccessful in her attempts. Thus, she worried that the guidance she gave to colleagues in content-area classrooms who sought her advice in modifying tests for ELs or offering literacy instruction to ELs was not always relevant to the needs or interests of adolescents and young adults.

Diane likewise had trouble relating portions of her preparation program to her work with secondary-level students. She was generally pleased with her preparation program, but observed

that it "it didn't address what I really wanted to know: how do we teach ELLs effectively in the mainstream classroom? How do we help kids deal with the mainstream curriculum in their mainstream courses?" (Diane, Interview, 4 October, 2012) This concern, of course, is relevant to teachers at both the elementary and the secondary levels. However, in light of the fact that Diane spent only one hour of each day working with ELs at the elementary level, it is likely that her comments referred to her experiences in working with students at the secondary level.

While I was unable to arrange an observation of Shirley's sheltered English class, she acknowledged that she had trouble in this class combining language learning with content learning in ways that met the curricular requirements determined by the English department at Westmoreland High School. She clearly felt that her preparation program was to blame for the fact that she was unable to combine language and content learning in cohesive ways that fulfilled curricular expectations. She remarked several times that "the curriculum piece" was missing from her preparation program (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012). She suspected that this may have had something to do with the fact that the program at Lake State worked so closely with the Wembley District to certify teachers working on an emergency license in the district's bilingual program. Since these teachers already had a clear picture of the curricular standards they were expected to fulfill in their various classrooms, discussions of curriculum development and implementation in the ESL context may have been overlooked by educators in the program. Shirley explains that "…the hard part was the connecting [course material] to ESL and what that would look like when I got here. And so [the instructor] talked about how they do it in Wembley, but I didn't understand the connection; like I didn't understand where they got it or how they actually did it" (Shirley, Interview, 24 May, 2012).

**PROGRAM CHARACTERISTIC TWO – The philosophy and structure of each teacher preparation program reflects underlying assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will teach**

**intersects with**

**THEME FOUR: Teachers were uncertain whether and how they should incorporate the use of students' native languages into classroom instruction**

Kara, Ashley, Linda and, to some extent, Donna struggled with this issue more than the remaining participating teachers. However, Kara's difficulties in this area lay more in her inability to "act like a teacher in Mexico," (Kara, Interview, 3 May, 2012) than in any potential weaknesses of her preparation program. For this reason, her situation will not be considered here.

On the other hand, Ashley's struggle to use students' L1 effectively in the classroom seems as if it may have been influenced by her teacher preparation program. Specifically, the assumption that graduates of Glacier State University are likely to work at the elementary level seems to have played a role in shaping Ashley's approach to use of students' L1 in the classroom. Recall that Ashley tended to use students' native language primarily for the purpose of directing students' behavior. It seems that she may have relied on this strategy simply because it was the most useful classroom management tool at her disposal. In reminding students that she could understand and respond if they used their L1 to disrupt class, she may have been trying to establish a sense of control or authority that she did not otherwise know how to establish, as she felt that her preparation program had left her ill-prepared to deal with issues of student motivation and classroom management at the secondary level.

She commented that

> "I didn't get it in my training, … and I wasn't prepared for it. When I got here, initially I was thinking, well, they're high-school students; they're young adults. They are responsible for their own learning. It was really hard for me to push them; it was really

> unnatural for me, so … right away, I was thinking, gosh, I wish there was a way I could have been prepared for this" (Ashley, Interview, 17 October, 2011).

Ashley noted that, in an effort to compensate for this gap in her preparation, she has read extensively on issues of student motivation and classroom management at the secondary level and that these two issues always top the list when she makes her annual professional development plans.

Linda's beliefs about the use of students' L1 in the classroom may likewise have been shaped by her preparation program. Recall that Cliff State University offers a certification program to candidates preparing to teach both ESL at home in the K-12 setting and EFL abroad. International EFL teaching contexts differ in many ways from domestic ESL teaching contexts, but the most salient difference for the purposes of the present discussion lies in beliefs about the role of students' L1 in instruction. That is, EFL programs are much less likely than ESL programs, particularly those ESL programs found in the K-12 public school context, to incorporate the use of students' L1 into instruction. Indeed, a substantial number of EFL employers do not require that their teachers speak, understand, or even exhibit familiarity with students' L1, as the demand for native-speaker teachers generally trumps the demand for a bilingual instructional setting.

If the preparation program at Cliff State University is built upon the assumption that a substantial number of graduates will work in international settings where the teacher's native-speaker status is likely to be more important than his or her knowledge either of students' native languages or of bilingual teaching methods, it is unlikely that instructors in the program spend much time helping teacher candidates develop either an appreciation of the benefits of L1 use in the classroom or a repertoire of strategies for incorporating L1 use effectively. This could go far

in explaining both the presence of the "English Only" sign in Linda's classroom and her concerns about ensuring that students had adequate time to practice English.

While it is plausible that Linda's beliefs about the use of students' L1 in the classroom were influenced by her experiences in a teacher preparation program that may exhibit a bias for international EFL teaching contexts, it is also possible that her beliefs were influenced by her limited personal experience with the L2 acquisition process. She is the only one of the eight participating teachers who does not speak a second language with any degree of proficiency. Although she took enough French courses in college to satisfy the L2 proficiency requirements of her school's ESL preparation program, she admitted that she hadn't learned the language well enough to survive as a tourist in a French-speaking country.

Linda's colleague in the Eldon District seemed to share some of her concerns about the use of students' L1 interfering with opportunities to learn and practice English. Yet, unlike Linda, Donna was clearly torn between these concerns and the body of literature that points to the effectiveness of bilingual education. Her ambivalence about the use of students' L1 may have been influenced by the assumptions of educators at Andrews University regarding their graduates' work. That is, Donna's sentiments clearly echo Bernadette's comment that "long-term bilingual immersion programs would be ideal, but how do we pull this off, especially in the Gemini City area?" (Bernadette, Interview, 7 May, 2012). In assuming that graduates of Andrews University's program would work in schools where bilingual instruction was not a feasible option, teacher educators may have failed to help candidates develop not only a full appreciation of the value of using students' L1 in the classroom but also an understanding of the ways in which teachers can incorporate the use of one or many non-English languages into classroom instruction.

## CONCLUSION

The discussion above suggests that teachers' preparation programs may have played a larger role than initially realized in shaping teachers' abilities to work effectively with ELs. Some of the challenges encountered by participating teachers in working effectively with ELs may initially seem to have been caused by district- or school-level policies over which teachers had no control. Nevertheless the themes examined in this chapter have revealed that teachers' preparation programs may, indeed, have contributed to the challenges that teachers faced by sending teachers into the field ill-prepared to fulfill those roles that would have allowed them to work more effectively with ELs. To review, these roles are as follows:

1) the role of language expert *and* content expert, and

2) the role of advocate

Meanwhile, the characteristics of teachers' preparation programs that may have prevented teachers from successfully developing the skills and knowledge needed to fulfill the duties of these roles are as follows:

1) the structure of each teacher preparation program allows teacher candidates to graduate with a limited knowledge of core secondary-level content; and
2) the philosophy or structure of each teacher preparation program reflects underlying assumptions about the contexts in which graduates will teach.

The intersections section of this chapter detailed the ways in which program characteristics may have a played a role in preventing participating teachers either from providing effective content and language instruction or from advocating for more effective program models. In reflecting on those details, it seems that participating teachers were unable to work effectively with ELs not only because of obstacles created by school policies or administrative decisions or other

unrecognized factors but also because their preparation programs had not been successful in helping them develop the knowledge and skills needed to remove those obstacles.

Namely, all participating teachers lacked an understanding of those two characteristics described in Chapter Two as vital components of effective language-support programs. Although the literature clearly indicates that effective language-support programs are built upon the concepts of additive bilingualism and combined language and content instruction, the study or discussion of these concepts seems to have been omitted from participating teachers' preparation programs. Recall that neither participating teachers nor participating teacher educators explicitly spoke about either the concept of additive bilingualism or the concept of combined language and content instruction. Furthermore, two participating teachers - Linda and Diane - stated unequivocally that their preparation programs had not prepared them to combine language and content instruction. Shirley was less direct in her evaluation, but clearly felt that her preparation program had likewise left her unable to implement instruction that meaningfully and successfully combined language goals with curricular goals.

A discussion of combined language and content instruction seems to have been precluded in each teacher's preparation program by two factors. First, teachers were not required to possess knowledge of or certification to teach any of the four core secondary-level content areas. In failing to require that candidates for ESL certification at the secondary level possess knowledge of or qualifications to teach a core content area, teachers' preparation programs strongly reinforce the idea that language is a subject which can be studied in isolation from its contexts of use. Sent into the field with such a conception of language – and with neither knowledge of nor qualifications to teach core academic content – it is hardly surprising that participating teachers were unable to implement or even advocate successfully for the

implementation of program models that combine language and content instruction. Recall that Linda alone was successful in creating such a program model; yet she admitted that her success was in no way related to her preparation program. Rather, she succeeded because district administrators trusted her to do the right thing and supported her in her efforts to visit and learn from another district with a successful, well established program of secondary-level language support.

An additional factor that likely contributed to the dearth of discussions about the benefits of combined language and content instruction lies in the assumptions that teacher educators held regarding the contexts in which graduates would work. Recall that educators in two programs – that at Lake State University and that at Andrews University – made very specific assumptions about their graduates' teaching contexts. Marshall Miller admitted that he and his colleague at Lake State had, to a large extent, designed their program to meet the needs of teachers already working in the Wembley District's K-8 dual-immersion Spanish/English bilingual program. Bernadette Sester and her colleagues at Andrews University assumed that a substantial number of their graduates would work in one of the newcomer programs in Gemini City. Meanwhile, Angela Jackson and her colleagues at Glacier State built their instruction on the assumption that graduates would work at the elementary level. Finally, River State University – and most likely Cliff State University, which is not officially represented in this study by an interview with a teacher educator, but which offers a program similar to the program offered at River State – assumed that graduates might work anywhere in the world with learners of any age.

These assumptions likely played a role in precluding discussions about the benefits of program models that offer combined language and content support. That is, teacher educators seem to have assumed that their curricula should focus not on theoretical discussions of the most

effective program models or instructional approaches, but on those skills, knowledge, dispositions, and beliefs that would be most helpful in the specific contexts in which their graduates were likely to work. Few of these contexts required the skillful combination of language instruction with content instruction at the secondary level.

For example, Donna's experience, as described above, indicates that the type of instruction she was encouraged to use focused on the acquisition and practice of discrete language forms and lexical items. This philosophy of language teacher education seems to have been strongly influenced by Bernadette Sester's and her colleagues' assumptions that graduates of the ESL preparation program at Andrews University seek – and find – employment in area newcomer centers. Such assumptions were likely quite helpful to those teachers who do work in newcomer centers, where a cognitivist approach to instruction that treats language as a subject in and of itself is generally acceptable. Nonetheless, these assumptions were likely less helpful to Donna, who worked in a setting that required the thoughtful and authentic combination of language and content instruction.

Meanwhile, Shirley's experience, as described above, indicates that much of the curriculum in her courses focused on the needs and experiences of those classmates who had been granted emergency licenses to work in the Wembley District's K-8 Spanish/English dual-immersion bilingual program. While she was interested in learning about their experiences, she acknowledged that class discussions which were so closely tied to their situations often made little sense to her. She described two ways in which her program's emphasis on the experiences and needs of candidates from Wembley shortchanged her own understanding of what it means to work effectively with ELs.

First, the teacher candidates from Wembley, because of their experience with the bilingual program within which they worked, assumed a norm of combined language and content instruction. Thus, they neither initiated conversation about the benefits of such instruction and the program model within which they experienced it nor sought to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of other approaches to language instruction or alternative program models. Teacher educators, aware of the fact that the candidates from Wembley, who comprised the bulk of the student body, wanted to discuss immediate classroom needs, rather than theoretical underpinnings of language education, likewise did not initiate such conversations. Thus, Shirley and the other candidates who were not from Wembley had no real opportunities to discuss the benefits of combined language and content instruction from a theoretical perspective, to explore the strengths and weaknesses of program models other than the one used at Wembley, or to compare the Wembley program with other program types.

Second, teacher candidates from Wembley already understood the curricular goals that were expected in each classroom at each grade level. While they sought help in incorporating meaningful language instruction into these curricular goals, they did not need assistance in devising the curriculum itself. For this reason, curriculum development was not discussed, or was discussed only briefly in specific reference to isolated events or lessons at Wembley. Thus, Shirley and her non-Wembley classmates were deprived of the opportunity to engage in conversation about appropriate vs. inappropriate curricular choices for a language-support model that combines language and content instruction.

Comments offered by Fanny, Ashley, and Diane indicate that assumptions about graduates' work contexts likewise precluded conversations at Glacier State University about the benefits of combined language and content instruction. All three teachers indicated that the

program focused so extensively on the needs of elementary-level teachers guiding students through initial literacy acquisition that they found it difficult to translate what they had learned in their coursework to their daily practice as secondary-level teachers whose students struggled with math, science, social studies, and English content. This was, indeed, Fanny's chief complaint about her preparation program. Concerns about the focus on elementary-level teaching figured largely in Ashley's comments about the program, as well, although she was unable to pinpoint the exact nature of the problem, instead noting repeatedly that she hadn't been "ready" for many of the issues that she encountered in her work with adolescents.

Conversations about the benefits of promoting additive bilingualism seem likewise to have been omitted from teachers' preparation programs. This omission could, like the omission of conversations about the benefits of combined language and content instruction, be attributed to one – or both – of two causes. The first of these causes is the clear bias exhibited by each preparation program for cognitive theories about the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy. This bias is expressed, as noted previously, in the practice of allowing teachers who plan to work at the secondary level to obtain ESL certification without linking it to certification in a core secondary-level content area. Such a practice espouses the cognitivist belief that language is an object of study in and of itself, and that language teachers need not be experts in any subject other than the subject of language.

Furthermore, Mia Park from River State University confirms that her program is informed by theories drawn from the cognitive strand of SLA, while Bernadette Sester and Angela Jackson suggest that such theories are foundational at their institutions, as well. Educators working within a program built on theories of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy drawn from the cognitive strand of SLA may either be unaware of vital

concepts contained within the sociocultural framework of SLA, such as the concept of translanguaging, or may simply find it unnecessary to discuss such concepts.

A second possible cause for the omission of discussions about the benefits of additive bilingualism may lie in teacher educators' assumptions, as detailed above, about the contexts in which graduates of their respective programs will work. Marshall Miller and his colleague at Lake State University, for example, probably find it unnecessary to explore with teacher candidates the benefits of translanguaging practices or additive bilingualism, since the majority of candidates enrolled in their program already work in a setting that presumably promotes additive bilingualism and encourages students to engage in translanguaging practices. Bernadette Sester and her colleagues likewise probably see little need to discuss such concepts, as the majority of their graduates work in newcomer centers, where students' profound linguistic diversity and vastly differing experiences with schooling outside of the US make it difficult, if not impossible, to implement L1 use in sustained, meaningful ways. Indeed, Bernadette remarked during her interview that "long-term bilingual immersion would be ideal, but how do we pull this off, especially in the Gemini City area?" (Bernadette, Interview, 7 May, 2012).

Teacher educators at Cliff State University and River State University are likewise unlikely to engage candidates in conversations about the benefits of additive bilingualism and the value of encouraging students to engage in translanguaging practices. These programs both prepare candidates for work not just in the domestic K-12 setting but also in international contexts. In light of the fact that bilingual English-language instruction is generally not encouraged in international contexts and that students in international settings are, in any case, at very little risk of experiencing subtractive bilingualism, it seems unlikely that teacher educators

at either of these institutions would encourage candidates, who may very well work overseas, to engage thoughtfully with theories that promote additive bilingualism.

Without the opportunity to engage in meaningful discussion of those two concepts – additive bilingualism and combined language and content instruction – identified in the literature as vital to the success of language support program models, participating teachers were ill equipped to take on the responsibilities of either of those roles that they most needed to adopt. That is, they were not able to serve either as experts of both language and content or as effective advocates.

Participating teachers could not realistically teach combined language and content courses, since they had not been adequately prepared to implement the kinds of instructional practices necessary in such a setting. Exacerbating this problem is the fact that their preparation programs treated language as an isolated object of study, allowing teachers to obtain stand-alone licenses or licenses linked to foreign language certification, instead of requiring that they link their ESL certification to certification in a core content area. Nor could teachers advocate convincingly for the implementation of combined language and content instruction, since they had little knowledge about the benefits or practical workings of such a model of language support.

Teachers were likewise unable to offer instruction that promoted additive bilingualism or encouraged students to engage in translanguaging practices, as they had not been adequately prepared to create classroom environments that encourage such practices. Nor could they advocate successfully for the implementation of school-wide policies or practices that would promote classroom and non-classroom use of multiple languages, since they had little knowledge about the benefits or practical workings of such practices.

Thus, in focusing exclusively on those assumptions about language embedded in cognitive theories of SLA and in designing programs tailored to the needs of teachers in specific settings, participating teachers' preparation programs seem to have left these eight teachers ill equipped to deal with the challenges they faced every day in their schools. The final chapter will bring together characteristics of preparation programs, teachers' experiences, and the literature on working effectively with ELs in recommending strategies to enhance the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs in meeting the needs of secondary-level ESL teachers.

# Chapter Six

## Building Preparation Programs that Meet the Needs of Secondary-Level ESL Teachers and their Students

The data collected in this study reminds us of the many challenges that confront the growing number of adolescent ELs in U.S. schools. From teachers who lack appropriate preparation or certification to school climates that subtract cultural, social, and linguistic resources from them, ELs are positioned, by and large, to fail in school. Thus, it is not surprising that ELs as a group – both nationally and in the communities in which this study was conducted – experience alienation or dissatisfaction at school; drop out or are truant in greater numbers than their native-speaker peers; are less well prepared for post-secondary studies than any other peer groups; and perform less well on standardized tests of achievement.

Lucas, Henze and Donato remind us that successful schooling for ELs is characterized "not only [by] effective classroom instruction but also [by] whole-school approaches" (1990, p. 318). Yet individual ESL teachers can lead the way in implementing the kinds of "whole-school approaches" that promote, rather than prevent, the success and satisfaction of adolescent ELs. In order to do this, ESL teachers must be able to fulfill those roles delineated at the end of Chapter Four. Namely, they must be able to serve 1) as experts of both content and language, and 2) as advocates for school policies and practices that facilitate ELs' access to authentic school-based Discourses within an environment that promotes additive bilingualism.

I believe that the participating teachers chronicled in this study would gladly have fulfilled both of those roles in their respective schools had they possessed the knowledge and skills necessary to do so. The classroom interactions I observed and the concerns that teachers voiced during their interviews consistently revealed that these teachers cared deeply about their students and were frustrated not just by their own inability to serve ELs more effectively but also

by the inability (or unwillingness) of colleagues in mainstream classrooms to join in the effort of ensuring that ELs have access to an engaging, challenging, and achievement-oriented education at the secondary level. Meanwhile, the intersections of themes that emerged from teachers' data with themes that emerged from teacher educators' data suggest that preparation programs were not successful in helping teachers develop the skills and knowledge needed to serve as either language and content experts or as expert advocates. This chapter suggests three steps that preparation programs can take to assist teachers in becoming experts of both language and content as well as expert advocates. Note that the steps need not be taken sequentially in the order listed here; ideally, all three will be implemented simultaneously.

**STEP ONE: RESTRUCTURE ESL LICENSING OPTIONS**

Recall that all four participating institutions of higher education as well as Cliff State University, which was not officially represented in this study through an interview with a teacher educator, allow candidates to obtain either a stand-alone ESL license or an ESL license that is linked to certification in a non-core secondary-level content area, such as music, art, special education, or a foreign language. While teacher candidates attending these institutions have the option of linking an ESL license to certification in a core secondary-level content area, they are not required to do so, and the evidence presented herein suggests that many of them do not. Of the eight participating teachers represented in this study, four linked their ESL licenses to certification in a foreign language, one to certification in special education, two to certification in grades 1-8 general education, and one to certification in 6-12 biology. Thus, only one of the participating teachers - Ashley - possessed the qualifications and knowledge necessary to serve as an expert of both language and content in a core content area at the upper secondary level.

This ability to serve as an expert of both language and content is crucial to an ESL teacher's work when that work is viewed from a sociocultural perspective.

Lave and Wenger (1991) remind us that learning is a process of apprenticeship into a new community of practice. This process begins with legitimate peripheral participation and moves towards full, expert participation. Meanwhile, Gee (1996) reminds us that the school-based Discourses of science, math, social studies, and English are those communities of practice into which each student – both EL and non-EL - must be apprenticed. Each Discourse is characterized by a set of "linguistic choices [that] construe particular kinds of meanings" (Schleppegrell, 2004, p. 10). Yet the correct application of linguistic choices within a school-based Discourse is insufficient for full, expert participation. Gee (1996) points out that competent participation in a Discourse also encompasses ways of

> thinking, feeling, believing, valuing and acting, as well as using various tools, technologies, or props that can be used to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or 'social network,' to signal (that one is playing) a socially meaningful 'role,' or to signal that one is filling a social niche in a distinctively recognizable fashion (p. 161).

Thus, the job of an educator is twofold. First, he or she must establish a learning environment that enables students to observe authentic math, science, social studies, or English Discourses in action. Second, he or she must scaffold students' ability to adopt and successfully employ both the linguistic and the non-linguistic elements of that Discourse as they move from legitimate peripheral participation to full, expert participation. Teachers who lack sufficient experience with the Discourse in question cannot be expected to understand either the linguistic or the non-linguistic conventions of that Discourse well enough to recreate authentic Discourse practices within the classroom, let alone to create effective scaffolds for student participation.

ESL teachers who lack certification in a core secondary-level content area find themselves in this difficult position.

Even Ashley, who was ostensibly qualified to serve as an expert of both language and science content, may not have been properly prepared to implement the kind of combined language and content instruction that effectively apprentices students into school-based Discourses. Preparation programs such as hers, in offering licensing options that treat ESL as an isolated subject decoupled from the academic contexts in which English is used at school, reinforce the idea that teaching and learning at the secondary level can be neatly divided into distinct subjects. Recall that Ruiz-de-Velasco and Fix (2000) pinpointed the departmentalization of content at the secondary level as one of the key challenges to working effectively with adolescent ELs.

The licensing practices of all five institutions of higher education represented officially or unofficially in this study seem to reinforce the notion that instruction in secondary schools should be divided into specialized departments. That is, all five programs isolate teacher candidates' language coursework from the coursework that candidates take if they seek certification to teach a core academic subject. In thus treating ESL and biology as separate subjects, each with its own set of courses required for licensure, rather than integrated subjects with integrated course requirements, Glacier State University may have sent Ashley into the field prepared to teach either biology or ESL in isolation, but not in combination. Moreover, her preparation program may have sent her into the field convinced that biology and ESL *should be* taught in isolation, rather than in combination.

Thus, in failing to require combined certification in ESL and a core secondary-level content area, preparation programs severely limit teachers' capacity to fulfill the role not only of

an expert in both language and content but also of an expert advocate. Without an effective understanding of the intricate interconnections between language and its contexts of use, teachers can neither teach effectively in a combined language and content classroom nor advocate convincingly for others to do so.

Preparation programs can take steps towards remedying this problem by eliminating licensing requirements that allow for the acquisition of a stand-alone ESL license or of an ESL license linked to certification in a non-core secondary-level content area. Such requirements can be replaced with a system that distinguishes among the following types of ESL licenses:

1) domestic certification at the elementary level + ESL and, as applicable, bilingual certification,
2) domestic certification in a core upper secondary-level content area + ESL and, as applicable, bilingual certification, and
3) international certification in TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language)

While some coursework would be shared amongst the requirements of these three types of license, sufficient flexibility would remain to allow for a focus on those issues of greatest relevance to teachers working within the educational setting assumed by the license type. For example, it may be appropriate to emphasize a cognitivist language-as-content approach to pedagogy in the TEFL strand, even though such an emphasis would clearly be inappropriate for candidates enrolled in the elementary or secondary content + ESL strands. Indeed, coursework in these strands must fully integrate the teaching and learning of academic content with the teaching and learning of language, so that teachers not only recognize the intricate connections between language and its contexts of use but also possess the skills to teach language effectively within those academic contexts that students encounter in American high schools.

A reorganization of licensing requirements such as that recommended above would go far in ensuring that ESL teachers are properly grounded in the theories and practices most applicable to the settings in which they work. Furthermore, such a structure may help to break down the departmentalized and fragmentary nature of instruction in secondary-level schools, which serves as one obstacle to the success of adolescent ELs. Ruiz de Velasco and Fix (2000) remind us that ESL teachers at the secondary level are often regarded as members of a unique department whose members are discouraged from working across departmental lines to provide quality educational experiences for ELs. However, ESL teachers who hold qualifications as both language experts and content experts can claim allegiance to both the language department and their respective content departments. With the borders of departmental membership thus blurred, it becomes increasingly more difficult to justify the continued reliance upon a strictly departmentalized environment, in which a specialized ESL department bears primary or even sole responsibility for the education of ELs.

Finally, a reorganized license structure such as the one described above would aid secondary-level school administrators in making appropriate faculty hiring and course assignment decisions. The practice of issuing a generic K-12 ESL license to a "language expert" who possesses no other area of academic expertise reinforces the notion that ELs are best served by programs that help them "master" English as a subject in and of itself before attempting to engage with rigorous academic content presented in English. Thus, it is not surprising that many schools hire language specialists to guide ELs through the process of "mastering" English in isolation from academic content. A licensing system that treats language and content as an indivisible unit will assist administrators not only in recognizing that language cannot be learned

in isolation from content but also in finding appropriately qualified teachers to implement combined language and content instruction.

Administrators will be further aided in making appropriate hiring and placement decisions by working closely with teachers who have been prepared to advocate for the implementation of effective language-support programs. Such teachers will understand that, while combined language and content instruction should always be the overarching goal of language-support programs, there is no single model that can be appropriately applied to the education of all ELs. Underschooled newcomers at the secondary level, for example, may benefit from a CBI approach, while adolescent ELs who are already familiar with both school culture and the English language are more likely to benefit from an SI approach. Recall from Chapter Two that a CBI approach emphasizes the study of language through the use of authentic academic materials, while an SI approach emphasizes the study of academic content, but focuses attention on the unique linguistic demands of the discipline. ESL teachers who have been prepared to advocate for effective programming will be able not only to describe with confidence the need for such differentiation but also to design high quality differentiated curricula, make appropriate staffing and student placement recommendations, and monitor each program for its continued degree of fit with the needs of those students whom it was designed to serve. The next step offers guidance in preparing ESL teachers to work as effective advocates.

**STEP TWO: EMBRACE AND FULLY INCORPORATE ASSUMPTIONS INTO THE TEACHER PREPARATION CURRICULUM**

On the surface, this seems like an unusual suggestion for enhancing the quality of teacher preparation programs. We have seen that those assumptions held by teacher educators about the contexts in which graduates of their programs would work presented serious difficulties and

frustrations to participating teachers. Fanny, for example, had a good deal of trouble translating her program's emphasis on the needs of elementary-level ESL teachers to her own needs as a secondary-level teacher. Shirley, meanwhile, appreciated hearing about the work of her classmates in Wembley's K-8 dual-immersion Spanish/English bilingual program, but was frustrated by her inability to apply any of their experiences to her own situation. Shirley's interest in learning from her classmates' experiences and her frustration at being unable to do so suggest that teacher educators' underlying assumptions about the contexts in which candidates will work may have a positive role to play in the teacher preparation curriculum.

The primary problem with educators' assumptions about the contexts in which their graduates would work lay not in the fact that they held such assumptions, but in the fact that these assumptions seem to have precluded meaningful discussion of other teaching contexts or instructional approaches. Shirley, for example, clearly did not have opportunities to discuss with her classmates and educators the logistics of applying what she had learned to models that differed from the model used at Wembley. Nor did Fanny enjoy an opportunity to discuss ways of transforming her knowledge for use at the secondary level. Data collected from Diane and Ashley, who, like Fanny, attended Glacier State, suggest that they, too, were denied opportunities to discuss the practicalities of teaching ESL in various program models at the secondary level.

Meanwhile, Linda admitted quite explicitly that her preparation program had not discussed program models or instructional approaches other than those traditionally found in ELD courses that assume a cognitivist focus on language as an academic subject in and of itself. This is hardly surprising, given the fact that Cliff State University prepares teachers for work as both ESL teachers in the U.S. K-12 setting and EFL teachers in international settings.

Confronted with such a diverse array of possible work contexts, educators at Cliff State may have felt that there was no room in the curriculum for a discussion of all possible program models in which graduates might work.

It is, of course, difficult to conclude decisively that teachers' preparation programs failed to teach candidates about and engage them in discussion of multiple program models or teaching contexts because of educators' assumptions about those contexts in which graduates would work. Nevertheless, it is clear that such discussions did not happen. It is also clear that educators did hold assumptions about the contexts in which graduates would work and that those assumptions, moreover, did affect the experiences of teacher candidates. Rather than suggesting that educators attempt to set aside their assumptions, I suggest that they clearly acknowledge these assumptions and use them to their instructional advantage.

That is, educators' assumptions about graduates' future teaching contexts could serve as valuable springboards for exploration and discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of various program models and instructional approaches. For example, the preponderance of teacher candidates at Lake State University working on emergency licenses in the Wembley District's bilingual program offers an ideal opportunity for all teacher candidates in the program to engage in discussion about the work that Wembley teachers do, the theories that inform this work, the advantages their school's model can offer over other models, the weaknesses that may be present in their model, and the ways in which successful elements of their model can be effectively incorporated into other models. Similar learning opportunities are offered at Andrews University by educators' assumptions about graduates' work in newcomer centers in Gemini City; at Glacier State University by educators' assumptions about graduates' work at the elementary

level; and at Cliff State University or River State University by educators' assumptions about graduates' work in both international TEFL contexts and domestic ESL contexts.

In taking the opportunity to explore carefully those contexts in which graduates of each program are presumed to work and to compare those contexts with other contexts, preparation programs could do much to prepare ESL teachers for their work as successful advocates. Such an exploration would equip teachers with the theoretical knowledge of and terminology to speak convincingly about various language support program models, their advantages and disadvantages, and the details of their implementation. Without such knowledge teachers are, as we have seen, unable to serve as effective advocates for the implementation of effective language support programs or school policies.

Moreover, a discussion of the ways to implement various program models in various teaching contexts opens the door onto another important conversation that must take place in teachers' preparation programs. Namely, the inseparability of language acquisition and language use as well as the inseparability of language use and context require that teachers who wish to work effectively with ELs be able to identify, analyze, and respond appropriately to the multiple contexts of language use within which their students operate. Effective teachers must also be able to identify, analyze, and respond appropriately to the multiple elements that intersect within, between, and among all of the language-use contexts relevant to students' lives. This is a formidable task that must, nonetheless, be undertaken, if teachers wish to help students recognize, participate effectively in, and learn to appropriate for their own purposes those Discourses employed by communities of which they need or want to become members. The process of reflecting upon and acting appropriately within various contexts of language use may seem less daunting for teacher candidates if they begin by reflecting on teaching contexts in the

narrow sense of specific program models. Gradually, these reflective skills and conceptions of "context" can be broadened to include ever more pieces of the various puzzles that comprise the multiple language-use contexts in which students live.

**STEP THREE: EMBRACE A MORE HOLISTIC CONCEPTION OF SLA**

Participating institutions of higher education all seem to have built their preparation programs around cognitivist conceptions, as described in Chapter Two, of the nature of language, language learning, and language pedagogy. This bias is reflected, as described above, in the practice of allowing teachers to pursue ESL certification that casts them as experts of language as an object for study, but not as experts of language in use. Preparation programs' preference for a cognitive framework of SLA is likewise reflected in the fact that all but one of the eight participating teachers exhibited the characteristics of good language teachers, when a language teacher's quality or effectiveness is viewed through a cognitive framework that values her ability to describe language-use rules clearly and effectively; to devise exercises that allow students to practice the proper use of certain discrete language forms; to compare and contrast students' L1 with their L2; and to model the use of language-learning strategies.

These skills and knowledge are not unimportant, particularly when teachers find themselves working with underschooled newcomers who have very little familiarity with English or with the concept of written literacy. Nevertheless, these skills and knowledge are insufficient for a teacher's work with adolescent ELs who need – and want – to continue developing their proficiency in English while they engage with challenging academic content. The ability to implement a pedagogical approach that combines language instruction with challenging content instruction is particularly vital to the work of ESL teachers at the upper secondary level, where academic content becomes increasingly more complex and specialized. In order to work

successfully with learners in such a context, teachers must understand the following about the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy:

1) Language is a dynamic set of resources used by individuals to interpret, interact with, and act upon their environment. Language is not a static body of knowledge that will always be understood and used in identical ways across contexts and individuals.
2) Multilinguals have access to more linguistic resources than monolinguals and will interpret, interact with, and act upon their environment most effectively when allowed to draw upon the full set of resources at their disposal, rather than trying to compartmentalize the use of L1, L2, L3, etc.
3) Language is best developed through authentic use in meaningful contexts. Provided that appropriate scaffolds are supplied, learners can use the L2 to perform complex and academically challenging tasks even when their proficiency levels are quite low. Waiting for learners to develop a "full" command of the language before allowing them to use it for meaningful and intellectually challenging purposes merely deprives learners of the opportunity both to study academic content and to continue developing their proficiency in English.
4) Ideal language pedagogy apprentices learners into the appropriate use of the L2 by creating authentic classroom Discourses in which learners can legitimately participate, even if they are not comfortable working alone or playing the role of an "expert." In an ideal language classroom, specific lexical items and discrete language forms are studied as needed, not as the centerpiece of the curriculum.

These understandings about the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy are central to the sociocultural framework of SLA, but play no part in the cognitive

framework. Thus, an ESL preparation program informed solely by scholarship from the cognitive strand of SLA fails to provide teacher candidates the theoretical underpinnings necessary to offer – or advocate for the implementation of - effective practices built upon the concepts of combined language and content instruction in an environment that promotes additive bilingualism. Programs that wish to prepare secondary-level ESL teachers for their roles not only as experts of both language and content but also as advocates for effective programming would do well to build their curriculum and instruction around a holistic framework of SLA scholarship that encompasses the most salient understandings of both the sociocultural approach and the cognitive approach.

Recall that scholars such as Firth and Wagner (1997) and Lantolf (1996) have called for a reconceptualization of the field of SLA, in which a sociocultural perspective on the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy can flourish alongside the cognitive perspective which has long dominated the field. This injunction is imperative if the field of SLA is to make an effective contribution to the preparation of ESL teachers who will work in U.S. secondary-level schools. Teachers in such settings can no longer rely solely on a cognitivist understanding of the nature of language, language acquisition, and language pedagogy. Such understandings clearly leave teachers unprepared either to implement or to advocate for the implementation of truly effective pedagogical approaches and program models. Adolescent ELs have languished in inadequate school environments for far too long. It is time, indeed, for both scholars and the teacher educators who find guidance in their work to embrace a vision of SLA that no longer excludes the sociocultural understandings of language and learning upon which effective pedagogy for ELs must necessarily be built.

While the themes and ideas presented herein can provide valuable insight to teacher educators who wish to design effective ESL teacher preparation programs, they can offer only so much guidance. As noted above, a teacher's preparation program is not the only experience that influences her beliefs, dispositions, skills, knowledge, or daily work. Thus, our understanding of what it means to create an effective preparation program for ESL teachers must be tempered by and supplemented with an understanding of the ways in which the broader contexts of teachers' lives and work affect their beliefs, dispositions, knowledge, skills, and classroom practice. Additionally, further research is needed into the intersections of teachers' work with teachers' preparation programs. The present study suggests five future research directions, each of which will be discussed briefly below.

**SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH**

A key question that emerged from this study is the question of whether or not preparation programs explicitly teach theories of SLA. The data indicates that all five institutions of higher education represented officially or unofficially in this study built their ESL teacher preparation programs on the cognitive framework of SLA. However, it is not clear that teachers were explicitly taught about cognitive – or any other – theories of SLA. Three of the participating teachers – Fanny, Donna, and Amanda - specifically mentioned having taken an SLA course, from which they recalled having learned about the cognitivist theories proposed by Stephen Krashen. Amanda was also familiar with the work of Jim Cummins. Kara, meanwhile, indicated that her understanding of SLA, also based largely on the work of Stephen Krashen and Jim Cummins, was acquired through her preparation as a foreign language teacher, not through her ESL-specific preparation. Diane admitted that she acquired her understanding of SLA theory

through a combination of self study and the coursework required for her foreign language certification. The remaining three teachers made no mention of SLA coursework or theory.

A visit to the website of each institution of higher education suggests that many ESL teacher candidates do not take SLA coursework. Such courses are not a required part of the undergraduate-level ESL teacher preparation curriculum at any of the five preparing institutions attended by participating teachers. Thus, it is unlikely that Ashley, whose biology and ESL licenses were both earned at the undergraduate level, took a course in SLA. Meanwhile, four of the institutions represented herein offer SLA coursework as an elective, rather than a required component, of the graduate-level ESL certification or MA/MED curriculum. Ashley is the only participating teacher who earned her ESL certification at the undergraduate level; thus, the remaining seven teachers would have been given the opportunity to take SLA as an elective. Amanda and Fanny noted that they had, indeed, each taken an SLA course. Fanny, moreover, had been required to take an SLA course during her undergraduate preparation as an EFL teacher in Brazil. She commented that her SLA course in Brazil had been quite similar to the SLA course that she took at Glacier State University; that is, both courses were built around the cognitive theories of scholars such as Stephen Krashen. Donna, meanwhile, was the only participating teacher who was required to take an SLA course, as Andrews University, alone of all participating institutions of higher education, requires its graduate-level ESL certification or MA candidates to take an SLA course.

In light of these circumstances, it would be beneficial to conduct a study that focuses specifically on ESL teachers' knowledge of SLA. Namely, did teachers take SLA courses as part of their preparation programs? If yes, what concepts and theories did they explore? Did their SLA coursework encompass underlying ideas about the nature of language and language

use, or did it focus narrowly on classroom practice? If teachers did not take SLA coursework, do they subscribe to a particular theory of SLA and how did they develop that theory? Does this theory encompass underlying ideas about the nature of language and language use, or does it focus narrowly on classroom practice? If SLA courses are not offered at teachers' preparing institutions, what reasons do educators at these institutions offer to explain this gap in the curriculum?

Of the remaining four suggestions for future research, one focuses attention on both teachers and teacher educators, while three focus squarely on teacher educators. The first of these research needs was described in Chapter Three as a potential limitation of the present study. Namely, in focusing on teachers in non-gateway areas, this study leaves a host of questions unanswered about the similarities – and differences – that distinguish the work of teachers in gateway areas from the work of teachers in non-gateway areas. Chief among these is the question of whether or not teachers in traditional gateway districts enjoy more opportunities than their counterparts in non-gateway districts, as represented by the participating teachers in this study, to work in meaningful ways with ELs. If they do, can this disparity in the amount and quality of instruction that teachers are able to offer be attributed to differences in teachers' professional development experiences or to differences in school structures, school culture, and district-level decision-making processes? If they do not, can this similarity in the amount and quality of instruction that teachers are able to offer be attributed to similarities in teachers' professional development experiences or to similarities in school structures, school culture, and district-level decision-making processes?

The remaining three areas for future research focus on the knowledge, experiences, and practices of teacher educators. The first of these areas seeks to understand whether or not

teacher educators themselves embrace a holistic picture of SLA. While participating teacher educators did not specifically discuss their beliefs about SLA, their oft-repeated concerns about helping teachers understand the "big picture" social and political issues of their work as well as their stated preferences for bilingual educational models suggest that all four teacher educators respect the principles upon which sociocultural theories of SLA are built. Nevertheless, the preparation programs in which they work reflect a one-sided cognitive approach to SLA. Indeed, both Mia and Angela expressed varying degrees of frustration with the fact that their respective programs focused to such a great extent on the details of daily classroom practice and discrete linguistic knowledge at the expense of overarching theories and issues.

Likewise helpful would be an inquiry into teacher educators' own beliefs about and skills in teaching combined language and content courses within an environment that promotes additive bilingualism. If teacher educators do value such a teaching environment, are they able to effectively prepare ESL teacher candidates for such work? For example, teacher educators may be limited in preparing secondary-level teachers for such work by inadequate knowledge of academic content or by an inability to place teacher candidates in practicum sites that offer meaningful opportunities either to observe or implement language and content instruction within an environment that promotes additive bilingualism.

Finally, the literature on preparing ESL teachers for work at the secondary level would be greatly enhanced by research which explores teacher educators' understandings not only of the importance of preparing ESL teachers to work as advocates but also of what it means to be an effective advocate for adolescent ELs. The issue of preparing teachers to work as advocates was raised by only one of the teacher educators who participated in this study. Bernadette Sester explained that Andrews University offers a course in advocacy, which is required of all students

pursuing a Master's in ESL Education, but is merely an elective for undergraduate students or students enrolled in the graduate-level ESL certification program. When asked to elaborate on the content of this course or the need for advocacy in schools, Bernadette simply alluded vaguely to the fact that ESL teachers must be prepared to "wear a variety of hats" (Bernadette, Interview, 7 May, 2102).

Thus, it seems that teacher preparation programs, by and large, focus only scant attention on the needs of ESL teachers as advocates. Research on this issue as well as on each of the other four issues named above is clearly needed to aid educators in the task of creating strong preparation programs that send ESL teachers into the field well prepared to meet the challenges of working effectively with ELs at the secondary level.

# APPENDIX A

Teacher Interview Protocol

1. Describe your position in your district/school.
2. What do you think are key things that teachers need to know and do to work with English learners (ELs) effectively?
3. What are the biggest challenges your ELs face?
4. What are your particular strengths in teaching them?
5. Your biggest challenges?
6. What sorts of support are available to you in working with ELs?
7. What sorts of support would you like to see in place?
8. What was your professional preparation for teaching ELs (and where)?
9. What do you feel you gained from it?
10. How might it be improved?

# APPENDIX B

Teacher Educator Interview Protocol

1. Describe your position in your institution.
2. What are the key things that teachers need to know and do to work with ELs effectively?
3. What are the biggest challenges ELs face?
4. What are the biggest challenges teachers of ELs face?
5. Does your program have a particular philosophy or perspective on preparing teachers of ELs? (if so, what is it?)
6. Do you have a particular philosophy or perspective on preparing teachers of ELs?
7. What sorts of programs and practices do you feel are effective in teaching ELs?
8. Can you describe the structure of your program?
9. Can you describe the sorts of pedagogies and practices you promote?
10. Can you tell us about your background and preparation in terms of the field of English as a Second Language?

# APPENDIX C

Table of Emergent Themes across Teachers' Data

| | Diane | Donna | Ashley | Amanda | Linda | Kara | Fanny | Shirley |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| obtained ESL certification and/or current job through an atypical route | x | x | | x | x | | x | x |
| chosen for work with ELs because experience / initial teacher preparation was in a foreign language or languages | x | | | x | | x | | x |
| spent little or no time teaching ELs , in the traditional sense of "teaching" | x | x | x | x | depends on semester | x | x | x |
| explicitly stated that she perceived a disconnect between the work for which she had been prepared and the work that she actually performed | yes & no | | x | | x | x | x | x |
| described a disconnect between the work for which she had been prepared and the work that she actually performed | x | x | x | yes & no | x | yes & no | x | x |
| was generally satisfied with ESL prep program, even it if was perceived to have been disconnected from the work that she actually performs on a daily basis | yes & no | x | x | x | | x | x | x |
| | | | | | | | | |
| *Identified the following as necessary components of working successfully with ELs* | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| positive beliefs/attitudes about diversity, students' abilities, students' native cultures and languages, and/or students' right to be in school | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| good relationships with students | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| ability to differentiate language, instruction, and assessment | x | x | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| some understanding of the SLA process (cognitive) and the ways in which it affects students' academic work and social/instructional interactions | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x |

| | Diane | Donna | Ashley | Amanda | Linda | Kara | Fanny | Shirley |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ability to understand/empathize with students' needs | x | x | x | x | x | | x | x |
| good, consistent relationships with families | x | | | | x | x | x | x |
| ability to understand / use students' L1, and understanding of when to use L1 vs. when to use L2 | x | | x | | | x | x | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| *Identified the following challenges faced by ELs in her school* | | | | | | | | |
| negative, exclusionary, or ill-informed beliefs/attitudes about cultural and linguistic diversity, students' home cultures, ELs' academic abilities, and/or ELs' status in the school/community | x | x | x | x | x | * | x | x |
| teachers who don't understand/empathize with students' needs | x | x | x | x | x | | | x |
| lack of post-graduation options = low motivation to do well in school | x | | x | | | x | x | |
| lack of academic support/expertise/language at home (in any language) | | x | x | | | x | x | |
| home/school culture divide | x | x | | x | x | | x | |
| academic language (reading in particular) | x | x | | | | x | x | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| *Identified the following needs* | | | | | | | | |
| support from colleagues, in terms of being able/willing to differentiate and/or in terms of holding more positive beliefs and attitudes about students' abilities and the cultural and linguistic diversity that they bring to the community | x | x | | x | x | x | x | x |
| more time | x | x | x | x | x | | | x |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| | Diane | Donna | Ashley | Amanda | Linda | Kara | Fanny | Shirley |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| perceived the school environment to be supportive of ELs/ESL teacher as long as there were adequate funds and the principal was responsive to her needs as a teacher; her definition of "supportive environment" had very little to do with the behaviors and attitudes of colleagues in mainstream classrooms, even if colleagues' behaviors and attitudes were cited as challenges that ELs must overcome | x | x | x | x | yes & no | | yes & no | yes & no |

* - felt that this was a major challenge typically faced by ELs, but did not perceive it to be a challenge in her particular school; attributed the absence of this challenge to luck.

## REFERENCES

Anderson, J. (2013). Online comment describing the location and campus culture of "Andrews University." Retrieved from http://www.hamline.edu/undergraduate/addmission/ask-apiper.html.

Ballantyne, K. G., Sanderman, A. R., & Levy, J. (2008). *Educating English Language learners: Building teacher capacity*. Roundtable Report from the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition.

Bérubé, B. (2000). *Managing ESL programs in rural and small urban schools.* Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J.S., & Herwantoro, S. (2005). *The new demography of America's schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Cazden, C. B. (2001). *Classroom discourse: The language of teaching and learning* (2nd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Chambers, J. & Parrish, T. (1992). *Meeting the challenges of diversity: An evaluation of programs for pupils with limited proficiency in English: Vol. 4. Cost of programs and services for LEP students.* Berkeley, CA: BW Associates.

Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Charmaz, K. (2005). Grounded theory in the 21st century: Applications for advancing social justice studies. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of*

*Qualitative Research, (3rd ed.)* (pp. 507-535). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Chomsky, N. (1957). *Syntactic structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

------- (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

------- (1981). *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

------- (1995). *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

------- (2002). *On nature and language*, Ed. A. Belletti, & L. Rizzi. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clahsen, H., Meisel, J., & Pienemann, M. (1983). *Deutsch als Zweitspraches der Spracherwerb ausländischer Arbeiter.* Tübingen, Deutschland: Gunter Narr.

Cosentino de Cohen, C., Deterding, N., & Clewell, B.C. (2005). *Who's left behind? Immigrant children in high and low LEP schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Crandall, J. (Ed.). (1987). *ESL through content-area instruction: Mathematics, science, social studies.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Crawford, J. (1999). *Bilingual education: History, politics, theory, and practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services.

Cronbach, L. J. (1975). Beyond the two disciplines of scientific psychology. *American Psychologist, 30,* 116-127.

Cummins, J. (1981a). Age on arrival and immigrant second language learning in Canada: A reassessment. *Applied Linguistics*, 2, 131-149.

------- (1981b). The role of primary language development in promoting educational success for language minority students. In Office of Bilingual Bicultural Education, Department of Education, Sacramento, California (Ed.), *Schooling and language*

*minority students: A theoretical framework* (pp. 3-49). Los Angeles: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University, Los Angeles.

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

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

de Jong, E. J., & Harper, C. A. (2004). *Is ESL just good teaching?* Creating teacher community: selected papers from the third international conference on language teacher education.

------- (2005). Preparing mainstream teachers for English-Language Learners: Is being a good teacher good enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly, Spring,* 101-124.

Diaz-Rico, L., & Weed, K. (2006). *The crosscultural, language, and academic development handbook* (3rd ed.). Boston: Pearson Education.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). A new perspective on the creative construction process in child second language acquisition. *Working Papers on Bilingualism,* 4:71-98.

Dulay, H., Burt, M., & Krashen, S. (1982). *Language Two*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Dutro. S., & Moran, C. (2003). Rethinking English language instruction: An architectural approach. (Draft). In G. G. García (Ed.), *English Learners: Reaching the highest level of English literacy* (pp. 227-258). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Echevarria, J. & Graves, A. (2007.) *Sheltered content instruction: Teaching English Language Learners with diverse abilities.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Echevarria, J., Vogt, M., & Short, D. (2000 / 2008). *Making content comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP model.* Boston: Pearson Education.

Firth, A., & Wagner, J. (1997). On discourse, communication, and (some) fundamental concepts in SLA research. *Modern Language Journal, 81*(3), 285-300.

Gándara, P., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Driscoll, A. (2005). *Listening to teachers of English Language Learners: A survey of California teachers' challenges, experiences, and professional development needs.* Santa Cruz, CA: The Regents of the University of California / The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning. Retrieved from www.cftl.org.

García, O. (2009). Education, multilingualism and translanguaging in the 21st century. In A. Mohanty, et al. (Eds.), *Multilingual education for social justice: Globalising the local* (pp. 128-145). New Delhi: Orient Blackswan (formerly Orient Longman).

------- (2013). Educating international and immigrant students in U.S. higher education: Opportunities and challenges. In A. Doiz et al (Eds.), *Bilingual community education and multilingualism: Beyond heritage languages in a global city* (pp. 3-42). Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Gee, J.P. (1996). *Social linguistics and literacies: Ideology in Discourses*. Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Genesee, F. (Ed.). (1999). *Program alternatives for linguistically diverse students*. Santa Cruz, CA / Washington, D.C.: Center for Research on Education, Diversity & Excellence / U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Educational Resources Information Center.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

González, N., Moll, L. C., & Amanti, C., (Eds.). (2005). *Funds of knowledge: Theorizing practices in households, communities, and classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hanks, W. (1991). Foreword. In, Lave, J. & Wenger, E., *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation* (pp. 13-24). Cambridge, England / New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Harper, C. A., de Jong, E. J., & Platt, E. J. (2008). Marginalizing English as a Second Language teacher expertise: The exclusionary consequence of No Child Left Behind. *Language Policy, 7*(3), September, 267-284.

Hawkins, M. (2005). ESL in elementary education. In G. Hinkel (Ed.), *The handbook of research on second language learning and teaching* (pp. 25-43). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

------- (2010). Sociocultural approaches to language teaching and learning. In A. Creese & C. Leung (Eds.), *English as an additional language: Approaches to teaching language minority students* (pp. 97-107). London: Sage UK

Kenny, W. R., & Grotelueschen, A. D. (1980). *Making the case for case study*. Occasional paper, Office for the Study of Continuing Professional Education. Urbana-Champaign: College of Education, University of Illinois.

Klein, W., & Perdue, C. (1992). *Utterance structure: Developing grammar again.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Krashen, S. (1978). The Monitor Model for second-language acquisition. In R. C. Gingras (Ed.), *Second language acquisition and foreign language teaching* (pp. 1-26). Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lantolf, J. (1996). SLA theory building: "Letting all the flowers bloom!" *Language Learning, 46*(4), 713-749.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge, England / New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lee, S. J. (2001). More than "Model Minorities" or "Delinquents": A look at Hmong American high school students. *Harvard Educational Review, 71* (3), 505-528.

------- (2005). *Up Against Whiteness.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Levinson, B., Bucher, K., Harvey, L., Martinez, R., Perez, B., Russell, S., Harris, B., Cowan, P., Chung C. (2007). Latino language minority students in Indiana: Conditions & challenges. A special report of the Center for Evaluation and Education Policy, Indiana University. http://www.indiana.edu/~iplacc/docs/Language%20Minority%20Report%20CEEP.pdf Retrieved on 15 April, 2011.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). *How languages are learned* (revised ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. In W. C. Ritchie & T. K. Bhatia (Eds.), *Handbook of second language acquisition* (pp. 413-68). New York: Academic Press.

Lucas, T. (1997). *Into, through, and beyond secondary school: Critical transitions for immigrant youths.* McHenry, IL: Delta Systems Co., Inc./Center for Applied Linguistics.

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, D. J. McIntyre, & K. E. Demers, (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education: Enduring questions in changing contexts* (3rd ed.) (pp. 606-636). New York: Routledge / Manassas, VA: the Association of Teacher Educators.

Lucas, T., Henze, R., & Donato, R. (1990). Promoting the success of Latino language-minority students: An exploratory study of six high schools. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(3), 315-340.

Mace-Matluck, B., Alexander-Kasparik, R., & Queen, R. (1998). *Through the golden door: Educational approaches for immigrant adolescents with limited schooling.* McHenry, IL / Washington, D.C.: Delta Systems, Co., Inc. / Center for Applied Linguistics.

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

NCELA (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition). (February, 2008). Educating English Language Learners: Building teacher capacity, vol. III, State requirements for pre-service teachers of ELLs. Retrieved from http://www.ncela.gwu.edu.

Pienemann, M. (1998). Developmental dynamics in L1 and L2 acquisition: Processability Theory and generative enrichment. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, 1*, 1-20.

Reese, L., Garnier, H., Gallimore, R., & Goldenberg, C. (2000). Longitudinal analysis of the antecedents of emergent Spanish literacy and middle-school English reading achievement of Spanish-speaking students. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(3), 633-662.

Reeves, J. (2004). Like everybody else: Equalizing educational opportunity for ELLs. *TESOL Quarterly,* 38 (1), 43-66.

------- (2006). Secondary teacher attitudes toward including English-Language Learners in mainstream classrooms. *The Journal of Educational Research, 99* (3), 131-142.

Royer, J., & Carlo, M. (1991). Transfer of comprehension skills from native to second language. *Journal of Reading, 34*(6), 450-455.

Ruiz-de-Velasco, J. & Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked and underserved: Immigrant students in U.S. secondary schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute.

Saville-Troike, M. (1984). What really matters in second language learning for academic achievement? *TESOL Quarterly, 18*(2), 199-219.

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

Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. *International Review of Applied Linguistics, 10*, 209-231.

(1992). *Rediscovering interlanguage.* London: Longman.

Short, D. (1991a). *How to integrate language and content instruction: A training manual.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

------- (1991b). Content-based English language teaching: A focus on teaching training. *Cross Currents, 18*(2), 167-173.

Short, D. & Boyson, B. (2004). *Creating access: Language and academic programs for secondary school newcomers.* Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Sleeter, C. (1999). Foreword. In G. Valenzuela, *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring* (pp. xv-xviii). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Stryker, S., & Leaver, B. (1997). Content-based instruction: From theory to practice. In S. Stryker and B. Leaver (Eds.), *Content-based instruction in foreign language education: models and methods* (pp 3 – 28). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16* (3), 371-91.

Téllez, K., & Waxman, H. C., (Eds.). (2006). *Preparing quality educators for English Language Learners: Research, policies, and practices.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

TESOL (2006). *PreK-12 English language proficiency standards*. Retrieved from http://www.tesol.org/advance-the-field/standards/prek-12-english-language-proficiency-standards.

Thomas, W., & Collier, V. (1997). *School effectiveness and language minority students.* (NCBE Resource Collection Series, No. 9). Washington, D.C.: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Toohey, K. (2000). *Learning English at school: Identity, social relations, and classroom practices.* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Olson. C., & Land, R. (2007). A cognitive strategies approach to reading and writing instruction for English Language Learners in secondary school. *Research in the Teaching of English, 41*(3), 269-303.

Valdés, G. (1998). The world outside and inside schools: Language and immigrant children. *Educational Researcher, 27* (6), 4-18.

------- (2001). *Learning and not learning English: Latino students in American schools.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Valenzuela, A. (1997). Mexican American youth and the politics of caring. In E. Long (Ed.), *From sociology to cultural studies* (pp. 322 -350). London: Blackwell.

------- (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Verplaetse, L. S. (1998). How content teachers interact with English Language Learners. *TESOL Journal, 7*, 24-28.

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

------- (2007). The culturally responsive teacher. *Educational leadership,* March, 28-33.

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

WIDA (2012). *English Language Development (ELD) Standards.* Retrieved from http://www.wida.us/standards/eld.aspx.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (2009). Statistical information on ELs. Retrieved from http://dpi.wi.gov/ell/bilingual-esl.html and http://dpi.wi.gov/ell/lepdatacoll.html.

Wisconsin Legislature. *Wisconsin State Statute 115.95/PL13*. Retrieved from https://docs.legis.wisconsin.gov/statutes/statutes/115/VII/95/4.

Wong Fillmore, L., & Snow, C. E. (2002). What teachers need to know about language. In C. Temple Adger, C. E. Snow, & D. Christian (Eds.), *What teachers need to know about language* (pp. 7-53). McHenry, IL: Center for Applied Linguistics and Delta Systems Co., Inc.

Yin, R. K. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods, (2nd ed.)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.