How Prepared are the U. S. Preservice Teachers to Teach English Language Learners?

Aydin Yücesan Durgunoğlu and Trudie Hughes
University of Minnesota Duluth

This study focuses on self-efficacy, attitudes, perceived preparedness, and the knowledge of preservice teachers in the USA regarding isolated English Language Learners (ELLs) in high school classrooms. In the first study, 62 preservice teachers who were doing their student teaching completed a survey on: (a) their perceived preparation and self-efficacy regarding ELL students, (b) their attitudes towards ELL students in mainstream classrooms and their parents. They also completed an ELL knowledge test. In Study 2, several high school classrooms that included a few ELLs were observed to determine what these students experienced in a mainstream classroom and how the preservice teachers interacted with them. Four Caucasian female pre-service teachers from Study 1 were observed. Results from Study 1 showed that the sense of preparedness was verified by the performance on the knowledge test and was related to self-efficacy. The classroom observations indicated that these preservice teachers were not well prepared to teach ELL students and their mentoring teachers were not providing any guidance.

In classrooms around the world, the number of students who do not speak the predominant language of the country is increasing significantly (Arkoudis, 2005; Milani, 2007, Spotti, 2007). In the US, the population of English Language Learners (ELL) has more than doubled, representing approximately 8.4% of all public school students (Zehler, Fleischman, Hopstock, Stephenson, Pendzick & Sapru, 2003). Although the majority of ELL speak Spanish (Zehler et al, 2003), 56% of schools have students coming from 3-50 different language backgrounds, with 48% of schools having fewer than 30 ELL students. This implies that students from many linguistic backgrounds can be found across mainstream classrooms. We call these students "isolated ELLs." Teachers in the mainstream classrooms shoulder responsibility for the education of isolated ELLs, including their language development. Unfortunately, teachers, especially in secondary education, are largely untrained to work with ELL students or may assume that ELL students are the responsibility of the English as a Second Language teacher (Reeves, 2006). The isolated ELLs in the classrooms of teachers who do not feel competent or responsible for teaching ELL students become "invisible" or even "powerless" (Yoon, 2008). These patterns of exclusion and neglect are likely to be more serious in high schools, where teachers are more specialized in their own areas (Coulter and Smith, 2006).

In this study, we investigated the self-efficacy and knowledge of preservice teachers to determine how prepared and confident they are for teaching ELL students who are likely to be in their future classrooms. Research of the last few decades has shown that self-efficacy is significantly related to work performance regardless of the complexity of the task. Self-efficacy is the belief in one's capabilities to organize and conduct activities to produce certain outcomes, as well as the perception that the surrounding context is controllable (Bandura, 1993; 2004). It relates to performance because it affects the amount of effort expended, persistence at the task, resilience when faced with obstacles, and perceived stress. Individuals who have high self-efficacy put in sufficient effort that may produce successful outcomes, whereas those who have low self-efficacy are likely to give up prematurely and fail on a task. In short, individuals regulate their efforts in accordance with the effects they expect their actions to have.

A teacher's self-efficacy has a powerful connection to teaching and learning (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk, Hoy & Hoy, 1998; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). Two questions on a survey (now called the RAND items) turned out to be strong predictors of teacher persistence and effectiveness. The first item, "When it comes right down to it, a teacher can't do much because most of a student's motivation and performance depends on his or her home environment," is considered to reflect an individual's views on General Teaching Efficacy (GTE), regarding the profession in general and whether or not other factors (e.g., home environment) are perceived to be major influences that are beyond the control of the teacher. The second RAND item, "If I try really hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated student," is considered to reflect one's own Personal Teaching Efficacy—PTE (Gibson & Dembo, 1994; Henson, 2002).

Self-efficacy scores are related to, among other outcomes, teacher commitment and teacher strategies/practices. Teachers who have lower self-efficacy also have higher levels of stress and are more likely to burn out and leave the profession. Evers, Brouwers, and Tomic (2002) showed that Dutch

teachers' self-efficacy scores were related to their level of burnout. Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007) found the same link in a Norwegian sample.

Self-efficacy is an important component of behavior change. Teachers may not adopt new strategies if they have doubts about their abilities for successful implementation and they question their role in shaping student outcomes. Smylie (1988) measured the effectiveness of a professional development program and noted that PTE was one of two factors predicting a change in teacher practice (the other factor was class size). Teachers who assume external factors play a larger role than their own skills may believe that there is not much they can do in a classroom, especially with low-achieving students. This of course strengthens the cycle of low expectations and low student outcomes and further supports low teacher self-efficacy beliefs.

Gibson & Dembo (1984) found that although high and low self-efficacy teachers did not differ in their allocation of class time, high efficacy teachers persisted in leading the students to the correct answer, did more whole group work, kept students on task, and were more positive and responsive to the students. Wolters and Daugherty (2007) found that even after variables such as teacher experience and grades taught were entered into the equation, three self-efficacy measures (regarding discipline, instruction, and engagement) together still explained additional variance in how much a mastery structure was used in a classroom.

These results are not surprising when viewed through the lens of Bandura's self-efficacy model. Bandura (1993) has shown that individuals who are high in self-efficacy are more achievement and mastery-oriented, view failures as due to insufficient effort, and work to change strategies and to perform better to get a more positive outcome. In contrast, those with low self-efficacy attribute failure to inherent low ability and give up rather than trying other venues or learning from mistakes. High self-efficacy is also linked with better goal setting, trying to meet challenges, and experiencing less anxiety when faced with a barrier, as there is trust in one's abilities to overcome obstacles.

Snyder and colleagues define the construct of "hope" as self-perceptions regarding the capacities to 1) conceptualize goals, 2) develop strategies to reach these goals, and 3) maintain motivation for using these strategies. Like Bandura's model, Hope theory incorporates goals and individuals' perception of their capacity to achieve these goals, and also includes an awareness of using appropriate strategies and continuous effort (Snyder, Lopez, Shorey, Rand, & Feldman, 2003). Hope theory defines self-efficacy by including not only the confidence in one's capabilities but also the availability of strategies and motivation to accomplish specific goals.

For preservice teachers, the level of specific preparation and knowledge is likely to relate to their self-efficacy about teaching. Indeed Darling-Hammond, Chung, and Frelow (2002) noted that overall perceived preparedness of in-service teachers was significantly correlated with their confidence in their abilities to handle discipline issues, to reach all students, and to make a difference in students' lives, even after factors such as age, experience, grade level taught, and race were entered into the equation.

Smylie (1988) reported that the confidence of preservice teachers about their teaching methodology and skills was the main factor relating to their self-efficacy, again highlighting the importance of their perceived preparedness. To determine teacher self-efficacy, Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007) used 6 subscales focusing on specific strategies and competencies (instruction, adapting education to individual students' needs, motivating students, keeping discipline, cooperating with colleagues and parents, and coping with changes and challenges).

It is important to study self-efficacy levels of preservice teachers because teachers' personal efficacies remain stable across the years, and in fact may get worse as they start their professional lives. Woolfolk, Hoy, & Spero (2005) followed prospective teachers from the beginning of their preparation to the end of their first year of teaching. These novice teachers showed a significant drop in their efficacy scores as they experienced the real classrooms. The changes in personal efficacy scores were correlated with the perceived support in the school environment. (This in turn was related to school socio-economic status (SES) and how difficult the teaching assignment was perceived by new teachers.) Considering that ELL students are mostly in lower SES schools and urban environments, which are more difficult teaching contexts, self-efficacy of novice teachers becomes an important variable to consider, especially given the fact that teacher self-efficacy is related to student outcomes.

However, there is domain specificity in self-efficacy. For example, self-efficacy specific to math is a better predictor of students' math performance than a global academic self concept or confidence in overall academic abilities (Lent, Brown, & Gore, 1997). Raudenbush, Rowan, and Cheong (1992) found that variation in self-efficacy levels *within* a teacher depended on the class, subject matter, student body characteristics, and how well prepared a teacher felt. Thus, specific questions regarding the classroom contexts and the students illustrate a teacher's self-efficacy better. This also relates to the Hope theory, which includes specific strategies affecting hope or confidence in oneself to accomplish one's goals.

In our two studies assessing self-efficacy, we asked preservice teachers questions about classroom contexts

and strategies, since preservice teachers' efficacy may strongly relate to managing and motivating students (Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990).   In every question, we specifically asked about ELL students since even experienced teachers who have high teaching self-efficacy show moderate levels of self-efficacy when asked about ELL students (Karabenick & Clemens Noda, 2004).

We also included questions assessing attitudes towards parents and the presence of ELLs in mainstream classrooms. Because attitudes and behaviors are related, one can predict that more negative attitudes are related to lower levels of preparedness and self-efficacy. If preservice teachers have low self-efficacy regarding ELL students, they may attribute the low achievement of students to factors outside of a teachers' control, particularly an unfavorable impact of parents and home environments.

However, verbal reports of self- efficacy may over or underestimate what a teacher actually accomplishes. In our first study, to support the teachers' self reports of efficacy and preparedness, we assessed their knowledge regarding ELL students.   In the second study, we supported the self-reports with actual classroom observations.

Study 1

In this study, preservice teachers completed a survey and a knowledge test. We predicted that their perceived level of preparedness regarding ELLs would be positively correlated with both self-efficacy and actual knowledge.   We also predicted that better prepared preservice teachers would have more positive attitudes towards ELLs as well as their parents.

Method

Participants

Participants were 62 preservice teachers in a medium-sized Midwestern university in the USA. The participants had at least 180 hours of classroom experience, had successfully completed two required courses, Human Diversity and Teaching American Indian Students, and had fulfilled the Diversity Immersion Experience Requirement of 60 volunteer hours in a diverse classroom setting

Tasks and Procedure

Prior to the observations, preservice teachers completed a survey on their attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge of ELL issues. The survey was distributed to participants during their methods course. The participants completed a test asking about their

perceptions regarding how they will teach ELL students. Twenty-seven questions pertaining to the students' attitudes, beliefs, and self-efficacy were presented in random order within the survey based on a survey by Darling-Hammond et al. (2002). Questions focusing on the students' attitudes included statements such as: "ELL students in the general education classroom setting slows down the progress of the other students in the class;" "Inclusion of ELL students in general education classes is good in theory, but does not work in the real world;" and "If I try hard, I can get through to most of the ELL students." Questions focusing on the students' beliefs included statements such as: " I am prepared to tailor instructional and other services to the needs to ELL students;" "I have received adequate training to be specifically prepared to tailor instructional and other services to the needs of ELL students;" "I possess a clear understanding of the language demands of the content area that I will teach;" "I am confident in my ability to teach all ELL students to high levels;" and "I am confident of my skills to provide alternative/performance assessments to ELL students." Questions focusing on the students' self-efficacy included statements such as: "I am knowledgeable of teaching practices that are attuned to students' language proficiencies and cognitive levels;" "I am knowledgeable of alternate ways of giving feedback;" and "I am knowledgeable of teaching practices that are culturally supportive and relevant." The survey included ratings of their level of confidence in teaching ELLs, methods about how they would teach them, and general knowledge and attitudes towards ELLs. The rating scale on the survey ranged from a score of 1 = strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neutral, 4 = agree, to 5 = strongly agree. The survey also included open-ended questions that focused on terminology and concepts of ELL education to further assess the students' knowledge of teaching ELL students.

The questions were created to tap into five constructs: (a) self-efficacy regarding ELL students, (b) attitudes towards ELL students in mainstream classrooms,   (c) attitudes towards parents of ELL students, (d) perceived knowledge, and (e) perceived preparation.

The authors of this study scored the surveys independently and then compared the results of each survey. The reliability analyses indicated the "perceived knowledge" construct had an unacceptably low level of reliability, so it was not included in any further analyses. The "Attitudes towards parents" construct had a moderate level of reliability (alpha=.68) so it was included in the analyses but data were interpreted with caution. The remaining three constructs had acceptable levels of reliability. The questions and alpha levels are presented in Table 1.

Table 1
Items on the Teacher Survey

Perceived Preparation (α =.81)
(Higher score indicates more perceived preparedness)
1. I am prepared to tailor instructional and other services to the needs to ELL students
2. I possess a clean understanding of the language demands of the content area that I will teach.
3. I am knowledgeable of teaching strategies and instructional practices for ELL students that are developmentally appropriate.
4. I am knowledgeable of alternate ways of giving feedback.
5. I am knowledgeable of teaching practices that are attuned to students' language proficiencies and cognitive levels
6. I am knowledgeable of teaching practices that are culturally supportive and relevant.

Self-Efficacy (α =83)
(Higher score indicates more perceived self-efficacy)
1. If I try hard, I can get through to most of the ELL students. (RAND-2 item)
2. I am confident in my ability to handle most discipline problems with ELL students.
3. I am confident in my ability to teach all ELL students to high levels.
4. I am confident I am making a difference in the lives of my students.
5. I am uncertain how to teach some of my ELL students. (REVERSE CODED)
6. I feel confident in providing a positive learning environment and create a climate characterized by high expectations.
7. I am confident of my skills to effectively communicate with parents and guardians of ELL students.
8. I am confident of my skills to provide alternative/performance assessments to ELL students.
9. I feel confident in providing linguistically and cultural appropriate learning experiences for ELL students

Attitude Towards ELLs in the Classroom (α =.79)
(Higher score indicates a more negative attitude)
1. ELL students in the general education classroom setting slows down the progress of the other students in the class.
2. Inclusion of ELL students in general education classes is good in theory, but does not work in the real world.

Attitude Towards Parents of ELLs (α=.68)
(Higher score indicates a more negative attitude)
1. Immigrant parents do not try to learn English.
2. In order for ELLs to learn English, their parents should attempt to speak English.

Table 2
The Means and Standard Deviations of Attitude, Perceived Preparedness,
Self-efficacy and Knowledge Scores and the Correlations Among Scores in Study 1

	Attitude- Students	Attitude- Parents	Perceived Preparedness	Self-efficacy	Knowledge
Attitude- Students	1.0	.31*	-.24[a]	-.24	-.24[a]
Attitude- Parents		1.0	-.08	-.03	-.13
Preparedness			1.0	.66*	.32*
Self-efficacy				1.0	.26*
Knowledge					1.0
Mean*	2.25	2.52	3.08	3.23	6.29
Sd	.69	.60	.69	.57	2.83

*scores range from 1-5 for the first 4 measures and 0-26 for the knowledge measure

The second part was a knowledge test. There were 8 terms to define (e.g., immersion, late exit, sheltered instruction…) and five questions. Two questions were about demographics of ELL students to gauge if the preservice teachers were aware of the changing student body in the US and in their state. The remaining three questions were open-ended and focused on assessment and teaching/learning strategies for ELL students in general classrooms. Each question had a score of 2 points possible, with partial credit given.

Results

For each construct on the survey, the ratings were added and divided by the number of questions, hence mean scores ranged from 1-5 for each construct. The means and standard deviations are given at the bottom of Table 2.

The participants had somewhat positive attitudes to ELL students and their parents, 2.25 and 2.52, respectively. The perceived preparedness (3.08) and self-efficacy (3.23) ratings indicated that the students had neutral views about their preparedness and effectiveness regarding ELL students. Although neutral values may be viewed as a fine outcome, we view it more negatively because these participants had completed their teaching education, as well as diversity training, and were now doing their student teaching. Still they did not feel well-prepared to address the needs of ELL students.   Our classroom observations (Study 2) indicated that mentoring teachers were not providing any guidance about isolated ELLs to the

Table 3
The Means (and the Standard Deviations) on the Survey Items and Knowledge
Test for the Four Preservice Teachers (with their Pseudonyms)in Study 2

Teacher	Knowledge (max=26)	Self-efficacy (max=5)	Preparedness (max=5)	Attitude students (max=5)	Attitude parents (max=5)
Teacher1 Marie	4	3.56	3.0	2.0	2.0
Teacher2 Jane	4	2.33	2.5	3.0	2.5
Teacher3 Becky	4	2.78	2.67	1.0	1.5
Teacher4 Laura	8	3.89	3.5	1.0	2.0

student teachers. In short, participants were not well prepared, and their student teaching was not adding any more to their knowledge about ELL pedagogy. The knowledge test verified this concern. The average score of 6.29 out of 26 possible represents only 25% accuracy on the knowledge test.

As seen in Table 2, the four factors were correlated with each other to see their interrelationships. As expected, there was a strong correlation between sense of preparedness and self-efficacy. Students who believed they are well-prepared had higher levels of self-efficacy ($r = .66$). Previous research has highlighted the importance of preparation in self-efficacy, and we found similar patterns within the particular context of ELL teachers. The sense of preparedness could be verified by the actual knowledge test. Individuals who felt better prepared scored higher on the knowledge test ($r = .32$).

The attitudes towards parents construct did not correlate with the other constructs (except for attitudes towards students), possibly because of its lower reliability. Attitudes towards ELL students in general classrooms were marginally related to both the sense of preparedness and knowledge. Those with lower knowledge scores had more negative attitudes; likewise, those who felt less prepared had more negative attitudes.

In a multiple regression analysis, preparedness, self-efficacy, and attitudes towards ELL students were entered into the equation to predict the knowledge score. Perceived preparedness was the only significant variable (beta = .321), explaining 10% of the knowledge test performance. In another analysis, preparedness and attitudes towards ELL students were entered into the equation to predict the self-efficacy score. Again, perceived preparedness was the only significant predictor (beta =.663), explaining 44% of the variance in self-efficacy scores.

Study 2

In this study, we verified the self reported efficacy and preparedness scores with a qualitative, in-depth observation of four preservice teachers (who were part of Study 1) during their student teaching in high

schools. We randomly selected preservice teachers who had isolated ELLs in their classrooms and who were in a high school because currently there is a paucity of research regarding ELLs, especially isolated ELLs, in high schools (Coulter & Smith, 2006).

Methods

The observations evaluated each teacher's use of additional resources, classroom activity alterations, and personal modifications elicited to aide the ELL students. Detailed notes were taken about the lesson and what the preservice teacher did throughout observation periods. In addition, a 61-item observation checklist was used to more specifically document use (or non-use) of the types of general teaching strategies, content delivery methods, assessment procedures, and language strategies incorporated in the lesson. Concepts such as cooperative learning activities, use of graphic organizers, and comprehension questioning strategies were on the checklist. Each preservice teacher was observed twice by the second author. One teacher (Marie) was observed in two separate classrooms, thus there were a total of 10 observations.

Results

Table 3 summarizes data from the surveys and knowledge test (discussed in Study 1) specifically for the four preservice teachers who were observed. All four participants had relatively positive attitudes towards the ELLs and their parents. The perceived preparedness and self-efficacy ratings were low. This was supported by low levels of performance on the knowledge test (about 15% correct for three participants and 30% for the fourth participant).

Across 10 observations, three themes became apparent: (a) Neglect; (b) Peer support; (c) No mentoring by supervising teachers. Neglect refers to implicit understanding between the teacher and the ELL student to leave each other alone. Preservice teachers did not interact with ELL students and ELL students did not call attention to themselves. However, peers provided some support and help to ELL students. While this non-interaction between preservice teachers

and ELL students was occurring, there was no guidance from the mentoring teacher. Below are specific examples from each of the five classrooms illustrating these themes:

Teacher 1: Marie (First Classroom)

Marie had 26 students in the 11th grade Language Arts class. Within this class was one student (Haru) who spoke fluent Japanese and limited English. He received pull out services from the ESL teacher to build his vocabulary, but this instruction was different from the Language Arts class curriculum.

During the observation, the class read a short story in small groups of five students. Students were to answer two discussion questions and underline important parts of the story. Haru did not seem to understand the directions and copied the questions from a student sitting next to him. Haru was able to read his section aloud, but spoke very quietly and read very slowly, making 4 decoding mistakes of vocabulary words (these words were not included in his vocabulary instruction). As students read through the story, everyone except Haru underlined important parts of the story. During small group instruction, Haru remained quiet and copied answers from another student. The student he was copying from neither seemed to mind nor to acknowledge this activity. Whole class discussion to clarify symbolism took place. Throughout this activity, Haru stared into space and finally put his head down on the desk and did not participate.

During the second observation, Haru was late to class and without his homework. He spent several minutes looking for the story, which he never found. He missed the directions to answer comprehension questions and copied the answers from another student. Once he was finished copying answers, he put his head down on his desk and went to sleep for the remainder of the class period.

Marie told the entire class to form groups and to read the story aloud, underline certain parts of the story that seemed relevant, and discuss its main points. Comprehension questions were also provided orally, and directions were repeated 4-5 times. During whole class discussion activities, Marie remained at the front of the class standing behind a podium. The mentoring teacher remained in the classroom and would make comments of the story to relate to students' real-life situations.

After class, the researcher met with Marie and asked her if she thought Haru understood the story and the symbolism. She thought he was following along fine and seemed to understand the main idea, but she was not sure if he understood symbolism due to translation difficulties in his native language. When asked about his participation, she said many of the students do not openly express their ideas, but she can tell if they are engaged or not.

Teacher 1: Marie (Second Classroom)

In Marie's second Language Arts class there were 18 students in 11th grade. There was one student from Serbia (Benjamin) who spoke fluent Serbian and was reported to be fairly fluent in English. Marie said she used a special vocabulary list acquired from the ESL teacher as described in Case Study 1, but Benjamin did not receive pull out services.

This class had the same activities as the class discussed before. Benjamin was staring off into space and was not paying attention when the directions were given. He looked at another student's paper but did not copy the questions. He did not know which group to get into. After a couple of minutes of confusion, a student pulled him into his group. His group chose to read the short story silently. It did not appear that Benjamin was reading the story; he just sat and stared at the paper. After silent reading, the group had minimal discussion of the main idea, they did not discuss the symbolism of the story, nor did they write anything down on paper. Benjamin did not participate at all during this discussion time. Benjamin had his head down on the desk for several minutes while the teacher was talking. At one point he started talking to another student-clearly not about the story because they were laughing and whispering to each other.

The next class session, Benjamin could not find his story after several minutes of searching his backpack. He put his head down on his desk and shut his eyes for 10 minutes. A student who sat next to Benjamin showed him his answers and Benjamin copied them onto a sheet of paper. No discussion took place with the other student, who did not seem to mind his answers being copied. After Benjamin copied the answers onto his paper, he put his head down on his desk and fell asleep until the class bell rang.

After class Marie told the researcher that she was disappointed with the students' lack of understanding the concept of symbolism and with the lack of participation during whole-class discussion. She did not seem disappointed in Benjamin's lack of participation; she said he is always quiet and she thinks that is cultural. When asked if she noticed that he did not have his story at the beginning of class, she said he always loses his assignments and she was tired of always giving him extra copies.

Teacher 2: Jane

Jane was teaching 26 12th graders in the Language Arts classroom. Within this class there was one ELL student (Amy) who is both German and Japanese. She

was raised in Japan and spoke fluent Japanese; she did not speak German, and her English was comprehensible at a basic level. This particular class was a requirement for seniors who have not performed well in previous Language Arts classes, so there was a wide range of ability levels.

The routine for this class included 15 minutes of silent reading each day, followed by a quiz that covered the previous day's reading assignment from the literature book. Jane presented directions to the class orally, and provided wait time for students to respond before starting the next activity. During the quiz, Jane read five questions, one at a time, and waited for students to write their answers. Jane reviewed the answers orally to the whole class. As Jane provided the answers to the quiz, each student graded their own work. After she provided a synopsis of the novel students were reading, she had a whole class discussion of the main parts of the book. She asked several questions but did not call on specific students to answer. Generally, the same 3-4 students answered. This was followed by a video clip about war. On the next day, there was again silent reading and a quiz, but instead of the video, students worked independently on an art project.

Amy sat quietly and read her book during silent reading. After the quiz was completed, Amy asked Jane what the word "loan" on the quiz meant. Jane verbally tried to explain the concept to her, but Amy still did not understand. Then Jane tried to demonstrate the words "borrow" and "lend" with her pencil by handing it to Amy, but Amy still did not understand. Amy got a 4 out of 5 on the quiz correct. (She had left blank the question having to do with the concept of "loan.") The researcher did not notice Amy interacting with any students during down time in the class or during class discussions.

During the second observation, Amy got 2 out of 5 questions correct on her quiz. After the quiz, students completed their art projects that focused on a part of the literature book. Amy worked alone but was actively engaged in this assignment. She did not speak to any other students during this time, while other students became increasingly vocal.

Jane reported that Amy did not participate in large group discussions. She apparently participated more in smaller groups; however, small group activities were hard to do in such a large class. Jane reported that Amy was very artistic, so they provided many opportunities to do art projects that relate to literature in this class.

Teacher 3: Becky

Becky was teaching 25 students in an 11th grade Language Arts classroom. Within this classroom there was one ELL student from Japan (Akio) who, according to the teacher, spoke fluent English.

The mentoring teacher introduced concept of proverbs by reading the beginnings of different phrases and having students guess the endings (e.g., "An ounce of…."). The mentoring teacher then conducted a question and answer session on how to write a thesis statement and supporting details. Students exchanged papers for peer editing. When the students got a little loud, he played classical music and told the students that he would have to resort to changing diapers.

Throughout the entire class time, as other students asked questions, Akio filled out a form that was not related to class. When students exchanged papers with a partner for peer editing, Akio continued to fill out his form and did not exchange papers. When Becky asked to see his paper to check off the assignment, he just shrugged his shoulders and indicated he was not finished. Then, Akio spent several minutes helping another student on a math assignment; both students did not complete their writing assignments. At one point, Akio left his desk and crouched by a boy he was helping with math to better explain the problems. He kept going back and forth between editing his paper and helping his classmate with math.

Becky tried to walk around the crowded room and to keep students focused on their writing assignment. The mentoring teacher sat at the desk in front of class and met with students who voluntarily wanted help.

During the second observation, class was held in the computer lab. The teachers only assisted those students who requested help on their writing assignment. These teachers seemed to ignore at least half of the students who were also in the computer lab but were engaged on computers with activities other than the writing assignment.

After class, the researcher spoke with both teachers about Akio. The mentoring teacher said the English department "does not know what to do with this student;" he has always received A's and B's because teachers pass him up and do not know how to grade him. He earned a C last semester. They thought Akio was a hard working student. Akio was going to a small liberal arts college the next year and the teachers were concerned about his writing. They had been in contact with a local university's ESL teachers to get some ideas for accommodations. Suggested accommodations included: breaking writing assignments into small segments, teacher provides initial editing and feedback, and student write second draft with edits.

Teacher 4: Laura

Laura was teaching 30 students in 10th and 11th grade Algebra 2. In this classroom there was one ELL student from Japan (Daichi) who spoke limited English. Daichi had an ESL teacher also from Japan who worked with him in class.

At the beginning of class, Laura reviewed the answers to the previous math test. After the review, instruction on the next chapter was presented orally and displayed on the overhead projector. The ESL teacher checked Daichi's work as each problem was discussed. Daichi seemed to follow along without assistance; when he missed a problem, the ESL teacher pointed to it and had him correct his work. During math instruction, when the teacher asked a question, Daichi never responded; he always averted his eyes downward, sat silently, and never answered a question. He spoke with the ESL teacher in Japanese. The ESL teacher also wrote down math information in her notebook. Daichi stopped trying to copy from the board; he tried to listen as the ESL teacher wrote the notes. Then he copied from her notes.

Laura used the overhead projector to display math problems and asked the class what to do first to solve the problem. Laura worked out problems using a talk aloud method for solving the problem. All of the students sat quietly as Laura solved problems on the overhead. Laura orally reviewed what would be on the quiz for the next day, and she provided directions to put information on a note card.

Laura introduced a new section in the math text, and Daichi had trouble finding the correct page in the textbook. Laura continued her instruction as he tried to find the correct page. She put information on the overhead and talked through solving the problem; the pace was very quick. After instruction, time was given to complete homework. Daichi stayed in his seat and worked on his homework.

During the second observation, the class had the same routine as the earlier observation. Daichi had his ESL teacher with him who reviewed his work, checked his problems, and took notes for him. Daichi got lost in taking notes a couple of times, and the ESL teacher got him back on track. Laura did not stop instruction or even notice when students were lost. Students did not raise their hands to ask questions. Again problems requiring multiple steps to solve were put on the overhead. Laura provided talk alouds when she went over the problems but did not ask comprehension questions to any students. The pace of the class was very fast. The ESL teacher was writing and taking notes frantically; she would periodically check Daichi's work to make sure he was following along. Laura did not check any students' notes; she kept going through several problems at a quick pace.

Conclusions

The two studies painted a grim picture at several different levels. First, the pre-service teachers clearly articulated they did not feel prepared to educate the ELL students they would encounter in their mainstream classrooms. Their self-perceptions were verified by their poor responses to knowledge questions. The classroom observations indicated that the preservice teachers treated isolated ELLs with neglect. Across five different classrooms, we observed very little interaction between teachers and their ELL students. ELL students were not disruptive; they worked or acted as if they were working on assignments that were given. During class discussions, teachers did not call on them or interact with them. The teachers interpreted lack of participation as cultural/personal and did not make an effort to pull the student into the discussion. The lack of participation was rationalized by Marie when she stated she did not seem disappointed in Benjamin's lack of participation; she said he is always quiet and she thinks that is cultural. The pattern of neglect relates to self-efficacy. Preservice teachers who do not feel well-prepared to teach ELL students do not seem to know how to engage these students.

Sensitizing pre-service teachers to cultural and linguistic differences they can expect to encounter in their future classrooms is an essential first step. However, it is also necessary to provide preservice teachers with actual tools and strategies, since cultural sensitivities cannot be easily transported to a classroom without those tools (Rodriguez & Sjostrom, 1995).

Second, mentoring teachers did not model any behaviors or themselves interact with the ELL students. This provided the preservice teacher with insufficient mentoring about (isolated) ELLs. Veteran teachers seem to need in-service support regarding ELLs so that they can become better mentors for preservice teachers.

Third, except for one classroom in which there was a tutor, there was no support for ELL students in the classrooms. Although some students were in pullout ESL classes, the ESL and classroom content did not seem to be coordinated. In addition, pullout classes reportedly focused mostly on teaching vocabulary and not on other proficiencies such as comprehending connected text, understanding oral instructions, and writing. A coordinated effort needs to take place between the ESL and regular classroom teachers to and integrate language and content instruction. The acquisition of vocabulary words is only one set of skills necessary for language development. In addition, background knowledge is vital in understanding concepts.

Although we identified several negative results, we did observe some positive teaching strategies that were implemented in the classrooms. Students had the opportunity to share and discuss ideas in small cooperative learning groups. We observed one teacher using the think aloud method (Montgomery, 2001) to model cognitive processes involved in solving math problems. Also, students had the opportunity to choose alternative projects (e.g., art) to demonstrate their knowledge of the literature assignment.

One unexpected positive result was the interaction among peers. Although we did not observe any vigorous or sustained conversations among the ELL students and their peers, peers were the most helpful members in the classroom. The peers, in their own way, accommodated the needs of ELL students and in turn asked for help from ELL students in some instances. To capitalize on the positive interactions with peers, teachers can incorporate peer-tutoring procedures in the classroom setting. Peer tutoring can provide opportunities for monitoring student achievement and providing explicit instruction and feedback (S'aenz, Fuchs and Fuchs, 2005).

For isolated ELLs, their classroom teacher may be their one and only resource. The self-efficacy of the teacher regarding ELLs influences classroom culture and student outcomes. Our data imply that preparing preservice teachers thoroughly to reach ELL students is likely to lead to better knowledge and higher levels of self-efficacy. This in turn can translate into increased teacher commitment and better educational opportunities for ELL students.

References

Arkoudis, S. (2005). Fusing pedagogic horizons: Language and content teaching in the mainstream. *Linguistics and Education, 16*, 173-187.

Bandura, A. (1993) Perceived self efficacy in cognitive development and functioning. *Educational Psychologist, 28*, 117-148.

Bandura, A. (2004). Social cognitive theory for personal and social change by enabling media. In A. Singhal, M. J. Cody, E. M. Rogers, & M. Sabido (Eds.), *Entertainment-education and social change* (pp. 75-96). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Coulter & Smith (2006). English language learners in a comprehensive high school. *Bilingual Research Journal, 30*(2).

Darling-Hammond, L., Chung, R., & Frelow, F. (2002). Variation in teacher preparation. *Journal of Teacher Education, 53*(4), 286-302.

Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A., & Tomic, W. (2002) Burnout and self-efficacy: A study on teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative educational system in the Netherlands. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*(2), 227-244.

Gibson, S., & Dembo, M. H. (1984). Teacher efficacy: A construct validation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*(4), 569-582.

Henson, R. K. (2002). From adolescent angst to adulthood: Substantive implications and measurement dilemmas in the development of teacher efficacy research. *Educational Psychologist, 37*(3), 137-150.

Karabenick, S. A., Clemens Noda, P. A. (2004). Professional development implications of teachers' beliefs and attitudes toward English language learners. *Bilingual Research Journal, 2,* 55-75.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Gore, P. (1997). Discriminant and predictive validity of academic self-concept, academic self-efficacy, and mathematics-specific self-efficacy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 44*(3), 307-315.

Milani, T. M. (2007). Voices of authority in conflict: The making of the expert in a language debate in Sweden. *Linguistics and Education, 18,* 99-120.

Montgomery, W. (2001). Creating culturally responsive, inclusive classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children, March-April,* 4-9.

Raudenbush, S. W., Rowan, B., & Cheong, Y. F. (1992). Contextual effects on the self-perceived efficacy of high school teachers. *Sociology of Education, 65*(2), 150-167.

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

Rodriguez, Y. E., & Sjostrom, B. (1995). Culturally responsive teacher preparation evident in classroom approaches to cultural diversity: A novice and an experienced teacher. *Journal Of Teacher Education, 46*(4), 304-311.

S'aenz, L. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Peer-assisted learning strategies for English language learners with learning disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 71*(3), 231-247.

Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007) Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(3), 611–625.

Smylie, M. A. (1988). The enhancement function of staff development: Organizational and psychological antecedents to individual teacher change. *American Educational Research Journal, 25*(1), 1-30.

Snyder, C. R., Lopez, S. J., Shorey, H. S., Rand, K. L., & Feldman, D. B. (2003). Hope theory, measurements, and applications to school psychology. *School Psychology Quarterly, 18*(2), 122-139.

Spotti, M . (2008). Exploring the construction of immigrant minority pupils' identities in a Flemish classroom. *Linguistics and Education, 19*, 20-36.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, A. W. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 17,* 783-805.

Tschannen-Moran, M., Woolfolk Hoy, A. W., & Hoy, W. K. (1998). Teacher efficacy: Its meaning and measure. *Review of Educational Research, 68*(2), 202-248.

Wolters, C. A., & Daugherty, S. G. (2007). Goal structures and teachers' sense of efficacy: Their relation and association to teaching experience and academic level. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*(1), 181-193.

Woolfolk, A. E., & Hoy, W. K. (1990). Prospective teachers' sense of efficacy and beliefs about control. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 82*(1), 81-91.

Woolfolk Hoy, A. W., & Spero, R. B. (2005). Changes in teacher efficacy during the early years of teaching: A comparison of four measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 21*(4), 343-356.

Yoon, J. S. (2002). Teacher characteristics as predictors of teacher-student relationships: Stress, negative affect, and self-efficacy. *Social Behavior and Personality, 30*(5), 485-493.

Yoon, B. (2008). Uninvited guests: The influence of teachers' roles and pedagogies on the positioning of English language learners in the regular classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 45,* 495-522.

Zehler, A., Fleischman, H., Hopstock, P., Stephenson, T., Pendzick, M., & Sapru, S. (2003) .*Policy report: Summary of findings related to LEP and SPED-LEP students.* Submitted by Development Associates, Inc. to U.S. Department of Education, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement of Limited English Proficient Students.

AYDIN YÜCESAN DURGUNOĞLU, Ph.D. is a Professor of Psychology at the University of Minnesota Duluth. Her research interests are in language and literacy development, especially in bilingual contexts. She also conducts research on adult literacy development and is one of the developers of an adult literacy program in Turkey that has now reached 100 000 people.

TRUDIE HUGHES, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor at the University of Minnesota Duluth (UMD) where she teaches in the secondary education, special education licensure, and special education masters programs. Dr. Hughes has expertise on modification and adaptations for diverse learners across general education content areas. She also coordinates the Autism Certificate Program and the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome Disorder Certificate Programs at UMD.